



## City of Hamilton

# HAMILTON MUNICIPAL HERITAGE COMMITTEE REVISÉ

**Meeting #:** 22-005

**Date:** May 13, 2022

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

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

All electronic meetings can be viewed at:

City's Website:

<https://www.hamilton.ca/council-committee/council-committee-meetings/meetings-and-agendas>

City's YouTube Channel:

<https://www.youtube.com/user/InsideCityofHamilton> or Cable 14

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. April 21, 2022

**5. COMMUNICATIONS**

- 5.1. Correspondence to the Provincial Registrar respecting Heritage Designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act for

289 Dundas Street East, 292 Dundas Street East, 298 Dundas Street East, 1 Main Street North, 134 Main Street South and 8 Margaret Street, Flamborough(City of Hamilton)

Recommendation: Be received

## **6. DELEGATION REQUESTS**

## **7. CONSENT ITEMS**

- 7.1. Heritage Permit Review Sub-Committee Minutes - March 15, 2022

- \*7.2. Inventory and Research Working Group Meeting Notes - March 28, 2022

- \*7.3. Heritage Permit Applications - Delegated Approvals

- \*7.3.a. Heritage Permit Application HP2022-008 Proposed Alteration of Lobby and Rooftop Addition at 127 Hughson Street North (Ward 2), By-law No. 20-217

- \*7.3.b. Heritage Permit Application HP2022-009: Proposed Alteration of the Windows and Trim at 256-258 MacNab Street North (Ward 2), By-law No. 89-176

## **8. STAFF PRESENTATIONS**

- 8.1. Recommendation to Designate 56 York Boulevard, Hamilton (Copley / Commercial Block) Under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (PED22108) (Ward 2)

## **9. PUBLIC HEARINGS / DELEGATIONS**

- 9.1. Lesia Mokrycke, Tropos, respecting an Introduction to the Monument Tree Project

## **10. DISCUSSION ITEMS**

- 10.1. Heritage Permit Application HP2022-007, Under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act, to Permit the Demolition of the Existing Dwelling and Garage, 940 Beach Boulevard, Hamilton (Ward 5) (PED22124)

## **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 (D) – G. Carroll
- (ix) 120 Park Street, North, Hamilton (R) – R. McKee
- (x) 398 Wilson Street East, Ancaster (D) – C. Dimitry
- (xi) Lampman House, 1021 Garner Road East, Ancaster (D) – 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) Former Hanrahan Hotel (former) 80 to 92 Barton Street East (I)– T. Ritchie
- (xvi) Television City, 163 Jackson Street West (D) – J. Brown
- (xvii) 1932 Wing of the Former Mount Hamilton Hospital, 711 Concession Street (R) – G. Carroll
- (xviii) 215 King Street West, Dundas (I) – K. Burke
- (xix) 679 Main Street East, and 85 Holton Street South, Hamilton (Former St. Giles Church) – D. Beland
- (xx) 219 King Street West, Dundas – K. Burke
- (xxi) 216 Hatt Street, Dundas – K. Burke
- (xxii) 537 King Street East, Hamilton – G. Carroll
- (xxiii) Beach Canal Lighthouse and Cottage (D) – R. McKee

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) – C. Dimitry
- (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) Cannon Knitting Mill, 134 Cannon Street East, Hamilton (R) – T. Ritchie
- (xiv) 1 Main Street West, Hamilton (D) – W. Rosart
- (xv) 54 - 56 Hess Street South, Hamilton (R) – J. Brown
- (xvi) 384 Barton Street East, Hamilton – T. Ritchie
- (xvii) 311 Rymal Road East, Hamilton – C. Dimitry
- (xviii) 42 Dartnell Road, Hamilton (Rymal Road Stations Silos) – G. Carroll
- (xix) Knox Presbyterian Church, 23 Melville Street, Dundas – K. Burke
- (xx) 84 York Blvd. (Philpott Church), Hamilton – G. Carroll

13.1.c. Heritage Properties Update (GREEN)

Green = Properties whose status is stable)

- (i) Auchmar, 88 Fennell Avenue West, Hamilton (D) – R. McKee
- (ii) Former Post Office, 104 King Street West, Dundas (R) – K. Burke
- (iii) Rastrick House, 46 Forest Avenue, Hamilton – G. Carroll
- (iv) 125 King Street East, Hamilton (R) – T. Ritchie

13.1.d. Heritage Properties Update (BLACK)

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

(i) 442, 450 and 452 Wilson Street East, Ancaster – C. Dimitry

14. PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

15. ADJOURNMENT



# Hamilton

## HAMILTON MUNICIPAL HERITAGE COMMITTEE

Minutes 22-004

9:30 a.m.

T, April 21, 2022

Due to COVID-19 and the closure of City Hall, this meeting was held virtually

---

<b>Present:</b>	A. Denham-Robinson (Chair), K. Burke, G. Carroll, C. Dimitry (Vice-Chair), L. Lunsted, R. McKee and T. Ritchie
<b>Absent with Regrets:</b>	Councillor M. Pearson – City Business, J. Brown D. Beland, W. Rosart
<b>Also Present:</b>	Miranda Brunton, Infrastructure Ontario Frank Dieterman, Infrastructure Ontario Amita Patkar, Infrastructure Ontario Pranav Sidhwani, Infrastructure Ontario Jane Burgess, Stevens Burgess Architects Ltd. Arnab Ghosh, Stevens Burgess Architects Ltd.

---

### FOR INFORMATION:

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

The Clerk advised the Committee that there were no changes to the agenda.

**(Burke/Lunsted)**

That the agenda for April 21, 2022, be approved, as presented.

**CARRIED**

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

No declarations of interest were made.

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

**(i) April 1, 2022 (Item 4.1)**

**(Ritchie/Lunsted)**

That the Minutes of the April 1, 2022 meeting of the Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee be approved, as amended.

**CARRIED**

**(d) DELEGATION REQUEST (Item 6)**

- (i) **Marc Bader, respecting Support for the Ancaster Highschool Grounds (for a future meeting) (Item 6.1)**

**(Ritchie/Dimitry)**

That the Delegation Request from Marc Bader, respecting Support for the Ancaster Highschool Grounds be approved, for a future meeting.

**CARRIED**

**(e) STAFF PRESENTATION (Item 8)**

- (i) **Former Hamilton Psychiatric Lands – Cultural Heritage Presentation and Engagement (Item 8.1)**

Miranda Brunton, Infrastructure Ontario, introduced Jane Burgess of Stevens Burgess Architects Ltd.

Jane Burgess gave an overview of their report regarding the Former Hamilton Psychiatric Lands.

**(McKee/Lunsted)**

That the Presentation respecting Former Hamilton Psychiatric Lands – Cultural Heritage Presentation and Engagement, be received.

**CARRIED**

**(McKee/Burke)**

That staff be directed to explore the upgrade of the 1997 Heritage Designation of Century Manor to the current version of the Ontario Heritage Act and to include parts of the Former Hamilton Psychiatric Lands.

**CARRIED**

**(Dimitry/Ritchie)**

That staff be directed to request for status updates on status of Century Manor, from Infrastructure Ontario.

**CARRIED**

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

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

**(Ritchie/Carroll)**

That the following updates, be 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
- (viii) Long and Bisby Building, 828 Sanatorium Road (D) – G. Carroll
- (ix) 120 Park Street, North, Hamilton (R) – R. McKee
- (x) 398 Wilson Street East, Ancaster (D) – C. Dimitry
- (xi) Lampman House, 1021 Garner Road East, Ancaster (D) – 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) Former Hanrahan Hotel (former) 80 to 92 Barton Street East (I)– T. Ritchie
- (xvi) Television City, 163 Jackson Street West (D) – J. Brown
- (xvii) 1932 Wing of the Former Mount Hamilton Hospital, 711 Concession Street (R) – G. Carroll
- (xviii) 215 King Street West, Dundas (I) – K. Burke
- (xix) 679 Main Street East, and 85 Holton Street South, Hamilton (Former St. Giles Church) – D. Beland
- (xx) 219 King Street West, Dundas – K. Burke
- (xxi) 216 Hatt Street, Dundas – K. Burke
- (xxii) 537 King Street East, Hamilton – G. Carroll
- (xxiii) Beach Canal Lighthouse and Cottage (D) – R. McKee

**(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) – C. Dimitry
- (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) Cannon Knitting Mill, 134 Cannon Street East, Hamilton (R) – T. Ritchie
- (xiv) 1 Main Street West, Hamilton (D) – W. Rosart
- (xv) 54 - 56 Hess Street South, Hamilton (R) – J. Brown
- (xvi) 384 Barton Street East, Hamilton – T. Ritchie
- (xvii) 311 Rymal Road East, Hamilton – C. Dimitry
- (xviii) 42 Dartnell Road, Hamilton (Rymal Road Stations Silos) – G. Carroll
- (xix) Knox Presbyterian Church, 23 Melville Street, Dundas – K. Burke
- (xx) 84 York Blvd. (Philpott Church), Hamilton – G. Carroll

**(c) Heritage Properties Update (GREEN):**

**(Green = Properties whose status is stable)**

- (i) Auchmar, 88 Fennell Avenue West, Hamilton (D) – R. McKee
- (ii) Former Post Office, 104 King Street West, Dundas (R) – K. Burke
- (iii) Rastrick House, 46 Forest Avenue, Hamilton – G. Carroll
- (iv) 125 King Street East, Hamilton (R) – T. Ritchie

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

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

- (i) 442, 450 and 452 Wilson Street East, Ancaster – C. Dimitry

**(g) ADJOURNMENT (Item 15)**

**(Beland/Carroll)**

That there being no further business, the Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee adjourned at 11:01a.m.

**CARRIED**

Respectfully submitted,

Loren Kolar  
Legislative Coordinator  
Office of the City Clerk

Alissa Denham-Robinson, Chair  
Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee



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. 1291  
Fax: 905-540-5611

Tuesday, April 5, 2022

Ontario Heritage Trust  
Attn: Provincial Heritage Registrar  
10 Adelaide Street East  
Toronto, ON M5C 1J3

Dear Provincial Heritage Registrar:

**Re: Heritage Designation under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* for 289  
Dundas Street East, 292 Dundas Street East, 298 Dundas Street East, 1 Main  
Street North, 134 Main Street South and 8 Margaret Street, Flamborough  
(City of Hamilton)**

---

Attached please find the Notice of Intention to Designate, Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and Description of Heritage Attributes for:

- 289 Dundas Street East, Flamborough (Smith-Carson House)
- 292 Dundas Street East, Flamborough (Maple Lawn)
- 298 Dundas Street East, Flamborough (Former New Connexion Church)
- 1 Main Street North, Flamborough (Royal Coachman / Former Kirk House Hotel)
- 134 Main Street South, Flamborough (Former Wesleyan Methodist Parsonage)
- 8 Margaret Street, Flamborough (Reid House)


The Notice of Intention to Designate has been published in the Hamilton Spectator on April 5, 2022.

Yours truly,

Steve Robichaud, MCIP RPP  
Director of Planning and Chief Planner


AG:CR  
Attach.

cc: Councillor Partridge, Ward 15  
Patrick MacDonald, Solicitor



Hamilton

Ed VanderWindt, Director, Building Division  
Loren Kolar, Legislative Coordinator  
Chloe Richer, Cultural Heritage Planner  
Alissa Golden, Heritage Project Specialist



Hamilton

CITY OF HAMILTON

## Notice of Intention to Designate

The City of Hamilton intends to designate the following properties under Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, as being property of cultural heritage value.

### **289 Dundas Street East, Flamborough (Smith-Carson House)**


The property located at 289 Dundas Street East is comprised of a two-storey brick dwelling believed to have been constructed circa 1885 by the Cummer family, who made significant contributions to the Village of Waterdown's industrial development. The property also has long-standing associations with the Carson family, and their prominent local business of Fred Carson and Sons, and Richard "Dick" Smith, former Reeve of Waterdown. The design of the building is influenced by the Queen Anne architectural style and demonstrates a high degree of craftsmanship and artistic merit in its detailing, including the decorative wooden bargeboard and treillage, the stone work in the voussoirs and keystones and the dichromatic brickwork. The building's distinctive tower and mature trees on the property help define it as a landmark on Dundas Street East that marks the transition into the historic downtown core of Waterdown.

### **292 Dundas Street East, Flamborough (Maple Lawn)**

The property located at 292 Dundas Street East is comprised of a two-storey brick dwelling believed to have been constructed in 1887, later converted into a commercial building. The property has direct associations with two prominent people significant to Waterdown's history, George Allison (1841-1926), a farmer and local magistrate; and George Harold Greene (1874-1960), the first publisher of the *Waterdown Review*. The former residence is a representative example of a late-nineteenth century farm house influenced by the Gothic Revival and Italianate architectural styles and displays a high degree of craftsmanship and artistic merit demonstrated through the decorative bargeboard and bracket detailing. This local landmark helps mark the transition into the historic core of Waterdown and define the Dundas streetscape.

### **298 Dundas Street East, Flamborough (Former New Connexion Church)**

The property located at 298 Dundas Street East, known as the Former New Connexion Methodist Church and the Maycock House, is comprised of a two-storey stone building originally constructed as a church circa 1859. The heritage value of the property lies in its long-standing association with the Methodist Church. The New Connexion Methodists purchased the property in 1859 and built the church, later using the building as their Sunday School (1874-1882) and then parsonage (1893-1921). The property also has direct associations with prominent Waterdown resident Paul Maycock (1931-2012), a plant ecology professor and former director of the Flamborough Historical Society who dedicated his spare time to researching and writing about the history of



## Hamilton

Waterdown. The property is also an early and unique example of an adaptively re-used mid-nineteenth century building displaying Classical Revival, Ontario Cottage and Gothic Revival influences. The prominent location of the building at the southwest corner of Dundas and Flamboro Streets in the core of Waterdown makes it a local landmark.

### **1 Main Street North, Flamborough (Royal Coachman / Former Kirk House Hotel)**


The property located at 1 Main Street North, formerly known as the Kirk Hotel or the Kirk House and currently known as The Royal Coachman, is comprised of a two-and-a-half storey brick commercial building constructed circa 1889. The historical value of the property lies in its role as a significant gathering place in the Village of Waterdown for over 130 years, its association with the Great Fire of 1922 and its long-standing connection to the Kirk family. The property is also a representative example of a late-nineteenth century commercial building influenced by the Queen Anne Revival and Italianate architectural styles, which displays a high degree of craftsmanship and artistic merit in its decorative wood detailing. Located on the prominent intersection of two historic roads, Main Street North and Dundas Street East, the former Kirk House was connected to early stagecoach routes and provided a place to eat and stay for travellers on their journey. Today, The Royal Coachman restaurant continues to serve as an important landmark and defines the historic character of the Village's commercial core.

### **134 Main Street South, Flamborough (Former Wesleyan Methodist Parsonage)**

The property located at 134 Main Street South, known as the former Wesleyan Methodist Parsonage, is comprised of a one-and-a-half-storey stone building constructed circa 1857. The heritage value of the property lies in its association with the Wesleyan Methodist Church, who originally constructed the building as their parsonage, and with Ada Medlar (born 1868), a founding member of the Waterdown Women's Institute in 1897. The property is also a representative example of a vernacular Ontario Cottage influenced by the Gothic Revival architectural style and has a high degree of craftsmanship demonstrated by the ornate front porch and wooden detailing. The property defines the historic character of Main Street South, located on the prominent southwest corner of Flamboro and Main Streets, and is considered a local landmark.

### **8 Margaret Street, Flamborough (Reid House)**

The property located at 8 Margaret Street, known as the Reid House, is comprised of a two-and-a-half storey wood-frame dwelling constructed circa 1860 with a substantial circa 1910 addition. The historical value of the property lies in its association with the Reid family. John Reid (1854-1912) was a prominent Waterdown builder, who lived in and constructed the circa 1910 addition. His son, William (Will) Reid (1888-1956), was a photographer who created a visual record of life in Waterdown in the early-twentieth century. The property is a unique example of a dwelling believed to have been constructed in two distinct phases: a one-and-a-half storey cross-gabled vernacular farm house constructed circa 1860; and a substantial two-and-a-half storey, hipped roof,



Hamilton

Queen Anne Revival influenced front addition constructed circa 1910. It demonstrates a high degree of craftsmanship and artistic merit demonstrated by the ornate wood detailing in the 1910 addition. The Reid House is a recognizable local landmark that defines the historic character of the area known as Vinegar Hill.

**Additional Information**

Further information respecting this notice of intention to designate properties is available from the City. The Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, Description of Heritage Attributes and supporting Cultural Heritage Assessment for the above properties may be found online via [www.hamilton.ca](http://www.hamilton.ca) or viewed at the Office of the City Clerk, 71 Main Street West, 1st Floor, Hamilton, Ontario, L8P 4Y5, during regular business hours.

Any person may, within 30 days after the date of the publication of this Notice, serve written notice of their objections to the proposed designation of any property herein, together with a statement setting out the reason for the objection and all relevant facts. Such notice of objection shall be served on the City Clerk at the Office of the City Clerk.

Dated at Hamilton, this 5th day of April, 2022.

Andrea Holland  
City Clerk  
Hamilton, Ontario

**CONTACT:** Alissa Golden, Heritage Project Specialist, Phone: (905) 546-2424 ext. 4654, E-mail: [alissa.golden@hamilton.ca](mailto:alissa.golden@hamilton.ca)

**Website: [www.hamilton.ca/heritageplanning](http://www.hamilton.ca/heritageplanning)**





Hamilton

289 Dundas Street East, Flamborough

## **STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST AND DESCRIPTION OF HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES**


### **Description of Property**

The 0.5-acre property at 289 Dundas Street East is comprised of a two-storey single-detached brick building located on the north side of Dundas Street East near the northeast corner of Dundas Street and Hamilton Street in the former Village of Waterdown and the former Township of East Flamborough, within the City of Hamilton.

### **Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest**

The property located at 289 Dundas Street East, known as the Smith-Carson House, is comprised of a two-storey brick dwelling constructed circa 1885. The historical value of the property lies in its association with three prominent families in Waterdown: the Cummer family, the Smith family and the Carson family. Lockman A. Cummer (1827-1907) made significant contributions to the village's industrial development operating every type of mill at most of the mill sites, operating a sawmill and flour mill at Smokey Hollow, and building row houses for mill workers. It is believed that the Cummer family built the dwelling located at 289 Dundas Street East following purchase of the property in 1883 by Flora (Green) Cummer, Lockman's wife. The property is also associated prominent Waterdown resident Richard "Dick" Smith (died 1960). Smith, who owned the property from 1898 until his death, was the Reeve of Waterdown from 1920-1924 and 1932-1943 and ran the largest market garden in the area, located behind Cedar Street north of this residence. The property also has direct association with the Carson family and their significant Waterdown business, Fred Carson & Sons who installed the first waterworks in Waterdown and aided the Department of Defence in paving airport runways during the Second World War. In 1959, Cecil Carson was granted the subject property by the estate of Richard Smith. The property continues to be owned by the Carson family today creating a legacy of over 50 years.

The cultural heritage value of the property also lies in its design value as a representative example of a vernacular dwelling influenced by the Queen Anne architectural style, demonstrated by the: red brick construction; hip roof punctuated by multiple gables, a chimney and a front tower; decorative bargeboard; ornately-decorated, covered front porch; and, use of a variety of materials and textures, including brick, wood and stone. The physical value of the property also lies in its high degree of craftsmanship and artistic merit demonstrated by the wood detailing including the decorative bargeboard and treillage on the front porch, the stone detailing on the voussoirs and keystones, and the dichromatic brickwork.




## Hamilton

The contextual value of the property lies in its contribution to defining the historic character of Dundas Street and the Village of Waterdown. The Smith-Carson House is physically, functionally, visually, and historically linked to its surroundings, located on the north side of Dundas Street near the northeast corner of Dundas Street and Hamilton Street. The property is also a local landmark, with its tower and mature trees marking the transition into the historic downtown core of Waterdown from the modern commercial area to the west.

### **Description of Heritage Attributes**

Key attributes that embody the heritage value of the property include the:

- Four exterior elevations of the two-storey brick building, including its:
  - Rectangular footprint with a truncated hip roof punctuated by projecting bays on the front (south) and side facades, a front tower and chimneys;
  - Two-and-a-half-storey front tower with a:
    - High hip roof clad in cedar shingles with a boxed cornice with decorative brackets, panels and trim, a decorated hooded dormer and an ornate finial;
    - Semi-circular second-storey window with a decorated wood transom and paired flat-headed hung wood windows below; and,
    - A ground floor front entrance with a wood double door with moulded panels and a transom;
  - Projecting high-pitched gables on the south, west and north facades with boxed cornices and decorative bargeboard;
  - Projecting two-storey side (east) bay with a hip roof, projecting eaves, boxed cornice and decorative brackets;
  - Single brick front chimney offset to the west side;
  - Single brick rear chimney on the east side with dichromatic brick and corbelling;
  - Red brick facade laid in Stretcher bond;



## Hamilton

- Broken-course stone foundation with segmentally-shaped basement window openings with brick voussoirs;
  - Semi-circular and segmental window openings featuring dichromatic brickwork, decorated keystones, stone detailing and stone lug and continuous sills;
  - Covered front porch with a wood-shingle clad mansard roof, decorative brackets, treillage, shaped posts and open railing;
  - One-storey, hipped-roof addition on the front southwest corner with grouped flat-headed hung windows with continuous sills; and,
  - One-storey shed-roof wing on the rear northeast corner projecting out from behind the side bay with raised entry door.
- Moderate setback from Dundas Street with grassed front lawn, walkway to the front entrance, and mature deciduous trees.



Hamilton

292 Dundas Street East, Flamborough

## **STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST AND DESCRIPTION OF HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES**

### **Description of Property**

The 0.29-acre property at 292 Dundas Street East is comprised of a two-storey single-detached brick building, situated on the south side of Dundas Street East near the southeast corner of Dundas Street and Hamilton Street in the former Village of Waterdown and the former Township of East Flamborough, within the City of Hamilton.

### **Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest**


The property located at 292 Dundas Street East, known as Maple Lawn, is comprised of a two-storey brick dwelling converted into a commercial building believed to have been constructed in 1887. The historical value of the property lies in its direct association with two locally significant people: George Allison (1841-1926), a farmer and local magistrate; and, George Harold Greene (1874-1960), the first publisher of the Waterdown Review.

The cultural heritage value of the property also lies in its design value as a late-nineteenth century farm house influenced by the Gothic Revival and Italianate architectural styles. The physical value of the property also lies in its high degree of craftsmanship and artistic merit demonstrated through the decorative bargeboard Gothic-influenced high-pitched gables; bay windows with Italianate bracket detailing; and, front entrance with wooden paneled surround, multi-pane transom and flanking sidelights.

The contextual value of the property lies in its role in defining the historic character of Dundas Street and the Village of Waterdown. Maple Lawn is physically, visually and historically linked to its surroundings, located on the south side of Dundas Street East near the southeast corner of Dundas Street and Hamilton Street. The property is also considered a local landmark marking the transition between the commercial area to the west and the historic downtown core to the east, in addition to marking the beginning of collection of former residences converted to commercial use. The "MAPLE LAWN HOUSE 1860" lettering, located on the fascia of the front porch, makes this property recognizable at a glance and indicates its defining role in the community.

### **Description of Heritage Attributes**

Key attributes that embody the heritage value of the property include the:




## Hamilton

- Four exterior elevations of the two-storey brick building, including its:
  - Brick facades;
  - Stone foundation;
  - T-shaped gable roof with:
    - Paired high-pitched projecting gables to the front (north) and side(west);
    - Projecting eaves and verges;
    - Decorative bargeboard under the front gables;
    - One-storey projecting bay windows on the north and east facades including:
      - Hipped roof with plain boxed cornice and decorative brackets; and,
      - Segmental window openings.
  - Semi-elliptical window openings on the second floor of the front facade with brick voussoirs and stone lug sills;
  - Segmental window openings in the first and second storeys with brick voussoirs and stone lug sills;
  - Covered front porch with a hipped roof and projecting eaves;
  - "MAPLE LAWN HOUSE 1860" lettering;
  - Central front entrance with a single, four-panel wooden door including semi-circular upper panels of plain glass and moulded wooden bottom panels, with segmentally shaped three-pane transom, flanking sidelights and paneled door surround;
  - One-and-a-half storey rear wing, including the:
    - Gable roof with projecting eaves;



## Hamilton

- Projecting gables to the east and west with semi-circular windows below the gables;
- Segmentally-shaped window openings in the first storey with brick voussoirs and stone lug sills; and,
- Covered side (east) porch with a hip roof.
- Remaining first-storey portion of the former coach house attached to the rear wing;
- Remaining historic interior features, including:
  - Central staircase leading from the front hallway to the second storey including the wooden newel post, curved wooden railing with balusters on each tread, decorated string and wooden detailing on the side of each tread;
  - Wooden baseboards and door mouldings;
  - Wainscoting in the area past the front hallway staircase;
  - Ceiling mouldings on the first storey; and,
- Moderate setback from Dundas Street with grassed front lawn, walkway to the front entrance and mature trees.



Hamilton

298 Dundas Street East, Flamborough

## **STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST AND DESCRIPTION OF HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES**

### **Description of Property**


The 0.16-acre property at 298 Dundas Street East is comprised of a two-storey single-detached stone building with a one-storey wood-frame rear (south) addition, situated on the southwest corner of Dundas Street East and Flamboro Street near the intersection of Dundas and Main Streets in the Village of Waterdown, in the former Township of East Flamborough, within the City of Hamilton.

### **Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest**

The property located at 298 Dundas Street East, known as the Former New Connexion Methodist Church and the Maycock House, is comprised of a two-storey stone building originally constructed as a church circa 1859. The cultural heritage value of the property lies in its association with the Methodist Church. The New Connexion Methodists purchased the property in 1859 and built the church, before uniting with the Wesleyan Methodist Church in 1874 and subsequently using the building as their Sunday School from 1874 to 1882, and their parsonage from 1893 to 1921. The property is also associated with Eliza Sealey (1856-1929) daughter-in-law of Charles Sealey, prominent businessman and first Reeve of Waterdown, and Paul Maycock (1931-2012), a plant ecology professor and former director of the Flamborough Historical Society who dedicated his spare time to researching and writing about the history of Waterdown, most well-known for his book entitled "Noble of Waterdown". Deborah Jarvis (1837-1915) facilitated the conversion of the building from a church to a residence in 1882.

The cultural heritage value of the property also lies in its design value as an early and unique example of an adaptively re-used mid-nineteenth century building displaying Classical Revival, Ontario Cottage and Gothic Revival influences. Key architectural features include the: cut-stone and rubble-stone facades with cut-stone quoins; gable roof with plain boxed cornice and returning eaves; outlines of the original arched church windows; shuttered lunette; continuous stone course running above the stone foundation; off-centre door on the north façade; steep centre gable with decorative bargeboard and an entrance below on the east façade; flanking brick chimneys; and, segmentally-shaped window openings, stone voussoirs and stone lug sills.

The contextual value of the property lies in its contribution to defining the historic character of Dundas Street and the Village of Waterdown. The Former New Connexion Methodist Church is visually, functionally and historically linked to its surroundings,



## Hamilton


located on the prominent southwest corner of Dundas and Flamboro Streets making it a local landmark.

### **Description of Heritage Attributes**

Key attributes that embody the heritage value of the property include the:

- Four exterior facades of the two-storey stone building, including its:
  - Rectangular footprint;
  - Front-gable roof with a plain boxed cornice and returning eaves;
  - Projecting central gable on east facade with decorative bargeboard;
  - Flanking single-stack brick chimneys;
  - Broken-course, cut-stone facade facing Dundas Street;
  - Broken-course, rubble-stone facades to the east, west and south;
  - Cut-stone quoining on all four corners;
  - Shuttered lunette with stone voussoirs under the north facade gable;
  - Segmentally-shaped window and door openings with stone voussoirs stone lug sills;
  - Central entrance on the east facade comprised of a transom and wooden double-leaf door with flat-headed windows above decorative wooden panels;
  - Off-centre entrance in the north facade in a segmentally-shaped opening with a flat-headed transom and stone voussoirs;
  - Outlines of the original three bays of tall arched church windows on the east and west facades;
  - Rubble-stone foundation with continuous cut stone course running above;
  - One-storey wood-frame south addition clad in board-and-batten with a stone foundation; and,





Hamilton

- Moderate setbacks from Flamboro Street and Dundas Street with a grassed lawns and deciduous trees.



Hamilton

1 Main Street North, Flamborough

## **STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST AND DESCRIPTION OF HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES**

### **Description of Property**


The 0.61-acre property at 1 Main Street North is comprised of a two-and-a-half storey single-detached brick building located on the northwest corner of Main Street North and Dundas Street East in the former Village of Waterdown and the former Township of East Flamborough, within the City of Hamilton.

### **Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest**

The property located at 1 Main Street North, formerly known as the Kirk Hotel or the Kirk House and currently known as The Royal Coachman, is comprised of a two-and-a-half storey brick commercial building constructed circa 1889. The historical value of the property lies in its role as a significant gathering place in the Village of Waterdown, its association with the Great Fire of 1922 and its long-standing connection to the Kirk family.

The subject property has been a significant gathering place in the Village of Waterdown for over 130 years, originally as a hotel and tavern, and later a restaurant. Its location on early stagecoach routes, and its use as a stop on John Prudham's delivery service route, made it an important part of village life at the turn of the nineteenth century. The early establishment of stagecoach routes in the Waterdown area not only brought travelers but also news of outside places that would not otherwise reach the village. The Kirk House's central location made it a notable gathering place for events, including the annual dinner hosted by John Prudham (1850-1920) for his farming customers. The Great Fire of 1922 destroyed a large section of Dundas Street surrounding the Kirk Hotel. The Hamilton Fire Department used the Kirk Hotel as their headquarters while battling the fire, due to its proximity to both the fire and its water source (the former stream behind the hotel). The hotel also served as a temporary hospital during the blaze to treat a firefighter suffering from smoke inhalation.

The property also has direct and long-standing associations with the Kirk family, a well-known and significant family in Waterdown. The Kirk family were hotelkeepers who owned and operated the Kirk House in Waterdown from 1888 to 1966. Patrick Kirk (1843-1894) purchased the property on the corner of Dundas and Main Streets from William Heisse, proprietor of the Right House Hotel, in 1888. With his wife Ellen (1837-1907), Patrick established the Kirk House and operated it until his death in 1894, which was publicized in the Hamilton Evening Times. The hotel was passed on and operated



## Hamilton

by subsequent family members John Henry (1866-1944), John Leo (1897-1947), and Mary (1897-1985) until finally being sold in 1966.


The cultural heritage value of the property also lies in its design value as a late-nineteenth century commercial building influenced by the Queen Anne Revival and Italianate architectural styles. The physical value of the property also lies in its high degree of craftsmanship and artistic merit demonstrated by the wood detailing including the decorative bargeboard, wood pilasters, panelling and trim on the projecting bay, and, decorative wood bracketing.

The contextual value of the property lies in its contribution to defining the historic character the Village of Waterdown. The property is physically, functionally, visually, and historically linked to its surroundings, located close to the street on the northwest corner of prominent intersection of two historic roads, Main Street North and Dundas Street East. Historically, the Kirk House was connected to multiple stagecoach routes established early in Waterdown's history, and the former hotel provided a place to eat and stay for travellers on their journey. The growth of rail and the popularity of the automobile led to the decline in stagecoaches; however, the Kirk House's central location in the village has allowed it to continue to thrive as a restaurant, operating as the Royal Coachman since 1995. The property is a village landmark.

### **Description of Heritage Attributes**


Key attributes that embody the heritage value of the property include the:

- Four exterior elevations of the two-and-a-half-storey brick building, including its:
  - Rectangular footprint;
  - Red brick facade laid in Stretcher bond;
  - Truncated hip roof with chamfered southeast corner, projecting eaves and moulded wood fascia, plain soffit, and decorative wood bracketing below the eaves;
  - Hooded dormers with two-over-two hung wood windows centred on the south and north sides;
  - Segmentally-arched window openings with brick voussoirs and stone lug sills;
  - Remaining hung wood windows;



## Hamilton

- Projecting bay in the second storey of the east facade including:
  - Gable roof with projecting eaves and decorative wooden bargeboard;
  - Half-round transom window;
  - Pair of segmentally-arched window openings;
  - Flanking door openings; and,
  - Wood pilasters, panelling and trim;
- Hipped roof veranda on the east side below the projecting bay running the length of the facade;
- Southeast chamfered corner window configuration in the second storey including three flat-headed window openings and trim;
- Painted Kirk House signs that may remain intact under the hipped-roof verandah;
- Exterior elevations of the two-storey wood-frame, brick-clad rear (west) wing with matching detailing, including low hip roof, wood bracketing under the projecting eaves and segmentally-arched window openings with brick voussoirs and stone lug sills; and,
- Location on the northwest corner of Dundas and Main Streets.



Hamilton

134 Main Street South, Flamborough

## **STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST AND DESCRIPTION OF HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES**

### **Description of Property**

The 0.71-acre property at 134 Main Street South is comprised of a one-and-a-half-storey single-detached stone dwelling located on the west side of Main Street South, south of the terminus of Flamboro Street, in the Village of Waterdown, in the former Township of East Flamborough, within the City of Hamilton.

### **Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest**

The property located at 134 Main Street South, known as the former Wesleyan Methodist Parsonage, is comprised of a one-and-a-half-storey stone building constructed circa 1857. The historical value of the property lies in its association with the Wesleyan Methodist Church. In 1854, Waterdown was chosen as the head of a new Wesleyan Methodist Circuit requiring a home that was central to the minister's route giving him easy access to the villages charged to him. This property was available and was situated on J.K. Griffin's new road, making it an ideal candidate. As a result, the Trustees of the Wesleyan Methodist Church purchased the property in 1857 and a one-and-a-half storey stone parsonage was built. The property is also associated with Ada Medlar (born 1868), who lived in the home from 1895 to 1924 and was a founding member of the Waterdown Women's Institute in 1897.


The cultural heritage value of the property also lies in its design value as a representative example of a vernacular Ontario Cottage influenced by the Gothic Revival architectural style. The physical value of the property also lies in its high degree of craftsmanship demonstrated by the ornate front porch with decorative wooden posts, spindles and bracketing, and the decorative bargeboard in the front gable.

The contextual value of the property lies in its contribution to defining the historic character of Main Street South and the Village of Waterdown. The former Wesleyan Methodist Parsonage is physically, visually, functionally, and historically linked to its surroundings, located on the prominent southwest corner of Flamboro and Main Streets, and is considered a local landmark.

### **Description of Heritage Attributes**


Key attributes that embody the heritage value of the property include the:

- Four exterior elevations of the one-and-a-half-storey stone building, including its:



## Hamilton

- Rectangular footprint;
  - Squared, rubble-stone facades with cut-stone quoins;
  - Gable roof with plain boxed cornice and steep centre gable with decorative bargeboard;
  - Pointed arch wood window below the centre gable;
  - Flat-headed six-over-six wooden sash windows with cut-stone voussoirs and plain stone lug sills;
  - Covered front porch with shaped posts, mansard roof, decorated brackets and wood detailing; and,
  - Central front entrance with rectangular transom and sidelights;
- Moderate setback from Main Street South.



Hamilton

8 Margaret Street, Flamborough

## **STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST AND DESCRIPTION OF HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES**

### **Description of Property**


The 0.41-acre property located at 8 Margaret Street is comprised of a two-and-a-half storey single-detached wood-frame dwelling located on the east side of Margaret Street in the area known as Vinegar Hill in the Village of Waterdown, in the former Township of East Flamborough, within the City of Hamilton.

### **Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest**

The property located at 8 Margaret Street, known as the Reid House, is comprised of a two-and-a-half storey wood-frame dwelling believed to have been constructed in two distinct phases: a one-and-a-half storey cross-gabled vernacular farm house constructed circa 1860; and, a substantial two-and-a-half storey, hipped roof, Queen Anne influenced front addition constructed circa 1910.

The historical value of the property lies in its association with the Reid family and John Vanderweide (1929-2010). John Reid (1854-1912) was a building contractor and carpenter that built a sawmill on the east side of Grindstone Creek, which he operated until 1912. John built a number of prominent homes in the village including the McGregor House (49 Main Street North) and the addition to his childhood home at this property. John Reid's son, William (Will) Reid (1888-1956), was a photographer who created a visual record of life in Waterdown in the early-twentieth century. Without Will's photographs, little would be known about life in Waterdown during his lifetime. The Reid family owned the property from 1855, when William Reid, John's father, purchased it, until it was granted through Clara Reid's will to John Vanderweide in 1966. John Vanderweide (1929-2010) was a trained printer who established his own business called The Printing Korner following his first job at the Waterdown Review. The associative value of the property also lies in its demonstration of the work of well-known local builder John Reid.

The cultural heritage value of the property also lies in its design value as a unique example of a dwelling believed to have been constructed in two phases, including: a one-and-a-half storey cross-gabled vernacular farm house constructed circa 1860; and, a substantial two-and-a-half storey, hipped roof, Queen Anne influenced front addition constructed circa 1910. The physical value of the property also lies in its high degree of craftsmanship and artistic merit, demonstrated by the ornate wood detailing in the front porch, projecting front bay and window trim.



## Hamilton

The contextual value of the property lies in its contribution to defining the historic character of Vinegar Hill and the Village of Waterdown. The Reid House is physically, functionally, visually and historically linked to its surroundings, located on the east side of Margaret Street across from Waterdown Union Cemetery on the east side of Grindstone Creek with prominent views of the home to and from the cemetery. The Reid House is a recognizable local landmark.

### **Description of Heritage Attributes**

Key attributes that embody the heritage value of the property include the:

- Exterior elevations of the two-and-a-half-storey, wood-framed front (western) section with a:
  - Truncated hip roof with projecting eaves, a plain boxed cornice and decorative brackets;
  - Projecting two-and-a-half storey front bay with a pedimented gable, chamfered sides, half-cove wood shingles in the gable and ornately decorated wood trim, detailing and bracketing;
  - Flat-headed window openings with decorated wood trim;
  - Offset single-door front entrance covered by a mansard-roof with decorative bracketing below;
  - Horizontal siding;
- One-and-a-half-storey, wood-framed cross-gabled rear (eastern) section with flat-headed window openings and horizontal siding; and,
- Moderate setback from Margaret Street with a grassed front lawn and mature trees.



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

**Tuesday, March 15, 2022**

**Present:** Melissa Alexander, Karen Burke, Graham Carroll, Diane Dent, Charles Dimitry (Chair), Andy MacLaren, Tim Ritchie (Vice Chair), Stefan Spolnik, Steve Wiegand

**Attending Staff:** Ken Coit, James Croft, Chloe Richer

**Absent with Regrets:** Carol Priamo

Meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Charles Dimitry, at 5:00pm

## **1) Approval of Agenda:**

(Burke/Ritchie)

That the Agenda for March 15, 2022 be approved as presented.

## **2) Approval of Minutes from Previous Meetings:**

(Ritchie/MacLaren)

That the Minutes of February 15, 2022 be approved as presented.

### 3) Heritage Permit Applications

#### a. **HP2021-012: 20 Union Street, Flamborough (Part V) (Revised Submission)**

- Original Scope of work:
  - Construct a 2-storey rear addition to the existing structure with full basement and dormer side (east) dormer
  - Reclad the existing structure with cut stone blocks
  - Replace existing front porch with one identical in size and location with minor aesthetic changes
  - Construct a rear deck and balcony
- Revisions to scope of work:
  - Alteration to facades of the house minimizing the stone and increasing the board and batten
  - Wrapping a stone skirt around the existing house
  - Keeping the stone bump out
  - Adding board and batten to either side of the front stone bump out and wrapping it around the house
  - Additional dormer (two total)
- Reason for work:
  - Home expansion and improvement

Neither the property owners (Evan Koebel and Samantha Peris) nor the agent (Duy Nguyen, N-Cubed Designs) attended the permit review on March 15, 2022.

The Sub-Committee considered the revised application and decided that it was necessary to hear input from the owners or agent before proceeding. The Sub-Committee passed the following motion:

(Ritchie/Alexander)

That the Heritage Permit Review Sub-Committee advises that Heritage Permit application HP2021-012 be deferred until the next meeting on April 19, 2022.

4) **Adjournment:** Meeting was adjourned at 5:15 pm

(Burke/MacLaren)

That the meeting be adjourned.

5) **Next Meeting:** Tuesday, April 19, 2022 from 5:00 – 8:30pm

## Inventory & Research Working Group (IRWG)

### Meeting Notes

March 28, 2022 (6:00pm-8:00pm)  
City of Hamilton WebEx Virtual Meeting

- Present:** Janice Brown (Chair); Rammy Saini (Secretary); Lyn Lunsted; Graham Carroll; Alissa Denham-Robinson; Chuck Dimitry
- Staff Present:** Amber Knowles (Cultural Heritage Planner); Chloe Richer (Cultural Heritage Planner); Stacey Kursikowski (Cultural Heritage Planner); Ken Coit, Manager, Heritage & Urban Design
- Regrets:** Jim Charlton; Brian Kowalesicz; Alissa Golden (Heritage Project Specialist)

### NOTES

#### 1. Chair's Remarks

Welcome to all.

#### 2. Declarations of Interest

None.

#### 3. Review and Approval of Meeting Notes – February 28 and March 18, 2022

Both sets of meeting notes were approved by general consensus.

#### 4. Staff Presentation – Amber Knowles: Copley Building, 56 York Blvd, Designation

Amber gave a presentation on the above property. This property has been protected by a Notice of Intention to Designate (NOID) for 40 years, but the designation by-law was never passed. The draft by-law was written in 1979 and does not meet the value statement and heritage attribute requirements under the current *Ontario Heritage Act*. Staff have moved forward with a Cultural Heritage Assessment report to provide the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value and/or Interest and Heritage Attributes for an updated NOID and designation by-law to replace the expiring NOID. Unlike the 1979 NOID, which only protected a couple of facades of the stone building, this new NOID and designation by-law will allow for more attributes of the two buildings that exist on the property to be protected.

The IRWG discussed the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value and/or Interest and the heritage evaluations from the report and recommends that the report re-address and re-work the statement that the property is not a landmark. Arguing the building is not a landmark because it is not the biggest building on the block is a misunderstanding of how a landmark should be defined. 56 York Blvd is one of the last remaining buildings with that character in the neighbourhood, which arguably makes it a landmark. The statements are also missing key features within the attribute entries. The importance of the courtyard, for example, is mentioned in the document but is not reflected in the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value and/or Interest. The IRWG also feel the interior features deserve another

conversation: are there features, such as some of the cast iron pillars, that remain in good shape and should be noted in the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value and/or Interest? Chuck noted that the opening of the windows could also be reflected in the Statement in order to ensure they are not filled in over time. Lastly, Graham noted there is a factual error on page 25: Rastrick is wrongly credited with the design of the Custom House.

## 5. Staff Presentation – Chloe Richer: 265 Mill St. Waterdown, Cummer House

The IRWG reviewed the Heritage Evaluation and Statement of Significance from the February 2022 Cultural Heritage Assessment (CHIA) on 265 Mill Street South. This is a revised document from a CHIA that was received last year. The property is being reviewed as it requires a zoning by-law amendment to adapt the original house to a Montessori school for pre-school and elementary school-aged children. Staff and the IRWG see no issue with an adaptive reuse of the property, however, they do have some concerns regarding the Heritage Evaluation and Statement of Significance that they reviewed.

The original report outlined how the property met 5 of 9 criteria under Ont. Reg. 9/06, but was given feedback on how some of the criteria was only partially met. The new, revised report has omitted the partial criteria and now only recognizes 2 of the 9 criteria being met, neither of which meets the Design or Physical Value attributes criteria. This property has also been noted as a designation candidate as part of the Waterdown Inventory that was recently completed by staff.

The IRWG was surprised that the report does not recognize any **Design or Physical Value** of the property. It was agreed that the property is representative if not an early example of Georgian style and that it demonstrates a high degree of craftsmanship. The report only mentions the interior staircase with respect to craftsmanship and has excluded other elements, such as the exterior. The IRWG also had some questions regarding where the stone would have been derived as there were two limestone quarries within a short distance of the property, meaning building materials themselves may have come locally.

With regards to **Historical or Associative Value**, the IRWG disagree that the landscape design by Dunington-Grubb is insufficient to demonstrate historical/associative value. Pictures show the landscape and the report itself notes that these were notable Landscape Architects. The IRWG also disagreed with the **Contextual Value** as both the first and third criteria are clearly met: the property is one of the earliest houses in Waterdown (built 1846), especially given its size and the stone construction; and the community itself recognizes the property as a landmark. The IRWG further agreed that some interior attributes are missing, including the crown moulding, ceiling medallions, interior plaster, wainscotting, and baseboards. The IRWG would also like to see a note on the early single-storey addition being retained.

In addition to wanting the above items noted in the CHIA Report, IRWG members are recommending that 265 Mill Street South be added to the staff work plan for heritage designation as the property meets the requirements under regulation 9/06. This recommendation was approved by all members during the meeting and sent to the Heritage Committee's April 1<sup>st</sup> meeting separately as a special recommendation.

## 6. Discussion – Early Designations: Ken Coit and All

Ken Coit gave the IRWG an overview of the work involved for updating the 230+ by-laws

from pre-2002 and the 102. There's arguably a decade's worth of work here, so Ken is hoping to come up with some criteria to help triage the work. To help prioritize the work as requests are made, Ken proposes the following as potential criteria:

- Is owner friendly to designation or want it to be designated?
- Is owner willing to pay for research to get designation? If so, why not support that property?

The IRWG brainstormed the following as additional criteria that could be taken into consideration:

- Is the property under threat (i.e. is there an emergency)?
- Is the property in an area that is under pressure to change?
- Who owns the building (i.e. filter out Municipal properties)?
- Is their public or community interest? This could include council interest.
- Is the building vacant?
- Was there a change to ownership?
- Is there development pressure?

There is a lot of work to do, and it can't be completed immediately so some guidelines will allow us to get through the work in an efficient manner. Ken will take these suggestions to staff as they map out their workflows.

#### **1. Meeting Note Secretary**


A new notetaker is needed for the IRWG as Rammy has stepped down from this role. A potential solution would be to alternate who takes notes each meeting. Janice noted that she will have to step down as Chair if she is ultimately tasked with note-taking (slight aside: I'm sure we won't let that happen...we need Janice!).

#### **2. New Business**

None.

#### **3. Meeting Adjourned: 8:05 PM**

#### **4. Next Meeting: April 25, 2022**



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, 4th Floor, Hamilton, Ontario, L8P 4Y5  
Phone: 905-546-2424, Ext. 1291  
Fax: 905-540-5611

FILE: HP2022-008

May 4, 2022

Christienne Uchiyama  
LHC Heritage Planning and Archaeology Inc.  
837 Princess Street, Suite 400  
Kingston, ON  
K7L 1G8

7.3(a)

**Re: Heritage Permit Application HP2022-008  
Proposed alteration of lobby and rooftop addition at 127 Hughson Street  
North (Ward 2), By-law No. 20-217**

---

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 HP2022-008 is approved for the designated property at 127 Hughson Street North, in accordance with the submitted Heritage Permit Application for the following alterations:

- A one-storey addition on top of the existing building to accommodate a new rooftop restaurant space that will add an additional 4.4 m to the height of the structure;
- Repairs to the entryway door, east elevation; and,
- Reorientation and integration of marble staircase into a new staircase with four additional concrete steps at the base. The existing wood and brass railing in to be integrated or replicated into a code-compliant railing.

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 April 30, 2024. If the alterations are not completed by April

30, 2024, 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) The Applicant to integrate the timber beams back into the lobby space;
- d) The Applicant to work with staff to provide options to integrate the 'F' Firth Brothers logo into the lobby space in a way in which it will be visible; and,
- e) The Applicant to provide design details on the replicated railing in the lobby space.

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 Ontario Land Tribunal 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 Chloe Richer, Cultural Heritage Planner, at 905-546-2424 ext. 7163, or via email at [Chloe.Richer@hamilton.ca](mailto:Chloe.Richer@hamilton.ca).

Yours truly,



Steve Robichaud, MCIP RPP  
Director of Planning and Chief Planner

cc: Chloe Richer, Cultural Heritage Planner  
Chantal Costa, Plan Examination Secretary  
Lisa Low, Administrative Assistant II, Building Division  
Tamara Reid, Supervisor-Operations and Enforcement  
Loren Kolar, Legislative Coordinator  
Councillor Jason Farr (Ward 2)



**HERITAGE PERMIT DELEGATED AUTHORITY REPORT – HP2022-008**

**ADDRESS:** 127 Hughson Street North, Hamilton

**Owner:** Robert Knuth, Ladir Developments Ltd.

**Applicant / Agent:** Christienne Uchiyama, CAHP, LHC Heritage Planning and Archaeology Inc.

**Description of proposed alterations:**

- A one-storey addition on top of the existing building to accommodate a new rooftop restaurant space that will add an additional 4.4 m to the height of the structure;
- Repairs to the entryway door, east elevation; and,
- Reorientation and integration of marble staircase into a new staircase with four additional concrete steps at the base. The existing wood and brass railing is to be integrated or replicated into a code-compliant railing.

**Reasons for proposed alterations:**

- To renovate the existing building to include a rooftop restaurant and reorient the staircase to meet business needs.

**Documentation submitted with Application:**

- 127 Hughson Street North Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment;
- Concept plans; and,
- Context renderings/floor plans.

**Staff assessment:**

Key factors in the evaluation of alterations affecting a heritage building or its setting are the consideration of:

- **“displacement effects”** (those adverse actions that result in the damage, loss or removal of valued heritage features); and,
- **“disruption effects”** (those actions that result in detrimental changes to the setting or character of a heritage feature).

In the consideration of any Heritage Permit Application, staff must assess the impact of the displacement and disruption effects on the heritage resource, particularly in relation to the heritage attributes mentioned in the Designation By-law, in this case By-law No. 20-217.

The Applicant proposes to construct a one-storey addition on top of the existing building to accommodate a new rooftop restaurant space (which will add an additional 4.4 m to the height of the structure), repair the entryway door (east elevation) and to reorient and integrate the marble staircase into a new staircase with four additional concrete steps at

the base. The existing wood and brass railing is to be integrated or replicated into a code-compliant railing.

Moderate “disruption effects” are expected to the heritage context of the property, as the changes to the property are extensive, particularly to the Art Deco aesthetic of the split-level foyer, which will be updated to a more industrial aesthetic. However, key heritage features (the timber beams, the ‘F’ Firth Brothers logo and a replicated railing in the lobby space) will be retained or replicated due to the additional approved conditions recommended by the Heritage Permit Review Sub-committee and staff. Regarding the repairs to the entrance, east elevation, the colour is to remain dark to match the existing wood and brick exterior, glass is to be bevelled to match presumed original glass in the transom and sidelites, and wood that cannot be repaired is to be replicated and replaced.

There will be minimal “displacement effects” to the subject property as a result of this work, as many of the affected heritage features will be preserved in a way that does not cause any damage and maintains the heritage value (e.g., the timber rafters were previously removed from their original context and should be reinstated, and the ‘F’ Firth Brothers logo will be retained though it should be made visible). The existing wooden handrailing will be removed, however, it will be replicated and duplicated to maintain the wood and brass elements while meeting Building Code requirements.

Staff are supportive of the Application as there will be minimal displacement effects though moderate disruption effects. Through the additional conditions, key heritage features of the split-level foyer will be retained and/or reinstated, and the wooden handrailing will be replicated.

**Key dates:**

Sub-committee meeting date: April 19, 2022  
Notice of Complete Application: April 20, 2022

**Sub-committee comments and advice:**

The Sub-committee considered the Application and passed the following motion:

(Ritchie/Priamo)

That the Heritage Permit Review Sub-committee advises that Heritage Permit Application HP2022-008 be approved as submitted, 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/installation of the alterations, in accordance with this approval, shall be completed no later than April 30, 2024. If the alterations are not completed

by April 30, 2024, 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) The Applicant to integrate the timber beams back into the lobby space;
- d) The Applicant to work with city staff to provide options to integrate the 'F' Firth Brothers logo into the lobby space in a way in which it will be visible; and,
- e) The Applicant to provide design details on the replicated railing in the lobby space.

CARRIED

**Final Recommendation:**

That the Applicant be advised that Heritage Permit Application HP2022-008 is approved in accordance with the submitted Application, 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) Implementation/installation of the alterations, in accordance with this approval, shall be completed no later than April 30, 2024. If the alterations are not completed by April 30, 2024, 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) The Applicant to integrate the timber beams back into the lobby space;
- d) The Applicant to work with city staff to provide options to integrate the 'F' Firth Brothers logo into the lobby space in a way in which it will be visible; and,
- e) The Applicant to provide design details on the replicated railing in the lobby space.

**Approval:**

Staff Approval:

*Chloe Richer*

Chloe Richer, MCIP RPP, CAHP  
Cultural Heritage Planner

SPM/MGR Initials

Authorized:



Steve Robichaud, MCIP RPP  
Director of Planning and Chief Planner

<b>Description of Heritage Attributes (By-law No. 20-217)</b>
---

### **Description of Heritage Attributes**


The Cultural Heritage Value or interest of the property resides in the four storey east section of the structure, built in 1929.

Key heritage attributes associated with the split level foyer include:

- The use of marble, brass and wood;
- The marble and pebble tile Firth Brothers 'F' logo at the top of the stairs; and,
- The timber rafters with dentils and decorative supports.

Key heritage exterior attributes of the 1929 east section of the building associated with the façade include:

- Vernacular interpretation of Art Deco style architecture;
- Red brick construction and polychrome brick façade;
- Brick pilasters;
- The multi-panelled windows with operable openings together with the locations, configuration, size, scale, and shape of these window openings which reinforce the industrial character of the building;
- Brick work, including a double herringbone pattern and soldier courses with square-shaped stone insert;
- Decorative and symmetrical use of stone throughout the brickwork, including at the top and bottom of the brick pilasters;
- Flat roof with a pair of decorative parapets with centrally placed stone 'F's';
- Defined main entrance with stone lintel, pilasters, and dentils;
- Decorative brickwork above the main entrance; and,
- Large rectangular transom and sidelights openings found at the front door.



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. 1202  
Fax: 905-540-5611

FILE: HP2022-009

April 26, 2022

Kathy Stacey  
Architectural Solutions Inc.  
224 Hatt Street, Dundas  
ON L9H 2G8

7.3(b)

**Re: Heritage Permit Application HP2022-009:  
Proposed Alteration of the Windows and Trim at 256-258 MacNab Street  
North (Ward 2), By-law No. 89-176**

---

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 HP2022-009 is approved for the designated property at 256-258 MacNab Street North in accordance with the submitted Heritage Permit Application for the following alterations:

- Restoration of wood elements of the front façade – dutchman patches and replication (exact replica) where required – utilizing same species of lumber as currently exists;
- Replacement of non-original storm windows with custom wood two-light arched windows, single pane – constructed using traditional mortise and tenon joinery and linseed oil glazing putty; and,
- Attachment of a scaffold system to the building, with a minimum of two anchors set into the mortar line between the bricks.

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) That the Applicant submit designer specifications for the replacement storm windows prior to the commencement of any alterations to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner; and,

**Re: Heritage Permit Application HP2022-009:  
Proposed alteration of the windows and trim at 256-  
258 MacNab Street North (Ward 2), By-law No. 89-176**

**Page 2 of 2**


- c) Implementation of the alterations, in accordance with this approval, shall be completed no later than April 30, 2025. If the alterations are not completed by April 30, 2025, 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 Ontario Land Tribunal 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 Stacey Kursikowski, Cultural Heritage Planner, at 905-546-2424 ext. 1202, or via email at [Stacey.Kursikowski@hamilton.ca](mailto:Stacey.Kursikowski@hamilton.ca)

Yours truly,



Steve Robichaud, MCIP RPP  
Director of Planning and Chief Planner

cc: Stacey Kursikowski, Cultural Heritage Planner  
Chantal Costa, Plan Examination Secretary  
Bob Nuttall, Acting Manager, Building Inspections  
Tamara Reid, Supervisor-Operations and Enforcement  
Loren Kolar, Legislative Coordinator  
Lisa Kelsey, Legislative Coordinator  
Councillor Jason Farr

**HERITAGE PERMIT DELEGATED AUTHORITY REPORT – HP2022-009**

**ADDRESS:** 256-258 MacNab Street North, Hamilton

**Owner:** Sonja De Pauw-Morgan and David Morgan

**Applicant / Agent:** Kathy Stacey

**Description of proposed alterations:**

- Restoration of wood elements of the front façade – dutchman patches and replication (exact replica) where required – utilizing same species of lumber as currently exists;
- Replacement of non-original storm windows with custom wood two-light arched windows, single pane – constructed using traditional mortise and tenon joinery and linseed oil glazing putty; and,
- Attachment of a scaffold system to the building, with a minimum of two anchors set into the mortar line between the bricks.

**Reasons for proposed alterations:**

- To restore wood elements and windows on the front façade resulting from deterioration and rot.

**Documentation submitted Application:**

- Overview of proposed work;
- Images of areas to be restored; and,
- Photographs of underlying rot and impacted areas.

**Staff assessment:**

Key factors in the evaluation of alterations affecting a heritage building or its setting are the consideration of:

- **“displacement effects”** (those adverse actions that result in the damage, loss or removal of valued heritage features); and,
- **“disruption effects”** (those actions that result in detrimental changes to the setting or character of a heritage feature).

In the consideration of any Heritage Permit Application, staff must assess the impact of the displacement and disruption effects on the heritage resource, particularly in relation

to the heritage attributes mentioned in the Designation By-law, in this case By-law No. 89-176.

The Applicant proposes to restore the wood elements of the front façade (dutchman patches and replication (exact replica) where required – utilizing same species of lumber as currently exists); Replace the non-original storm windows with custom wood two-light arched windows, single pane – constructed using traditional mortise and tenon joinery and linseed oil glazing putty and attach a scaffold system to the building, with a minimum of two anchors set into the mortar line between the bricks.

Minimal “disruption effects” are expected to the heritage context of the property, as the areas of the property being altered include deteriorating wood elements as a result of water infiltration that will be restored or replaced with traditional materials and replicated profiles, which will preserve the heritage features of the property for the future.

There will be minimal “displacement effects” to the subject property as a result of this work, as the heritage attributes of the property will be maintained through the use of traditional craftsmanship, materials and replicated profiles.

Staff are supportive of the Application as there will be minimal disruption and displacement effects. The restoration and replacement of the heritage attributes deteriorated by water infiltration will incorporate traditional craftsmanship and materials to replicate profiles to match existing and remaining to ensure longevity and maintain the designated features of the property.

**Key dates:**

Sub-committee meeting date: April 19, 2022  
Notice of Complete Application: April 11, 2022

**Sub-committee comments and advice:**

The Sub-committee considered the Application and passed the following motion:

(Burke/Carroll)

That the Heritage Permit Review Sub-committee advises that Heritage Permit Application HP2022-009 be approved as submitted, 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) That the Applicant submit designer specifications for the replacement storm windows prior to the commencement of any alterations; and,
- c) Implementation of the alterations, in accordance with this approval, shall be completed no later than April 30, 2025. If the alterations are not completed by April



30, 2025, then this approval expires as of that date and no alterations shall be undertaken without a new approval issued by the City of Hamilton.

CARRIED

**Final Recommendation:**

That the Applicant be advised that Heritage Permit Application HP2022-009 is approved in accordance with the submitted Application, 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 the Applicant submit designer specifications for the replacement storm windows prior to the commencement of any alterations to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner; and,
- c) Implementation of the alterations, in accordance with this approval, shall be completed no later than April 30, 2025. If the alterations are not completed by April 30, 2025, then this approval expires as of that date and no alterations shall be undertaken without a new approval issued by the City of Hamilton.

**Approval:**

Staff Approval:



Stacey Kursikowski, MCIP RPP  
Cultural Heritage Planner

Ken Coit  
Digitally signed by Ken Coit  
Date: 2022.04.26 11:46:55 -0400

MGR Initials

Authorized:



Steve Robichaud, MCIP RPP  
Director of Planning and Chief Planner

**Reasons for Designation (By-law No. 89-176)**

Of particular importance to the preservation of 256-258 MacNab Street North is the street facade, including the carriage entrance, the ornate wooden bays, the dormers, bargeboard, original doorways and windows, and roofs and chimneys (but excluding the later porch additions).



**CITY OF HAMILTON**  
**PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**  
Planning Division

<b>TO:</b>	Chair and Committee Members Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee
<b>COMMITTEE DATE:</b>	May 13, 2022
<b>SUBJECT/REPORT NO:</b>	Recommendation to Designate 56 York Boulevard, Hamilton (Copley / Commercial Block) Under Part IV of the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i> (PED22108) (Ward 2)
<b>WARD(S) AFFECTED:</b>	Ward 2
<b>PREPARED BY:</b>	Ken Coit (905) 546-2424 Ext. 7557
<b>SUBMITTED BY:</b>	Steve Robichaud Director, Planning and Chief Planner Planning and Economic Development Department
<b>SIGNATURE:</b>	

**RECOMMENDATION**

- (a) That City Council withdraw the 1979 Notice of Intention to Designate under Part IV, Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, for the property at 56 York Boulevard, Hamilton (Copley / Commercial Block);
- (b) That City Council state its intention to designate under Part IV, Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, the property at 56 York Boulevard, Hamilton (Copley / Commercial Block) in accordance with the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and Description of Heritage Attributes of 56 York Boulevard, Hamilton, attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED22108;
- (c) That the Clerk be directed to give notice of intention to designate the property at 56 York Boulevard, Hamilton as a property of cultural heritage value or interest in accordance with the requirements of section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* subject to the following:
  - (i) If there are no objections to the designation in accordance with the *Ontario Heritage Act*, City Council directs staff to introduce the necessary by-law to designate 56 York Boulevard, Hamilton to be of cultural heritage value or interest to City Council;

---

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.

OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.

OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.

**SUBJECT: Recommendation to Designate 56 York Boulevard. Hamilton (Coppley / Commercial Block) Under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (PED22108) (Ward 2) - Page 2 of 12**

---

- (ii) If there are objections in accordance with the *Ontario Heritage Act*, City Council directs staff to report back to Council to allow Council to consider the objection and make a decision on whether or not to withdraw the notice of intention to designate the property.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Council approved the designation of 56 York Boulevard, Hamilton, the Coppley / Commercial Block, (see Appendix “A” attached to Report PED22108), under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* and issued a Notice of Intent to Designate (NOID) in 1979. The designation was appealed to the Conservation Review Board, who advised in favour of the designation in 1980. This advice was forwarded to City Council however, the designation by-law did not receive a third reading. The property remains protected under the provisions of the *Ontario Heritage Act* under the 1979 Notice of Intention to Designate.

As part of amendments to the *Ontario Heritage Act* in Bill 108 *More Homes, More Choice Act*, 2019, if the council of the municipality has not, before July 1, 2021, passed a by-law designating the property or withdrawn the notice of intention to designate before that day, the notice of intention to designate the property is deemed to be withdrawn on July 1, 2022.

The draft by-law for 56 York Boulevard under the *Ontario Heritage Act* only provides exterior protection for the stone 1856 building, although there are two historic buildings on site. Additionally, the former Notice of Intention to Designate and draft by-law do not meet the current requirements of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The by-law does not contain a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and Description of Heritage Attributes.

In December 2021, the City of Hamilton Planning Division retained Archaeological Research Associates Ltd. to prepare a comprehensive Cultural Heritage Assessment for 56 York Boulevard, Hamilton (Coppley / Commercial Block). The historical research, evaluation of the significance of the property, and detailed description of the heritage attributes, were finalized by Archaeological Research Associates Ltd. on April 21, 2022. The Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and Description of Heritage Attributes was drafted as part of the Cultural Heritage Assessment and is attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED22108; the draft Notice of Intention to Designate is attached as Appendix “C” to Report PED22108; and the full Cultural Heritage Assessment Report by Archaeological Research Associates Ltd. is attached as Appendix “D” to Report PED22108.

**SUBJECT: Recommendation to Designate 56 York Boulevard. Hamilton (Coppley / Commercial Block) Under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (PED22108) (Ward 2) - Page 3 of 12**

---

The subject property has been evaluated using both the City of Hamilton's Framework for Evaluating the Cultural Heritage Value or Interest of Property for Designation under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, and the Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, as defined in Ontario Regulation 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, in accordance with the Council-approved Designation Process.

It has been determined that 56 York Boulevard, Hamilton, has design / physical value, historical / associative value and contextual value, and meets 10 of the City's 12 criteria and six of nine criteria as defined in Ontario Regulation 9/06. Therefore, staff recommend proceeding with the designation of the property under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, as amended by Bill 108.

**Alternatives for Consideration – See Page 11**

**FINANCIAL – STAFFING – LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Financial: Not applicable.

Staffing: Not applicable.

Legal: The designation process will follow the requirements of the *Ontario Heritage Act* and provide for adequate notice of Council's intention to designate the property. Formal objections may be made under the *Ontario Heritage Act* and considered by Council before either withdrawing the notice of intention to designate or passing a designation by-law. Once a designation by-law has been passed, any further objection would be heard before the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT).

Designation under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* allows the City of Hamilton to recognize a property's cultural heritage value or interest and to conserve and manage the property through the Heritage Permit process enabled under Sections 33 (alterations) and 34 (demolition or removal) of the *Act*.

Where alterations to designated properties are contemplated, a property owner is required to apply for, obtain, and comply with a Heritage Permit, for any alteration that "is likely to affect the property's heritage attributes, as set out in the description of the property's heritage attributes" (Sub-section 33(1)). Designation does not restrict the zoning use of a property, prohibit alterations or additions, or restrict the sale of a property. The City of Hamilton also provides heritage grant and loan programs to assist in the continuing conservation of properties, once they are designated.

As part of amendments to the *Ontario Heritage Act* in Bill 108 *More Homes, More Choice Act*, 2019, if the council of the municipality has not, before July 1, 2021, passed a by-law designating the property or withdrawn the notice of intention to designate before that day, the notice of intention to designate the property is deemed to be withdrawn on July 1, 2022.

## **HISTORICAL BACKGROUND**

56 York Boulevard contains two buildings, a stone commercial building from 1856, known as Coppley, Noyes and Randall, the “Coppley Building” or “Commercial Block”, and a red-brick building from 1911, also used as part of the Coppley clothing company (see Appendix “A” attached to Report PED22108).

Council approved the designation of 56 York Boulevard, Hamilton (known as Coppley, Noyes and Randall, the “Coppley Building” or “Commercial Block”) under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* and issued a Notice of Intent to Designate (NOID) in 1979. The designation was appealed to the Conservation Review Board, who advised in favour of the designation in 1980. This advice was forwarded to City Council however, the designation by-law did not receive a third reading. The property remains protected under the provisions of the *Ontario Heritage Act* under the Notice of Intention to Designate.

The draft 1980 designation by-law (Bill 231/80) limits protection to the following:

1. The York Street and MacNab Street facades of the Commercial Block;
2. So much of the physical structure and land as is necessary for the preservation of the facades including;
  - a. The exterior and interior land bearing walls;
  - b. The land upon which the building is erected; and,
  - c. A ten-foot wide strip of land abutting to the west of the building.

The above text from the draft 1980 by-law only pertains to the stone 1856 building on the site. Additionally, the existing draft by-law does not meet the current requirements of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, as it does not contain a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and Description of Heritage Attributes.

The following is a summary of the chronology of events surrounding the heritage status of the property:

### **Chronology of Events**

#### **April 1978**

LACAC considers recommending designation of the property in light of proposed alterations to the exterior of the building, including sandblasting the masonry.

#### **April 1979**

The Board of Control approved designation of the property on April 4, 1979. Council ratified the decision on April 24, 1979.

#### **June 1979**

The Notice of Intention to Designate was published and sent to the property owners on June 5, 1979.

#### **July 1979**

The property owners submitted an objection to the designation on July 4, 1979.

#### **May 1980**

The owners objection was heard by the Conservation Review Board (CRB) on May 22, 1980. The CRB found that the property should be designated, including the York Boulevard and MacNab Street North façades, as well as much of the physical structure and land as is necessary for the preservation of such façades (interior and exterior load bearing walls, and a strip of land abutting the west side of the building).

#### **August 1980**

The CRB report recommending designation of the property was forwarded to Council for their consideration on August 11, 1980. Owners sent a letter to Council on August 21, 1980, requesting that the by-law be tabled to allow for further discussion, stating concerns over potentially closing down and loss of jobs if the property was designated. The Hamilton and District Labour Council sent a similar letter on August 22, 1980, supporting the owner's concerns. Bill 231/80 (the proposed designation by-law) received its first and second readings by Council on August 26, 1980 and was referred back to the Planning and Development Committee prior to its third and final reading. No further mention of the bill can be found on file and the bill number was not reassigned.

#### **August 1984**

LACAC brought the issue back up and requested that Council pass the by-law. The file notes indicate that the recommendation was tabled and staff were directed to have further discussions with the owner as to their feelings about the designation, citing a

**SUBJECT: Recommendation to Designate 56 York Boulevard. Hamilton (Coppley / Commercial Block) Under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (PED22108) (Ward 2) - Page 6 of 12**

---

Parks and Recreation Committee meeting on August 16, 1984. There is no further correspondence in the file following up on this request.

**November 2013**

Planning staff met with representatives of the property owners to discuss the current status of the property, including the requirement for a Heritage Permit for any alterations to the property and the potential to take advantage of grant and loan programs if the designation by-law is passed by Council. Staff updated HMHC on this matter in a memo dated November 13, 2013.

**September 2014**

Planning staff met with the Ward Councillor and representatives of the property owners to discuss passing the designation by-law to allow for the installation of a designation plaque. The owner indicated they would prefer to keep the status quo and would not like to pursue passing the designation by-law for the property.

**December 2014**

HMHC requested that Planning staff report back with a written update outlining a detailed history of why the designation by-law never received its final reading in 1980 and the alternatives moving forward to address the Notice of Intention to Designate.

**June 2021**

56 York Boulevard acquired by TAS.

**July 2021**

Bill 108 *More Homes, More Choice Act*, 2019 comes into effect. As part of amendments to the *Ontario Heritage Act* from Bill 108, if the council of the municipality has not, before July 1, 2021, passed a by-law designating the property or withdrawn the notice of intention to designate before that day, the notice of intention to designate the property is deemed to be withdrawn on July 1, 2022.

**November 2021**

Planning staff discusses property heritage status with TAS and TAS indicated support of updated heritage designation for 56 York Boulevard.

**December 2021**

The City of Hamilton Planning Division retained Archaeological Research Associates Ltd. to prepare a comprehensive Cultural Heritage Assessment for 56 York Boulevard, Hamilton (Coppley / Commercial Block) containing a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and Description of Heritage Attributes.



## **POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND LEGISLATED REQUIREMENTS**

As part of amendments to the *Ontario Heritage Act* from Bill 108 *More Homes, More Choice Act*, 2019, if the council of the municipality has not, before July 1, 2021, passed a by-law designating the property or withdrawn the notice of intention to designate before that day, the notice of intention to designate the property is deemed to be withdrawn on July 1, 2022.

The draft 1980 designation by-law (Bill 231/80) that has protected 56 York Boulevard under the *Ontario Heritage Act* only provides exterior protection for the stone 1856 building. Additionally, the existing draft by-law does not meet the current requirements of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, as it does not contain a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and Description of Heritage Attributes.

Issuing a new Notice of Intention to Designate (NOID) would open up the proposed designation to appeal, as required under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. If there are objections to the NOID in accordance with the *Ontario Heritage Act*, staff will report back to Council to allow Council to consider the objection and make a decision on whether or not to withdraw the notice of intention to designate the property. If there are no objections to the NOID in accordance with the *Ontario Heritage Act*, staff will introduce the necessary by-law to designate 56 York Boulevard to be of cultural heritage value or interest to City Council. Upon Council passing a designation by-law for 56 York Boulevard under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, any person who objects to the designation by-law may appeal to the OLT within 30 days of the Notice of Passing of the designation by-law. However, by not proceeding, the existing 1979 NOID will be null and void effective on July 1, 2022 and the existing heritage protection for the building will no longer have any legal status.

### **Provincial Policy Statement, 2020:**

Section 2.6 of the Provincial Policy Statement pertains to Cultural Heritage and Archaeology and provides that:

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

The recommendations to designate the subject lands under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* of Report PED22108 are consistent with this policy.

**Urban Hamilton Official Plan:**

Volume 1, Section B.3.4 - Cultural Heritage Resources Policies of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP) include the following:

- “B.3.4.2.1(a) The City of Hamilton shall, in partnership with others where appropriate, protect and conserve the tangible cultural heritage resources of the City, including archaeological resources, built heritage resources, and cultural heritage landscapes for present and future generations.
- B.3.4.2.1(b) The City of Hamilton shall, in partnership with others where appropriate, identify cultural heritage resources through a continuing process of inventory, survey, and evaluation, as a basis for the wise management of these resources.
- B.3.4.2.3 The City may by By-law designate individual and groups of properties of cultural heritage value under Parts IV and V respectively of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, including buildings, properties, cultural heritage landscapes, heritage conservation districts, and heritage roads or road allowances.”

The recommendations to designate the subject lands under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* of Report PED22108 comply with these policies.

**RELEVANT CONSULTATION**

Pursuant to Sub-section 29 (2) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, Council is required to consult with its Heritage Committee respecting designation of property under Sub-section (1) of the Act. Typically, Cultural Heritage Assessments are reviewed by the Inventory and Research Working Group of the HMHC in accordance with the Council approved process attached as Appendix “E” to Report PED22108.

A draft Cultural Heritage Assessment prepared by Archaeological Research Associates Ltd. was presented to the Inventory and Research Working Group of the HMHC at their meeting of March 28, 2022. The Inventory and Research Working Group recommended that staff proceed with the recommendation to designate the subject property under the *Ontario Heritage Act* and provided areas for revision and further exploration within the report which were consistent with those identified by staff. Archaeological Research Associates Ltd. addressed the revisions and submitted a final report dated April 21, 2022 (attached as Appendix “D” to Report PED22108).

Throughout the process, Planning staff have been in regular consultation with the new owners of the site, TAS, who have indicated their overall support for the updated

heritage designation for 56 York Boulevard. TAS's intention to adaptively reuse the structures requires an extensive amount of work throughout the building and to ensure compliance with the requirements of the Building Code. They have expressed concerns with including the wooden floors (where exposed) and the metal fire doors in both the stone and brick buildings, as listed in the list of heritage attributes identified by ARA. TAS noted the floors have suffered a significant amount of damage, are not consistent throughout and will require extension repairs, while the metal fire doors pose issues for meeting today's Building Code. Heritage staff understand and appreciate the concerns expressed by TAS and are of the opinion that the remaining interior heritage attributes, being the wood and cast-iron pillars and vaults with metal doors, maintain the overall sense of a former industrial/manufacturing building. Heritage staff strongly encourage TAS to incorporate the metal fire doors in a fixed position, where possible, to act as a visual representation and commemoration to the original conditions.

## **ANALYSIS AND RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION**

The intent of a designation under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, is to enable a process for the management and conservation of cultural resources. Once a property is designated, the municipality is enabled to manage alterations to the property through the Heritage Permit process and to ensure that the significant features of the property are maintained through the provision of financial assistance programs and the enforcement of Property Standards By-laws.

### **Cultural Heritage Evaluation:**

Designation is guided by the process of cultural heritage evaluation and assessment. The evaluation process, as documented in the Cultural Heritage Assessment, attached as Appendix "D" to Report PED22108, identifies those heritage values associated with the property.

### **Council-Adopted Evaluation Criteria:**

A set of criteria were endorsed by the City of Hamilton's Municipal Heritage Committee on June 19, 2003 and were adopted by Council as The City of Hamilton: Cultural Heritage Evaluation Criteria on October 29, 2008 (Appendix "B" attached to Report PED08211). The criteria are used to identify the cultural heritage values of a property, and to assess their significance. This evaluation assists in determining a property's merit for designation under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, as well as deriving a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and Description of Heritage Attributes.

As identified in the Cultural Heritage Assessment attached as Appendix "D" to Report PED22108, the property was determined to have met 10 of the City's 12 criteria

pertaining to built heritage value.

**Ontario Regulation 9/06: Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest:**

Section 29 (1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act* permits the Council of a municipality to designate property to be of cultural heritage value or interest where property meets the criteria prescribed by provincial regulation. In 2006, the Province issued Ontario Regulation 9/06: Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest. According to Sub-section 1 (2) of Ontario Regulation 9/06, a property may be designated under Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* where it meets one or more of the identified criteria. Ontario Regulation 9/06 identifies criteria in three broad categories: Design/Physical Value, Historical/Associative Value and Contextual Value.

As outlined in the attached Cultural Heritage Assessment (Appendix "D" attached to Report PED22108), the subject property at 56 York Boulevard satisfies six of the nine criteria contained in Ontario Regulation 9/06 in all three categories.

(1) Design/Physical Value:

- (i) Together, the brick and stone building create a representative example of turn-of-the-century industrial/manufacturing building; and,
- (ii) The three-storey plus mansard roof building constructed of limestone displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic value expressed through its hand carved stone finishes with scrollwork, varying arches and vermiculated detailing;

(2) Historical/Associative Value:

- (i) 56 York Boulevard represents the direct associations with the textiles and clothing production theme that was and remains significant to the growth of Hamilton; and,
- (ii) The stone building is associated with Frederick James Rastrick, a prominent Hamilton architect who practised in the area in the 19th century. The brick building is associated with the architect Alfred Wavell Peene, a notable late 19th century and early 20th century architect who practiced extensively in Hamilton and is credited with civic, commercial and residential buildings throughout the city.

**SUBJECT: Recommendation to Designate 56 York Boulevard. Hamilton (Coppley / Commercial Block) Under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (PED22108) (Ward 2) - Page 11 of 12**

---

(3) Contextual Value:

- (i) The three-storey plus mansard stone building is a prominent part of the streetscape aids in defining the historic character of downtown Hamilton. The four-storey brick building supports the evolving character of downtown Hamilton as an early 20th century commercial building placed along 19th century structures; and,
- (ii) Prominently placed at the southwestern and southeastern property boundaries on the northwest corner of the busy intersection of York Boulevard and MacNab Street the three-storey plus mansard limestone building is a preeminent feature of the streetscape that helps communicate the historic nature of the area and is considered a landmark.

**Conclusion:**

Archaeological Research Associates Ltd., have determined that 56 York Boulevard, Hamilton (Coppley / Commercial Block), is of cultural heritage value or interest, sufficient to warrant designation under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Staff concur with the findings of the Cultural Heritage Assessment and recommend designation of 56 York Boulevard, Hamilton (Coppley / Commercial Block), under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* according to the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and the Description of Heritage Attributes, attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED22108 and the draft Notice of Intention to Designate attached as Appendix “C” to Report PED22108.

The Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and the Description of Heritage Attributes aligns with the current requirements for designation under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* and will provide further protection of heritage features on the property than the existing and expiring protection under the 1979 NOID.

**ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION**

Under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, the designation of property is a discretionary activity on the part of Council. Council, after receiving advice from its Municipal Heritage Committee, may consider two alternatives: agree to designate property, or decline to designate property.

**Decline to Designate:**

By declining to designate, the municipality would be unable to provide long-term, legal protection to this significant heritage resource (designation provides protection against

**SUBJECT: Recommendation to Designate 56 York Boulevard. Hamilton (Coppley / Commercial Block) Under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (PED22108) (Ward 2) - Page 12 of 12**

---

inappropriate alterations, new construction and demolition), and would not fulfil the expectations established by existing municipal and provincial policies.

Designation does not restrict the zoning use of property, prohibit alterations and additions, nor does it restrict the sale of a property, or affect its resale value. Staff do not consider declining to designate the property to be an appropriate conservation alternative.

The property can no longer continue to be protected by the current Notice of Intention to Designate which will be deemed to be withdrawn on July 1, 2022, as per the Bill 108 *More Homes, More Choice Act*, 2019, changes to the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

## **ALIGNMENT TO THE 2016 – 2025 STRATEGIC PLAN**

### **Clean and Green**

Hamilton is environmentally sustainable with a healthy balance of natural and urban spaces.

### **Built Environment and Infrastructure**

Hamilton is supported by state-of-the-art infrastructure, transportation options, buildings and public spaces that create a dynamic City.

### **Culture and Diversity**

Hamilton is a thriving, vibrant place for arts, culture, and heritage where diversity and inclusivity are embraced and celebrated.

## **APPENDICES AND SCHEDULES ATTACHED**

Appendix “A” to Report PED22108 - Location Map


Appendix “B” to Report PED22108 - Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and Description of Heritage Attributes

Appendix “C” to Report PED22108 - Notice of Intention to Designate

Appendix “D” to Report PED22108 - Cultural Heritage Assessment Report on Coppley / Commercial Block

Appendix “E” to Report PED22108 - Council-Adopted Heritage Designation Process

KC:sd



## Location Map

PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

File Name/Number: 56 York Blvd	Date: April 7, 2022	
Appendix "A"	Scale: N.T.S	Planner/Technician: AK/NB

**Subject Property**

56 York Boulevard, Hamilton (Ward 2)  
- Copley / Commercial Block

56 York Boulevard, Hamilton

## STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST AND DESCRIPTION OF HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES

### Introduction and Description of Property

56 York Boulevard includes a three-storey plus mansard roof limestone Renaissance Revival commercial building built in two phases in 1856 and 1881. The later 1911 addition of a four-storey building constructed of brick masonry is a representative example of an Edwardian Classicism commercial building.

### Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

**56 York Boulevard (stone portion) is a representative example of the Renaissance Revival style for commercial buildings.** Built in 1856, with a later 1881 addition, it is a good example of this architectural type, expressed through its balanced façade, massing, varying arched window and door openings and stone detailing with oversized keystones and contrasting vermiculated and smooth masonry. The stone building displays both astylar and columnar stylistic influences. However, given that the structure is devoid of obvious Classical orders and detailing, the subject building is best described as an astylar version of Renaissance Revival.

**56 York Boulevard (brick portion) is a representative example of the Edwardian Classicism style for commercial buildings.** Built in 1911 the structure is emblematic of a commercial building designed in the Edwardian Classicism architectural style. This is expressed through the building’s brick construction, massing, fenestration, the use of brick banding along the façade, stone detailing on string courses, sills, and keystones, parapet wall and prominent stone surround on the façade entrance.

**56 York Boulevard (stone portion) displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic value** expressed through its carved stone finishes with scrollwork, varying arched window and door openings, intricate vermiculated detailing and interior courtyard.

**56 York Boulevard represents direct associations with the textiles and clothing production industries that were and remain significant to the growth of Hamilton.** Late 19th and early 20th century growth and development in Hamilton is attributed to its manufacturing prowess, particularly in textile production. As the home to the iconic clothing manufacturer Copley Noyes and Randall, the building at 56 York Boulevard represents an organization that has been significant to the City of Hamilton for nearly 130 years of continuous service as one of the founding pillars of the local fashion industry, preceding the now well-known textile and fabric hub of nearby Ottawa Street. The subject buildings are of the few remaining structures in the City of Hamilton that represent this textile boom.



**56 York Boulevard demonstrates the work of Frederick James Rastrick (stone building) and Alfred Wavell Peene (brick building) who are significant architects.**

Frederick James Rastrick, a prominent Hamilton architect who practised in the area in the 19th century. Rastrick was a key part of the development of the professional association of architects in Ontario. Rastrick served as the vice-president of the Association of Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors of Canada, the first president of the Canadian Institute of Architects and a member of the council of the Ontario Association of Architects in 1889. From 1854 to 1857, Rastrick served as the appointed engineer for the County of Wentworth. Alfred Wavell Peene was a prominent late 19<sup>th</sup> century and early 20th century architect who practiced extensively in Hamilton and is credited with civic, commercial and residential buildings throughout the city.

**56 York Boulevard is important in maintaining the historical character of the area’s mid-19th century development as an economic centre in downtown Hamilton.** While much of the surrounding blocks have been redeveloped, 56 York Boulevard continues to maintain the historic nature of the streetscape. Further, the buildings support the historical character of the City of Hamilton as a textile manufacturing centre for over 130 years. The City’s prowess in textiles is exhibited in the many mills and industrial buildings associated with textile production, some of which remain today, like the Cotton Factory on Sherman Avenue and the subject building.

**56 York Boulevard has contextual significance as a landmark.** Prominently placed at the southwestern and southeastern property boundaries on the northwest corner of the busy intersection of York Boulevard and MacNab Street the three-storey plus mansard limestone building is a preeminent feature of the streetscape that helps communicate the historic nature of the area. The property’s positioning across from a major city centre, the Hamilton Farmer’s Market and Central Branch of the Hamilton Public Library further elevates this property’s streetscape status. For these reasons, the stone building is considered a landmark.

### **Description of Heritage Attributes**

**The stone building at 56 York Boulevard is a representative example of a commercial building constructed in the Renaissance Revival architectural style.**

The property contains the following heritage attributes that reflect these values:

- Three-storey plus mansard roof building constructed of whirlpool limestone;
- Balanced façade;
- Mansard roof dormers;
- Projecting string courses;
- Bracketed stone cornice;
- Varying arched fenestration on the front façade and east elevation;
- Stone frontispiece chimney fronting MacNab Street with scrollwork detailing;
- Interior courtyard and courtyard fenestration; and,
- Vermiculated stone detailing on first storey façade and east elevation.

**The brick building at 56 York Boulevard is a representative example of a commercial building designed in the Edwardian Classicism architectural style.**

The property contains the following heritage attributes that reflect these values:

- Four-storey building constructed of brick masonry;
- Balanced façade;
- Brick banding or channelling on the front façade;
- Parapet Wall;
- Segmentally arched fenestration on the front façade;
- Stone trim and accents around openings; and,
- Oversized decorative architectural elements, including:
  - Façade entrance surround; and,
  - Stone keystones.

**56 York Boulevard displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic value**

through its hand carved stone finishes with scrollwork, varying arches, and intricate vermiculated detailing. The property contains the following attributes that reflect these values:

- Three-storey plus mansard roof building constructed of whirlpool limestone;
- Balanced façade;
- Mansard roof dormers;
- Projecting string courses;
- Bracketed stone cornice;
- Varying arched fenestration;
- Stone frontispiece chimney fronting MacNab Street with scrollwork detailing;
- Interior courtyard and courtyard fenestration; and,
- Vermiculated stone detailing on first storey façade and east elevation.

**56 York Boulevard’s interiors are representative of a turn-of-the-century industrial/manufacturing building.** The property contains the following interior attributes that reflect this value:

- Wood and cast-iron pillars on all floors in both the brick and stone building; in particular, the decorative cast-iron pillars on the first floor of the stone building; and,
- Vaults with metal doors found in both the brick and stone building, some with graffiti dating to the 19th century.

**56 York Boulevard has historical associations related to the growth of the City of Hamilton in the 19th and 20th century** as a manufacturing centre, specifically related to the City’s history related to the development of the textile manufacturing. The property contains the following attributes that reflect these values:

- Copley Noyes and Randall sign; and,
- Prominent location at a main crossroads.

**56 York Boulevard has direct associations with Frederick James Rastrick, a prominent architect** practicing in the City of Hamilton in the 19th century. The property contains the following attributes that reflect this value:

- Three-storey plus mansard roof building constructed of whirlpool limestone;
- Balanced façade
- Mansard roof dormers;
- Projecting string courses;
- Bracketed stone cornice;
- Varying arched fenestration;
- Stone frontispiece chimney fronting MacNab Street with scrollwork detailing;
- Interior courtyard and courtyard fenestration; and,
- Vermiculated stone detailing on first storey façade and east elevation.

**56 York Boulevard has direct associations with Alfred Wavell Peene, a notable local architect** practicing in the City of Hamilton. The property contains the following attributes that reflect this value:

- Four-storey building constructed of brick masonry;
- Balanced façade;
- Brick banding or channeling on the front façade;
- Parapet wall;
- Segmentally arched fenestration on the front façade;
- Stone trim and accents around openings; and,
- Oversized decorative architectural elements, including:
  - Façade entrance surround; and,
  - Stone keystones.

**56 York Boulevard is important in maintaining the historical character of the area’s mid-19th century development** as an economic centre in downtown Hamilton. The property contains the following attributes that reflect this value:

- Three-storey plus mansard roof building constructed of whirlpool limestone;
  - Balanced façade;
  - Mansard roof dormers;
  - Projecting string courses;
  - Bracketed stone cornice;
  - Varying arched fenestration;
  - Stone frontispiece chimney fronting MacNab Street with scrollwork detailing;
  - Interior courtyard and courtyard fenestration;
  - Vermiculated stone detailing on first storey façade and east elevation; and,
  - Copley Noyes and Randall sign.
- Four-storey building constructed of brick masonry;
  - Balanced façade;
  - Brick banding or channelling on the front façade;
  - Parapet Wall;
  - Segmentally arched fenestration on the front façade;

- Stone trim and accents around openings; and,
- Oversized decorative architectural elements, including:
  - Façade entrance surround; and,
  - Stone keystones.
- Prominent location at intersection of MacNab Street and York Boulevard.

**56 York Boulevard has contextual significance as a landmark.** The property contains the following attributes that reflect this value:

- Three-storey plus mansard roof building constructed of whirlpool limestone;
  - Balanced façade;
  - Mansard roof dormers;
  - Projecting string courses;
  - Bracketed stone cornice;
  - Varying arched fenestration;
  - Stone frontispiece chimney fronting MacNab Street with scrollwork detailing;
  - Interior courtyard and courtyard fenestration;
  - Vermiculated stone detailing on first storey façade and east elevation; and,
  - Copley Noyes and Randall sign;
- Prominent location at intersection of MacNab Street and York Boulevard.

CITY OF HAMILTON

## Notice of Intention to Designate

### 56 York Boulevard, Hamilton (Copley / Commercial Block)

The City of Hamilton intends to designate 56 York Boulevard, Hamilton, under Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, as being a property of cultural heritage value.

#### Introduction and Description of Property

56 York Boulevard includes a three-storey plus mansard roof limestone Renaissance Revival commercial building built in two phases in 1856 and 1881. The later 1911 addition of a four-storey building constructed of brick masonry is a representative example of an Edwardian Classicism commercial building.

#### Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

**56 York Boulevard (stone portion) is a representative example of the Renaissance Revival style for commercial buildings.** Built in 1856, with a later 1881 addition, it is a good example of this architectural type, expressed through its balanced façade, massing, varying arched window and door openings and stone detailing with oversized keystones and contrasting vermiculated and smooth masonry. The stone building displays both astylar and columnar stylistic influences. However, given that the structure is devoid of obvious Classical orders and detailing, the subject building is best described as an astylar version of Renaissance Revival.

**56 York Boulevard (brick portion) is a representative example of the Edwardian Classicism style for commercial buildings.** Built in 1911 the structure is emblematic of a commercial building designed in the Edwardian Classicism architectural style. This is expressed through the building’s brick construction, massing, fenestration, the use of brick banding along the façade, stone detailing on string courses, sills, and keystones, parapet wall and prominent stone surround on the façade entrance.

**56 York Boulevard (stone portion) displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic value** expressed through its carved stone finishes with scrollwork, varying arched window and door openings, intricate vermiculated detailing and interior courtyard.

**56 York Boulevard represents direct associations with the textiles and clothing production industries that were and remain significant to the growth of Hamilton.** Late 19th and early 20th century growth and development in Hamilton is attributed to its manufacturing prowess, particularly in textile production. As the home to the iconic clothing manufacturer Copley Noyes and Randall, the building at 56 York Boulevard represents an organization that has been significant to the City of Hamilton for nearly 130 years of continuous service as one of the founding pillars of the local fashion

industry, preceding the now well-known textile and fabric hub of nearby Ottawa Street. The subject buildings are of the few remaining structures in the City of Hamilton that represent this textile boom.

**56 York Boulevard demonstrates the work of Frederick James Rastrick (stone building) and Alfred Wavell Peene (brick building) who are significant architects.**

Frederick James Rastrick, a prominent Hamilton architect who practised in the area in the 19th century. Rastrick was a key part of the development of the professional association of architects in Ontario. Rastrick served as the vice-president of the Association of Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors of Canada, the first president of the Canadian Institute of Architects and a member of the council of the Ontario Association of Architects in 1889. From 1854 to 1857, Rastrick served as the appointed engineer for the County of Wentworth. Alfred Wavell Peene was a prominent late 19<sup>th</sup> century and early 20<sup>th</sup> century architect who practiced extensively in Hamilton and is credited with civic, commercial and residential buildings throughout the city.

**56 York Boulevard is important in maintaining the historical character of the area’s mid 19th century development as an economic centre in downtown Hamilton.** While much of the surrounding blocks have been redeveloped, 56 York Boulevard continues to maintain the historic nature of the streetscape. Further, the buildings support the historical character of the City of Hamilton as a textile manufacturing centre for over 130 years. The City’s prowess in textiles is exhibited in the many mills and industrial buildings associated with textile production, some of which remain today, like the Cotton Factory on Sherman Avenue and the subject building.

**56 York Boulevard has contextual significance as a landmark.** Prominently placed at the southwestern and southeastern property boundaries on the northwest corner of the busy intersection of York Boulevard and MacNab Street the three-storey plus mansard limestone building is a preeminent feature of the streetscape that helps communicate the historic nature of the area. The property’s positioning across from a major city centre, the Hamilton Farmer’s Market and Central Branch of the Hamilton Public Library further elevates this property’s streetscape status. For these reasons, the stone building is considered a landmark

### **Description of Heritage Attributes**

**The stone building at 56 York Boulevard is a representative example of a commercial building constructed in the Renaissance Revival architectural style.**

The property contains the following heritage attributes that reflect these values:

- Three-storey plus mansard roof building constructed of whirlpool limestone;
- Balanced façade;
- Mansard roof dormers;
- Projecting string courses;
- Bracketed stone cornice;
- Varying arched fenestration on the front façade and east elevation;
- Stone frontispiece chimney fronting MacNab Street with scrollwork detailing;
- Interior courtyard and courtyard fenestration; and,

- Vermiculated stone detailing on first storey façade and east elevation.

**The brick building at 56 York Boulevard is a representative example of a commercial building designed in the Edwardian Classicism architectural style.**

The property contains the following heritage attributes that reflect these values:

- Four-storey building constructed of brick masonry;
- Balanced façade;
- Brick banding or channelling on the front façade;
- Parapet Wall;
- Segmentally arched fenestration on the front façade;
- Stone trim and accents around openings; and,
- Oversized decorative architectural elements, including:
  - Façade entrance surround; and,
  - Stone keystones.

**56 York Boulevard displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic value** through its hand carved stone finishes with scrollwork, varying arches, and intricate vermiculated detailing. The property contains the following attributes that reflect these values:

- Three-storey plus mansard roof building constructed of whirlpool limestone;
- Balanced façade;
- Mansard roof dormers;
- Projecting string courses;
- Bracketed stone cornice;
- Varying arched fenestration;
- Stone frontispiece chimney fronting MacNab Street with scrollwork detailing;
- Interior courtyard and courtyard fenestration; and,
- Vermiculated stone detailing on first storey façade and east elevation.

**56 York Boulevard’s interiors are representative of a turn-of-the-century industrial/manufacturing building.** The property contains the following interior attributes that reflect this value:

- Wood and cast-iron pillars on all floors in both the brick and stone building; in particular, the decorative cast-iron pillars on the first floor of the stone building; and,
- Vaults with metal doors found in both the brick and stone building, some with graffiti dating to the 19th century.

**56 York Boulevard has historical associations related to the growth of the City of Hamilton in the 19th and 20th century** as a manufacturing centre, specifically related to the City’s history related to the development of the textile manufacturing. The property contains the following attributes that reflect these values:

- Copley Noyes and Randall sign; and,

- Prominent location at a main crossroads.

**56 York Boulevard has direct associations with Frederick James Rastrick, a prominent architect** practicing in the City of Hamilton in the 19th century. The property contains the following attributes that reflect this value:

- Three-storey plus mansard roof building constructed of whirlpool limestone;
- Balanced façade;
- Mansard roof dormers;
- Projecting string courses;
- Bracketed stone cornice;
- Varying arched fenestration;
- Stone frontispiece chimney fronting MacNab Street with scrollwork detailing;
- Interior courtyard and courtyard fenestration; and,
- Vermiculated stone detailing on first storey façade and east elevation.

**56 York Boulevard has direct associations with Alfred Wavell Peene, a notable local architect** practicing in the City of Hamilton. The property contains the following attributes that reflect this value:

- Four-storey building constructed of brick masonry;
- Balanced façade;
- Brick banding or channelling on the front façade;
- Parapet wall;
- Segmentally arched fenestration on the front façade;
- Stone trim and accents around openings; and,
- Oversized decorative architectural elements, including:
  - Façade entrance surround; and,
  - Stone keystones.

**56 York Boulevard is important in maintaining the historical character of the area’s mid-19th century development** as an economic centre in downtown Hamilton. The property contains the following attributes that reflect this value:

- Three-storey plus mansard roof building constructed of whirlpool limestone;
  - Balanced façade;
  - Mansard roof dormers;
  - Projecting string courses;
  - Bracketed stone cornice;
  - Varying arched fenestration;
  - Stone frontispiece chimney fronting MacNab Street with scrollwork detailing;
  - Interior courtyard and courtyard fenestration;
  - Vermiculated stone detailing on first storey façade and east elevation; and,
  - Copley Noyes and Randall sign;
- Four-storey building constructed of brick masonry;
  - Balanced façade;
  - Brick banding or channelling on the front façade;
  - Parapet Wall;



- Segmentally arched fenestration on the front façade;
- Stone trim and accents around openings; and,
- Oversized decorative architectural elements, including:
  - Façade entrance surround; and,
  - Stone keystones;
- Prominent location at intersection of MacNab Street and York Boulevard

**56 York Boulevard has contextual significance as a landmark.** The property contains the following attributes that reflect this value:

- Three-storey plus mansard roof building constructed of whirlpool limestone;
  - Balanced façade;
  - Mansard roof dormers;
  - Projecting string courses;
  - Bracketed stone cornice;
  - Varying arched fenestration;
  - Stone frontispiece chimney fronting MacNab Street with scrollwork detailing;
  - Interior courtyard and courtyard fenestration;
  - Vermiculated stone detailing on first storey façade and east elevation; and,
  - Copley Noyes and Randall sign;
- Prominent location at intersection of MacNab Street and York Boulevard

The Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, Description of Heritage Attributes and supporting Cultural Heritage Assessment may be found online via [www.hamilton.ca](http://www.hamilton.ca) or viewed at the Office of the City Clerk, 71 Main Street West, 1st Floor, City Hall, Hamilton, Ontario, L8P 4Y5, during regular business hours.


Any person may, within 30 days after the date of the publication of the Notice, serve written notice of their objections to the proposed designation, together with a statement for the objection and relevant facts.

Dated at Hamilton, this [REDACTED] day of [REDACTED], 2022.

Andrea Holland  
City Clerk  
Hamilton, Ontario

**CONTACT:** Stacey Kursikowski, Cultural Heritage Planner, Phone: (905) 546-2424 ext. 1202, E-mail: [Stacey.Kursikowski@hamilton.ca](mailto:Stacey.Kursikowski@hamilton.ca)

**Website:** [www.hamilton.ca/heritageplanning](http://www.hamilton.ca/heritageplanning)





**Cultural Heritage Assessment  
56 York Boulevard  
City of Hamilton, ON  
Part of Lot 15, Concession 2  
Geographic Township of Barton  
Former Wentworth County**

Prepared for  
Amber Knowles  
Cultural Heritage Planner  
**City of Hamilton**  
71 Main Street West, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5  
Tel: (905) 546-2424 x1291  
[amber.knowles@hamilton.ca](mailto:amber.knowles@hamilton.ca)

By  
**Archaeological Research Associates Ltd.**  
219-900 Guelph Street  
Kitchener, ON N2H 5Z6  
Tel: (519) 804-2291 Fax: (519) 286-0493  
[www.araheritage.ca](http://www.araheritage.ca)

HR-381-2021  
ARA File# 2021-0587

**21/04/2022**

**Revised**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City of Hamilton retained Archaeological Research Associates Ltd. (ARA) to evaluate the cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI) of 56 York Boulevard (the subject property) in The City of Hamilton. The property is currently protected with a Notice of Intention to Designate (NOID) which was issued in 1979 under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act and included in the City's Municipal Heritage Register.

Amendments made to the OHA in 2019 as part of Bill 108 stipulate that properties with NOIDs issued prior to July 1, 2021 are required to have designation by-laws passed by July 1, 2022. 56 York Boulevard currently has a valid NOID that will expire on July 1, 2022. The City of Hamilton requires a Cultural Heritage Assessment report (CHA) to assess and identify the cultural heritage value and significant cultural heritage features of the property to inform a new NOID.

This report examines the design of the property and presents its history and describes its context. Using this information, the subject property is evaluated against *Ontario Regulation 9/06 (O.Reg 9/06)* to determine if the property possess cultural heritage value or interest. This CHA includes an examination of the property against the City of Hamilton's *Framework for Cultural Heritage Evaluation Section 3 (Built Heritage)* and provides conclusions drawn from those evaluations.

The Cultural Heritage Assessment approach included:

- Background research concerning the project and historical context of the subject property;
- Consultation with City of Hamilton staff regarding heritage matters associated with the subject property;
- On-site inspection and creation of an inventory of all properties with potential Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes within and adjacent to the study area;
- A description of the location and nature of potential cultural heritage resources; and
- Evaluation of each potential cultural heritage resource against the criteria set out in *O.Reg 9/06* for determining CHVI.

56 York Boulevard was shown to possess physical and design value, historical and associative value and contextual value according to *O.Reg 9/06* and can therefore be considered to have CHVI. The property meets ten of the City of Hamilton's *Framework for Cultural Heritage Evaluation Section 3 (Built Heritage)* criteria and should be considered a candidate for designation under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

The *Provincial Policy Statement* notes that CHVI is bestowed upon cultural heritage resources by communities (MMAH 2014). Accordingly, the system by which heritage is governed in this province places emphasis on the decision-making of local municipalities in determining CHVI. It is hoped that the information presented in this report will be useful in those deliberations.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ..... I**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... II**

**LIST OF MAPS ..... IX**

**LIST OF IMAGES ..... IX**

**LIST OF FIGURES ..... XIII**

**LIST OF PLATES ..... XIII**

**LIST OF TABLES ..... XIV**

**LIST OF APPENDICES ..... XIV**

**GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS ..... XV**

**PERSONNEL ..... XV**

**1.0 INTRODUCTION ..... 1**

**2.0 PROPERTY LOCATION ..... 1**

    Map 1: Subject Property in the City of Hamilton ..... 2

    Map 2: Aerial Image of Subject Property in City of Hamilton (Current) ..... 3

    Figure 1: Oblique Image of Context (Current)..... 4

**3.0 PHYSIOGRAPHIC CONTEXT ..... 5**

**4.0 SETTLEMENT CONTEXT ..... 5**

    Table 1: Post-Contact Settlement History..... 5

    4.1 Subject Property History- 56 York Boulevard..... 6

    4.2 John Young ..... 8

    4.3 Copley, Noyes and Randall Limited ..... 9

    4.4 Frederick James Rastrick ..... 9

    Table 2: Selection of Frederick James Rastrick’s Architectural Works..... 10

    4.5 Alfred Wavell Peene ..... 11

    Table 3: Selection of Alfred Wavell Peene’s Architectural Works ..... 11

    4.6 Textile Industry in Hamilton..... 12

    Table 4: Summary of Land Transactions for 56 York Boulevard..... 12

**5.0 PROPERTY DESCRIPTION – SUBJECT PROPERTY ..... 14**

    5.1 Context..... 14

    5.2 56 York Boulevard ..... 15

        5.2.1 Exterior – Stone Building ..... 15

        5.2.2 Exterior – Brick Building..... 17

        5.2.3 Interior – Stone Building..... 18

        5.2.4 Interior – Brick Building ..... 19

    5.3 Adjacent Properties ..... 20

    Table 5: Adjacent Cultural Heritage Resources..... 21

    5.4 Architectural Style/Design..... 21

        5.4.1 Renaissance Revival – Stone Building..... 21

Table 6: Characteristics of Renaissance Revival Commercial Buildings.....	22
5.4.2 Edwardian Classicism– Brick Building .....	23
Table 7: Characteristics of Edwardian Classicism Commercial Buildings .....	23
<b>6.0 COMMUNITY RECOGNITION .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>7.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE EVALUATION.....</b>	<b>24</b>
7.1 Evaluation of the Properties in the Study Area according to <i>Ontario Regulation 9/06</i> 26	
Table 8: Evaluation of the CHVI of 56 York Boulevard using Ontario Regulation 9/06.....	26
7.2 Evaluation of CHVI according to the City of Hamilton Framework for Cultural Heritage Evaluation Section 3 .....	28
Table 9: 56 York Boulevard - City of Hamilton Evaluation Criteria (Section 3: Built Heritage)28	
<b>8.0 STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST .....</b>	<b>31</b>
8.1 56 York Boulevard - Statement.....	31
8.2 56 York Boulevard - Cultural Heritage Attributes.....	32
<b>9.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>10.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY.....</b>	<b>37</b>
Appendix A: Historic Maps and Aerials.....	42
Map 3: 56 York Boulevard on a Map from 1859 .....	42
Map 4: 56 York Boulevard on the Map of the Township of Barton in the <i>Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth, 1875</i> .....	43
Map 5: 56 York Boulevard on a Bird’s Eye View Map from 1876.....	44
Map 6: 56 York Boulevard on a Bird’s Eye View Map from 1893.....	45
Map 7: 56 York Boulevard on Fire Insurance Plans from 1898 and 1911 .....	46
Map 8: 56 York Boulevard on a Historic Topographic Map from 1909 .....	47
Map 9: 56 York Boulevard on an Aerial Image from 1955 .....	48
Map 10: 56 York Boulevard Building Phases.....	49
Appendix B: Historic Photograph (Plates) .....	50
Plate 1: Subject Property in 1892.....	50
Plate 2: View of Hamilton Market with Stone Subject Building at Left.....	50
Plate 3: Subject Property Stone Building Circa 1903.....	51
Plate 4: View of Hamilton Market with Stone Subject Building at Left.....	51
Plate 5: View of Hamilton Market with Stone Subject Building at Left.....	52
Plate 6: Subject Property Bordered in Yellow at Left, 1919 .....	52
Plate 7: Wright Fruit Company at 73 MacNab Street.....	53
Plate 8: Wright Fruit Company at 73 MacNab Street.....	53
Plate 9: Wright Fruit Company Interior at 73 MacNab Street.....	54
Plate 10: Stone Building at 56 York Boulevard.....	54
Plate 11: Stone Building at 56 York Boulevard.....	55
Plate 12: Stone Building at 56 York Boulevard.....	55
Plate 13: View of Market Property with Stone Subject Building at Top Left .....	56
Plate 14: View of York Boulevard from Market Square with 56 York Boulevard at Centre .....	56
Plate 15: Restoration in Progress at 63-73 MacNab Street .....	57

Plate 16: Restoration in Progress at 63-73 MacNab Street .....	57
Plate 17: 56 York Boulevard.....	58
Plate 18: Brick Building at 56 York Boulevard, no date.....	58
Plate 19: Brick Building at 56 York Boulevard, no date.....	59
Plate 20: Brick and Stone Building at 56 York Boulevard .....	59
Appendix C: Images.....	60
Figure 2: Subject Property Showing Heritage Attributes, 56 York Boulevard - Stone.....	60
Figure 3: Subject Property Showing Heritage Attributes, 56 York Boulevard - Brick.....	61
Map 11: Subject Property with Image Locations and Directions, 56 York Boulevard .....	62
Image 1: View of York Street Streetscape – Subject Property at Centre .....	63
Image 2: View of MacNab Street Streetscape – Subject Property at Right.....	63
Image 3: View of Subject Property .....	64
Image 4: York Street Front Façade (South Elevation) .....	64
Image 5: York Street Entrance – Detail .....	65
Image 6: Vermiculated Stone Pilaster – Detail .....	65
Image 7: First Storey Window Opening and Vermiculated Ashlar Pilasters – Detail .....	66
Image 8: Detail of Basement Window Opening on York Street Front Façade.....	66
Image 9: Detail of Central Section of York Street Front Façade .....	67
Image 10: Vermiculated Stone Pilaster and Dressed Stone – Detail .....	67
Image 11: Second and Third Storey Window Openings and Brackets – Detail.....	68
Image 12: York Street Front Façade and Overhead Walkway at Left.....	68
Image 13: Detail of Corner at York Street Front Façade and West Elevation .....	69
Image 14: First Storey of Front Façade on York Boulevard .....	69
Image 15: West Elevation and Overhead Walkway.....	70
Image 16: West Elevation .....	70
Image 17: West Elevation .....	71
Image 18: North Elevation.....	71
Image 19: Foundation and Concrete Walkway – Detail .....	72
Image 20: North and East Elevations .....	72
Image 21: East Elevation .....	73
Image 22: East Elevation Entrance on MacNab Street.....	73
Image 23: Sign on East Elevation .....	74
Image 24: East Elevation Chimney, Brackets and Dormers Detail .....	74
Image 25: East Elevation Window Openings and Door Opening to Courtyard-Detail .....	75
Image 26: East Elevation Window Opening - Detail .....	75
Image 27: East Elevation Window and Door Openings - Detail .....	76
Image 28: Courtyard .....	76
Image 29: Courtyard .....	77
Image 30: Courtyard .....	77
Image 31: Courtyard .....	78

Image 32: Courtyard .....	78
Image 33: Courtyard .....	79
Image 34: Courtyard .....	79
Image 35: Courtyard .....	80
Image 36: York Street Front Façade Showing Entrance to Loading Area .....	80
Image 37: York Street Front Façade .....	81
Image 38: Detail of Front Façade Cladding .....	81
Image 39: York Street Front Façade Door Opening Detail .....	82
Image 40: York Street Front Façade Basement Window Opening – Detail .....	82
Image 41: York Street Front Façade Rusticated Stone – Detail .....	83
Image 42: South and West Elevations .....	83
Image 43: West Elevation .....	84
Image 44: Detail of Stone Foundation Brick Coursing on West Elevation .....	84
Image 45: West Elevation Showing Elevator Shaft .....	85
Image 46: Detail of Door Opening on West Elevation .....	85
Image 47: Detail of Basement Window Openings on West Elevation .....	86
Image 48: Addition at North Part of West Elevation – Detail .....	86
Image 49: North Elevation and Cinderblock Addition .....	87
Image 50: North Elevation .....	87
Image 51: Window Opening on North Elevation – Detail .....	88
Image 52: Common Bond Brick Coursing and Uncoursed Stone Foundation – Detail .....	88
Image 53: South and East Elevations .....	89
Image 54: Detail of East Elevation .....	89
Interior Photographs-Stone Building .....	90
Image 55: First Floor – Stairwell Addition and West Elevation Entrance .....	90
Image 56: West Elevation Entrance .....	90
Image 57: First Floor – Interior .....	91
Image 58: First Floor – Interior .....	91
Image 59: First Floor – Interior .....	92
Image 60: First Floor – Interior .....	92
Image 61: First Floor – Interior .....	93
Image 62: First Floor – Interior .....	93
Image 63: First Floor – Interior .....	94
Image 64: First Floor – Interior Detail Chair Rail .....	94
Image 65: First Floor – Interior .....	95
Image 66: First Floor – Interior .....	95
Image 67: First Floor – Interior .....	96
Image 68: First Floor – Interior .....	96
Image 69: First Floor – Interior .....	97
Image 70: First Floor – Interior .....	97



Image 71: First Floor – Interior .....	98
Image 72: First Floor – Interior .....	98
Image 73: Interior Stone Wall – Detail .....	99
Image 74: First Floor Interior – Wood Sill Detail .....	99
Image 75: First Floor Interior – Staircase Detail .....	100
Image 76: First Floor Entrance to North Addition – Interior .....	100
Image 77: First Floor North Addition – Interior .....	101
Image 78: First Floor North Addition – Interior .....	101
Image 79: First Floor North Addition – Interior .....	102
Image 80: First Floor North Addition – Interior .....	102
Image 81: First Floor North Addition – Vault Detail .....	103
Image 82: First Floor North Addition – Vault Detail .....	103
Image 83: First Floor North Addition – Vault Detail .....	104
Image 84: First Floor North Addition – Interior .....	104
Image 85: First Floor North Addition – Bathroom .....	105
Image 86: First Floor North Addition – Interior .....	105
Image 87: First Floor North Addition – Interior .....	106
Image 88: First Floor North Addition – Interior .....	106
Image 89: First Floor North Addition – Interior .....	107
Image 90: First Floor North Addition – Heat Register Detail .....	107
Image 91: First Floor North Addition – Window Opening .....	108
Image 92: First Floor North Addition – Wainscotting Detail .....	108
Image 93: First Floor North Addition – Stair Landing - Interior .....	109
Image 94: First Floor North Addition – Stairwell Radiator .....	109
Image 95: First Floor North Addition – Staircase .....	110
Image 96: First Floor North Addition – Stairwell and Basement Entrance .....	110
Image 97: North Addition – Basement Entrance Alarm .....	111
Image 98: Second Floor Stone Building – Landing .....	111
Image 99: Second Floor Stone Building – Landing .....	112
Image 100: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior .....	112
Image 101: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior .....	113
Image 102: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior .....	113
Image 103: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior .....	114
Image 104: Second Floor Stone Building – Fireplace Surround and Mantle Detail .....	114
Image 105: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior .....	115
Image 106: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior .....	115
Image 107: Second Floor Stone Building – Window Opening and Wainscotting .....	116
Image 108: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior Showing Plank and Beam Construction .....	116
Image 109: Second Floor Stone Building – Walkway to Brick Building .....	117

Image 110: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior .....	117
Image 111: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior .....	118
Image 112: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior .....	118
Image 113: Second Floor Stone Building – Entrance to North Addition .....	119
Image 114: Second Floor North Addition – Interior.....	119
Image 115: Second Floor North Addition – Window Opening – Detail.....	120
Image 116: Second Floor North Addition – Interior.....	120
Image 117: Second Floor North Addition – Interior.....	121
Image 118: Second Floor North Addition – Interior.....	121
Image 119: Second Floor North Addition – Interior.....	122
Image 120: Second Floor North Addition – Interior.....	122
Image 121: Second Floor North Addition – Vault.....	123
Image 122: Second Floor North Addition – Vault.....	123
Image 123: Second Floor North Addition Vault – Detail.....	124
Image 124: Third Floor Stone Building – Interior .....	124
Image 125: Third Floor Stone Building – Interior .....	125
Image 126: Third Floor Stone Building – Interior .....	125
Image 127: Third Floor Stone Building – Support Pillar .....	126
Image 128: Third Floor Stone Building – Interior .....	126
Image 129: Third Floor Stone Building – Interior .....	127
Image 130: Third Floor – Interior.....	127
Image 131: Third Floor – Interior.....	128
Image 132: Second Floor Hardwood Flooring – Detail .....	128
Image 133: Staircase to Fourth Floor of Stone Building .....	129
Image 134: Fourth Floor Stone Building – Interior .....	129
Image 135: Fourth Floor Stone Building – Interior .....	130
Image 136: Fourth Floor Stone Building – Interior .....	130
Image 137: Fourth Floor Fourth Floor Stone Building – Interior.....	131
Image 138: Fourth Floor Stone Building – Dormer Detail .....	131
Image 139: Fourth Floor Stone Building – Ceiling .....	132
Image 140: Fourth Floor West Stairwell Addition.....	132
Image 141: Fourth Floor Stone Building – Opening to Brick Building .....	133
Image 142: Fourth Floor Ramp to Brick Building – Interior .....	133
Image 143: Basement Stone Building – Staircase.....	134
Image 144: Basement Stone Building – Interior .....	134
Image 145: Basement Stone Building – Interior .....	135
Image 146: Basement Stone Building – Interior .....	135
Image 147: Basement Stone Building – Interior .....	136
Image 148: Basement Stone Building – Interior .....	136
Image 149: Basement Stone Building – Interior .....	137

Image 150: Basement Stone Building – Interior .....	137
Image 151: Basement Stone Building – Interior .....	138
Image 152: Basement Stone Building – Interior .....	138
Image 153: Basement Stone Building – Interior .....	139
Image 154: Basement Stone Building – Vault – Interior .....	139
Image 155: Basement Stone Building – Vault Detail .....	140
Image 156: Basement Stone Building – Vault Graffiti .....	140
Image 157: First Floor Brick Building – Interior.....	141
Image 158: First Floor Brick Building – Interior.....	141
Image 159: First Floor Brick Building – Interior.....	142
Image 160: First Floor Brick Building – Interior.....	142
Image 161: First Floor Brick Building – Vault.....	143
Image 162: First Floor Brick Building – Vault.....	143
Image 163: First Floor Brick Building – Interior.....	144
Image 164: First Floor Brick Building – Ceiling Detail.....	144
Image 165: First Floor Brick Building – Interior.....	145
Image 166: First Floor Brick Building – Interior.....	145
Image 167: First Floor Brick Building – Interior.....	146
Image 168: Second Floor Brick Building– Interior.....	146
Image 169: Second Floor Brick Building – Interior.....	147
Image 170: Second Floor Brick Building – Opening to Stone Building.....	147
Image 171: Second Floor Brick Building – Interior.....	148
Image 172: Second Floor Brick Building – Elevator.....	148
Image 173: Second Floor Brick Building – Window Detail .....	149
Image 174: Third Floor Brick Building – Stairwell .....	149
Image 175: Third Floor Brick Building – Interior.....	150
Image 176: Third Floor Brick Building – Ceiling Detail.....	150
Image 177: Third Floor Brick Building – Stairwell .....	151
Image 178: Basement Brick Building – Interior.....	151
Image 179: Basement Brick Building – Ceiling .....	152
Image 180: Basement Brick Building – Entryway .....	152
Image 181: Basement Brick Building – Interior.....	153
Image 182: Basement Brick Building – Interior.....	153
Image 183: Basement Brick Building – Window Detail .....	154
Image 184: Basement Brick Building – Interior.....	154
Image 185: Basement Brick Building– Stone and Window Detail .....	155
Image 186: Basement Brick Building – Interior.....	155
Image 187: Basement Brick Building – Interior.....	156
Appendix D: City of Hamilton Framework for Cultural Heritage Evaluation .....	157
Appendix E: Curriculum Vitae .....	168

## LIST OF MAPS

Map 1: Subject Property in the City of Hamilton	2
Map 2: Aerial Image of Subject Property in City of Hamilton (Current)	3
Map 3: 56 York Boulevard on a Map from 1859	42
Map 4: 56 York Boulevard on the Map of the Township of Barton in the <i>Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth</i> , 1875	43
Map 5: 56 York Boulevard on a Bird's Eye View Map from 1876	44
Map 6: 56 York Boulevard on a Bird's Eye View Map from 1893	45
Map 7: 56 York Boulevard on Fire Insurance Plans from 1898 and 1911	46
Map 8: 56 York Boulevard on a Historic Topographic Map from 1909	47
Map 9: 56 York Boulevard on an Aerial Image from 1955	48
Map 10: 56 York Boulevard Building Phases	49
Map 11: Subject Property with Image Locations and Directions, 56 York Boulevard	62

## LIST OF IMAGES

Image 1: View of York Street Streetscape – Subject Property at Centre	63
Image 2: View of MacNab Street Streetscape – Subject Property at Right	63
Image 3: View of Subject Property	64
Image 4: York Street Façade (South Elevation)	64
Image 5: York Street Entrance – Detail	65
Image 6: Vermiculated Stone Pilaster – Detail	65
Image 7: First Storey Window Opening and Vermiculated Ashlar Pilasters – Detail	66
Image 8: Detail of Basement Window Opening on York Street Façade	66
Image 9: Detail of Central Section of York Street Façade	67
Image 10: Vermiculated Stone Pilaster and Dressed Stone – Detail	67
Image 11: Second and Third Storey Window Openings and Brackets – Detail	68
Image 12: York Street Façade and Overhead Walkway at Left	68
Image 13: Detail of Corner at York Street Façade and West Elevation	69
Image 14: First Storey of Façade on York Boulevard	69
Image 15: West Elevation and Overhead Walkway	70
Image 16: West Elevation	70
Image 17: West Elevation	71
Image 18: North Elevation	71
Image 19: Foundation and Concrete Walkway – Detail	72
Image 20: North and East Elevations	72
Image 21: East Elevation	73
Image 22: East Elevation Entrance on MacNab Street	73
Image 23: Sign on East Elevation	74
Image 24: East Elevation Chimney, Brackets and Dormers Detail	74
Image 25: East Elevation Window Openings and Door Opening to Courtyard-Detail	75
Image 26: East Elevation Window Opening - Detail	75
Image 27: East Elevation Window and Door Openings - Detail	76

Image 28: Courtyard	76
Image 29: Courtyard	77
Image 30: Courtyard	77
Image 31: Courtyard	78
Image 32: Courtyard	78
Image 33: Courtyard	79
Image 34: Courtyard	79
Image 35: Courtyard	80
Image 36: York Street Façade Showing Entrance to Loading Area	80
Image 37: York Street Facade	81
Image 38: Detail of Façade Cladding	81
Image 39: York Street Façade Door Opening Detail	82
Image 40: York Street Façade Basement Window Opening – Detail	82
Image 41: York Street Façade Rusticated Stone – Detail	83
Image 42: South and West Elevations	83
Image 43: West Elevation	84
Image 44: Detail of Stone Foundation Brick Coursing on West Elevation	84
Image 45: West Elevation Showing Elevator Shaft	85
Image 46: Detail of Door Opening on West Elevation	85
Image 47: Detail of Basement Window Openings on West Elevation	86
Image 48: Addition at North Part of West Elevation – Detail	86
Image 49: North Elevation and Cinderblock Addition	87
Image 50: North Elevation	87
Image 51: Window Opening on North Elevation – Detail	88
Image 52: Common Bond Brick Coursing and Uncoursed Stone Foundation – Detail	88
Image 53: South and East Elevations	89
Image 54: Detail of East Elevation	89
Image 55: First Floor – Stairwell Addition and West Elevation Entrance	90
Image 56: West Elevation Entrance	90
Image 57: First Floor – Interior	91
Image 58: First Floor – Interior	91
Image 59: First Floor – Interior	92
Image 60: First Floor – Interior	92
Image 61: First Floor – Interior	93
Image 62: First Floor – Interior	93
Image 63: First Floor – Interior	94
Image 64: First Floor – Interior Detail Chair Rail	94
Image 65: First Floor – Interior	95
Image 66: First Floor – Interior	95
Image 67: First Floor – Interior	96
Image 68: First Floor – Interior	96
Image 69: First Floor – Interior	97
Image 70: First Floor – Interior	97
Image 71: First Floor – Interior	98
Image 72: First Floor – Interior	98

Image 73: Interior Stone Wall – Detail	99
Image 74: First Floor Interior – Wood Sill Detail	99
Image 75: First Floor Interior – Staircase Detail	100
Image 76: First Floor Entrance to North Addition – Interior	100
Image 77: First Floor North Addition – Interior	101
Image 78: First Floor North Addition – Interior	101
Image 79: First Floor North Addition – Interior	102
Image 80: First Floor North Addition – Interior	102
Image 81: First Floor North Addition – Vault Detail	103
Image 82: First Floor North Addition – Vault Detail	103
Image 83: First Floor North Addition – Vault Detail	104
Image 84: First Floor North Addition – Interior	104
Image 85: First Floor North Addition – Bathroom	105
Image 86: First Floor North Addition – Interior	105
Image 87: First Floor North Addition – Interior	106
Image 88: First Floor North Addition – Interior	106
Image 89: First Floor North Addition – Interior	107
Image 90: First Floor North Addition – Heat Register Detail	107
Image 91: First Floor North Addition – Window Opening	108
Image 92: First Floor North Addition – Wainscotting Detail	108
Image 93: First Floor North Addition – Stair Landing - Interior	109
Image 94: First Floor North Addition – Stairwell Radiator	109
Image 95: First Floor North Addition – Staircase	110
Image 96: First Floor North Addition – Stairwell and Basement Entrance	110
Image 97: North Addition – Basement Entrance Alarm	111
Image 98: Second Floor Stone Building – Landing	111
Image 99: Second Floor Stone Building – Landing	112
Image 100: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior	112
Image 101: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior	113
Image 102: Second Floor Stone Building - Interior	113
Image 103: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior	114
Image 104: Second Floor Stone Building – Fireplace Surround and Mantle Detail	114
Image 105: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior	115
Image 106: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior	115
Image 107: Second Floor Stone Building – Window Opening and Wainscotting	116
Image 108: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior Showing Plank and Beam Construction	116
Image 109: Second Floor Stone Building – Walkway to Brick Building	117
Image 110: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior	117
Image 111: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior	118
Image 112: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior	118
Image 113: Second Floor Stone Building – Entrance to North Addition	119
Image 114: Second Floor North Addition – Interior	119
Image 115: Second Floor North Addition – Window Opening – Detail	120
Image 116: Second Floor North Addition – Interior	120

Image 117: Second Floor North Addition – Interior	121
Image 118: Second Floor North Addition – Interior	121
Image 119: Second Floor North Addition – Interior	122
Image 120: Second Floor North Addition – Interior	122
Image 121: Second Floor North Addition – Vault	123
Image 122: Second Floor North Addition – Vault	123
Image 123: Second Floor North Addition Vault – Detail	124
Image 124: Third Floor Stone Building – Interior	124
Image 125: Third Floor Stone Building – Interior	125
Image 126: Third Floor Stone Building – Interior	125
Image 127: Third Floor Stone Building – Support Pillar	126
Image 128: Third Floor Stone Building – Interior	126
Image 129: Third Floor Stone Building – Interior	127
Image 130: Third Floor – Interior	127
Image 131: Third Floor – Interior	128
Image 132: Second Floor Hardwood Flooring – Detail	128
Image 133: Staircase to Fourth Floor of Stone Building	129
Image 134: Fourth Floor Stone Building – Interior	129
Image 135: Fourth Floor Stone Building – Interior	130
Image 136: Fourth Floor Stone Building – Interior	130
Image 137: Fourth Floor Fourth Floor Stone Building – Interior	131
Image 138: Fourth Floor Stone Building – Dormer Detail	131
Image 139: Fourth Floor Stone Building – Ceiling	132
Image 140: Fourth Floor West Stairwell Addition	132
Image 141: Fourth Floor Stone Building – Opening to Brick Building	133
Image 142: Fourth Floor Ramp to Brick Building – Interior	133
Image 143: Basement Stone Building – Staircase	134
Image 144: Basement Stone Building – Interior	134
Image 145: Basement Stone Building – Interior	135
Image 146: Basement Stone Building – Interior	135
Image 147: Basement Stone Building – Interior	136
Image 148: Basement Stone Building – Interior	136
Image 149: Basement Stone Building – Interior	137
Image 150: Basement Stone Building – Interior	137
Image 151: Basement Stone Building – Interior	138
Image 152: Basement Stone Building – Interior	138
Image 153: Basement Stone Building – Interior	139
Image 154: Basement Stone Building – Vault – Interior	139
Image 155: Basement Stone Building – Vault Detail	140
Image 156: Basement Stone Building – Vault Graffiti	140
Image 157: First Floor Brick Building – Interior	141
Image 158: First Floor Brick Building – Interior	141
Image 159: First Floor Brick Building – Interior	142
Image 160: First Floor Brick Building – Interior	142
Image 161: First Floor Brick Building – Vault	143

Image 162: First Floor Brick Building – Vault	143
Image 163: First Floor Brick Building – Interior	144
Image 164: First Floor Brick Building – Ceiling Detail	144
Image 165: First Floor Brick Building – Interior	145
Image 166: First Floor Brick Building – Interior	145
Image 167: First Floor Brick Building – Interior	146
Image 168: Second Floor Brick Building– Interior	146
Image 169: Second Floor Brick Building – Interior	147
Image 170: Second Floor Brick Building – Opening to Stone Building	147
Image 171: Second Floor Brick Building – Interior	148
Image 172: Second Floor Brick Building – Elevator	148
Image 173: Second Floor Brick Building – Window Detail	149
Image 174: Third Floor Brick Building – Stairwell	149
Image 175: Third Floor Brick Building – Interior	150
Image 176: Third Floor Brick Building – Ceiling Detail	150
Image 177: Third Floor Brick Building – Stairwell	151
Image 178: Basement Brick Building – Interior	151
Image 179: Basement Brick Building – Ceiling	152
Image 180: Basement Brick Building – Entryway	152
Image 181: Basement Brick Building – Interior	153
Image 182: Basement Brick Building – Interior	153
Image 183: Basement Brick Building – Window Detail	154
Image 184: Basement Brick Building – Interior	154
Image 185: Basement Brick Building– Stone and Window Detail	155
Image 186: Basement Brick Building – Interior	155
Image 187: Basement Brick Building – Interior	156

#### LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Oblique Image of Context (Current)	4
Figure 2: Subject Property Showing Heritage Attributes, 56 York Boulevard - Stone	60
Figure 3: Subject Property Showing Heritage Attributes, 56 York Boulevard - Brick	61

#### LIST OF PLATES

Plate 1: Subject Property in 1892	50
Plate 2: View of Hamilton Market with Stone Subject Building at Left	50
Plate 3: Subject Property Stone Building Circa 1903	51
Plate 4: View of Hamilton Market with Stone Subject Building at Left	51
Plate 5: View of Hamilton Market with Stone Subject Building at Left	52
Plate 6: Subject Property Bordered in Yellow at Left, 1919	52
Plate 7: Wright Fruit Company at 73 MacNab Street	53
Plate 8: Wright Fruit Company at 73 MacNab Street	53



---

Plate 9: Wright Fruit Company Interior at 73 MacNab Street	54
Plate 10: Stone Building at 56 York Boulevard	54
Plate 11: Stone Building at 56 York Boulevard	55
Plate 12: Stone Building at 56 York Boulevard	55
Plate 13: View of Market Property with Stone Subject Building at Top Left	56
Plate 14: View of York Boulevard from Market Square with 56 York Boulevard at Centre	56
Plate 15: Restoration in Progress at 63-73 MacNab Street	57
Plate 16: Restoration in Progress at 63-73 MacNab Street	57
Plate 17: 56 York Boulevard	58
Plate 18: Brick Building at 56 York Boulevard, no date	58
Plate 19: Brick Building at 56 York Boulevard, no date	59
Plate 20: Brick and Stone Building at 56 York Boulevard	59

### LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Post-Contact Settlement History	5
Table 2: Selection of Frederick James Rastrick's Architectural Works	10
Table 3: Selection of Alfred Wavell Peene's Architectural Works	11
Table 4: Summary of Land Transactions for 56 York Boulevard	12
Table 5: Adjacent Cultural Heritage Resources	21
Table 6: Characteristics of Renaissance Revival Commercial Buildings	22
Table 7: Characteristics of Edwardian Commercial Buildings	23
Table 8: Evaluation of the CHVI of 56 York Boulevard using Ontario Regulation 9/06	26
Table 9: 56 York Boulevard - City of Hamilton Evaluation Criteria (Section 3: Built Heritage)	28

### LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A: Historic Maps and Aerials	42
Appendix B: Historic Photograph (Plates)	50
Appendix C: Images	60
Appendix D: City of Hamilton Framework for Cultural Heritage Evaluation	157
Appendix E: Curriculum Vitae	168

---

## GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS

ARA – Archaeological Research Associates Ltd.  
CHAR – Cultural Heritage Assessment Report  
CHVI – Cultural Heritage Value or Interest  
MMAH – Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing  
MHSTCI – Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism, and Culture Industries  
NOID – Notice of Intention to Designate  
OHA – Ontario Heritage Act  
O. Reg. – Ontario Regulation

## PERSONNEL

**Principal:** P.J. Racher, MA (#P007), CAHP  
**Heritage Operations Manager:** K. Jonas Galvin, MA, CAHP, RPP, MCIP  
**Project Manager:** J. McDermid, BA, CAHP  
**Field Survey:** S. Clarke, BA, CAHP  
**Photography:** S. Clarke  
**Historic Research:** S. Clarke  
**Cartographer:** K. Brightwell, (GIS), L. Bailey (GIS)  
**Technical Writer:** S. Clarke, A. Bousfield-Bastedo, BA, Dip. Heritage Conservation  
**Editor:** V. Cafik, BA CAHP

Two-page curriculum vitae (CV) that demonstrate the qualifications and expertise of key team members to perform cultural heritage work in Ontario are provided in Appendix E.

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The City of Hamilton retained Archaeological Research Associates Ltd. (ARA) to evaluate the cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI) of 56 York Boulevard (the subject property) in The City of Hamilton. The property is currently protected with a Notice of Intention to Designate (NOID) which was issued in 1979 under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act and included in the City's Municipal Heritage Register.

Amendments made to the OHA in 2019 as part of Bill 108 stipulate that properties with NOIDs issued prior to July 1, 2021 are required to have designation by-laws passed by July 1, 2022. 56 York Boulevard currently has a valid NOID that will expire on July 1, 2022. The City of Hamilton requires a Cultural Heritage Assessment report (CHA) to assess and identify the cultural heritage value and significant cultural heritage features of the property to inform a new NOID.


This report examines the design of the property and presents its history and describes its context. Using this information, the subject property is evaluated against *Ontario Regulation 9/06 (O.Reg 9/06)* to determine if the property possess CHVI. This CHA includes an examination of the property against the City of Hamilton's *Framework for Cultural Heritage Evaluation Section 3 (Built Heritage)* and provides conclusions drawn from those evaluations.

## 2.0 PROPERTY LOCATION

Civic Address: 56 York Boulevard

Legal Description: Part of Lot 15, Concession 2, Geographic Township of Barton, former Wentworth County, City of Hamilton (see Map 1)

The subject property is approximately 0.79 acres, rectilinear in shape and contains a three-storey stone commercial building and a four-storey brick commercial building situated on the same lot (see Map 2). The buildings are located at the northwest corner of York Boulevard and MacNab Street North in the core of downtown Hamilton. The surrounding area includes the Hamilton Farmers' Market and the Hamilton Central Public Library to the south, the First Ontario Centre (formerly Coppins Coliseum) to the southwest and a large parking structure to the east that connects through an enclosed pedestrian walkway to Jackson Square and the Hamilton City Centre to the southeast (see Figure 1).



**Map 1: Subject Property in the City of Hamilton**  
(Produced by ARA under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri)



**Map 2: Aerial Image of Subject Property in City of Hamilton (Current)**  
(Produced under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri; City of Hamilton 2019)



**Figure 1: Oblique Image of Context (Current)  
(Google Earth 2022)**

### 3.0 PHYSIOGRAPHIC CONTEXT

The subject property at 56 York Boulevard in the City of Hamilton, Ontario, lies within the physiographic region known as the Iroquois Plain, which extends around the western and northern parts of Lake Ontario and consists of the shoreline and lakebed of Lake Iroquois. The old shorelines, including cliffs, bars, beaches and boulder pavements are clearly visible in this area, and the undulating till plains above stand in marked contrast to the smoothed lake bottom (Chapman and Putnam 1984:190–192).

According to the Ontario Soil Survey, the study area consists entirely of Urban Lands. Urban Lands are understood to be heavily developed urban spaces (e.g., a cityscape) wherein the natural soil context has been significantly altered as a result of infrastructural development and construction (Presant and Wicklund 1965).

In terms of local watersheds, the subject lands fall within the Urban Hamilton drainage basin, which is under the jurisdiction of the Hamilton Conservation Authority (HCA 2019). Specifically, the study area is located 1.1 km south of Lake Ontario and 3.2 km southeast of the Cootes Paradise wetland.

### 4.0 SETTLEMENT CONTEXT

Background information was obtained from historical maps (i.e., illustrated atlases), archival sources (i.e., historical publications and directories), and published secondary sources (online and print). Land ownership history was obtained from land registry records, including the abstract indexes and property instruments.

The City of Hamilton and Wentworth County have a long history of Indigenous land use and settlement including Pre-Contact and Post-Contact campsites and villages. It should be noted that the written historical record regarding Indigenous use of the landscape in Southern Ontario draws on accounts by European explorers and settlers. As such, this record details only a small period of time in the overall human presence in Ontario. Oral histories and the archaeological record show that Indigenous communities were mobile across great distances, which transcend modern understandings of geographical boundaries and transportation routes.

Based on current knowledge, the cultural heritage resources located within the subject property are tied to the history of the initial settlement and growth of Euro-Canadian populations in the now City of Hamilton. Accordingly, this historical context section spans the early Euro-Canadian settlement history through to the present. The Post-Contact period can be effectively discussed in terms of major historical events, and the principal characteristics associated with these events are summarized Table 1.

**Table 1: Post-Contact Settlement History**  
(Smith 1846; Coyne 1895; Lajeunesse 1960; DVSA 1971; Ellis and Ferris 1990; Surtees 1994; AO 2015)

Historical Event	Timeframe	Characteristics
Early Exploration	Early 17 <sup>th</sup> century	Brûlé explores southern Ontario in 1610; Champlain travels through in 1613 and 1615/1616, encountering a variety of Indigenous groups (including both Iroquoian-speakers and Algonquian-speakers); European goods begin to replace traditional tools

Historical Event	Timeframe	Characteristics
Increased Contact and Conflict	Mid- to late 17 <sup>th</sup> century	Conflicts between various First Nations during the Beaver Wars result in numerous population shifts; European explorers continue to document the area, and many Indigenous groups trade directly with the French and English; 'The Great Peace of Montreal' treaty established between roughly 39 different First Nations and New France in 1701
Fur Trade Development	Early to mid-18 <sup>th</sup> century	Growth and spread of the fur trade; Peace between the French and English with the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713; Ethnogenesis of the Métis; Hostilities between French and British lead to the Seven Years' War in 1754; French surrender in 1760
British Control	Mid-18 <sup>th</sup> century	<i>Royal Proclamation</i> of 1763 recognizes the title of the First Nations to the land; Numerous treaties arranged by the Crown; First acquisition is the Seneca surrender of the west side of the Niagara River in August 1764
Loyalist Influx	Late 18 <sup>th</sup> century	United Empire Loyalist influx after the American Revolutionary War (1775–1783); British develop interior communication routes and acquire additional lands; <i>Constitutional Act</i> of 1791 creates Upper and Lower Canada
County Development	Late 18 <sup>th</sup> to early 19 <sup>th</sup> century	The county became part of Lincoln County's 'First Riding' in July 1792; Lands acquired in the second 'Between the Lakes Purchase' in December 1792; Became part of Wentworth County (Gore District) in 1816; Extent of Wentworth County redefined after the abolition of the district system in 1849
Township Formation	Late 18 <sup>th</sup> to early 19 <sup>th</sup> century	Surveyed by Augustus Jones in 1788; J. and W. Rymal, W. Terryberry, C. and S. Ryckman, L. and P. Horning, and the Markle family were among the first settlers 'above the mountain'; In 1815, there were 102 ratepayers in the township, as well as 72 one-storey log homes and approximately 25 frame homes; In 1822, over 70 landowners were present and nearly 410 ha of land had been cleared 'below the mountain'; By 1823, there were only five merchant shops in the entire township (four of which were in Hamilton), with 3 saw mills and 1 grist mill in operation; At that time, a total of 1,150 ha had been cleared south of the escarpment and 865 ha had been cleared north of the escarpment
Township Development	Mid-19 <sup>th</sup> to early 20 <sup>th</sup> century	Population of Barton was 1,484 in 1841 (Hamilton itself had a population of 6,475 in 1845); 6,229 ha taken up by 1846, with 3,639 ha under cultivation; 1 grist mill and 5 saw mills in operation in Barton at that time; Traversed by the Great Western Railway (1853), the Hamilton & Lake Erie Railway (1873) and the Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo Railway (1895); The Village/Town/City of Hamilton was the most prominent settlement, and there were smaller communities at Ryckman's Corners and Bartonville

#### 4.1 Subject Property History- 56 York Boulevard

In an attempt to reconstruct the historic land use of the subject property and its context, ARA examined three historical maps documenting past residents, structures (e.g., homes, businesses and public buildings) and features during the 19<sup>th</sup> century, two fire insurance plans, one topographic map from the early 20<sup>th</sup> century and one aerial image from the mid-20<sup>th</sup> century. Specifically, the following resources were consulted:

- H. Gregory's *Map of the County of Wentworth, Canada West* (1859) (OHCMP 2019);
- Map of the Township of Barton from Page & Smith's *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth, Ont.* (1875) (McGill University 2001);
- Bird's Eye View Maps from 1876 and 1893 (McMaster Digital Archive 1876 and 1893);
- Fire Insurance Plans from 1898 and 1911 (McMaster Digital Archive 1898 and 1911) and
- A topographic map from 1909 (OCUL 2022); and



- An aerial image from 1955 (McMaster Digital Archive 2022).

ARA also completed a Summary of Land Transactions for the subject properties to understand the land ownership history (see Table 4).

The Crown Patent for Lot 12, Concession 5 in the Township of Barton went to John Askin Sr. in July 1801 (see Table 4). Askin sold the lot to Nathaniel Hughson in May 1805 and in 1811 David Kirkendall purchased part of the lot. A Quit Claim in February 1818 officially transferred ownership of the lot from Nathaniel Hughson to William Wedge, albeit seven years after Kirkendall's purchase in 1811. Kirkendall had his lands surveyed as Plan 39 (David Kirkendall's Survey), Town of Hamilton and began selling lots within Block 12 in the early 1840s. In 1847, Kirkendall sold Lots 4 and 5, Block 12, Plan 39 to Calvin McQuesten who held the lots until November 1853 (see Instruments 678 and 679, Table 4). McQuesten sold the aforementioned lots to John Young in 1853. Frederick James Rastrick, an English architect created a design for a three-storey stone building and construction of the stone building at the northwest corner of York Boulevard (formerly Merrick Street) and MacNab Street began in 1854 (Biographical Dictionary of Architects in Canada 2022b). The interior of the building was designed to follow the plank-and-beam method of construction which was employed to allow for an open plan as well as fire resistance (see Image 108). This method of construction, later known as "slow burning" or "mill construction", uses iron or wood pillars to support large beams between floors (Langenbach 2010). The firm, Young, Law and Company was established in the new building on Lots 4 and 5, Block 12, Plan 39 in 1855 as a dry goods retailer.

In 1856, Lots 4 and 5 were transferred from John Young and David Law by Will to Thomas MacDuff who was possibly a trustee for the company. A historic map from 1859 indicates that this part of Hamilton was well established by that time, however the stone subject building is not depicted on the map (see Map 3). Andrew Law sold his interest in the property to John Young and others in 1869 and by April 1873 the stone building was under the ownership of John Young (see Instrument #9455, Table 4). In 1875, Lots 4 and 5, Block 12, Plan 39 were transferred from John Young to his son-in-law Richard Alan Lucas. A map from 1875 does not depict the stone subject building on the property, however a bird's eye view map from 1876 provides a view from the rear of the property looking south toward York Boulevard before the courtyard was enclosed (see Map 5).

In 1881, Lucas had a building constructed on the east side of MacNab Street abutting the original 1856 stone building which enclosed the courtyard. A bird's eye view map from 1893 provides a similar view of the subject property from the rear and facing south. After comparing the 1893 map to the 1876 bird's eye view map and later maps that show the building arrangement on the property, it can be concluded that artistic license was taken with the 1893 drawing (see Map 6). The 1893 bird's eye view map does not provide an accurate representation of the stone building.

In 1896, Lots 4 and 5, Block 12, Plan 39 containing the stone building were sold by Alexander Bruce and Richard A. Lucas to Lucas' wife Agnes (see Instruments 62370 and 62373, Table 4). A fire insurance plan from 1898 shows the wholesale grocers, Steele, Lucas and Bristol at 73 MacNab Street which was constructed in 1881 (see Map 7). This section of the building on the north side of the courtyard is shown as having interior access to the original stone building to the south at 63–69 MacNab Street. At this time, 63–69 MacNab Street was occupied by wholesale clothiers J. Calder and Company. Additional details can be gleaned about the stone building from the 1898 fire insurance plan including the presence of a mansard roof on the original building at

63–69 MacNab Street and the three-and-a-half storey height of the building. The Lucas addition at 73 MacNab Street is noted to be three storeys.

Images of the stone building from 1892 and 1903 of the 1856 part of the stone building indicate that the dormers on the mansard roof of were formerly triangular in shape with circular window (or vent) openings, with three dormers on the York Boulevard elevation and one dormer on the MacNab Street elevation of the mansard roof (see Plate 1, Plate 2 and Plate 3). At the time the subject property was purchased by Coppley, Noyes and Randall in 1903, the triangle dormers remained in place but the cresting on the mansard roof had been removed (see Plate 3). By the early 1919 the triangular dormers were replaced with dormers currently extant (see Plate 4, Plate 5 and Plate 6).

In 1903, Richard A. Lucas sold part of Lot 6, Block 12, Plan 39 to Canada Grocers. That same year, Coppley, Noyes and Randall Limited purchased part of Lots 6, 7, and 13, Block 12, Plan 39 from John Stewart, Adam Stewart and Joseph Nellis (see Instruments 77411 and 77559, Table 4). This property would later become the location of the brick portion of the building (see Plate 18 and Plate 19), which was constructed in 1906 and designed by Alfred Wavell Peene. Canada Grocers sold Part of Lot 6 to George E. Bristol in 1912 and George E. Bristol and Company Wholesale Grocers are indicated as the occupants of the former Lucas building at 73 MacNab Street as well as part of the 1856 building according to a fire insurance plan from 1911 (see Map 7).

The brick portion of the building at 56–58 Merrick Street (Part of Lot 7, Block 12, Plan 39) to the west of the stone was constructed by 1911 (see Map 7). In 1938, George Bristol's executor sold the stone building to St. Clair Balfour who retained ownership of the property until 1957 when it was transferred to Balfours Limited. During this time, the northern section of the stone building (former 73 MacNab Street) was the location of Wright's Fruit Company (see Plate 7, Plate 8 and Plate 9). According to the 1911 fire insurance plan, Balfour, Smye and Company were wholesale grocers who also owned property on the east side of MacNab Street to the north of Hotel Stroud (see Map 7).

In 1967, Balfours Limited sold the property with the stone building to Coppley, Noyes and Randall Limited (see Instrument 56331AB, Table 4). By this time, Coppley, Noyes and Randall occupied all of the parts of the subject property at 56 York Boulevard. A curious transfer of the property to Sterling Clothing of Canada Limited occurred in 1971, however, Coppley, Noyes and Randall Limited were the owners of the property again at the time it was sold to 1059292 Ontario Inc. in 1994 (see Instrument VM188294, Table 4).

In 1978, the exterior of the stone building was cleaned to remove more than 100 years of black soot and pollutants (see Plate 15 and Plate 16). Images of the stone building before the exterior cleaning support the statement that it was "grimy as a Glasgow warehouse" (Chapple and Moore 1979:7; see Plate 10, Plate 11, Plate 12, Plate 13 and Plate 14). An image from around 1990 shows the York Street elevation with the subject brick and subject stone building as well as part of the MacNab Street front façade (see Plate 20).

## 4.2 John Young

John Young (1808–1878), a prominent Hamilton businessperson, was born in Scotland and immigrated to Hamilton in 1832 (Doucet and Weaver 1984:80). Young was first associated with Isaac Buchanan and the pair opened Buchanan, Harris and Company wholesalers in 1840. By

1853, John Young of Hamilton and James Law of Montreal separated from the Buchanans to establish Young, Law and Company wholesalers. Young, Law and Company had the stone building constructed in 1856 to house their wholesale operation which sold wholesale groceries and dry goods (McCalla 1972). Young retired from the wholesale business in 1866 but remained involved in his various interests. During his life Young helped to found St. Andrew's Church in 1833, was elected to the first board of directors of the Gore Bank in 1836, was an organizer of the Hamilton Gas Light Company in 1850 (was president of the company for 23 years), helped establish Canada Life Assurance Company in 1847 (vice-president for 20 years and president for 5 years), was involved with the Great Western Railway beginning in 1856 (served as vice-president of the railway and chairman of the Canadian board for 10 years each concurrently) and was an executive member of the Hamilton Board of Trade from 1845 (when it was first established) until his death (was president of the board from 1846–1852 and 1857–1858). After retiring from the wholesale business, Young assumed operation of Joseph Wright's Dundas Cotton Mills (McCalla 1972).

#### **4.3 Copley, Noyes and Randall Limited**

Copley, Noyes and Randall Limited are a Hamilton manufacturer of men's clothing that has operated from the subject property since 1883 (Copley 2022). In addition to dress-clothing such as suits, Copley, Noyes and Randall Limited manufactured uniforms for the war effort during the First and Second World Wars. The company entered the American market in the early 1990s and "revolutionized the tailored clothing industry's way of doing business by delivering made-to-measure suits within seven working days" (Copley 2022). In March 2020, Copley Apparel moved to a new facility on MacNab Street designed by TCA Architects. In 2021, 1059292 Ontario Inc sold the subject property to 56YB Corp.




George Charles Copley (1858–1936) immigrated to Hamilton from England in 1879. He established the clothing manufacturing company, Copley, Noyes and Randall in 1903 with E. Finch Noyes and James Randall. Copley, Noyes and Randall purchased the subject property while it was occupied by John Calder and company clothing manufacture. Copley, Noyes and Randall produced handmade suits and clothing for men at the subject building for more than 120 years (Copley 2022). Copley was the mayor of Hamilton from 1921–1922 and retired from Copley, Noyes and Randall the same year (AO 1936). The company continued to operate under the same name for years after the original partners had left the building. The name of the company was eventually shortened to Copley, which still operates today at its new location on MacNab Street.


#### **4.4 Frederick James Rastrick**

Frederick James Rastrick (1819–1897) was a prominent architect and a key part of the development of the professional association of architects in Ontario. Rastrick served as the vice-president of the Association of Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors of Canada, the first president of the Canadian Institute of Architects and a member of the council of the Ontario Association of Architects in 1889. Born and trained as an architect in Staffordshire England, Rastrick emigrated to Canada in 1852. From 1854 to 1857, Rastrick served as the appointed engineer for the County of Wentworth and the inspecting architect for the Hamilton, London and Orangeville post offices (Otto 2003, Biographical Dictionary of the Architects in Canada 1800–1950 2022b).

The stone building at 56 York Boulevard is listed as one of Rastrick's important works in Hamilton along with the Bank of Upper Canada, Canada Life Assurance Co. Building, and the Grammar School (OAA 2022, see Table 2).

**Table 2: Selection of Frederick James Rastrick's Architectural Works**



Address	Year Constructed and Status	Photo
<p>610 York Boulevard Dundurn Castle Portico Addition</p>	<p>1854 Extant</p>	 <p>(Ontario Architecture 2006)</p>
<p>Vine Street/James Street North Intersection Bank of Upper Canada</p>	<p>1856 Demolished</p>	 <p>(Otto 2007)</p>
<p>Caroline Street Grammar School Caroline Street/Main Street Intersection</p>	<p>1866-1867 Demolished</p>	 <p>(Otto 2007)</p>



Address	Year Constructed and Status	Photo
Gore Bank (Additions and Alterations) King Street East/Hughson Street Intersection	1870 Demolished	 (Downtown Hamilton 2021)

#### 4.5 Alfred Wavell Peene

Alfred Wavell Peene (1869–1940) was an architect who extensively practiced and designed buildings in Hamilton between the late 19<sup>th</sup> century to mid 20<sup>th</sup> century. Peene’s body of work included residential buildings, factories, commercial buildings and civic buildings. Notable works by Peene include the former Hamilton Public Library (now Unified Family Court), the Stinson Street School and the Hamilton Conservatory of Music (now Hamilton Conservatory for the Arts), all within the City of Hamilton (Biographical Dictionary of the Architects in Canada 1800–1950 2022a, see Table 3).

**Table 3: Selection of Alfred Wavell Peene’s Architectural Works**

Address	Year Constructed and Status	Photo (Google 2022, unless noted)
Barton/Ferguson Intersection Old City Jail Barton Street	1895 Demolished	 (Vintage Hamilton, 2022)
129 James Street South Hamilton Conservatory for the Arts	1904-1905 Extant	 (Google, 2022)

Address	Year Constructed and Status	Photo (Google 2022, unless noted)
55 Main Street West  Superior Court of Justice (former Carnegie Library)	1911-1913  Extant	 (Google, 2022)
71 Maplewood Avenue  Adelaide Hoodless Elementary School	1911-1912  Extant	 (Google, 2022)

#### 4.6 Textile Industry in Hamilton

The growth of the City of Hamilton during the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century is attributed to the manufacturing industry. The largest manufacturing industry in Hamilton is steel, followed by textile production (MccallumSather 2018:3–7). The City’s prowess in textiles is exhibited in the many mills and industrial buildings associated with textile production, some of which remain today, like the Cotton Factory on Sherman Avenue and the subject property.

As the home to the iconic clothing manufacturer, Copley Noyes and Randall, the building at 56 York Boulevard represents almost 130 years of continuous service as one of Hamilton’s founding pillars of the local fashion industry, preceding the now well-known textile and fabric hub of nearby Ottawa Street. Hamilton now has the fifth-largest cluster of fashion businesses in Canada, boasting over 520 businesses in the clothing and fashion sector (Reilly 2020).

**Table 4: Summary of Land Transactions for 56 York Boulevard  
(LRO #62)**

Instrument #	Instrument	Date	Grantor	Grantee	Comments
-	Patent	10 Jul 1801	Crown	John Askin Sr.	All Lot 12, Concession 5 Barton
41	Bargain and Sale	23 May 1805	John Askin Sr.	Nathaniel Hughson	All Lot 12, Concession 5 Barton
58	Bargain and Sale	11 Jan 1811	William Wedge and wife	David Kirkendall	Part of Lot 15, Concession 2 Barton
259	Quit Claim	2 Feb 1818	Nathaniel Hughson	William Wedge	Part of Lot 15, Concession 2 Barton

Instrument #	Instrument	Date	Grantor	Grantee	Comments
371	Bargain and Sale	23 Mar 1840	David Kirkendall	John Cook	Lot 6, Block 12, Plan 39
265	Bargain and Sale	17 Jul 1841	David Kirkendall	John Cook	Lot 7, Block 12, Plan 39
[522]	Bargain and Sale	27 Apr 1842	David Kirkendall	Thomas Kennedy	Part of Lot 13, Block 12, Plan 39
320	Bargain and Sale	26 Aug 1843	Thomas Kennedy	Samuel Kirkendall	Part of Lot 13, Block 12, Plan 39
927	Bargain and Sale	26 Dec 1845	Samuel Kirkendall	Thomas Taylor	Part of Lot 13, Block 12, Plan 39
678	Bargain and Sale	15 Nov 1847	David Kirkendall	Calvin McQuesten	Lot 4 and 5, Block 12, Plan 39
521	Bargain and Sale	7 Jun 1851	Thomas Taylor	James Stewart	Part of Lot 13, Block 12, Plan 39
679	Bargain and Sale	11 Nov 1853	Calvin McQuesten	John Young	Lot 4 and 5, Block 12, Plan 39
9453	Will	21 Jun 1856	John Young and David Law	Thomas MacDuff	Lot 4 and 5, Block 12, Plan 39
670	Bargain and Sale	29 Jan 1859	John Cook	James Stewart and Adam Cook	Lot 6, Part of Lot 7, Block 12, Plan 39
5849	Deed	30 Mar 1869	Andrew Law	John Young et al	Lot 4 and 5, Block 12, Plan 39
5850	Deed	3 Jun 1871	William [Leitch]	John Young et al	Lot 4 and 5, Block 12, Plan 39
8821	Bargain and Sale	18 Apr 1873	Executors of Adam Cook	James Stewart	Lot 6, Parts of Lot 7 and Lot 13, Block 12, Plan 39
9455	Deed	24 Apr 1873	Thomas MacDuff	David Law	Lot 5, Block 12, Plan 39
9455	Deed	24 Apr 1873	David Law, [illegible]	Executor of John Young	Lot 4, Block 12, Plan 39
14016	Transfer	21 Sep 1875	John Young	Richard Alan Lucas	Lot 4 and 5, Block 12, Plan 39
53163	Bargain and Sale	29 Dec 1892	Executors of James Stewart	John Stewart, Adam Stewart and Thomas Cook	Lot 6, Parts of Lot 7 and Lot 13, Block 12, Plan 39
62370	Deed	14 Oct 1896	Alexander Bruce and R.A. Lucas	Agnes Lucas	Lot 4, Block 12, Plan 39
62373	Deed	14 Oct 1896	Alexander Bruce and R.A. Lucas, trustees of [illegible] grocery	Agnes Lucas	Lot 5, Block 12, Plan 39
66992	Bargain and Sale	8 Nov 1898	John Stewart, Adam Stewart and Joseph Nellis	Richard A. Lucas	Part of Lot 6, Block 12, Plan 39
69525	Bargain and Sale	23 Dec 1899	Adam Stewart and wife and Joseph Nellis	John E. Brown	Part of Lot 6, Block 12, Plan 39
77411	Bargain and Sale	15 Apr 1903	John E. Brown	Copley, Noyes and Randall Limited	Part of Lot 6 and Lot 7, Block 12, Plan 39
77559	Deed	30 May 1903	John Stewart, Adam Stewart and Joseph Nellis	Copley, Noyes and Randall Limited	Parts of Lot 6, Lot 7 and Lot 13, Block 12, Plan 39
70464	Bargain and Sale	1 Oct 1903	Agnes Lucas	Richard A. Lucas	Lot 4 and 5, Block 12, Plan 39
70465	Bargain and Sale	1 Oct 1903	Richard Lucas	Canada Grocers Limited	Part of Lot 6, Block 12, Plan 39

<b>Instrument #</b>	<b>Instrument</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Grantor</b>	<b>Grantee</b>	<b>Comments</b>
139767	Grant	31 Oct 1912	Canada Grocers Limited	George E. Bristol	Part of Lot 6, Block 12, Plan 39
24586	Lease	19 Mar 1935	Agnes Lucas	Coppley, Noyes and Randall Limited	"Right to maintain a bridge or passageway over part", Part of Lot 6, Block 12, Plan 39
39045	Grant	20 May 1938	Executor of George Bristol	St. Clair Balfour	Part of Lot 3, Lot 4, Lot 5, Part of Lot 6, Block 12, Plan 39
15110HL	Grant	11 Jun 1957	St. Clair Balfour	Balfours Limited	Part of Lot 3, Lot 4, Lot 5, Part of Lot 6, Block 12, Plan 39
56331AB	Grant	1 Jun 1967	Balfours Limited	The Coppley, Noyes and Randall Limited	Part of Lot 3, Lot 4, Lot 5, Part of Lot 6, Block 12, Plan 39
233068AB	Grant	17 Dec 1971	The Coppley, Noyes and Randall Limited	Sterling Clothing of Canada Limited	Part of Lot 3, Lot 4, Lot 5, Parts of Lot 6, Lot 7 and Lot 13 Block 12, Plan 39
VM188294	Transfer	6 Jul 1994	The Coppley, Noyes and Randall Limited	1059292 Ontario Inc.	Lot 4 and 5, Part of Lots 3, 6, 7 and 13, Block 12, Plan 39; as in #233068AB
WE1522332	Transfer	21 Jun 2021	1059292 Ontario Inc.	56YB Corp.	Lot 4 and 5, Part of Lots 3, 6, 7 and 13, Block 12, Plan 39; 56 York Boulevard

## **5.0 PROPERTY DESCRIPTION – SUBJECT PROPERTY**

The field survey involved the collection of primary data through systematic photographic documentation of the exterior and interior of the subject property. Photographs of the subject property were taken, as are general views of the surrounding landscape. The field survey also assisted in confirming the location of each potential cultural heritage resource and helped to determine relationships between resources.

An initial field survey was conducted by ARA staff member S. Clarke on December 8, 2021. Permission to Enter (PTE) was organized by the property owners and the field survey included both interior and exterior investigation.

### **5.1 Context**

The subject property at 56 York Boulevard in Hamilton is an approximately 0.79-acre parcel with a three-storey stone commercial building and a four-storey brick building situated on the same lot. The property is located at the northwestern corner of the intersection of York Boulevard and MacNab Street (see Image 1–Image 2).



The subject property is located within the downtown area of the City of Hamilton and is surrounded by various property types. The property is bound by parking lots located to the immediate north and west, commercial businesses and parking structures to the east and commercial and civic services including the Hamilton Farmer's Market and Hamilton Public Library – Central Branch to the south.

## 5.2 56 York Boulevard

Sections 5.2.1 and 5.2.2 detail the physical attributes of the exterior elevations for the two buildings on the subject property. The buildings are representative of different construction materials and styles and have been described individually, referred to as the stone building and brick building. The building description and associated images are provided, starting from the front façade and working around the structures in a clockwise fashion (see Image 3–Image 54).

The location and direction of exterior photos are indicated Map 11. Interior photo locations and descriptions for all floors of both buildings are included in Section 5.2.3 and 5.2.4.

### 5.2.1 Exterior – Stone Building

The stone building situated at 56 York Boulevard is located at the northwest corner of the intersection of York Boulevard and MacNab Street, fronting on both York Boulevard and MacNab Street (see Image 1–Image 3). The building is arranged in a square plan with a central courtyard and was constructed in three phases, resulting in an irregular roof plan (see Map 2 and Map 10). The building is constructed of dressed limestone masonry with a mansard roof and designed in the Renaissance Revival architectural style (see Table 6). According to the NOID from 1979, the south and east elevations are constructed of “finished whirlpool sandstone” (City of Hamilton 1979:2).

The nine-bay front façade has symmetrical massing (see Image 3). Stone pilasters separate each bay on the first storey of the front façade and extends to the second and third storeys. The pilasters feature vermiculated detailing on the first storey and ashlar on the second and third storeys (see Image 4–Image 6). A projecting stone band located in the approximate middle of the first storey extends the length of the front façade and wraps around the east elevation (see Image 7). A second projecting stone band delineates the space between the first and second storeys. The first storey window openings are framed by stone sills and round arches. Limestone keystones with a vermiculated finish decorate the arched window openings on the first storey and basement window openings which have a segmental arch (see Image 7–Image 8).

The decorative stone finishes seen on the front façade continue along the east elevation of the structure which fronts MacNab Street (see Image 9 and Image 10). A prominent bracketed stone cornice also decorates the east elevation and front façade (see Image 11). The second storey window openings are slightly arched, and the third storey window openings have a flat or jack arch (see Image 11). The window openings on the first storey contain one-over-one sash windows, while the window openings on the second and third storeys, as well as on the dormers of the fourth storey contain one-over-two windows with a horizontal sliding window on the lower half. There are nine dormers with a shed roof on the mansard storey of the front façade (see Image 12). The ashlar and dressed stone finish wrap around the southwest corner of the building.

However, the west elevation is finished in rubble stone and uncoursed masonry (see Image 12–Image 13).

Openings on the west half of the front façade's first storey have been modified from their initial arched design and replaced with a large glass window panes and a recessed door entrance (see Image 14) The vermiculated keystone associated with the original opening remains above this entrance which has been partially clad in wood.

The west elevation comprises three sections that were constructed at different times (see Image 15–Image 16). The south part of the west elevation is three-and-a-half storeys and is part of the original building constructed in 1856. A small window opening covered with iron bars is located at the third storey of the south end of the west elevation (see Image 15). An entrance clad in corrugated metal sheets on the south end of the west elevation provides an entrance to an elevated walkway that connects the stone building to the adjacent brick building. The walkway is entirely encased in corrugated metal sheets (see Image 15). The central part of the west elevation is three-and-a-half storeys and was constructed in 1856. A large window opening is located centrally on the first storey of the west elevation (see Image 16). The northern extent of the west elevation is a three-storey addition that was constructed in 1881 with three bays (see Image 17). These window openings are framed by stone sills and lintels.

The north elevation (rear) is three storeys and has a gradually stepped roof line leading to the east elevation (see Image 18). There are no window or door openings and it has been covered in thick parging (see Image 19). According to historical images and fire insurance plans, the 1856 building was formerly connected to another building located to the north (see Plate 10 and Map 7: 56 York Boulevard on Fire Insurance Plans from 1898 and 1911). A poured concrete walkway connects the stone and brick buildings on the first storey and has been clad in corrugated metal (see Image 19).

The east elevation fronting MacNab Street was at one point used as the main entrance to the building according to imagery of the building's initial design and fire insurance plans (see Plate 3, Plate 10, Image 20 and Map 7). The south and central sections of the east elevation are three storeys plus a mansard storey and are part of the original building constructed in 1856. The northern part of the east elevation was constructed in 1881 and has three storeys (see Image 21). This elevation has nine bays and there are five dormers on the 1856 portion of the east elevation, each with a shed roof. The east elevation is finished with a similar massing as seen on the south facing front façade and includes the same decorative finishes as described on the front façade. These details include stone banding, vermiculated pilasters and keystones and arched window openings. A stepped entrance is located at the south end of the east elevation with an arched transom window that supports the design and rhythm of the openings on front façade and east elevation (see Image 22). A sign is affixed to the south of this entrance and reads, "COPPLEY NOYES & RANDALL LIMITED WHOLESALE CLOTHING" (see Image 22–Image 23).

A prominent stone chimney with decorative stone scrollwork is located at the centre of the east elevation (see Image 24). The east elevation also contains a large, vermiculated arched door opening that provides access to the building's interior courtyard (see Image 25). The door enclosing the opening on at the central section of the east elevation is constructed of wood. The first storey windows on the east elevation match those seen on the front façade except for two wider window openings with segmental arches located on the northern part of the elevation that was constructed in 1881. While differing in dimensions, these window openings mimic the stone

decorative finishes seen elsewhere on the first storey (see Image 26 and Image 27). Basement window openings on the east elevation have been covered with plywood and are recessed with vermiculated keystones (see Image 27).

### **5.2.1.1 Courtyard – Stone Building**

The stone building has a central courtyard that was enclosed with the construction of the north building in 1881 (see Map 10). The courtyard walls are constructed of cut stone masonry with the exception of the fourth storey of the north and west courtyard elevations that are constructed of brick masonry (see Image 28–Image 35). Basement window openings within the courtyard are small and covered with iron bars (see Image 28–Image 30). Window openings on the first storey of the courtyard are topped with round arches and several have iron bars affixed to the surrounding stone (see Image 28–Image 30). The large, round arched tunnel leads to the doorway on the east elevation (see Image 29).

The second and third storeys window openings are rectangular with stone sills and lintels (see Image 30–Image 35). The fourth storey of the north elevation is constructed of brick masonry has three large window openings with segmental arches evenly spaced and one small window opening at west end of the elevation. These openings are framed with brick voussoirs and brick sills (see Image 32).

### **5.2.2 Exterior – Brick Building**

The brick building at 56 York Boulevard is located immediately west of the stone building (see Image 36). The two buildings are connected by an elevated walkway on the second and third storeys. The brick building is four-storeys and constructed of red brick masonry on a stone foundation. While the building is constructed of brick masonry, views of the building's side elevations reveal that the front façade brickwork and stonework is an exterior cladding with decorative stone detailing in the form of banding courses, door surrounds, sills and keystones (see Image 37–Image 38). The front façade is five bays, punctuated by brick pilasters and features paired window openings. The building was constructed in 1911 as a commercial building and is designed in the Edwardian Classicism architectural style (see Image 37).

An entrance is located at the centre of the front façade on the first storey and is framed by an oversized dressed stone surround (see Image 39). Five window openings for the basement have been enclosed with brick and are separated by dressed stone with a tooled textured finish (see Image 40 and Image 41). Window openings on the first storey are framed with segmental arched brick voussoirs with a stone keystone. Similarly, the window openings on the second, third and fourth storeys have segmental arches with brick voussoirs. An unassuming door opening is located at the western extent of the front façade. The front façade has a parapet wall with a centred peak (see Image 42).

The west elevation is constructed of red brick masonry laid in common bond with projecting sections at either end of the elevation (see Image 43). The brick masonry rests on a cut stone foundation laid in a random ashlar pattern (see Image 44). The projecting section at the southern extent of the west elevation houses a stairwell and does not contain any openings (see Image 43). The projecting section at the north part of the west elevation has a double window opening flanked by a small window openings on the first, second, third and fourth storeys (see Image 42 and Image 43). Most of the openings on this elevation have stacked brick voussoirs laid in a segmental arch (see Image 43). A prominent metal apparatus has been attached to the west

elevation between the two projecting sections and partially or fully obscures the window openings (see Image 45). A wooden door is located on the first storey of the north projecting section (see Image 46). Basement window openings have stacked brick voussoirs laid in a segmental arch, with some openings enclosed and others with original glazing and metal mullions (see Image 47). There is a one-storey brick addition on the north elevation, with an enclosed square window opening and stacked brick voussoirs laid in a segmental arch (see Image 48). A one-storey cinder block addition connects to the north side of the one-story brick addition (see Image 49).

The north elevation is the rear of the building (see Image 50). An exterior brick chimney is located at the centre of this elevation and extends from the one-storey brick addition on the north elevation (see Image 50). The window openings on this elevation are similar to those previously described with stack brick voussoirs laid in a segmental arch with brick sills (see Image 51). The stone foundation visible on this elevation is uncoursed (see Image 52).

The east elevation is partially obscured from York Boulevard due to the elevated walkway (see Image 53). Openings along this elevation match the dimensions and finishes to those seen on the north and east elevation with stacked brick voussoirs laid in a segmental arch and brick sills (see Image 54). The first storey window opening at the south end of the east elevation is glazed with insulated glass block and the second and third storey openings just north of the southernmost window openings have been covered with the overhead walkway extending west from the stone building (see Image 54).

### **5.2.3 Interior – Stone Building**

#### **5.2.3.1 First Floor**

The interior of the structure has been modified through its history to best suit the needs of the businesses within. The interior was accessed through the door opening at the west elevation (see Image 55–Image 56). The first floor has been heavily modified for use a commercial retail space and offices (see Image 56, Image 63, Image 71 and Image 72). Painted cast iron pillar with fluted shafts are spaced throughout the first floor of the original 1856 structure and feature an eight-sided plinth and capital. and the retail and office spaces have been finished with a more contemporary wooden dropped ceiling (see Image 57, Image 59–Image 60, Image 62, Image 69, Image 70 and Image 78–Image 80). At the north extent of the 1856 building along MacNab Street is a decorative chair rail that dates to an earlier period of use for the buildings and remains somewhat intact (see Image 64). The window openings on the first floor have wood sills (see Image 62–Image 63). The north building, constructed in 1881 is less decorative than the remainder of the first floor and has been modified since its previous use as an imported fruit warehouse (see Image 76–Image 80 and Image 84–Image 88). A vault is located on the first floor of the 1881 building (see Image 80–Image 83). A narrow corridor provides access to stairs to the second floor and is the location of a window opening and wainscoting (see Image 89 and Image 91–Image 92). A metal heat register indicates the method of heating the building through much of its history (see Image 90).

#### **5.2.3.2 Second Floor**

A wooden dog-leg staircase leads to the second floor (see Image 93 and Image 95–Image 96). Horizontal wood paneling covers the walls around the stair area. The stairs open to a second floor landing and large framed opening, with doorways on to the left and right of the large opening

(see Image 98 and Image 100–Image 101). Cast-iron pillars support the third storey and are decoratively the same as the iron pillars found on the first floor (see Image 102, Image 106, Image 108, Image 110–Image 112 and Image 114). The doorways allow for fluid movement around the second floor and a door opening covered by a retractable metal fire door leads to the second-floor walkway allowing travel from the stone building to the brick building (see Image 109). Walls on the second floor are clad in wood paneling, dry wall and plaster (see Image 109, Image 111, Image 113, Image 117 and Image 120). A vault is located on the second floor and evidence of modifications to the building's interior can be seen on the second floor with the presence of a stairwell behind a door opening (see Image 121–Image 122). Flooring materials on the second floor consisted of hardwood and vinyl tiles.

### **5.2.3.3 Third Floor**

The third floor is very similar to the second floor, although the vault on the third floor is not as elaborate (see Image 123). The support pillars on the third floor are relatively plain and mostly undecorated (see Image 124–Image 130 and Image 132). The stairwell hidden behind the door opening on the third floor leads to the fourth floor (see Image 133).

### **5.2.3.4 Fourth Floor**

The fourth floor was accessed from the east side of the building and is supported by squared wooden posts and cast-iron pillars (see Image 135–Image 137). An opening to the north of the 1856 building leads to the half-storey central section of the west part of the building. The wall separating the central section from the south section of the building was constructed with red brick, while the west and north walls of the central section were built with stone. This section slants down from west to east and appears have functioned as a storage area. The dormer walls and ceiling are clad in painted beadboard (see Image 138–Image 139). A doorway at the south part of the west side of the building leads to an external staircase that was added to the property sometime in the 20<sup>th</sup> century (see Image 140). There is also a large opening to the walkway on the fourth floor that leads between the stone and brick buildings (see Image 141–Image 142).

### **5.2.3.5 Basement**

Stair access to the basement is located at the east part of the building, with the stairwell clad in wood panelling and plaster (see Image 97 and Image 143). Cylindrical fluted pillars support the first floor and the basement flooring is almost exclusively hardwood (see Image 145). Various rooms have been created for storage within the basement as well as a boiler area (see Image 144–Image 153). A vault is located in a room in the basement which, upon closer inspection, has remnants of graffiti by way of names of previous employees such as "TOM MAR [??] /57; JAN 18 /57" (see Image 156).

## **5.2.4 Interior – Brick Building**

### **5.2.4.1 First Floor**

The first floor of the building was accessed with the dog leg staircase within the stairwell on the west elevation through a door opening on the west elevation (see Image 157–Image 159). Metal "I" beams and posts support the second floor and some of the metal beams have been surrounded with an indeterminate cladding (see Image 160 and Image 163). The walls on the first floor are drywall, plaster and painted brick (see Image 161). A large vault at the west part of the building is

constructed of brick and has graffiti inside (see Image 161–Image 162). The first-floor ceiling is clad with beadboard that has been covered with acoustic panels (see Image 164). The north part of the first floor provides access to the ground floor loading bay between the brick and stone buildings on the eastern elevation (see Image 166–Image 167). The floor has been covered with painted plywood.

#### **5.2.4.2 Second Floor**

The second floor has hardwood flooring and painted metal “I” beams supporting the third floor. The abundance of window openings on each wall allows the room to be flooded with natural light (see Image 168–Image 169 and Image 171). An opening on the east side of the second floor of the building provides access to the walkway between the brick and stone buildings (see Image 170). A freight elevator shaft and associated shaft are located in the southern part of the western portion of the building (see Image 172). Many window opening on the second floor have painted brick sills (see Image 173).

#### **5.2.4.3 Third Floor**

The third floor is very similar to the second floor and has hardwood flooring throughout. It was accessed using a stairwell at the northeast corner of the building (see Image 174 and Image 177). Support beams for the fourth floor are missing in some cases and the remainder have been reinforced with cast iron pillars (see Image 175).





#### **5.2.4.4 Basement**

The basement is access by two sets of stairs. Support beams for the first floor are constructed of wood or stone, with the basement primarily functioning as storage. The ceiling joists have been painted white (see Image 179–Image 181 and Image 186–Image 187). Many basement window openings still have glazing and although the glass has been painted over, outdoor light is able to permeate (see Image 182–Image 185).

### **5.3 Adjacent Properties**

There are a number of adjacent properties that have recognition from the City that should be considered with this CHA. These properties have been detailed at a high-level in Table 5, including their recognition type, current photograph and assumed heritage attributes based on their listing on the Municipal Heritage Register (see Figure 1, Image 1–Image 2, Image 12 and Image 15).

**Table 5: Adjacent Cultural Heritage Resources**

Address	Recognition	Photo (City of Hamilton 2022)	Assumed Heritage Attributes
Hamilton Central Public Library 55 York Boulevard	Listed		Six-storey, brutalist civic building constructed of brick concrete with large expanse of glass, flat roof
Lloyd D. Jackson Square 2 King Street West	Inventoried		Four-storey commercial building with flat roof
G.S. Dunn & Co. 80 Park Street North	Listed		Four-storey brick masonry building with three bay façade and flat roof
Parking Structure 28 York Boulevard	Inventoried		Six-storey parking garage building with concrete balconies, setting close to the lot line, round window openings in interior staircase, flat roof

## 5.4 Architectural Style/Design

### 5.4.1 Renaissance Revival – Stone Building

The Renaissance Revival architectural style is commonly described or categorized into two distinctive types: astylar, meaning a building without columns or pilasters, and columnar or with columns. The astylar is simpler and relatively plain in comparison to the columnar which features elaborate decorations and a variety of formal column and pilaster designs.

A description of Renaissance Revival style is provided in *Ontario Architecture* by John Blumenson and is reproduced below:

*Both versions are formal in balance and harmony, reflecting a studied and academic interest in sixteenth century urban Italian palaces and town houses...As a result of an urban setting and an official appearance, the Renaissance Revival was most successfully adapted to commercial buildings, banks and offices than to houses (Blumenson 1990:96).*

The exterior of Renaissance Revival residences in the astylar style are typically no more than three storeys in height with each level clearly delineated by string courses and the elevations are framed by a prominent cornice often supported by bracketing. Opening surrounds are typically framed by a pronounced surround and scroll like-bracketing supports large architectural elements. Typically, masonry dressing is more ornate on the first storey with rusticated or vermiculated ashlar whereas the upper storeys typically have a smoother more simplistic ashlar finish. The second-floor openings usually exhibit more architectural embellishments in reference to the traditional Italian practice where the second floor is the main floor or *piano nobile*.

The exterior of the columnar version of Renaissance Revival is more elaborate with a variety of columns, pilasters and arches and is richer in textural treatment. Each storey is defined by a different Classical order with Doric or Ionic commonly seen on the ground floor and Corinthian, Composite or variations thereof implemented on the upper floors. Storeys are delineated on the exterior by a full entablature. Material finishes are elaborate with low relief sculptural elements and use luxurious materials such as marble.

The three-storey plus mansard stone building at 56 York Boulevard is an example of a Renaissance Revival commercial building expressed through its balanced front façade, massing, varying arched openings and stone detailing with oversized keystones and contrasting vermiculated and smooth masonry. The stone building displays both astylar and columnar stylistic influences. However, given that the structure is devoid of obvious Classical orders and detailing, the subject building is best described as an astylar version of Renaissance Revival.

**Table 6: Characteristics of Renaissance Revival Commercial Buildings**  
**(Blumenson 1990:96, Kyles 2016)**

<b>Stylistic Characteristics</b>	<b>Characteristics of 56 York Blvd – Stone Building</b>
Astylar or Columnar Style	Yes – Astylar style
Balanced front façade	Yes
Three storeys	Yes
Prominent string courses delineating storeys	Yes
Large cornice supported by bracketing	Yes
Scroll details supporting architectural elements	Yes – chimney fronting MacNab contains decorative scroll details
Highly decorated second storey openings	No
Oversized keystones	Yes
Varying arched openings	Yes – round and segmental arches visible
Frontispiece projecting above roofline	Yes – chimney fronting MacNab
Textured and decorative first storey masonry with details less evident on upper storeys	Yes – more vermiculated detailing on first storey, switches to smooth ashlar on upper storeys



### 5.4.2 Edwardian Classicism– Brick Building

The Edwardian Classicism style is commonly described as a simple but formal composition that emphasizes classical motifs. The change in style was described as:

*indicative of the new direction architecture was to take in the twentieth century. In contrast to the highly colouristic, complicated, and often eclectic compositions of the last nineteenth century, Edwardian classicism through its balanced façades, simplified but large roofs, smooth brick surfaces and generous fenestration, restored simplicity, and order to residential architecture (Blumenson 1942:166, Kyles 2016).*

The exterior of Edwardian Classicism commercial buildings is highlighted by a concentration of stylized and often exaggerated Classical elements. Edwardian Classicism front façades are punctuated by subdued pilaster or piers rather than Classical order columns, however window surrounds and entrance openings typically featured prominent detailing that reference Classical elements.

The brick building at 56 York Boulevard is emblematic of a commercial building designed in the Edwardian Classicism architectural style, expressed through the building’s brick construction, massing, the use of brick banding along the front façade, stone detailing on string courses, sills, and keystones, parapet wall and prominent stone surround on the front façade entrance.

**Table 7: Characteristics of Edwardian Classicism Commercial Buildings  
(Blumenson 1990:166, Kyles 2016)**

Stylistic Characteristics	Characteristics of 56 York Blvd – Brick Building
Brick Construction	Yes
Smooth Brick Surfaces	Yes
Brick Banding	Yes
Stone Trim and Accents Around Openings	Yes
Use of Parapets and Pediments	Yes
Projecting, Pressed-metal cornices	No – no cornice extant
Balanced Front Façade	Yes
Oversized Decorative Architectural Details	Yes – oversized keystones on first storey and carved stone front façade entrance surround
Classical Detailing	No
Columned frontispiece	No
Medium height – three to ten storeys	Yes – Three storeys

## 6.0 COMMUNITY RECOGNITION

Built Heritage Resources (BHRs) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHLs) are broadly referred to as cultural heritage resources. A variety of types of recognition exist to commemorate and/or protect cultural heritage resources in Ontario. As part of consultation process, ARA reviews relevant online sources and databases to determine if the subject property is recognized.

The Minister of the Environment, on the advice of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada (HSMBC), makes recommendations to declare a site, event or person of national significance. The National Historic Sites program commemorates important sites that had a

nationally significant effect on, or illustrates a nationally important aspect of, the history of Canada. A National Historic Event is a recognized event that evokes a moment, episode, movement or experience in the history of Canada. National Historic People are people who are recognized as those who through their words or actions, have made a unique and enduring contribution to the history of Canada. The Parks Canada's online *Directory of Federal Heritage Designations* captures these national commemorations as well as lists Heritage Railway Stations, Federal Heritage Buildings and Heritage Lighthouses. The subject property does not appear on any of these lists.

Another form of recognition involves the Canadian Heritage Rivers System program. It is a federal program to recognize and conserve rivers with outstanding natural, cultural and recreational heritage. The Canadian Heritage Rivers System database was consulted and there are no recognized river systems in proximity to the subject property.

The Ontario Heritage Trust (OHT) operates the Provincial Plaque Program that has over 1,250 provincial plaques recognizing key people, places and events that shaped the province. Additionally, properties owned by the province may be recognized as a "provincial heritage property" (MHSTCI 2010). The OHT plaque database and the Federal Canadian Heritage Database were searched. The subject property is not commemorated with an OHT plaque, nor is it recognized as a National Historic Site (OHT 2021; Parks Canada 2021). The subject property is not subject to an OHT or municipal easement.

MHSTCI's current list of Heritage Conservation Districts was consulted. The properties within the study area were not found to be located within a designated district (MHSTCI 2021). The list of properties designated by the MHSTCI under Section 34.5 of the *OHA* was consulted and the subject property is not included in this list.

Protected properties are those protected by Part IV (individual properties) or Part V (Heritage Conservation District) designation under the *OHA*. Once designated, a property cannot be altered or demolished without the permission of the local council. A cultural heritage resource may also be protected through a municipal or OHT easement. Many heritage committees and historical societies provide plaques for local places of interest. Under *Section 27* of the *OHA*, a municipality must keep a Municipal Heritage Register. A Municipal Heritage Register lists designated properties as well as other properties of CHVI in the municipality. Properties on this Register that are not formally designated are commonly referred to as "listed." Listed properties are flagged for planning purposes and are afforded a 60-day delay in demolition if a demolition request is received. The City of Hamilton Municipal Heritage Register was consulted, and it was confirmed that 56 York Boulevard is considered a designated property with a NOID issued in May 1979. Through further consultation with the City of Hamilton's Heritage Planner on November 25, 2021, it was learned that the NOID submitted for the subject property is scheduled to expire in July 2022 and is currently on the Staff Work Plan to receive an updated designation under Part IV of the *OHA* to reflect the changes implemented with Bill 108.

## 7.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE EVALUATION

56 York Boulevard was evaluated against the criteria of *Ontario Regulation 9/06*, and the City of Hamilton's *Framework for Cultural Heritage Evaluation* Section 3 (Built Heritage) to determine if the property has CHVI (see Table 8 and Table 9). 56 York Boulevard contains two structures, a three-storey plus mansard whirlpool limestone building and a four-storey brick building. These

buildings are connected via an elevated walkway and are contained within one property address. Both buildings have been addressed in the following evaluations.

7.1 Evaluation of the Properties in the Study Area according to *Ontario Regulation 9/06*

Table 8: Evaluation of the CHVI of 56 York Boulevard using Ontario Regulation 9/06

EVALUATION OF PROPERTY			
Criteria	Description	✓	Value Statement
Design or Physical Value	Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method	✓	The three-storey plus mansard roof building constructed of limestone at 56 York Boulevard is a representative example of the Renaissance Revival architectural style constructed in the mid 19 <sup>th</sup> century. Elements of the structure reflective of the Renaissance Revival style include the building's balanced front façade, massing, projecting string courses between storeys, large, bracketed cornice, scrollwork detailing on frontispiece chimney fronting MacNab Street, varying arched openings and the building's textured and decorative first storey and less decorated upper storeys.
		✓	The four-storey building constructed of brick masonry at 56 York Boulevard is a representative example of an Edwardian Classicism commercial building constructed in the early 20 <sup>th</sup> century. Elements of the structure that reflect the Edwardian Classicism style include the brick masonry construction with banding or channelling implemented along the front façade, segmentally arched openings with stone trim and accents, parapet wall, the building's balanced front façade and oversized decorative architectural elements such as the front façade entrance surround and stone keystones.
			Together, the brick and stone building at 56 York Boulevard create a representative example of turn-of-the-century industrial/manufacturing building. The interior of the buildings demonstrates construction methods and design common for industrial/manufacturing buildings of this time including plank and beam construction with timber and cast-iron pillars and beams to create large open spaces, the implementation of metal door sliding fire door system, exposed wooden flooring and vaults placed throughout the building.
	Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic value	✓	The three-storey plus mansard roof building constructed of limestone at 56 York Boulevard displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic value expressed through its hand carved stone finishes with scrollwork, varying arches and vermiculated detailing.
	Displays a high degree of technical or scientific achievement		The four-storey building constructed of brick masonry at 56 York Boulevard is a solidly built structure reflecting quality craftsmanship, however it does not display a particularly high degree of craftsmanship or artistic value in relation to the materials and designs commonly seen for its construction period.
			Neither the stone nor brick masonry building at 56 York Boulevard display a high level of technical or scientific achievement. While both are solidly built structures, they were built using common method and techniques of the construction period.

EVALUATION OF PROPERTY			
Criteria	Description	✓	Value Statement
<b>Historical or Associative Value</b>	Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community	✓	<p>The early growth of the City of Hamilton in the late 19th and early 20th century is attributed to manufacturing, specifically textile production. 56 York Boulevard represents the direct associations with the textiles and clothing production theme that was and remains significant to the growth of Hamilton.</p> <p>As the home to the iconic clothing manufacturer, Copley Noyes and Randall, 56 York Boulevard represents an organization that has been significant to the City of Hamilton for nearly 130 years of continuous service as and is one of the founding pillars of the local fashion industry, preceding the now well-known textile and fabric hub of nearby Ottawa Street. Hamilton has the fifth-largest cluster of fashion businesses in Canada, boasting over 520 businesses in the fashion industry sector.</p>
	Yields or has the potential to yield information that contributes to the understanding of a community or culture		Neither the stone building or brick building at 56 York Boulevard have the potential to yield information that contribute to an understanding of a community or culture.
	Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, builder, artist, designer or theorist who is significant to a community	✓	<p>The stone building is associated with Frederick James Rastrick, a prominent Hamilton architect who practised in the area in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Rastrick was a key part of the development of the professional association of architects in Ontario. Rastrick served as the vice-president of the Association of Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors of Canada, the first president of the Canadian Institute of Architects and a member of the council of the Ontario Association of Architects in 1889. From 1854 to 1857, Rastrick served as the appointed engineer for the County of Wentworth.</p> <p>The brick building is associated with the architect Alfred Wavell Peene a notable late 19<sup>th</sup> century and early 20<sup>th</sup> century architect who practiced extensively in Hamilton and is credited with civic, commercial and residential buildings throughout the city.</p>
	Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area	✓	<p>Placed on the northwest corner of the busy intersection of York Boulevard and MacNab Street and located across from a major city centre, the Hamilton Farmer's Market, the three-storey plus mansard stone building is a prominent part of the streetscape aids in defining the historic character of downtown Hamilton.</p> <p>The building is important in maintaining the historical character of the area's mid 19<sup>th</sup> century development as an economic centre in downtown Hamilton. While much of the surrounding blocks have been redeveloped this building defines the historic nature of the streetscape. Further, the building supports this historical character of the City of Hamilton as a textile manufacturing centre for over 130 years. The City's prowess in textiles is exhibited in the many mills and industrial buildings associated with textile production, some of which remain today, like the Cotton Factory on Sherman Avenue in Hamilton and the subject building.</p> <p>The four-storey brick building supports the evolving character of downtown Hamilton as an early 20<sup>th</sup> century commercial building placed along 19<sup>th</sup> century structures.</p>

EVALUATION OF PROPERTY			
Criteria	Description	✓	Value Statement
	Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings		Neither the stone building or brick building are physically, visually, functionally or historically linked to their surroundings. The link to the historical civic centre has been broken as the historic downtown are no longer extant. The building's historical links to its surroundings have been diminished and are not longer legible.
	Is a landmark	✓	Prominently placed at the southwestern and southeastern property boundaries on the northwest corner of the busy intersection of York Boulevard and MacNab Street the three-storey plus mansard limestone building is a preeminent feature of the streetscape that helps communicates the historic nature of the area. The property's positioning across from a major city centre, the Hamilton Farmer's Market and Central Branch of the Hamilton Public Library further elevates this property's streetscape status. For these reasons, the stone building is considered a landmark.  The four-storey brick building, while connected to the limestone building is located to the east of the intersection and does not have the same visual prominence as the stone structure. The brick building is not considered a landmark.

The above table demonstrates that 56 York Boulevard has physical and design value, historical and associative value, and contextual value according to *O.Reg 9/06*.

## 7.2 Evaluation of CHVI according to the City of Hamilton Framework for Cultural Heritage Evaluation Section 3

**Table 9: 56 York Boulevard - City of Hamilton Evaluation Criteria (Section 3: Built Heritage)**

EVALUATION OF PROPERTY			
Criteria	Description	✓	Value Statement
<b>Historical Associations</b>	Thematic: how well does the feature or property illustrate a historical theme that is representative of significant patterns of history in the context of the community, province or nation?	✓	56 York Boulevard is associated with the development of the textile industry in Hamilton in the 19 <sup>th</sup> and 20 <sup>th</sup> century. As the second most important industry attributed to the growth of Hamilton, the textile industry theme is reflected strongly in the subject property. As the home to the iconic clothing manufacturer Copley Noyes and Randall, 56 York Boulevard represents the home of an organization that has been significant to the City of Hamilton for nearly 130 years of continuous service as one of the founding pillars of the local fashion industry, preceding the now well-known textile and fabric hub of nearby Ottawa Street. Hamilton now has the fifth-largest cluster of fashion businesses in Canada, boasting over 520 businesses in the fashion industry sector.
	Event: is the property associated with a specific event that has made a significant contribution to the community, province or nation?		56 York Boulevard is not associated with any specific event that has made a significant contribution to the community, province or nation.

EVALUATION OF PROPERTY			
Criteria	Description	✓	Value Statement
	Person and/or Group: is the feature associated with the life or activities of a person or group that has made a significant contribution to the community, province or nation?		56 York Boulevard is a best associated with the textile and fashion industry in Hamilton, which is more of a thematic association than with a person or group.
<b>Architecture and Design</b>	Architectural merit: what is the architectural value of the resource?	✓	56 York Boulevard contains a representative example of a Renaissance Revival commercial building and an Edwardian Classicism commercial building.
	Functional merit: what is the functional quality of the resource?	✓	The buildings at 56 York Boulevard were previously used as a manufacturing centre for textiles and is associated with the clothing manufacturer Copley, Noyes and Randall. The building is currently vacant.
	Designer: what is the significance of this structure as an illustration of the work of an important designer?	✓	The stone building is associated with architect Frederick Rastrick, a prominent Hamilton architect who practised in the area in the 19 <sup>th</sup> century. Rastrick was a key part of the development of the professional association of architects in Ontario. Rastrick served as the vice-president of the Association of Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors of Canada, the first president of the Canadian Institute of Architects and a member of the council of the Ontario Association of Architects in 1889. From 1854 to 1857, Rastrick served as the appointed engineer for the County of Wentworth.  Additionally, the brick building is associated with the architect Alfred Wavell Peene a notable late 19 <sup>th</sup> century and early 20 <sup>th</sup> century architect who practiced extensively in Hamilton and is credited with civic, commercial and residential buildings throughout the city.
<b>Integrity</b>	Location integrity: is the structure in its original location?	✓	Both the stone and brick building at 56 York Boulevard are in their original location.
	Built integrity: is the structure and its components parts all there?	✓	The stone structure in its current iteration is composed of several portions constructed at varying times these additions have not detracted from the building's earliest iteration and contribute to an understanding of the building's evolution.  The brick building and its components are all present.
<b>Environmental Context</b>	Landmark: is it a visually conspicuous feature in the area?	✓	Prominently placed at the southwestern and southeastern property boundaries on the northwest corner of the busy intersection of York Boulevard and MacNab Street the three-storey plus mansard limestone building is a preeminent feature of the streetscape that helps communicate the historic nature of the area. The property's positioning across from a major city centre, the Hamilton Farmer's Market and Central Branch of the Hamilton Public Library further elevates this property's streetscape status. For these reasons, the stone building is considered a landmark

EVALUATION OF PROPERTY			
Criteria	Description	✓	Value Statement
			The four-storey brick building, while connected to the limestone building is located to the east of the intersection and does not have the same visual prominence as the stone structure. The brick building is not considered a landmark
	Character: what is the influence of the structure on the present character of the area?	✓	The architecture of the stone structure is representative of early development of downtown Hamilton as an urban centre in the mid-19 <sup>th</sup> century. The brick structure is representative of the continuing evolution of the downtown neighbourhood and of early 20 <sup>th</sup> century construction.
	Setting: what is the integrity of the historical relationship between the structure and its immediate surroundings?	✓	While 20 <sup>th</sup> and 21 <sup>st</sup> century development along York Boulevard has resulted in many larger structures which has somewhat diminished the building's overall prominence on the street, the buildings positioning at the intersection of MacNab Street and York Boulevard is intact and is a defining feature that helps communicate the historic nature of these streetscapes.
<b>Social Value</b>	Public perception: is the property or feature regarded as important within its area?	✓	Based on the numerous and prominent community interest in the re-development of the buildings between 2020–2021, it appears that this property is important to the local heritage community (Wilson 2020, .Polewski 2021, Passafiume 2021)

The above table demonstrates that 56 York Boulevard meets ten of the City of Hamilton's *Framework for Cultural Heritage Evaluation* Section 3 (Built Heritage) criteria.



## 8.0 STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST

### 8.1 56 York Boulevard - Statement

#### Introduction and Description of Property

56 York Boulevard includes a three-storey plus mansard roof limestone Renaissance Revival commercial building built in two phases in 1856 and 1881. The later 1911 addition of a four-storey building constructed of brick masonry is a representative example of an Edwardian Classicism commercial building.

#### Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

**56 York Boulevard (stone portion) is a representative example of the Renaissance Revival style for commercial buildings.** Built in 1856, with a later 1881 addition, it is a good example of this architectural type, expressed through its balanced front façade, massing, varying arched window and door openings and stone detailing with oversized keystones and contrasting vermiculated and smooth masonry. The stone building displays both astylar and columnar stylistic influences. However, given that the structure is devoid of obvious Classical orders and detailing, the subject building is best described as an astylar version of Renaissance Revival.

**56 York Boulevard (brick portion) is a representative example of the Edwardian Classicism style for commercial buildings.** Built in 1911 the structure is emblematic of a commercial building designed in the Edwardian Classicism architectural style. This is expressed through the building's brick construction, massing, fenestration, the use of brick banding along the front façade, stone detailing on string courses, sills, and keystones, parapet wall and prominent stone surround on the front façade entrance.

**56 York Boulevard (stone portion) displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic value** expressed through its carved stone finishes with scrollwork, varying arched window and door openings, intricate vermiculated detailing and interior courtyard.

**56 York Boulevard represents direct associations with the textiles and clothing production industries that were and remain significant to the growth of Hamilton.** Late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century growth and development in Hamilton is attributed to its manufacturing prowess, particularly in textile production. As the home to the iconic clothing manufacturer Copley Noyes and Randall, the building at 56 York Boulevard represents an organization that has been significant to the City of Hamilton for nearly 130 years of continuous service as one of the founding pillars of the local fashion industry, preceding the now well-known textile and fabric hub of nearby Ottawa Street. The subject buildings are of the few remaining structures in the City of Hamilton that represent this textile boom.

**56 York Boulevard demonstrates the work of Frederick James Rastrick (stone building) and Alfred Wavell Peene (brick building) who are significant architects.** Frederick James Rastrick, a prominent Hamilton architect who practised in the area in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Rastrick was a key part of the development of the professional association of architects in Ontario. Rastrick served as the vice-president of the Association of Architects, Engineers and Land Surveyors of Canada, the first president of the Canadian Institute of Architects and a member of the council of the Ontario Association of Architects in 1889. From 1854 to 1857, Rastrick served as the appointed engineer for the County of Wentworth. Alfred Wavell Peene was a prominent late 19<sup>th</sup>

century and early 20<sup>th</sup> century architect who practiced extensively in Hamilton and is credited with civic, commercial and residential buildings throughout the city.

**56 York Boulevard is important in maintaining the historical character of the area's mid 19<sup>th</sup> century development as an economic centre in downtown Hamilton.** While much of the surrounding blocks have been redeveloped, 56 York Boulevard continues to maintain the historic nature of the streetscape. Further, the buildings support the historical character of the City of Hamilton as a textile manufacturing centre for over 130 years. The City's prowess in textiles is exhibited in the many mills and industrial buildings associated with textile production, some of which remain today, like the Cotton Factory on Sherman Avenue and the subject building.

**56 York Boulevard has contextual significance as a landmark.** Prominently placed at the southwestern and southeastern property boundaries on the northwest corner of the busy intersection of York Boulevard and MacNab Street the three-storey plus mansard limestone building is a preeminent feature of the streetscape that helps communicate the historic nature of the area. The property's positioning across from a major city centre, the Hamilton Farmer's Market and Central Branch of the Hamilton Public Library further elevates this property's streetscape status. For these reasons, the stone building is considered a landmark

## 8.2 56 York Boulevard - Cultural Heritage Attributes

The heritage attributes of 56 York Boulevard are noted on Figure 2 for the stone building and Figure 3 for the brick building.

**The stone building at 56 York Boulevard is a representative example of a commercial building constructed in the Renaissance Revival architectural style.** The property contains the following heritage attributes that reflect these values:

- Three-storey plus mansard roof building constructed of whirlpool limestone;
- Balanced front façade;
- Mansard roof dormers;
- Projecting string courses;
- Bracketed stone cornice;
- Varying arched fenestration on the front façade and east elevation;
- Stone frontispiece chimney fronting MacNab Street with scrollwork detailing;
- Interior courtyard and courtyard fenestration; and
- Vermiculated stone detailing on first storey of the front façade and east elevation.

**The brick building at 56 York Boulevard is a representative example of a commercial building designed in the Edwardian Classicism architectural style.** The property contains the following heritage attributes that reflect these values:

- Four-storey building constructed of brick masonry;
- Balanced front façade;
- Brick banding or channelling on the front façade;
- Parapet wall;
- Segmentally arched fenestration on the front façade;
- Stone trim and accents around openings; and
- Oversized decorative architectural elements, including
  - Front façade entrance surround
  - Stone keystones

**56 York Boulevard displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic value** through its hand carved stone finishes with scrollwork, varying arches, and intricate vermiculated detailing. The property contains the following attributes that reflect these values:

- Three-storey plus mansard roof building constructed of whirlpool limestone;
- Balanced front façade;
- Mansard roof dormers;
- Projecting string courses;
- Bracketed stone cornice;
- Varying arched fenestration;
- Stone frontispiece chimney fronting MacNab Street with scrollwork detailing;
- Interior courtyard and courtyard fenestration; and
- Vermiculated stone detailing on first storey of the front façade and east elevation.

**56 York Boulevard's interiors are representative of a turn-of-the-century industrial/manufacturing building.** The property contains the following interior attributes that reflect this value:

- Wood and cast-iron pillars on all floors in both the brick and stone building; in particular, the decorative cast-iron pillars on the first floor of the stone building;
- Metal fire doors found in both the brick and stone building;
- Wooden flooring where exposed in both the brick and stone building;
- Vaults with metal doors found in both the brick and stone building, some with graffiti dating to the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

**56 York Boulevard has historical associations related to the growth of the City of Hamilton in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century** as a manufacturing centre, specifically related to the City's history related to the development of the textile manufacturing. The property contains the following attributes that reflect these values:

- Copley Noyes and Randall sign; and
- Prominent location at a main crossroads.

**56 York Boulevard has direct associations with Frederick James Rastrick, a prominent architect** practicing in the City of Hamilton in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The property contains the following attributes that reflect this value:

- Three-storey plus mansard roof building constructed of whirlpool limestone;
- Balanced front façade;
- Mansard roof dormers;
- Projecting string courses;
- Bracketed stone cornice;
- Varying arched fenestration;
- Stone frontispiece chimney fronting MacNab Street with scrollwork detailing;
- Interior courtyard and courtyard fenestration; and
- Vermiculated stone detailing on first storey of the front façade and east elevation.

**56 York Boulevard has direct associations with Alfred Wavell Peene, a notable local architect** practicing in the City of Hamilton. The property contains the following attributes that reflect this value:

- Four-storey building constructed of brick masonry;
- Balanced front façade;

- Brick banding or channelling on front façade;
- Parapet wall;
- Segmentally arched fenestration on front façade;
- Stone trim and accents around openings; and
- Oversized decorative architectural elements, including
  - Front façade entrance surround;
  - Stone keystones.

**56 York Boulevard is important in maintaining the historical character of the area's mid 19th century development** as an economic centre in downtown Hamilton. The property contains the following attributes that reflect this value:

- Three-storey plus mansard roof building constructed of whirlpool limestone;
  - Balanced front façade;
  - Mansard roof dormers;
  - Projecting string courses;
  - Bracketed stone cornice;
  - Varying arched fenestration;
  - Stone frontispiece chimney fronting MacNab Street with scrollwork detailing
  - Interior courtyard and courtyard fenestration; and
  - Vermiculated stone detailing on first storey of the front facade façade and east elevation
  - Copley Noyes and Randall sign; and
- Four-storey building constructed of brick masonry;
  - Balanced front façade;
  - Brick banding or channelling on front façade;
  - Parapet Wall;
  - Segmentally arched fenestration on front façade;
  - Stone trim and accents around openings; and
  - Oversized decorative architectural elements, including
    - Front façade entrance surround
    - Stone keystones
- Prominent location at intersection of MacNab Street and York Boulevard.

**56 York Boulevard has contextual significance as a landmark.** The property contains the following attributes that reflect this value:

- Three-storey plus mansard roof building constructed of whirlpool limestone;
  - Balanced front façade;
  - Mansard roof dormers;
  - Projecting string courses;
  - Bracketed stone cornice;
  - Varying arched fenestration;
  - Stone frontispiece chimney fronting MacNab Street with scrollwork detailing;
  - Interior courtyard and courtyard fenestration;
  - Vermiculated stone detailing on first storey on the front façade and east elevation;
  - Copley Noyes and Randall sign; and
- Prominent location at intersection of MacNab Street and York Boulevard.

Interior heritage attributes were identified as they relate to the significance of the site as a representative example of a turn-of-the-century industrial/manufacturing building. However,

based on observations from the field survey, the property contains visible and intact historic materials that should be considered for retention or restoration where possible, in keeping with heritage conservation best practices. These historic materials include:

**Stone Building**

- Vent covers
- Decorative chair rail
- Wooden window and door surrounds
- Wooden railing/banister in stairwell
- Wooden staircase
- Cast iron radiators
- Fireplace mantles
- Beadboard cladding in fourth floor walls and ceiling
- Panelled doors

**Brick Building**

- Cast iron radiators
- Beadboard ceiling remnant under first floor ceiling panels
- Elevator assembly and shaft
- Panelled doors
- Wooden four light basement windows

If these items are no longer needed in-situ or are proposed for removal as part of a building conversion, adaptive reuse, or demolition of the building, they should be considered for salvage and reuse elsewhere within the building.

## 9.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

56 York Boulevard was shown to possess physical and design value, historical and associative value and contextual value according to *O.Reg 9/06* and can therefore be considered to have CHVI. The property meets ten of the City of Hamilton's Framework for Cultural Heritage Evaluation Section 3 (Built Heritage) criteria and should be considered a candidate for designation under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

The *Provincial Policy Statement* notes that cultural heritage value or interest is bestowed upon cultural heritage resources by communities (MMAH 2014). Accordingly, the system by which heritage is governed in this province places emphasis on the decision-making of local municipalities in determining cultural heritage value or interest. It is hoped that the information presented in this report will be useful in those deliberations.

## 10.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Archives of Ontario (AO)

- 1936 George Copley in *Registrations of Deaths, 1869-1948*. MS935, Reel 574, Record 038962.
- 2015 *The Changing Shape of Ontario: Early Districts and Counties 1788–1899*. Accessed online at: <http://www.archives.gov.on.ca/en/maps/ontario-districts.aspx>.

### Biographical Dictionary of Architects in Canada 1800–1950

- 2022a Alfred Wavell Peene. Accessed online:  
<https://www.dictionaryofarchitectsincanada.org/node/1384>.
- 2022b Frederick James Rastrick. Accessed online:  
<https://www.dictionaryofarchitectsincanada.org/node/1408>.

### Chapman, L.J. and D.F. Putnam

- 1984 *The Physiography of Southern Ontario*, Third Edition. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources.

### Chapple, N. and C. Moore

- 1979 *The Commercial Block, 63-73 MacNab Street, Hamilton: An Architectural and Historical Report*. For the Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee, Hamilton Historical Board. Provided by the City of Hamilton.

### City of Hamilton

- n.d. Stone Building at 56 York Boulevard, no date.
- n.d. Brick Building at 56 York Boulevard, no date.

### Coyne, J. H.

- 1895 *The Country of the Neutrals (As Far as Comprised in the County of Elgin): From Champlain to Talbot*. St. Thomas: Times Print.

### Dundas Valley School of Art (DVSA)

- 1971 *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth*. Offset Edition, originally published by Page & Smith, Toronto (1875). Dundas: Dundas Valley School of Art.

### Ellis, C.J. and N. Ferris (eds.)

- 1990 *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650*. Occasional Publication of the London Chapter, OAS Number 5. London: Ontario Archaeological Society Inc.

### Fram, M.

- 2003 *Well-Preserved: The Ontario Heritage Foundations Manual of Principles and Practice for Architectural Conservation*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Erin, Ontario: The Boston Mills Press.

### Government of Ontario

- 2006 *Ontario Regulation 9/06* made under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Accessed online at: [www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/source/regs/english/2006/elaws\\_src\\_regs\\_r06009\\_e.htm](http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/source/regs/english/2006/elaws_src_regs_r06009_e.htm).
- 2009 *Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18*. Accessed online at: [www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/statutes/english/elaws\\_statutes\\_90o18\\_e.htm](http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/statutes/english/elaws_statutes_90o18_e.htm).

Hamilton Public Library Local History and Archives (HPL LHA)

- n.d. View of Hamilton Market with Stone Subject Building at Left.
- n.d. View of Hamilton Market with Stone Subject Building at Left.
- n.d. Stone Building at 56 York Boulevard.
- n.d. Stone Building at 56 York Boulevard.
- n.d. Stone Building at 56 York Boulevard.
- 1893 View of Hamilton Market with Stone Subject Building at Left.
- 1936 Wright Fruit Company at 73 MacNab Street.
- 1936 Wright Fruit Company at 73 MacNab Street.
- 1959 View of Market Property with Stone Subject Building at Top Left.
- 1961 View of York Boulevard from Market Square with 56 York Boulevard at Centre.
- 1978 Restoration in Progress at 63–73 MacNab Street.
- 1978 Restoration in Progress at 63–73 MacNab Street.
- 1978 56 York Boulevard.
- 1990 Brick and Stone Building at 56 York Boulevard.

Kyles, S.

- 2021a *Ontario Architecture – Edwardian*. Accessed online at <http://www.ontarioarchitecture.com/edwardian.htm>

Lajeunesse, E.J.

- 1960 *The Windsor Border Region: Canada's Southernmost Frontier*. Toronto: The Champlain Society.

Land Registry Office (LRO) #62

Lot 15, Concession 2, Township of Barton, Wentworth County, Ontario. Accessed online at: [www.onland.ca](http://www.onland.ca).

Lots 4 and 5, Part of Lots 3, 6, 7 and 13, Block 12, Plan 39, Hamilton, Ontario. Accessed online at: [www.onland.ca](http://www.onland.ca).

Langenbach, R.

- 2010 *Better Than Steel? (Part 2): Tall Wooden Factories and the Invention of "Slow-Burning" Heavy Timber Construction*. Conservationtech Consulting. Oakland, California.

McCalla, D.

- 1972 John Young in the *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Accessed online at: [http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/young\\_john\\_1808\\_73\\_10E.html](http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/young_john_1808_73_10E.html)

McCallumSather

- 2018 *Heritage Cultural Assessment 270 Sherman Street North Cotton Factory*.

McMaster Digital Archive

- 1893 Bird's Eye View of Hamilton, Ontario.
- 1876 Bird's Eye View of Hamilton, Ontario. Drawn by H. Brosius.
- 1919 Aerial Image #71642. Accessed online at: <http://digitalarchive.mcmaster.ca/islandora/object/macrepo%3A71642>.
- 2022 Aerial Image # 4312-141. Photograph date 1955.

Mikel, R.



2004 *Ontario Housestyles, The Distinctive architecture of the province's 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century homes.* Toronto: James Lorimer & Company Ltd.

OAA

2022 Frederick James Rastrick (1819-1897). Accessed online at:  
[https://oaa.on.ca/Assets/Common/Shared\\_Documents/Awards/Honour%20Roll/RASTRICK.%20Frederick%20James.pdf](https://oaa.on.ca/Assets/Common/Shared_Documents/Awards/Honour%20Roll/RASTRICK.%20Frederick%20James.pdf).

Ontario Historical County Maps Project (OHCMP)

2019 *Ontario Historical County Maps Project*. Accessed online at:  
<http://maps.library.utoronto.ca/hgis/countymaps/maps.html>.

Ontario Council of University Libraries (OCUL)

2022 *Historical Topographic Map Digitization Project*. Access online at:  
<https://ocul.on.ca/topomaps/>.

Otto, S.

2003 Frederick James Rastrick in *The Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. Accessed online at:  
[http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/rastrick\\_frederick\\_james\\_12E.html](http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/rastrick_frederick_james_12E.html).

Page & Smith

1875 *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth, Ont.* Toronto: Page & Smith.  
Accessed online at: <http://digital.library.mcgill.ca/countyatlas/searchmapframes.php>.

Passafiume, A.

2021 *An Old Building with New Ideas: Historic Copley Building is Being Reimagined, But its Design Will Stay*. The Hamilton Spectator. Accessed online at:  
<https://www.thespec.com/business/2021/11/19/hamilton-copley-factory-heritage-building-york-boulevard.html>.

Presant, E.W., R.E. Wicklund and B.C. Matthews

1965 *The Soils of Wentworth County*. Report No. 32 of the Ontario Soil Survey. Ottawa: Research Branch, Canada Department of Agriculture.

Polewski, L.

2021 *Historic Copley Building in Downtown Hamilton to Transform into Community Hub*. Global News. Accessed online at: <https://globalnews.ca/news/8387146/copley-building-development-downtown-hamilton/>.

Reilly, E.

2020 *Hamilton's Style Shift: How the Apparel Industry is Experiencing Not Just a Fashion Moment, but a Steady Movement*. Accessed online at:  
<https://investinhamilton.ca/blog/2020/12/08/hamiltons-style-shift/>.

Rich, T.D.

1892 *Hamilton: The Birmingham of Canada*. Hamilton: Times Print. Accessed online at:  
<https://archive.org/details/hamiltonbirmingh00hamiuoft/page/n3/mode/1up?q=young>.

Ricketts, S., Maitland, L. and Hucker, J.

2003 *A Guide to Canadian Architectural Styles*. University of Toronto Press, Higher Education Division; 2nd ed. Edition.

Smith, W.H.

1846 *Smith's Canadian Gazetteer: Comprising Statistical and General Information Respecting all Parts of the Upper Province, or Canada West.* Toronto: H. & W. Rowsell.


Surtees, R.J.

1994 Land Cessions, 1763–1830. *In Aboriginal Ontario: Historical Perspectives on the First Nations*, edited by E.S. Rogers and D.B. Smith, pp. 92–121. Toronto: Dundurn Press.


Wilson, P.

2020 *Coppley Building Still Standing in Downtown Hamilton. Lets Keep it that Way.* The Hamilton Spectator. Accessed online at: <https://www.thespec.com/opinion/columnists/2018/03/06/coppley-building-still-standing-in-downtown-hamilton-let-s-keep-it-that-way.html>.


Appendix A: Historic Maps and Aerials



**Map 3: 56 York Boulevard on a Map from 1859**  
(Produced under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri; OHCMP 2019)





**Map 4: 56 York Boulevard on the Map of the Township of Barton in the *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth, 1875***  
(Produced under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri; McGill 2001)





**Map 5: 56 York Boulevard on a Bird's Eye View Map from 1876**  
(Produced under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri; McMaster Digital Archive 1876)



**Map 6: 56 York Boulevard on a Bird's Eye View Map from 1893**  
(Produced under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri; McMaster Digital Archive 1893)




 Subject Property




**Map 7: 56 York Boulevard on Fire Insurance Plans from 1898 and 1911**  
(Produced under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri; McMaster Digital Archive 1898 and 1911)





**Map 8: 56 York Boulevard on a Historic Topographic Map from 1909**  
(Produced under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri; OCUL 2022)



**Map 9: 56 York Boulevard on an Aerial Image from 1955**  
(Produced under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri; McMaster Digital Archive 2022)



**Map 10: 56 York Boulevard Building Phases**  
(Produced under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri)


**Appendix B: Historic Photograph (Plates)**



**Plate 1: Subject Property in 1892  
(Adapted from Rich 1892)**



**Plate 2: View of Hamilton Market with Stone Subject Building at Left  
(HPL LHA circa 1893)**



**Plate 3: Subject Property Stone Building Circa 1903  
(Adapted from Chapple and Moore circa 1903)**



**Plate 4: View of Hamilton Market with Stone Subject Building at Left  
(HPL LHA , no date)**



**Plate 5: View of Hamilton Market with Stone Subject Building at Left  
(HPL LHA, no date)**



**Plate 6: Subject Property Bordered in Yellow at Left, 1919  
(McMaster Digital Archive #71642 1919)**



Plate 7: Wright Fruit Company at 73 MacNab Street  
(HPL LHA 1936)



Plate 8: Wright Fruit Company at 73 MacNab Street  
(HPL LHA 1936)



**Plate 9: Wright Fruit Company Interior at 73 MacNab Street  
(HPL LHA 1936)**



**Plate 10: Stone Building at 56 York Boulevard  
(HPL LHA no date)**





**Plate 11: Stone Building at 56 York Boulevard  
(HPL LHA no date)**



**Plate 12: Stone Building at 56 York Boulevard  
(HPL LHA no date)**



**Plate 13: View of Market Property with Stone Subject Building at Top Left  
(Vintage Hamilton 1959)**




**Plate 14: View of York Boulevard from Market Square with 56 York Boulevard at Centre  
(HPL LHA 1961)**



**Plate 15: Restoration in Progress at 63-73 MacNab Street  
(HPL LHA 1978)**



**Plate 16: Restoration in Progress at 63-73 MacNab Street  
(HPL LHA 1978)**



**Plate 17: 56 York Boulevard  
(HPL LHA Circa 1978)**



**Plate 18: Brick Building at 56 York Boulevard, no date  
(Provided by the City of Hamilton)**




**Plate 19: Brick Building at 56 York Boulevard, no date  
(Provided by the City of Hamilton)**




**Plate 20: Brick and Stone Building at 56 York Boulevard  
(HPL LHA circa 1990)**


Appendix C: Images



**Figure 2: Subject Property Showing Heritage Attributes, 56 York Boulevard - Stone**  
(Produced by ARA under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri)



**Figure 3: Subject Property Showing Heritage Attributes, 56 York Boulevard - Brick**  
(Produced by ARA under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri)



**Map 11: Subject Property with Image Locations and Directions, 56 York Boulevard**  
(Produced by ARA under licence using ArcGIS® software by Esri, © Esri)





**Image 1: View of York Street Streetscape – Subject Property at Centre  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Northeast)**



**Image 2: View of MacNab Street Streetscape – Subject Property at Right  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Southwest)**



**Image 3: View of Subject Property**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Northwest)



**Image 4: York Street Front Façade (South Elevation)**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)



**Image 5: York Street Entrance – Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)



**Image 6: Vermiculated Stone Pilaster – Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)



**Image 7: First Storey Window Opening and Vermiculated Ashlar Pilasters – Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)



**Image 8: Detail of Basement Window Opening on York Street Front Façade**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)



**Image 9: Detail of Central Section of York Street Front Façade**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)



**Image 10: Vermiculated Stone Pilaster and Dressed Stone – Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)



**Image 11: Second and Third Storey Window Openings and Brackets – Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)




**Image 12: York Street Front Façade and Overhead Walkway at Left**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Northeast)



**Image 13: Detail of Corner at York Street Front Façade and West Elevation**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Northeast)



**Image 14: First Storey of Front Façade on York Boulevard**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Northeast)



**Image 15: West Elevation and Overhead Walkway**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing East)



**Image 16: West Elevation**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Northeast)





**Image 17: West Elevation**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Southeast)



**Image 18: North Elevation**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing South)



**Image 19: Foundation and Concrete Walkway – Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Southeast)



**Image 20: North and East Elevations**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Southwest)



**Image 21: East Elevation**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)



**Image 22: East Elevation Entrance on MacNab Street**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)



**Image 23: Sign on East Elevation**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)



**Image 24: East Elevation Chimney, Brackets and Dormers Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)




**Image 25: East Elevation Window Openings and Door Opening to Courtyard-Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)




**Image 26: East Elevation Window Opening - Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)




**Image 27: East Elevation Window and Door Openings - Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)



**Image 28: Courtyard**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing East)



**Image 29: Courtyard**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Northeast)



**Image 30: Courtyard**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing South)



**Image 31: Courtyard**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)



**Image 32: Courtyard**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Southwest)





**Image 33: Courtyard**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)



**Image 34: Courtyard**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Northeast)



**Image 35: Courtyard**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Northwest)



**Image 36: York Street Front Façade Showing Entrance to Loading Area**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)



**Image 37: York Street Front Façade**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)



**Image 38: Detail of Front Façade Cladding**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing East)



**Image 39: York Street Front Façade Door Opening Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)




**Image 40: York Street Front Façade Basement Window Opening – Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)



**Image 41: York Street Front Façade Rusticated Stone – Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)



**Image 42: South and West Elevations**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Northeast)



**Image 43: West Elevation**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing East)



**Image 44: Detail of Stone Foundation Brick Coursing on West Elevation**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing East)



**Image 45: West Elevation Showing Elevator Shaft  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Southeast)**



**Image 46: Detail of Door Opening on West Elevation  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing East)**



**Image 47: Detail of Basement Window Openings on West Elevation**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing East)



**Image 48: Addition at North Part of West Elevation – Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing East)





**Image 49: North Elevation and Cinderblock Addition**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Southwest)



**Image 50: North Elevation**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing South)



**Image 51: Window Opening on North Elevation – Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing South)



**Image 52: Common Bond Brick Coursing and Uncoursed Stone Foundation – Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing South)



**Image 53: South and East Elevations**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Northwest)



**Image 54: Detail of East Elevation**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)

**Interior Photographs-Stone Building**




**Image 55: First Floor – Stairwell Addition and West Elevation Entrance**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing East)



**Image 56: West Elevation Entrance**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing East)



**Image 57: First Floor – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)



**Image 58: First Floor – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Southwest)



**Image 59: First Floor – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Northeast)



**Image 60: First Floor – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)



**Image 61: First Floor – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)



**Image 62: First Floor – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)



**Image 63: First Floor – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Southwest)



**Image 64: First Floor – Interior Detail Chair Rail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)





**Image 65: First Floor – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)



**Image 66: First Floor – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)



**Image 67: First Floor – Interior**  
(Measurements taken on December 8, 2021; Facing East)



**Image 68: First Floor – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)



**Image 69: First Floor – Interior**  
(Measurements taken on December 8, 2021; Facing South)



**Image 70: First Floor – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Southeast)



**Image 71: First Floor – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Southwest)



**Image 72: First Floor – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)



**Image 73: Interior Stone Wall – Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)



**Image 74: First Floor Interior – Wood Sill Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)



**Image 75: First Floor Interior – Staircase Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)



**Image 76: First Floor Entrance to North Addition – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; North)



**Image 77: First Floor North Addition – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)



**Image 78: First Floor North Addition – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing East)



**Image 79: First Floor North Addition – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Northeast)



**Image 80: First Floor North Addition – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)





**Image 81: First Floor North Addition – Vault Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Northwest)




**Image 82: First Floor North Addition – Vault Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)



**Image 83: First Floor North Addition – Vault Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Southwest)



**Image 84: First Floor North Addition – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing South)



**Image 85: First Floor North Addition – Bathroom**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing South)



**Image 86: First Floor North Addition – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)



**Image 87: First Floor North Addition – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 88: First Floor North Addition – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing South)



**Image 89: First Floor North Addition – Interior**  
(Measurements taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)



**Image 90: First Floor North Addition – Heat Register Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing South)



**Image 91: First Floor North Addition – Window Opening**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Southwest)



**Image 92: First Floor North Addition – Wainscoting Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing South)



**Image 93: First Floor North Addition – Stair Landing - Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 94: First Floor North Addition – Stairwell Radiator**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 95: First Floor North Addition – Staircase**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 96: First Floor North Addition – Stairwell and Basement Entrance**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)






**Image 97: North Addition – Basement Entrance Alarm**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 98: Second Floor Stone Building – Landing**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)




**Image 99: Second Floor Stone Building – Landing**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 100: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 101: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 102: Second Floor Stone Building - Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)




**Image 103: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing South)



**Image 104: Second Floor Stone Building – Fireplace Surround and Mantle Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing East)




**Image 105: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)



**Image 106: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Southwest)



**Image 107: Second Floor Stone Building – Window Opening and Wainscoting**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing East)



**Image 108: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior Showing Plank and Beam Construction**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Northeast)




**Image 109: Second Floor Stone Building – Walkway to Brick Building**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)



**Image 110: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)




**Image 111: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Southwest)




**Image 112: Second Floor Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)





**Image 113: Second Floor Stone Building – Entrance to North Addition**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)



**Image 114: Second Floor North Addition – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Southeast)



**Image 115: Second Floor North Addition – Window Opening – Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)




**Image 116: Second Floor North Addition – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)



**Image 117: Second Floor North Addition – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Northeast)



**Image 118: Second Floor North Addition – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing South)



**Image 119: Second Floor North Addition – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing East)



**Image 120: Second Floor North Addition – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)



**Image 121: Second Floor North Addition – Vault**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 122: Second Floor North Addition – Vault**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)




**Image 123: Second Floor North Addition Vault – Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Northwest)



**Image 124: Third Floor Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Northeast)



**Image 125: Third Floor Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)



**Image 126: Third Floor Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing South)




**Image 127: Third Floor Stone Building – Support Pillar**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)




**Image 128: Third Floor Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)





**Image 129: Third Floor Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)




**Image 130: Third Floor – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing East)




**Image 131: Third Floor – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)




**Image 132: Second Floor Hardwood Flooring – Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)




**Image 133: Staircase to Fourth Floor of Stone Building**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 134: Fourth Floor Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 135: Fourth Floor Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; )



**Image 136: Fourth Floor Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)




**Image 137: Fourth Floor Fourth Floor Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing East)




**Image 138: Fourth Floor Stone Building – Dormer Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing East)



**Image 139: Fourth Floor Stone Building – Ceiling**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)




**Image 140: Fourth Floor West Stairwell Addition**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing East)



**Image 141: Fourth Floor Stone Building – Opening to Brick Building**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)



**Image 142: Fourth Floor Ramp to Brick Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)



**Image 143: Basement Stone Building – Staircase**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 144: Basement Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)





**Image 145: Basement Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 146: Basement Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)




**Image 147: Basement Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 148: Basement Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 149: Basement Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 150: Basement Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)




**Image 151: Basement Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 152: Basement Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 153: Basement Stone Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 154: Basement Stone Building – Vault – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)




**Image 155: Basement Stone Building – Vault Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)




**Image 156: Basement Stone Building – Vault Graffiti**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 157: First Floor Brick Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)



**Image 158: First Floor Brick Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing South)




**Image 159: First Floor Brick Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing East)




**Image 160: First Floor Brick Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Northeast)






**Image 161: First Floor Brick Building – Vault**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)



**Image 162: First Floor Brick Building – Vault**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing North)



**Image 163: First Floor Brick Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Northeast)



**Image 164: First Floor Brick Building – Ceiling Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)




**Image 165: First Floor Brick Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Southwest)



**Image 166: First Floor Brick Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Northeast)



**Image 167: First Floor Brick Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing East)



**Image 168: Second Floor Brick Building– Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Southwest)




**Image 169: Second Floor Brick Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Northeast)



**Image 170: Second Floor Brick Building – Opening to Stone Building**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing East)



**Image 171: Second Floor Brick Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Southeast)



**Image 172: Second Floor Brick Building – Elevator**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing West)



**Image 173: Second Floor Brick Building – Window Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing East)



**Image 174: Third Floor Brick Building – Stairwell**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing Northeast)



**Image 175: Third Floor Brick Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing South)




**Image 176: Third Floor Brick Building – Ceiling Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)





**Image 177: Third Floor Brick Building – Stairwell**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing East)




**Image 178: Basement Brick Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 179: Basement Brick Building – Ceiling**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 180: Basement Brick Building – Entryway**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 181: Basement Brick Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 182: Basement Brick Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing East)




**Image 183: Basement Brick Building – Window Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021; Facing East)



**Image 184: Basement Brick Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 185: Basement Brick Building– Stone and Window Detail**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 186: Basement Brick Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)



**Image 187: Basement Brick Building – Interior**  
(Photo taken on December 8, 2021)

## Appendix D: City of Hamilton Framework for Cultural Heritage Evaluation

A Framework for Evaluating the Cultural Heritage Value or Interest of Property for Designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act

### 1. Introduction

The following evaluation criteria seek to provide a consistent means of examining and determining the cultural heritage value or interest of real property. They will be used by staff and the City of Hamilton's Municipal Heritage Committee (formerly the Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee or LACAC) in determining whether to designate property under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

It is anticipated that properties to be designated must have one or more demonstrated attributes of cultural heritage value or interest. The greater the number of attributes the more likely it is that a property will be of significant or considerable cultural heritage value.

These criteria recognize the housekeeping changes made to the *Ontario Heritage Act* as per the *Government Efficiency Act, 2002*. Municipalities are enabled to designate those properties of *cultural heritage value* and to identify those heritage attributes that account for the property's cultural heritage value or interest.

In keeping with contemporary heritage conservation and management practice these are considered to be those properties that have cultural heritage value expressed in the following forms:

- Archaeological sites and areas
- Built heritage features, and
- Cultural heritage landscapes.

These categories follow the direction and guidance in the Provincial Policy Statement issued pursuant to the Ontario Planning Act. No guidance is yet provided under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

### 2. Archaeology

#### 2.1. Introduction

The designation of archaeological sites under the Ontario Heritage Act (OHA) has traditionally been at the discretion of the Provincial Government, until the recent amendments to the OHA under the Government Efficiency Act, 2002. Among other effects, these changes extend this capacity to municipalities, hence the process herein of defining the City of Hamilton criteria for OHA designation of archaeological sites.

#### 2.2. Hamilton Archaeology

The City of Hamilton has approximately 735 archaeological sites currently (2001) registered by archaeologists on the Ontario Archaeological Sites Database, maintained by the Ontario Ministry of Culture (MCL). Numerous other sites are known to exist but are not as yet registered on the OASD. Further, a large number of unknown sites exist, but have not yet been identified. Many of

these sites, whether registered or not, are too small to warrant significant investigation, other than to establish and map their presence and general nature.

The registration of known sites by licensed archaeologists under the OHA serves to record the sites' presence, cultural affiliation, and status. Sites, which have been fully excavated, and therefore exist only in the form of excavation records, removed artifacts and reports, remain registered.

The overall pattern in the data is that the highest density of registered sites occurs in areas that have been the focus of survey, whether driven by development proposals and Planning Act requirements or academic research.

### **2.3. Archaeological Work**

Archaeology is by its nature a destructive discipline. Sites are identified through survey, arising from some form of soil disturbance, which informs the archaeologist that a site or sites are present. Apart from establishing a site presence and some broad ideas of site boundaries and cultural horizons, however, the nature of a site is largely unknown until excavation activities take place.

The difference between the archaeological excavation of a site and its undocumented removal by construction activities lies in the records retained and reported on by the archaeologists. The knowledge of the archaeological site persists, however, and while it may be absent, the former presence indicates that the area in which it occurs is one of archaeological potential, if the landscape remains relatively intact.

Soil disturbance can take many forms and has varied effects on the archaeological resource. Much of archaeology in Ontario occurs in the topsoil horizon, with some extending into the subsoil, which affects its visibility and sensitivity to disturbance.

Most of the archaeology in Hamilton has been identified as a result of over a hundred years of agricultural activities, namely tilling the soil. While cultivation disturbs sites, it does so with only moderate loss of site information. More intensive forms of agricultural, such as tree or sod farms, have a more substantial and deleterious effect. Soil disturbances such as grade alteration or compaction essentially obliterate archaeological resources.

### **2.4. Archaeologists**

Terrestrial and aquatic archaeology in Ontario is administered through the MCL, while some authority has been downloaded to municipalities. In addition to maintaining the site registry, MCL is responsible for licensing archaeologists: only licensed archaeologists are permitted to carry out archaeological fieldwork (Section 4.48.1) or alter archaeological sites through the removal or relocation of artifacts or any other physical evidence of past human use or activity, from the site (Section 4.48.2).

While recognizing this, much archaeological work has been conducted in the past by unlicensed archaeologists. This group falls into two categories: avocational or lay archaeologists, and "pothunters." Avocational archaeologists typically work in association with licensed archaeologists or the MCL. Pothunters tend to avoid working with archaeologists or the Ministry and are known to loot sites for artifacts, either to add to collections or sell on the open market. Such activities are illegal under the OHA.



## **2.5. Designation of Archaeological Sites**

As with other types of cultural heritage resources, “designation” is one of many conservation tools that a municipality may use to wisely manage its cultural heritage. With respect to archaeological sites, there are a number of unique aspects arising from the designation of archaeological sites. The protection of archaeological sites or areas of archaeological potential is possible through designation and is also a means by which to flag such properties for closer scrutiny through the development application process. The amended components of Part VI of the OHA also provide stronger and more appropriate means by which the resource can be protected.

The designation of existing sites may serve as a flag, which could result in unauthorized excavation, inferring some potential responsibility of the City of Hamilton to protect such sites. However, sites of sufficient significance to warrant designation are likely already well known to the pothunter population. In turn, the fact that many registered sites have already been fully excavated, primarily as part of the development process, does play a factor in the designation process and goals (i.e., inferring the recognition of a site no longer present).

While there is no official Ministry policy on the municipal designation of archaeological sites, the existence of provincially designated archaeological sites suggests that the recognition of such significant resources is warranted. The criteria below are to be used either as “stand-alone” criteria for the evaluation of archaeological sites and areas of archaeological potential suitable for designation or are to be used in conjunction with other criteria in the designation of heritage properties, such as heritage buildings and cultural heritage landscapes.

## **2.6. Determination of Significance**

1. *Cultural Definition: is the site used to define a cultural complex or horizon at the local or regional scale?*

Select archaeological sites are used to define specific cultural complexes or horizons, to which similar sites are compared for closeness of fit and relative position in cultural chronology and site function. Their identification as type-sites is typically achieved through academic discourse, for example the Princess Point site in Cootes Paradise.

2. *Temporal Integrity: does the site represent one or more readily distinguished cultural horizons, or a multi-component mixture of poorly-defined occupations?*

Archaeological sites are frequently re-occupied over a long period of time by different cultural groups. While soil stratification may separate these sequences and provide valuable information, agricultural and other activities can cause admixture of these separate components, resulting in a loss of information.

3. *Site Size: is the site a large or high-density occupation, or a small, low-intensity occupation?*

A higher level of importance tends to be placed on larger archaeological sites, as they generally represent larger or more frequent/long-term occupations. They also tend to yield more diagnostic material objects or settlement patterns, and so can be better defined chronologically and culturally, but can likewise be less clearly defined. Smaller sites can also yield diagnostic artifacts and are typically the predominant site size of earlier Native and Euro-Canadian occupations and may be subject to lower degrees of stratigraphic mixture.

*4. Site Type: is the site of a distinctive and well-defined type, with respect to its function or the activities carried out at the site?*

Sites range in nature from highly specialized to generalized, with a related range of interpretability: sites where many activities occur can make it hard to differentiate these activities, such as a pioneer farmstead. Sites where limited activities took place tend to show more identifiable patterns, like point manufacturing sites. While both end of this continuum represent similarly important parts of their inhabitants' lifeways, information may be more readily derived from those of lower complexity.

*5. Site Integrity: is the site largely intact?*

Sites that remain primarily intact retain significant levels of data, while degree of impact closely correlates with the extent of data-loss, particularly when all or some of the site has been impacted or removed through excavation, mitigation or other activities.

*6. Historical Association: does the site represent the archaeological remnants of a significant historical event, person, or group?*

The **direct** association of an archaeological site with a historical event, person, family or group can have a bearing on the significance of an archaeological site, depending on the significance to the community, province or nation of the event or person(s) involved. The nature of the association, such as transitory or long-term, also has a bearing on whether this association is of little or considerable significance.

*7. Setting: what is the integrity of the context surrounding the site?*

Sites do not exist independently, but rather are embedded (at varying scales) within the landscape encompassing them. As such, some semblance of the physiography (cultural heritage landscape) and relevant built culture concurrent to the site's occupation can provide an important context to the information derived from the site.

*8. Socio-political value: is there significant public value vested in the site?*

Real or perceived social or political value may be imparted to an archaeological site for various reasons by the public as a whole, or subsets of stakeholders and interest groups. Regardless of the origin of the value(s) ascribed the site, perception and expediency may play a large role in its identification as a significant feature.

*9. Uniqueness: is this a unique archaeological site?*

While all sites are by their nature unique, some are more so than others by nature of their distinctive type, role or character, which identifies them as "one-of-a-kind" within a specified frame of reference. The recognition of a site having such a unique nature as to warrant this distinction essentially refers to the information value implicit in such an identification. As a result, this will largely be the result of professional discourse.

*10. Rarity: is this a rare archaeological site?*

Rarity may be a measure of cultural affiliation, site type, function, location, artifact assemblage, and age, to mention some potential elements. This can take two forms: either because they occurred only very rarely as a site type originally, or because only a small number remain extant owing to destruction of the original set of sites. In both cases, the rarity of these sites warrants their identification as a result of their information value regarding such a limited resource. Evaluation of the distinct nature of such sites will largely originate through professional discourse.

*11. Human Remains: are there identified or probable burials on the site?*

Human remains can be encountered in a variety of circumstances, including within an archaeological site. Depending on the context, these can take the form of an approved cemetery, unapproved cemetery, unapproved Aboriginal Peoples cemetery, or irregular burial site. Regardless of the specific circumstance, burials carry a high cultural value in and of themselves. In addition, their significance can be evaluated as a sub-set of archaeological sites in complement with the standard cemetery management process. Native and pioneer cemeteries in particular can be assessed in reference to other archaeological sites and communities, as well as specific persons and events.

*12. Archaeological Potential: is the area of substantially high potential?*

The archaeological potential of a property is determined through an evaluation of a variety of factors. These include proximity to physiographic features, known archaeological sites, historic features, and degrees of landscape alteration/ disturbance. If a property is identified as having very high potential, designation may be warranted prior to field survey, or further impact.

### **3. Built Heritage**

#### **3.1. Introduction**

For the past 25 years Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act primarily concerned itself with the designation and hence protection and management of *buildings* of architectural or historic value or merit. The Ontario Heritage Act now enables municipalities to designate *property*, i.e., real property including buildings and structures. This may now include not only buildings but also plantings, landscaping elements and archaeological features (See preceding section 2.2).

As with archaeological evaluation the criteria below are to be used either as “stand-alone” or are to be used in conjunction with other criteria in the designation of heritage properties.

#### **Historical Associations**

*1. Thematic: how well does the feature or property illustrate a historical theme that is representative of significant patterns of history in the context of the community, province or nation?* The criterion evaluates the resource in the context of broad themes of community history. In assessing a resource, the evaluation should relate its importance specifically and with some precision to relevant themes usually of some duration, such as agricultural settlement, village or town development, recreational activities, suburbanization and industrial growth.

*2. Event: is the property associated with a specific event that has made a significant contribution to the community, province or nation?*

This criterion evaluates the resource with respect to its direct association with events, (i.e., the event took place in the building or on the property). The significance of the event must be clearly and consistently evaluated by examining the impact the event had on future activities, duration and scale of the event and the number of people involved. Battles, natural disasters and scientific discoveries are frequently recognized under this criterion.

*3. Person and/or Group: is the feature associated with the life or activities of a person or group that has made a significant contribution to the community, province or nation?*

This criterion evaluates the feature with respect to its direct association with a person or group, (i.e., ownership, use or occupancy of the resource). The significance of the person or group must be clearly described such as the impact on future activities, duration and scale of influence and number and range of people affected, e.g., the Calder or Book family in Ancaster. Public buildings such as post offices or courthouses though frequented by many important persons will seldom merit recognition under this criterion.

## **Architecture and Design**

*4. Architectural merit: what is the architectural value of the resource?*

This criterion serves to measure the architectural merit of a particular structure. The evaluation should assess whether the structure is a notable, rare, unique, early example or typical example of an architectural style, building type or construction techniques. Structures that are of particular merit because of the excellence and artistic value of the design, composition, craftsmanship and details should be identified whether or not they fall easily into a particular stylistic category (i.e., vernacular architecture).

*5. Functional merit: what is the functional quality of the resource?*

This criterion measures the functional merit of the structure apart from its aesthetic considerations. It takes into account the use or effectiveness of materials and method of construction. The criterion is also intended to provide a means of giving value to utilitarian structures, engineering works and industrial features that may not necessarily possess a strict "architectural" value.

The evaluation should note whether the structure is a notable, rare, unique, typical or early example of a particular material or method of construction.

*6. Designer: what is the significance of this structure as an illustration of the work of an important designer?*

This criterion evaluates the importance of the building in a designer's career. "Designer" may include architects, builders or engineers, either in private and public practice, or as individuals or professional firms. The evaluation will have to account for or describe whether or not a designer is important in terms of the impact that the person had on trends in building and activities in the community, province or nation before evaluating the importance of the specific structure in the designer's career. Comparisons should focus on surviving examples of the designer's work.

## Integrity

### *7. Location integrity: is the structure in its original location?*

The integrity of a resource relies in part on its relationship to its original site of construction. Original sites or locations of structures are benchmarks in the past physical, social, economic and cultural development of any area. The continued presence of heritage structures often contributes to a strong sense of place. Those features that have been moved from their original sites are considered to be of lesser cultural heritage value.

### *8. Built integrity: is the structure and its components parts all there?*

The integrity of a resource may affect the evaluation of the built heritage feature particularly where there have been either:

- adverse alterations, such as the loss of significant or noteworthy building elements; or
- unsympathetic additions, that obscure or detract from original building fabric.

Properties that remain intact or that have been systematically and sensitively added to over a number of decades (such as farmhouses) are considered to have greater value than those that have experienced detrimental effects. Building ruins may warrant special consideration where there are other important cultural heritage values, e.g., “The Hermitage”, Ancaster.

## Environmental Context

### *9. Landmark: is it a visually conspicuous feature in the area?*

This criterion addresses the physical importance of a structure to its community. The key physical characteristic of landmarks is their singularity, some aspect that is unique or memorable in its context. Significant landmarks can have a clear form, contrast with their background or have prominent locations. Landmarks are often used by people as reference points, markers or guides for moving or directing others through an area.

### *10. Character: what is the influence of the structure on the present character of the area?*

This criterion measures the influence of the resource on its surroundings. The character of the immediate area must be established before the site’s contribution can be assessed. (In the case of complexes, “area” may be defined as the complex itself, e.g., hospital, university, industrial plant.) Areas can convey a sense of cohesion through the similarity and/or dissimilarity of their details. Cohesion can be established by examining such things as scale, height, proportion, siting, building materials, colours and relationships to other structures and spaces.

### *11. Setting: what is the integrity of the historical relationship between the structure and its immediate surroundings?*

This criterion examines the degree to which the immediate environment enhances the structures physical value or prominence. It assesses the importance of the site in maintaining familiar edges, districts, paths, nodes and landmarks that assist in movement and orientation. Structures or sites may exhibit historic linkages such as those between a church and cemetery or a commercial block and service alleys. Other examples are original settings that provide the context for successive

replacement of bridges at the same location or traditional relationships such as those between a station and hotel located next to a rail line.

## **Social Value**

### *12. Public perception: is the property or feature regarded as important within its area?*

This criterion measures the symbolic importance of a structure within its area to people within the community. "Community" should not solely reflect the heritage community but the views of people generally. Examination of tourist brochures, newspaper articles, postcards, souvenirs or community logos for the identification of a site as a prominent symbolic focal point is sometimes useful.

## **4. Cultural Heritage Landscapes**

### **4.1. Introduction**

Prior to defining evaluation criteria, it is worthwhile to enumerate several general principles for understanding cultural heritage landscapes. The Provincial Policy Statement issued under the Planning Act states in 2.5.1, Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Resources that:

Significant built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes will be conserved.

"Cultural heritage landscape" is specifically defined to mean:

a defined geographical area of heritage significance which has been modified by human activities. Such an area is valued by a community and is of significance to the understanding of the history of a people or place.

In addition, "Significant" is also more generally defined. It is assigned a specific meaning according to the subject matter or policy context, such as wetlands or ecologically important areas. As cultural heritage landscapes and built heritage resources may be considered an "other matter", the following definition of "significant" applies:

in regard to other matters, important in terms of amount, content, representation or effect. These formal quasi-legislative definitions are important in defining the scope and limitations of what constitutes a significant cultural heritage landscape. The word "culture" or "cultural" is used here and in the context of the policy statement to differentiate between those environmental features that are considered to originate in "nature" and have "natural" forms or attributes. The use of the word culture in this context should not be misconstrued to indicate a refined or developed understanding of the arts or civilization.

Typically, cultural heritage landscapes comprise many items or objects that have been made or modified by human hands. Importantly, cultural heritage landscapes reflect human activity (including both the intended and accidental results of development, conservation and/or abandonment) and thus all landscape artifacts reflect "culture" in some way, shape or form. Accordingly, for the purposes of understanding a cultural landscape, most components of the landscape are usually equally important in giving some insight into the culture or historical past of an area (fields, farmsteads, treelines, woodlots, mill ponds, raceways, manufactories, etc.) Present landscapes that are inherited from the past typically represent the aspirations, value,

technology and so on of previous generations. Many present-day cultural heritage landscapes are relics of a former age. Small towns and rural hamlets, for instance, often represent nineteenth century rural lifeways that are no longer being built.

In order to understand the cultural heritage significance of a landscape it is important to understand not only the physiographic setting of an area but importantly the broader historical context of change. The role of technology and communications is particularly important at any given time as these often provided the physical artifacts or means available to permit change to occur within the landscape.

In the evaluation of cultural landscapes for the purpose of heritage conservation, the establishment of criteria is essentially concerned with attempting to identify those landscapes that have particular meaning, value or importance and consequently require some form of active conservation management including informed municipal decision making through the designation process. Traditionally, "landscapes" have tended to be evaluated on the basis of some measure of scenic merit, particularly those considered to be views of "nature", free from the effects of noticeable human activity. In identifying cultural heritage landscapes there is less a concern for assigning value based solely on scenic attributes. Attributes that address historical associations and social value are also equally important. The following criteria provide a broader base for evaluation.

#### **4.2. Applying the Evaluation Criteria**

The evaluation framework for cultural heritage landscapes is a set of criteria to be used in the assessment of cultural heritage landscapes throughout the City of Hamilton. These criteria are based on established precedents for the evaluation of heritage resources. It is anticipated that this framework will be applied to a broad range of landscapes in a consistent and systematic manner. It may be utilized either on a long-term basis as part of continuing survey and assessment work or on an issue-oriented case-by-case manner. The evaluation criteria are also to serve the purposes of determining cultural heritage value or interest for the purposes of designation under the Ontario Heritage Act.

The criteria recognize the value and merit of all types of cultural heritage landscapes. If at any time it is proposed to undertake a comparative evaluation amongst many landscapes such comparative analysis should be used only to compare like or similar landscapes. An industrial landscape, for example must be assessed through comparison with other industrial landscapes, not with a townscape or rural landscape.

The intent in applying the criteria is not to categorize or differentiate amongst different types of landscape based upon quality. In using and applying the criteria it is important that particular types of cultural heritage landscapes are each valued for their inherent character and are consistently evaluated and compared with similar or the same types.

#### **4.3. The Evaluation Criteria for Cultural Heritage Landscapes**

##### **Historical Associations**

*1. Themes: how well does the cultural heritage landscape illustrate one or more historical themes representative of cultural processes in the development and/or use of land in the context of the community, province or nation?*

This criterion evaluates the cultural landscape in the context of the broad themes of the City's history. In assessing the landscape, the evaluation should relate the landscape specifically to those themes, sub-themes and material heritage features, e.g., ports/industrial areas and cottage and resort communities.

*2. Event: is the cultural landscape associated with a specific event that has made a significant contribution to the community, province or nation?*

This criterion evaluates the cultural landscape's direct association with an event, i.e., the event took place in the area. The significance of the event must be evaluated by explicit description and research such as the impact event had on future activities, the duration and scale of the event and the number of people involved. Battle sites and areas of natural disasters are recognized under this criterion.

*3. Person and/or Group: is the cultural landscape associated with the life or activities of a person, group, organization or institution that has made a significant contribution to the community, province or nation?*

This criterion evaluates the cultural landscape's direct association with a person or group, i.e., ownership, use or development of the cultural landscape. The significance of the person or group must be considered in the context of impact, scale and duration of activities. Cultural landscapes resulting from resource-based activities such as forestry, mining or quarrying, etc. may be identified with a particular corporate group. Conversely, individuals may play a pivotal role in the development of cultural landscapes such as a town site, industrial operation or resort complex.

### **Scenic Amenity**

*4. Sense of place: does the cultural heritage landscape provide the observer(s) with a strong sense of position or place?*

This criterion evaluates the sensory impact to an observer either viewing the cultural heritage landscape from within or from an exterior viewpoint. Such landscapes are recognizable as having a common, identifying character derived from buildings, structures, spaces and/or natural landscape elements, such as urban centres, ports, villages and cottage communities.

*5. Serial Vision: does the cultural heritage landscape provide the observer(s) with opportunities for serial vision along paths of pedestrian or vehicular movement?*

This criterion measures the visual impact to an observer travelling through the cultural landscape. Sidewalks or streets in urban areas and roads or water routes in rural or beach areas often provide an observer with a series of views of the landscape beyond or anticipated to arrive within view. Such serial vision may be observed at a small scale in an urban area, moving from residential street to commercial area; or at a larger scale from urban to rural.

*6. Material Content: is the cultural heritage landscape visually satisfying or pleasing to the observer(s) in terms of colour, texture, style and scale?*

This criterion attempts to evaluate the visual impact to an observer of the content of the cultural landscape in terms of its overall design and appearance, however formally or informally,



consciously or unconsciously planned. Material content assesses whether the landscape is pleasing to look at regardless of historical completeness.

## **Integrity**

### *7. Integrity: is it all there?*

The evaluation of the integrity of a cultural heritage landscape seeks to identify the degree to which adverse changes have occurred. Landscapes that have suffered severe alterations, such as the removal of character defining heritage features and the introduction of intrusive contemporary features, may be weaker in overall material content, serial vision and the resultant sense of place that it provides.

## **Design**

### *8. Design: has the landscape been purposefully designed or planned?*

This criterion applies only to those landscapes that have been formally or purposefully designed or planned and includes examples such as "planned" communities, public parks, cemeteries, institutional grounds and the gardens of residences. Typically, they are scarce in comparison to evolving or relict landscapes. This criterion evaluates the importance of the landscape in the designer's career. "Designer" may include surveyors, architects, or landscape architects, both private and public, either as individuals or as professional firms. The evaluation assesses whether or not a designer is important in terms of the impact on trends in landscape design before evaluating the importance of the specific landscape in the designer's career. Comparisons should focus on surviving examples of the designer's work.

## **Social Value**

### *9. Public perception: is the landscape regarded as having importance within the City?*

This criterion measures the importance of the landscape as a cultural symbol. Examination of advertisements of the day, popular tourism literature and artifacts, public interviews and local contacts usually reveal potential landscapes of value.

## Appendix E: Curriculum Vitae

Kayla Jonas Galvin, MA, RPP, MCIP, CAHP  
Heritage Operations Manager  
**ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATES LTD.**

1 King Street West, Stoney Creek, L8G 1G7

Phone: (519) 804-2291 x120 Fax: (519) 286-0493

Email: [kayla.jonasgalvin@araheritage.ca](mailto:kayla.jonasgalvin@araheritage.ca) Web: [www.arch-research.com](http://www.arch-research.com)

### Biography

Kayla Jonas Galvin, Archaeological Research Associates Ltd.'s Heritage Operations Manager, has extensive experience evaluating cultural heritage resources and landscapes for private and public-sector clients to fulfil the requirements of provincial and municipal legislation such as the *Environmental Assessment Act*, the *Standards & Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties* and municipal Official Plans. She served as Team Lead on the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport Historic Places Initiative, which drafted over 850 Statements of Significance and for *Heritage Districts Work!*, a study of 64 heritage conservation districts in Ontario. Kayla was an editor of *Arch, Truss and Beam: The Grand River Watershed Heritage Bridge Inventory* and has worked on Municipal Heritage Registers in several municipalities. Kayla has drafted over 150 designation reports and by-laws for the City of Kingston, the City of Burlington, the Town of Newmarket, Municipality of Chatham-Kent, City of Brampton and the Township of Whitchurch-Stouffville. Kayla is the Heritage Team Lead for ARA's roster assignments for Infrastructure Ontario and oversees evaluation of properties according to *Standards & Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties*. Kayla is a Registered Professional Planner (RPP), a Member of the Canadian Institute of Planners (MCIP), is a professional member of the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP) and sits on the board of the Ontario Association of Heritage Professionals.

### Education

2016 MA in Planning, University of Waterloo. Thesis Topic: *Goderich – A Case Study of Conserving Cultural Heritage Resources in a Disaster*  
2003-2008 Honours BES University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario  
Joint Major: Environment and Resource Studies and Anthropology

### Professional Memberships and Accreditations

Current Registered Professional Planner (RPP)  
Member of the Canadian Institute of Planners (MCIP)  
Professional Member, Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP)  
Board Member, Ontario Association of Heritage Professionals

### Work Experience

Current **Heritage Operations Manager, Archaeological Research Associates Ltd.**  
Oversees business development for the Heritage Department, coordinates completion of designation by-laws, Heritage Impact Assessments, Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscape Assessments, and Cultural Heritage Resource Evaluations.  
2009-2013 **Heritage Planner, Heritage Resources Centre, University of Waterloo**  
Coordinated the completion of various contracts associated with built heritage including responding to grants, RFPs and initiating service proposals.  
2008-2009, **Project Coordinator–Heritage Conservation District Study, ACO**

- 2012 Coordinated the field research and authored reports for the study of 32 Heritage Conservation Districts in Ontario. Managed the efforts of over 84 volunteers, four staff and municipal planners from 23 communities.
- 2007-2008 **Team Lead, Historic Place Initiative, Ministry of Culture**  
Liaised with Ministry of Culture Staff, Centre's Director and municipal heritage staff to draft over 850 Statements of Significance for properties to be nominated to the Canadian Register of Historic Places. Managed a team of four people.

### Selected Professional Development

- 2019 OPPI and WeirFoulds Client Seminar: Bill 108 – More Homes, More Choice, 2019
- 2019 Annual attendance at Ontario Heritage Conference, Goderich, ON (Two-days)
- 2019 Information Session: Proposed Amendments to the OHA, by Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport
- 2018 Indigenous Canada Course, University of Alberta
- 2018 Volunteer Dig, Mohawk Institute
- 2018 Indigenizing Planning, three webinar series, Canadian Institute of Planners
- 2018 Cultural Heritage, Archaeology and Planning Symposium
- 2018 Transforming Public Apathy to Revitalize Engagement, Webinar, MetorQuest
- 2018 How to Plan for Communities: Listen to the Them, Webinar, CIP
- 2017 Empowering Indigenous Voices in Impact Assessments, Webinar, International Association for Impact Assessments
- 2017 Cultural Heritage, Archaeology and Planning Symposium
- 2017 Capitalizing on Heritage, National Trust Conference, Ottawa, ON.
- 2016 Cultural Heritage, Archaeology and Planning Symposium
- 2016 Heritage Rising, National Trust Conference, Hamilton
- 2016 Ontario Heritage Conference St. Marys and Stratford, ON.
- 2016 Heritage Inventories Workshop, City of Hamilton & ERA Architects
- 2015 Cultural Heritage, Archaeology and Planning Symposium
- 2015 City of Hamilton: Review of Existing Heritage Permit and Heritage Designation Process Workshop.
- 2015 Leadership Training for Managers Course, Dale Carnegie Training

### Selected Publications

- 2018 "Conserving Cultural Heritage Landscapes in Waterloo: An Innovative Approach." *Ontario Association of Heritage Professionals Newsletter*, Winter 2018.
- 2018 "Restoring Pioneer Cemeteries" *Ontario Association of Heritage Professionals Newsletter*. Spring 2018. *In print*.
- 2015 "Written in Stone: Cemeteries as Heritage Resources." *Municipal World*, Sept. 2015.
- 2015 "Bringing History to Life." *Municipal World*, February 2015, pages 11-12.
- 2014 "Inventorying our History." *Ontario Planning Journal*, January/February 2015.
- 2014 "Assessing the success of Heritage Conservation Districts: Insights from Ontario Canada." with R. Shipley and J. Kovacs. *Cities*.

Jacqueline McDermid, BA, CAHP  
Heritage Team–Project Manager  
**ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATES LTD.**  
1 King Street West, Stoney Creek, L8G 1G7  
Phone: (519) 755-9983 Email: [jacqueline.mcdermid@araheritage.ca](mailto:jacqueline.mcdermid@araheritage.ca)  
Web: [www.arch-research.com](http://www.arch-research.com)

### Biography

Jacqueline McDermid has ten years of technical writing and management experience; Seven years direct heritage experience. She has gained seven years of experience conducting primary and secondary research for archaeological and heritage assessments and drafting reports and evaluating property according to Ontario Regulation 9/06 and 10/06 as part of Municipal Heritage Registers. Jacqueline is expert at copy editing heritage reports including checking grammar, consistency and fact checking, to ensure a high-quality product is delivered to clients. She has experience assisting with the drafting of Heritage Conservation District Studies through the drafting of reports for potential Heritage Conservation Districts in the City of Toronto (Weston HCD) and Township of Bradford West Gwillimbury (Bond Head HCD). Jacqueline has proven project management experience gained by completing projects on time and on budget as well as formal Project Management training. In 2018, under a six-month contract as the Heritage Planner at the Ministry of Transportation, acquired considerable experience conducting technical reviews of consultant heritage reports for Ministry compliance including Cultural Heritage Evaluation Reports, Heritage Impact Assessment, Strategic Conservation Plans, and Cultural Heritage Resource Assessments as well as gained valuable insight on provincial heritage legislation (*Ontario Heritage Bridge Guidelines*, *Ontario MTO Environmental Standards and Practices for Cultural Heritage*, *MTO Environmental Reference for Highway Design – Heritage*, *MTCS' Heritage Identification & Evaluation Process* as well as the new *MHTCI Information Bulletins on Heritage Impact Assessments and Strategic Conservation Plans*, and inter-governmental processes. She has extensive Knowledge of heritage and environmental policies including the *Planning Act*, *Provincial Policy Statement*, the *Ontario Heritage Act*, *Official Plans*, *Environmental Assessment Act* and *Green Energy Act*. Working knowledge of the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (2011), Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport.

### Education

2000-2007 Honours B.A., Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario  
Major: Near Eastern Archaeology.

### Work Experience

2020-present **Project Manager – Heritage, Archaeological Research Associates, Stoney Creek, ON**

2015-2020 **Technical Writer and Researcher – Heritage, Archaeological Research Associates Ltd., Kitchener, ON**

Research and draft designation by-laws, heritage inventories, Heritage Impact Assessments, Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscape Assessments, and Cultural Heritage Resource Evaluations using Ontario Regulation 9/06, 10/06 and the Ontario Heritage Bridge Guidelines.

2018 **Environmental Planner – Heritage Ministry of Transportation, Central Region – Six-month contract.**

Responsibilities included: project management and coordination of MTO heritage program, managed multiple consultants, conducted and coordinated field

- assessments and surveys, estimated budgets including \$750,000 retainer contracts. Provided advice on heritage-related MTO policy to Environmental Policy Office (EPO) and the bridge office.
- 2017-2018 **Acting Heritage Team Lead – Heritage Archaeological Research Associates Ltd., Kitchener, ON**  
Managed a team of Heritage Specialists, oversaw the procurement of projects, retainers; managed all Heritage projects, ensured quality of all outgoing products.
- 2014-2015 **Technical Writer – Archaeology, Archaeological Research Associates Ltd., Kitchener, ON**  
Report preparation; correspondence with the Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport; report submission to the Ministry and clients; and administrative duties (PIF and Borden form completion).
- 2012-2013 **Lab Assistant, Archaeological Research Associates Ltd., Kitchener, ON**  
Receive, process and register artifacts.
- 2011-2012 **Field Technician, Archaeological Research Associates Ltd., Kitchener, ON**  
Participated in field excavation and artifact processing.
- 2005-2009 **Teaching Assistant, Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, ON**  
Responsible for teaching and evaluating first, second, third- and fourth-year student lab work, papers and exams.
- 2005-2007 **Lab Assistant, Wilfrid Laurier University – Near Eastern Lab, Waterloo, ON**  
Clean, Process, Draw and Research artifacts from various sites in Jordan.

### Professional Development

- 2019 OPPI and WeirFoulds Client Seminar: Bill 108 – More Homes, More Choice, 2019
- 2019 Ontario Heritage Conference, Goderich, ON (Two-days)
- 2019 Rural Heritage, Webinar, National Trust for Canada
- 2019 Information Session: Proposed Amendments to the OHA, by Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport
- 2019 Indigenous Heritage Places and Perspectives, Webinar, National Trust for Canada
- 2018 Indigenous Canada, University of Alberta
- 2018 Grand River Watershed 21<sup>st</sup> Annual Heritage Day Workshop and Celebration (One day)
- 2017 Leadership Training for Managers Course, Dale Carnegie Training
- 2015 Introduction to Blacksmithing, One-Day
- 2015 Ontario Heritage Trust symposium, topics included: Cultural landscapes, City building, Tangible heritage, How the public engages with heritage, and Conserving intangible heritage
- 2014 Community Heritage Ontario, webinar, Part IV and V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

### Presentations

- 2019 **Cemeteries and Burials Research.** Cultural Heritage Planning and Archaeology Symposium, Burlington.

Sarah Clarke, BA, CAHP  
Research Manager  
**ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATES LTD.**  
1 King Street West, Stoney Creek, L8G 1G7  
Phone: (519) 755-9983 Email: [sarah.clarke@araheritage.ca](mailto:sarah.clarke@araheritage.ca)  
Web: [www.arch-research.com](http://www.arch-research.com)

### Biography

Sarah Clarke is Archaeological Research Associates Ltd.'s Heritage Research Manager. Sarah has over 12 years of experience in Ontario archaeology and 10 years of experience with background research. Her experience includes conducting archival research (both local and remote), artifact cataloguing and processing, and fieldwork at various stages in both the consulting and research-based realms. As Team Lead of Research, Sarah is responsible for conducting archival research in advance of ARA's archaeological and heritage assessments. In this capacity, she performs Stage 1 archaeological assessment field surveys, conducts preliminary built heritage and cultural heritage landscape investigations and liaises with heritage resource offices and local community resources in order to obtain and process data. Sarah has in-depth experience in conducting historic research following the *Ontario Heritage Toolkit* series, and the *Standards and Guidelines for Provincial Heritage Properties*. Sarah holds an Honours B.A. in North American Archaeology, with a Historical/Industrial Option from Wilfrid Laurier University and is currently enrolled in Western University's Intensive Applied Archaeology MA program. She is a member of the Ontario Archaeological Society (OAS), the Society for Industrial Archaeology, the Ontario Genealogical Society (OGS), the Canadian Archaeological Association, and is a Council-appointed citizen volunteer on the Brantford Municipal Heritage Committee. Sarah holds an R-level archaeological license with the MTCS (#R446).

### Education

Current MA Intensive Applied Archaeology, Western University, London, ON. Proposed thesis topic: Archaeological Management at the Mohawk Village.  
1999–2010 Honours BA, Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario  
Major: North American Archaeology, Historical/Industrial Option

### Professional Memberships and Accreditations

Current Member of the Ontario Archaeological Society  
Current Member of the Society for Industrial Archaeology  
Current Member of the Brant Historical Society  
Current Member of the Ontario Genealogical Society  
Current Member of the Canadian Archaeological Association  
Current Member of the Archives Association of Ontario

### Work Experience

Current **Team Lead – Research; Team Lead – Archaeology, Archaeological Research Associates Ltd.**  
Manage and plan the research needs for archaeological and heritage projects. Research at offsite locations including land registry offices, local libraries and local and provincial archives. Historic analysis for archaeological and heritage projects. Field Director conducting Stage 1 assessments.  
2013-2015 **Heritage Research Manager; Archaeological Monitoring Coordinator, Archaeological Research Associates Ltd.**

- Stage 1 archaeological field assessments, research at local and distant archives at both the municipal and provincial levels, coordination of construction monitors for archaeological project locations.
- 2010-2013 **Historic Researcher, Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants Inc.**  
Report preparation, local and offsite research (libraries, archives); correspondence with the Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport; report submission to the MTCS and clients; and administrative duties (PIF and Borden form completion and submission, data requests).
- 2008-2009 **Field Technician, Archaeological Assessments Ltd.**  
Participated in field excavation and artifact processing.
- 2008-2009 **Teaching Assistant, Wilfrid Laurier University.**  
Responsible for teaching and evaluating first year student lab work.
- 2007-2008 **Field and Lab Technician, Historic Horizons.**  
Participated in excavations at Dundurn Castle and Auchmar in Hamilton, Ontario. Catalogued artifacts from excavations at Auchmar.
- 2006-2010 **Archaeological Field Technician/Supervisor, Wilfrid Laurier University.**  
Field school student in 2006, returned as a field school teaching assistant in 2008 and 2010.

### Professional Development

- 2019 Annual attendance at Ontario Heritage Conference, Goderich, ON
- 2018 Cultural Heritage, Archaeology and Planning Symposium
- 2018 Grand River Watershed 21<sup>st</sup> Annual Heritage Day Workshop & Celebration
- 2018 Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation Historical Gathering and Conference
- 2017 Ontario Genealogical Society Conference
- 2016 Ontario Archaeological Society Symposium
- 2015 Introduction to Blacksmithing Workshop, Milton Historical Society
- 2015 Applied Research License Workshop, MTCS
- 2014 Applied Research License Workshop, MTCS
- 2014 Heritage Preservation and Structural Recording in Historical and Industrial Archaeology. Four-month course taken at Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, ON. Professor: Meagan Brooks.

### Presentations

- 2018 *The Early Black History of Brantford.* Brant Historical Society, City of Brantford.
- 2017 *Mush Hole Archaeology.* Ontario Archaeological Society Symposium, Brantford.
- 2017 *Urban Historical Archaeology: Exploring the Black Community in St. Catharines, Ontario.* Canadian Archaeological Association Conference, Gatineau, QC.

### Volunteer Experience

- Current Council-appointed citizen volunteer for the Brantford Municipal Heritage Committee.

Aly Bousfield Bastedo, BA, Dip. Heritage Conservation  
Heritage Technical Writer and Researcher  
**ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATES LTD.**  
1 King Street West, Stoney Creek, ON L8G 1G7  
Phone: (519) 804-2291 x120 Fax: (519) 286-0493  
Email: aly.bousfield-bastedo@araheritage.ca  
Web: [www.araheritage.ca](http://www.araheritage.ca)

### Education

2017-2020 Post-Graduate Diploma in Heritage Conservation, Willowbank School of Restoration Arts. Queenston, ON  
2016-2017 Post-Graduate Certificate in Urban Design, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, BC  
2009-2013 Honours BA, University of Guelph, Guelph, ON  
Sociology

### Professional Memberships and Accreditations

Current Member, International Network for Traditional Building, Architecture & Urbanism, Guelph Chapter.

### Work Experience

Current **Technical Writer and Researcher, Archaeological Research Associates Ltd.**  
Produce deliverables for ARA's heritage team, including historic research, heritage assessment and evaluation for designation by-laws, Heritage Impact Assessments, Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscape Assessments, and Cultural Heritage Resource Evaluations.

2021 **Cultural Consultant, Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture**  
Provided liaison and advisory services to municipalities and stakeholders in the heritage sector on cultural heritage legislation in Ontario.

2020 **Heritage Planning Consultant, Megan Hobson & Associates**  
Provided heritage consulting services, including site investigation and documentation. Provided cultural heritage value assessment and evaluations.

2019-2020 **Cultural Heritage Planning Intern, ERA Architects**  
Coordinated and authored various heritage related contracts. Duties included historic research, heritage impact assessments, cultural heritage assessments and evaluations.

2016-2017 **Heritage Vancouver, Programs and Communications**  
Conducted research and analysis of heritage properties and neighbourhoods in Vancouver. Assisted in the creation of a cultural heritage landscape assessment of Vancouver's Chinatown neighbourhood through historical research and community engagement.

### Select Relevant Projects

#### **Cultural Heritage Landscape Inventories and Implementation**

2019 **Randwood Estate Cultural Heritage Landscape Evaluation**, Niagara-on-the-Lake.  
Client: Confidential

2018 **Chedoke Estate Cultural Heritage Landscape Analysis**, City of Hamilton. Client: City of Hamilton



**Interpretive Projects**

2019 **Scotiabank Area (Canada Post Delivery Building) Interpretation Report.** Client: Private owner

**Cultural Heritage Evaluations**

Current **Ontario Fire College, 1495 Muskoka Road North,** Gravenhurst. Client: Infrastructure Ontario

2021 **239 Elizabeth Street,** Guelph. Client: City of Guelph

2021 **62 Bayview Parkway,** Newmarket. Client: Region of York

2021 **Structure WG-16 Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Heritage Impact Assessment,** Township of Centre Wellington. Client: McIntosh Perry

2021 **Hamilton Amateur Athletic Association Grounds,** Hamilton, Ontario. Client: City of Hamilton

2019 **4304-4306 Line 10 (Earl Rowe House),** Bradford West Gwillimbury. Client: Private Owner

2019 **1347 Lakeshore Road East,** City of Mississauga Client: Private Owner

2019 **Rutherford Library,** Edmonton, Alberta. Client: University of Alberta Libraries

**Heritage Impact Assessments**

Current **Heritage Impact Assessment 11666 Young Street,** City of Richmond Hill. Client: Sky Development Group.

Current **Heritage Impact Assessment 10667 Trafalgar Road,** Town of Halton Hills. Client: RVA Associates Ltd.

Current **Heritage Impact Assessment 316 Grange Road,** City of Guelph. Client: Lunor Group Inc.

Current **Heritage Impact Assessment 50-60 Ellen Street,** City of Kitchener. Client: John MacDonald Associates.

Current **Heritage Impact Assessment 415 Water Street,** City of Cambridge. Client: Private Owner.

Current **Heritage Impact Assessment 133 & 133A Main Street,** City of Brampton. Client: GSAI.

2021 **Heritage Impact Assessment 619-637 Young Street & 7-9 Isabella Street,** City of Toronto. Client: Colliers International.

2021 **Heritage Impact Assessment 436 Fountain Street,** City of Cambridge. Client: Kiah Group.

2021 **Historic Neighbourhood Character Impact Assessment 19 Dundonald Street,** City of Barrie. Client: Innovative Planning Solutions.

2021 **Heritage Impact Assessment 130 Elgin Street,** City of Brantford. Client: King Management Group Inc.

2021 **Heritage Impact Assessment 436 Fountain Street,** City of Cambridge. Client: Private Owner.

2021 **Historic Neighbourhood Character Impact Assessment 19 Dundonald Street,** City of Barrie. Client: IPS.

2021 **Heritage Impact Assessment for M.41/05 (Eramosa River),** Township of Guelph-Eramosa. Client: Hatch on behalf of Metrolinx.

2021 **Heritage Impact Assessment Structure 16-WG,** Township of Centre Wellington. Client: McIntosh Perry.

2021 **Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment 215 & 219 King Street West,** Dundas, City of Hamilton. Client: IBI Group.

2021 **Heritage Impact Assessment 130 Elgin Street**, City of Brantford. Client: King Management.

**Cultural Heritage Assessment Reports (Environmental Assessment)**

Current **Cultural Heritage Assessment Report Constance Boulevard Drainage Improvement**. Town of Wasaga Beach. Client: Ainley & Associates Ltd.

2021 **Cultural Heritage Assessment Report Lundy's Lane Schedule C Municipal Class Environmental Assessment**, City of Niagara Falls. Client: Urban & Environmental Management Inc.

2021 **Cultural Heritage Assessment Report Merritt Street Road Improvements & Chestnut Street Extension**. City of St. Catharines. Client: Urban & Environmental Management Inc.

2021 **Morningside SPS Cultural Heritage Assessment Report**, Township of Wilmot. Client: GM Blueplan

**Designation Reports**

2021 **Updated Designation By-law 40 Station Street**, Clarington. Client: Municipality of Clarington

2021 **146 Wellington Street**, Clarington. Client: Municipality of Clarington

2021 **415 Davis Drive**, Town of Newmarket. Client: Town of Newmarket

**Documentation/Salvage Reports**

2021 **Cultural Heritage Landscape Documentation Report**, Town of Halton Hills. Client: RVA Associates Ltd.

2020 **79 Yates Street**, City of St. Catharines. Client: Private Owner

2020 **6507 Jane Street**, City of Burlington. Client: Private Owner

2020 **1460 Cataract Rd**, Town of Caledon Client: Private Owner

2020 **1110 Lakeshore Road West**, City of Oakville Client: Private Owner

**Strategic Conservation Plan**

Current **Brockville Psychiatric Hospital SCP**, City of Brockville. Client: Infrastructure Ontario.

Current **Conservation Plan 11666 Young Street**, City of Richmond Hill. Client: Sky Development Group.

Current **Conservation Plan 50-60 Ellen Street**, City of Kitchener. Client: John MacDonald Associates.

Current **Conservation Plan 133 & 133A Main Street**, City of Brampton. Client: GSAI.

2021 **Conservation Plan 62 Bayview Parkway**, Town of Newmarket Client: Region of York

**Conservation Technical Advice**

2021 **Conservation Advice – 41 Temperance Street**, Clarington, Client: Municipality of Clarington

2021 **Stone Wall Conservation Advice - 1220 Stavebank Road**, City of Mississauga. Client: Private Owner.

2021 **Land Registry Office Conservation Advice, 499 Centre Street**, Prescott Client: CBRE

**Prepared Research for Peer Reviews**

2019 **Peer Review of King Spadina Heritage Conservation District**. Client: Private Owner.

2019 **Peer Review of St. Lawrence Heritage Conservation District**, City of Toronto. Client: Private Owner.

**Professional Development**

- 
- 2021 COP26 and Climate Heritage Action – Seizing Momentum and the ‘Heritage Reset’”. Webinar. Presented by the National Trust for Canada.
  - 2021 “Standard Specification for Mortars for the Repair of Historic Masonry Confirmation”. Webinar. Presented by APT.
  - 2021 “Drafting Statements of Significance.” Webinar presented by ARA’s K. Jonas Galvin for ACO’s job shadow students
  - 2021 “Architectural Styles.” Webinar presented by ARA’s K. Jonas Galvin for ACO’s job shadow students
  - 2021 “Perspectives on Cultural Heritage Landscapes”. Cultural Heritage, Archaeology and Planning Symposium. ARA Ltd.
  - 2019 University of Toronto, Mark Laird “Selected topics on Landscape Architecture”, Course audit  
“Planning for Golf’s Decline”, INTBAU speaker series.  
Messors, “Fornello Sustainable Preservation Workshop”, Cultural Landscape Field School
  - 2018 Points of Departure. Association for Preservation Technology (APT) Conference. Buffalo, NY.


**Presentations**

- 2018 Essential issues or themes for education in heritage conservation: Montreal Roundtable on Heritage (Canada Research Chair on Built Heritage)

# Coppley Building – 56 York Boulevard Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report

Municipal Heritage Committee Presentation  
Friday May 13, 2022

# 56 York Boulevard Background



Approximate Property Boundary

# Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

56 York Boulevard was found to have cultural heritage value or interest under all three sections of Ontario Regulation 9/06: physical or design value including historical or associative value and contextual value.

Using the City of Hamilton's Framework for Evaluating Built Heritage, 56 York Boulevard was found to meet ten of the eleven criteria for having cultural heritage value or interest.



# Heritage Value Stone Building

The stone building at 56 York Boulevard has design/ physical value, historical/associative value and contextual value.

A representative example of a mid-19<sup>th</sup> century Renaissance Revival commercial building designed by Frederick James Rastrick with a high degree of craftsmanship

As a 19<sup>th</sup> century building associated with Hamilton's textile production history as the former location of Copley, Noyes and Randall

A local landmark, prominently placed at the intersection of York Boulevard and MacNab Street that defines the area's historic character



# Heritage Value Brick Building

The brick building at 56 York Boulevard has design/ physical value, historical/associative value and contextual value.


A representative example of an early 20th century Edwardian Classicism commercial building designed by Alfred Wavell Peene

As a 20<sup>th</sup> century building associated with Hamilton's textile production history

A local landmark, prominently placed at the intersection of York Boulevard and MacNab Street that defines the area's historic character







- Three storey plus mansard roof building constructed of whirlpool limestone
- Balanced façade
- Mansard roof dormers
- Projecting string courses
- Bracketed stone cornice
- Varying arched fenestration
- Frontispiece chimney with stone scrollwork detailing
- Vermiculated stone detailing
- Copley Noyes and Randall sign
- Interior Courtyard

## Heritage Attributes Stone Building



- Balanced façade
- Brick masonry construction
- Brick banding or channelling on facade
- Parapet wall
- Stone trim and accents around openings
- Oversized stone architectural elements
- Segmentally arched fenestration on façade

## Heritage Attributes Brick Building

# Heritage Attributes Interior

## Stone Building and Brick Building

- Wood and cast-iron pillars on all floors in both the brick and stone building; in particular, the decorative cast-iron pillars on the first floor of the stone building;
- Metal fire doors found in both the brick and stone building;
- Wooden flooring where exposed in both the brick and stone building;
- Vaults with metal doors found in both the brick and stone building, some with graffiti dating to the 19th century.

## Questions?

ARA Contact:  
**Jacqueline McDermid, Project Manager**  
jacqueline.mcdermid@araheritage.ca  
(519) 804-2291 x123



**CITY OF HAMILTON**  
**PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**  
Planning Division

<b>TO:</b>	Chair and Members Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee
<b>COMMITTEE DATE:</b>	May 13, 2022
<b>SUBJECT/REPORT NO:</b>	Heritage Permit Application HP2022-007, Under Part V of the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i> , to Permit the Demolition of the Existing Dwelling and Garage, 940 Beach Boulevard, Hamilton (Ward 5) (PED22124)
<b>WARD(S) AFFECTED:</b>	Ward 5
<b>PREPARED BY:</b>	Chloe Richer (905) 546-2424 Ext. 7163
<b>SUBMITTED BY:</b>	Steve Robichaud Director, Planning and Chief Planner Planning and Economic Development Department
<b>SIGNATURE:</b>	

**RECOMMENDATION**

- (a) That Heritage Permit Application HP2022-007, for the demolition of the Part V designated existing dwelling and detached garage for lands located at 940 Beach Boulevard, under Section 42 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, be **approved** with the following conditions:
- (i) Implementation of the demolition of the dwelling and detached garage, in accordance with this approval, shall be completed no later than April 30, 2024. If the alterations are not completed by April 30, 2024, then this approval expires as of that date and no alterations shall be undertaken without a new approval issued by the City of Hamilton;
- (b) That appropriate notice of the Council decision be served on the owner of 940 Beach Boulevard, Hamilton, and the Ontario Heritage Trust, as required under Section 42 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

---

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.

OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.

OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The subject property is located at 940 Beach Boulevard, Hamilton on the west side of Beach Boulevard, south of Third Avenue (see Appendix “A” attached to Report PED22124). The property is designated under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* as it is located within the Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District (HCD) by By-law No. 00-135 (see Appendix “B” attached to Report PED22124).

Staff concur with the advice of the Heritage Permit Review Subcommittee (HPRS) and recommend that the Heritage Permit Application HP2022-007 to demolish the existing dwelling and detached garage for the lands known as 940 Beach Boulevard be approved, as discussed below.

The Heritage Permit Review Subcommittee (HPRS) of the Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee (HMHC) were consulted at the April 19, 2022 meeting and were supportive of the Application as submitted. Staff have also reviewed the submitted documentation, including a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (see Appendix “C” attached to Report PED22124), and are of the opinion that the proposed demolition is supportable based on the evidence provided by the qualified heritage consultants.

### **Alternatives for Consideration – See Pages 6 to 7**

### **FINANCIAL – STAFFING – LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Financial: N/A

Staffing: N/A

Legal: Given the property’s designation under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, this Heritage Permit Application has been processed and considered within the context of the applicable legislation, as per the date in which the Application was submitted to the City of Hamilton (March 30, 2022). This Application follows Section 42 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* for demolition of a Part V designated property within the Heritage Conservation District.

Section 42 (1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act* states that:

“No owner of property situated in a heritage conservation district that has been designated by a municipality under this Part shall do any of the following, unless the owner obtains a permit from the municipality to do so:

- (1) Alter, or permit the alteration of, any part of the property, other than the interior of any structure or building on the property; and,
- (2) Erect, demolish or remove any building or structure on the property or permit the erection, demolition or removal of such a building or structure. 2005, c. 6, s. 32 (1).”

Section 42 (4) of the *Ontario Heritage Act* states that:

“Within 90 days after the notice of receipt is served on the Applicant under Subsection (3) or within such longer period as is agreed upon by the Applicant and the council, the council may give the Applicant,

- (a) The permit applied for;
- (b) Notice that the council is refusing the Application for the permit; or,
- (c) The permit applied for, with terms and conditions attached. 2005, c. 6, s. 32 (3).”

The City’s Heritage Permit process follows the legislative process required by the *Ontario Heritage Act* in relation to the requirement for Council approval to consent to demolition or removal of a building or structure designated under Part IV or V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

The Heritage Permit Application (HP2022-007) was received on March 30, 2022 and the Notice of Complete Application was issued on April 14, 2022. The *Ontario Heritage Act* requires that Council make a decision on a Heritage Permit Application within 90 days of the issuance of a Notice of Receipt. If no decision is reached within the 90-day timeframe, Council shall be deemed to consent to the Application. The subject Application’s 90-day timeframe will be reached on July 13, 2022.

## **HISTORICAL BACKGROUND**

The subject property was designated under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* in 2000 as part of the Hamilton Beach HCD by By-law No. 00-135. The HCD Plan area was historically known as a lakeside community with a long, rich history of human settlement, hunting and fishing grounds, as well as an important travel route around the lake. The HCD Plan area has an eclectic mix of single detached dwellings, many still reminiscent of the original summer cottage and seasonal homes constructed along the beach strip in the early twentieth century.

As identified in the property history included in the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA), the existing dwelling located at 940 Beach Boulevard was constructed prior to

1954 and the garage after 1967. Previously the “Heath Cottage,” a single-storey frame dwelling with a wrap-around porch and single-storey accessory structure, was located on the northern half of the property, however, the Heath Cottage was removed prior to the construction of the current dwelling, a mid-century vernacular bungalow constructed of red brick on a concrete foundation with a small rear addition. Cut stone cladding is included on the east (front) elevation. The detached garage is also constructed of red brick with cut stone cladding on the east (front) elevation. The Ontario Regulation 9/06 evaluation included in the CHIA determined that the property does not contain a contributing heritage building within the Beach Boulevard streetscape, which staff concur with.

The purpose of the proposal to demolish the existing dwelling and detached garage is to facilitate the severance of the property into three parcels. An Application for Consent to Sever Land went before the Committee of Adjustment on September 9, 2021 and was tabled as a Heritage Permit had not been approved to demolish the existing structures on the property. The owner then retained qualified heritage consultants to prepare a CHIA in support of this Heritage Permit Application.

## **POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND LEGISLATED REQUIREMENTS**

### **Urban Hamilton Official Plan**

Volume 1, Chapter B, Section 3.4.6.3-5 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP) speaks to Heritage Conservation Districts and states that “the City may in accordance with the *Ontario Heritage Act* by by-law prohibit or set limitations with respect to property alteration, erection, demolition, or removal of buildings or structures, or classes of buildings or structures, within the heritage conservation district study area.”

The intent of the Official Plan policies pertaining to cultural and built heritage is to ensure the preservation and conservation of these resources and demolition being a last resort. Staff review each Heritage Permit Application on its own merits and policies set out a number of requirements in order to ensure the proposal is adequately and appropriately assessed by qualified candidates. In this instance, it has been determined that the structures on the property are not contributing heritage buildings within the Beach Boulevard streetscape. As such, staff are of the opinion that the Applicant has demonstrated that the proposed demolition does not contravene the overall intent of the Official Plan.



## **RELEVANT CONSULTATION**

### **Heritage Permit Review Subcommittee**

Pursuant to Section 28 (1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act* and the Council approved Heritage Permit Process (Report PED05096), the HMHC advises and assists Council on matters relating to Part IV and V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

The HPRS of the HMHC reviewed the subject Application at the April 19, 2022 meeting. After a presentation and question and answer period with the Applicant's project team, the Subcommittee passed a motion to recommend approval of the Application as submitted, subject to two standard conditions, of which only (b) has been deemed necessary by staff:

- (b) Implementation / installation of the alteration(s), in accordance with this approval, shall be completed no later than April 30, 2024. If the alteration(s) are not completed by April 30, 2024, then this approval expires as of that date and no alterations shall be undertaken without a new approval issued by the City of Hamilton.

Staff are in agreement with the recommendation of the HPRS regarding approval and standard condition (b) is reflected in Recommendation (a)(i). Staff would note that standard condition (a) regarding minor changes to plans and elevations is not required for a demolition proposal. Staff are recommending a further condition regarding notice to the owner and the Ontario Heritage Trust regarding Council's decision.

## **ANALYSIS AND RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION**

The Heritage Permit Application (HP2022-007) is seeking approval to demolish the existing dwelling and detached garage in order to facilitate the severance of the property into three parcels. In support of the Application, the following documents were submitted:

- Completed Heritage Permit Application form;
- Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment, prepared by LHC Heritage Planning and Archaeology (March 2022); and,
- Committee of Adjustment Application and Notice of Public Hearing for HM/B-21:66 (tabled September 9, 2021).

Key factors that are considered in the evaluation of any change affecting a heritage resource are:

- **Displacement effects:** those adverse actions that result in the damage, loss, or removal of valued heritage features; and,
- **Disruption effects:** those actions that result in detrimental changes to the setting or character of the heritage feature.

In consideration of any Heritage Permit Application, staff must assess the impact of the displacement and disruption effects on the heritage resources. No heritage attributes for the subject property are identified but the proposal was assessed against the guidelines of the HCD Plan, while taking into account the recommendations of the supporting documentation.

As part of the supporting documentation, the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) provided a property history, Ontario Regulation 9/06 evaluation and assessment of existing conditions of the property, including images of the pre-1954 dwelling (which is not the original Heath Cottage), post-1967 garage and streetscape. The CHIA noted that the structures on the property are not contributing heritage buildings within the Beach Boulevard streetscape, which staff concur with. As such, the demolition of the existing structures would not result in displacement effects as valued heritage features are not being removed.

Minimal disruption effects are expected to the overall heritage context of the HCD Plan area as the Applicant is seeking to construct three new dwellings. This scope of work would require a future Heritage Permit Application following the return of the Application for Consent to Sever Land to the Committee of Adjustment. As the HCD Plan provides guidelines regarding new construction, the new dwellings must be designed in a fashion that complies with the HCD Plan and the design should be reviewed for compliance early in the process. However, the design of the new dwellings is beyond the scope of the Heritage Permit Application to demolish the existing dwelling.

## **ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION**

### **(1) Refuse the Heritage Permit Application.**

HMHC may advise Council to refuse this Application. This is not being recommended.

### **(2) Approve the Heritage Permit with Additional or Amended Conditions.**

**SUBJECT: Heritage Permit Application HP2022-007, Under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, to Permit the Demolition of the Existing Dwelling and Garage, 940 Beach Boulevard, Hamilton (Ward 5) (PED22124) - Page 7 of 7**

---

HMHC may advise Council to approve this Application with additional or amended conditions of approval. This is not being recommended.

**(3) Approve the Heritage Permit with No Conditions.**

HMHC may advise Council to approve this Application with no conditions. This alternative is not recommended.

**ALIGNMENT TO THE 2016 – 2025 STRATEGIC PLAN**

**Culture and Diversity**

Hamilton is a thriving, vibrant place for arts, culture, and heritage where diversity and inclusivity are embraced and celebrated.


**APPENDICES AND SCHEDULES ATTACHED**

Appendix “A” to Report PED22124 - Location Map



Appendix “B” to Report PED22124 - By-law No. 00-135

Appendix “C” to Report PED22124 - Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment, prepared by  
LHC Heritage Planning and Archaeology

CR:sd



● Site Location



Key Map - Ward 5

# Location Map



Hamilton

PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

File Name/Number:  
HP2022-007

Date:  
April 20, 2022

Appendix "A"

Scale:  
N.T.S

Planner/Technician:  
CR/AL

## Subject Property



940 Beach Boulevard

The Corporation of the City of Hamilton

BY-LAW NO. 00- 135

To Designate:

**AS A HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT  
THE AREA OF THE HAMILTON BEACH NEIGHBOURHOOD  
COMPRISED OF 869 TO 1019 BEACH BOULEVARD (LAKE SIDE)  
AND 870 TO 1064 BEACH BOULEVARD (BAY SIDE)  
EXCLUDING 913 BEACH BOULEVARD; INCLUDING 2 FOURTH AVENUE**

**WHEREAS** subsections 1 and 3 of section 41 of the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, Chapter O.18, provides as follows:

41. (1) Subject to subsection (2), where there is in effect in a municipality an official plan that contains provisions relating to the establishment of heritage conservation districts, the council of the municipality may by by-law designate the municipality or any defined area or areas thereof as a heritage conservation district.

(3) A by-law passed under subsection (1) does not come into force without the approval of the Board.

**AND WHEREAS** the Official Plan of the City of Hamilton contains provisions relating to the establishment of heritage conservation districts;

**AND WHEREAS** it is intended to designate the area defined by the said by-law.


**NOW THEREFORE** the Council of The Corporation of the City of Hamilton enacts as follows:

1. The area more particularly shown on Schedule "A" hereto annexed and forming part of this by-law, is hereby designated as a Heritage Conservation District.
2. This by-law shall come into force upon approval of the Ontario Municipal Board.


**PASSED** this 9th day of August A.D. 2000

ACTING MUNICIPAL CLERK

MAYOR



(2000) 13 R.P.D.C., August 9  
HCD-HB



This is Schedule "A" to By-Law No. 00 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Passed the \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 00.

*[Signature]*  
 Clerk

*[Signature]*  
 Mayor

City of Hamilton

## Schedule "A"

Map Forming Part of  
 By-Law No. 00-\_\_\_\_\_

Community Planning and Development Division

**Legend**

- Lands Subject to Heritage Conservation District Boundary By-Law No. \_\_\_\_\_
- Designated under Part IV, Ontario Heritage Act (exempt from By-Law No. \_\_\_\_\_)

North 	Scale	Reference File No.
	NOT TO SCALE	HCD-HB
	Date	Drawn By
	July, 2000	J.S

# FINAL REPORT:

## Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment

940 – 946 Beach Boulevard,  
Hamilton, Ontario



**LHC | Heritage  
Planning and  
Archaeology**

837 Princess Street, Suite 400  
Kingston, ON  
K7L 1G8

Phone: 613-507-7817  
Toll Free: 1-833-210-7817  
E-mail: [info@lhcheritage.com](mailto:info@lhcheritage.com)

March 2022

Project # LHC0283

**LHC**

*This page has been left blank deliberately*



**Report prepared for:** Shahzad Zia  
Broker  
202-2260 Bovaird Drive East  
Brampton ON  
L6R 3J5

**Report prepared by:** Lisa Coles, BA

**Graphics prepared by:** Jordan Greene, BA

**Reviewed by:** Christienne Uchiyama, MA, CAHP

## RIGHT OF USE

The information, recommendations and opinions expressed in this report are for the sole benefit of the 'Owner'. Any other use of this report by others without permission is prohibited and is without responsibility to LHC. The report, all plans, data, drawings, and other documents as well as all electronic media prepared by LHC are considered its professional work product and shall remain the copyright property of LHC, who authorizes only the Owners and approved users (including municipal review and approval bodies as well as any appeal bodies) to make copies of the report, but only in such quantities as are reasonably necessary for the use of the report by those parties. Unless otherwise stated, the suggestions, recommendations and opinions given in this report are intended only for the guidance of Owners and approved users.

## REPORT LIMITATIONS

The qualifications of the heritage consultants who authored this report are provided in Appendix A: Qualifications. This report reflects the professional opinion of the authors and the requirements of their membership in various professional and licensing bodies. All comments regarding the condition of any buildings on the Property are based on a superficial visual inspection and are not a structural engineering assessment of the buildings unless directly quoted from an engineering report. The findings of this report do not address any structural or physical condition related issues associated with any buildings on the property or the condition of any heritage attributes.

The review of policy and legislation was limited to that information directly related to cultural heritage management and is not a comprehensive planning review. Additionally, soundscapes, cultural identity, and sense of place analyses were not integrated into this report.

Due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, access to archives were limited.

Archaeological potential has not been assessed as part of this CHIA.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

*The Executive Summary only provides key points from the report. The reader should examine the complete report including background, results as well as limitations.*

LHC was retained 14 November 2021 by Shahzad Zia (the “Owner”) to undertake a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) for 940-946 Beach Boulevard (the “Property”) in the City of Hamilton (the “City”), Ontario.

The Owner is proposing to demolish the existing dwelling and detached garage to allow for the severance of the Property into three parcels.

This CHIA is being prepared to evaluate the cultural heritage value of the Property, outline heritage planning constraints, assess potential adverse impacts on the cultural heritage value and heritage attributes of the property and surrounding area, and identify mitigation measures and alternatives to avoid or lessen impacts. This CHIA was undertaken in accordance with the recommended methodology outlined within the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism, and Culture Industries’ (MHSTCI) *Ontario Heritage Toolkit* and the City of Hamilton’s *Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment Guidelines* (2020).

The HIA resulted in the following findings and recommendations:

- In LHC’s professional opinion, the property municipally known as 940-946 Beach Boulevard does not meet the criteria of *O. Reg. 9/06* and is not a heritage structure which contributes to the character of the HCD.
- No potential project-related adverse impacts were identified for the adjacent cultural heritage resources with respect to the proposed demolition and severance. Given that no adverse impacts were identified, alternatives and mitigation measures were not explored.
- Design of future single detached residences on the retained and severed lots has not commenced. Any new dwellings are required to comply with HCD Plan guidelines and will be required to be compatible with the streetscape character. Design, massing, setback, and materials should take cues from the surrounding buildings, while avoiding replication. It is recommended that design be reviewed for compliance with the HCD Plan early in the process to allow for flexibility in the event alternatives are recommended to better conform with the HCD Plan and to conserve the streetscape character.

## Table of Contents

<b>RIGHT OF USE .....</b>	<b>IV</b>
<b>REPORT LIMITATIONS .....</b>	<b>IV</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>V</b>
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION TO THE PROPERTY .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Property Owner .....	1
1.2 Property Location .....	1
1.3 Property Description .....	1
1.4 Property Heritage Status .....	1
<b>2.0 STUDY APPROACH .....</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1 City of Hamilton Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment Terms of Reference (2020) .....	4
2.2 Legislative/Policy Review .....	7
2.3 Historic Research .....	7
2.4 Site Visit .....	7
2.5 Impact Assessment .....	7
<b>3.0 POLICY FRAMEWORK .....</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1 Provincial Planning Context .....	9
3.1.1 The Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.13 .....	9
3.1.2 Provincial Policy Statement (2020) .....	9
3.1.3 Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.O.18 .....	10
3.1.4 Places to Grow Act, 2005, S.O. 2005 .....	11
3.1.5 A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2020) .....	12
3.1.6 Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25 .....	13
3.1.7 Provincial Planning Context Summary .....	13
3.2 Local Planning Context .....	13
3.2.1 Urban Hamilton Official Plan (2013) .....	13
3.2.2 Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District Plan (2000) .....	17
3.2.3 City of Hamilton Zoning By-law 6593 (1950, consolidated 12 April 2019) .....	19
3.2.4 Local Planning Context Summary .....	21
<b>4.0 RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>22</b>

4.1	Physiographic Context .....	22
4.2	Early Indigenous History .....	22
4.2.1	Paleo Period (9500-8000 BCE) .....	22
4.2.2	Archaic Period (8000-1000 BCE) .....	23
4.2.3	Woodland Period (1000 BCE – CE 1650).....	23
4.3	Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Historic Context.....	24
4.4	City of Hamilton.....	25
4.5	Burlington Beach.....	26
4.6	Property History .....	30
<b>5.0</b>	<b>ASSESSMENT OF EXISTING CONDITIONS .....</b>	<b>33</b>
5.1	940-946 Beach Boulevard.....	33
5.2	Surrounding Context .....	42
5.3	Adjacent Heritage Properties.....	46
<b>6.0</b>	<b>EVALUATION .....</b>	<b>50</b>
6.1	Ontario Regulation 9/06 Evaluation .....	50
6.1.1	Summary.....	51
<b>7.0</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT .....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>8.0</b>	<b>IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES .....</b>	<b>53</b>
8.1	Summary of Potential Impacts and Compliance .....	55
<b>9.0</b>	<b>CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>57</b>
	<b>SIGNATURES .....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>10.0</b>	<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>58</b>
10.1	Policy and Legislation Resources.....	58
10.2	Mapping Resources .....	59
10.3	Additional Resources .....	60
	<b>APPENDIX A: QUALIFICATIONS.....</b>	<b>62</b>
	<b>APPENDIX B: GLOSSARY .....</b>	<b>63</b>
	<b>APPENDIX C: HAMILTON BEACH HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT: DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR NEW INFILL CONSTRUCTION.....</b>	<b>67</b>

## List of Figures

Figure 1: Location Plan .....	2
Figure 2: Current Conditions .....	3
Figure 3: Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation Land Cessions.....	25
Figure 4: Canal and Beach Boulevard c. 1880s (HPL Archives).....	27
Figure 5: Historic Maps Showing the Property .....	28
Figure 6: The Beach, Hamilton Ont., Canada. c. 1890s Postcard (HPL Archives).....	29
Figure 7: Beach Boulevard c. 1940s (HPL Archives).....	29
Figure 8: Beach Boulevard c. 1958 (HPL Archives) .....	30
Figure 9: Overlay of 1900 Fire Insurance Plan over modern air photo.....	31
Figure 10: 1934, 1954, 1960, 1963 and 1967 aerial images showing the Properties.....	32
Figure 11: View of the east elevation of the residence .....	34
Figure 12: View of the south elevation of the residence .....	35
Figure 13: View of the south elevation of the rear addition .....	35
Figure 14: View of the west elevation of the residence and its rear addition.....	36
Figure 15: View of the north elevation of the residence and its rear addition; Source: Google Streetview November 2016.....	36
Figure 16: View of the residence's concrete foundation .....	37
Figure 17: View of the fireplace and the front foyer floor .....	37
Figure 18: View of the shower.....	38
Figure 19: View of the inset covered porch .....	38
Figure 20: View of the interior of the boarded-up door .....	39
Figure 21: View of the east elevation of the detached garage .....	40
Figure 22: View of the south elevation of the detached garage .....	40
Figure 23: View of the west elevation of the detached garage.....	41
Figure 24: View of the north elevation of the detached garage; Source: Google Streetview February 2021 .....	41
Figure 25: View of the circular driveway from the north side of the detached garage .....	42
Figure 26: View north along Beach Boulevard from the sidewalk in front of the Property .....	43
Figure 27: View south along Beach Boulevard from the sidewalk in front of the Property.....	44
Figure 28: View south along Beach Boulevard from in front of 930 Beach Boulevard .....	44
Figure 29: View south along Beach Boulevard from north of the corner of Fourth Avenue .....	45
Figure 30: View south along Beach Boulevard from in front of 957 Beach Boulevard .....	45
Figure 31: View north along Beach Boulevard from in front of 957 Beach Boulevard .....	46
Figure 32: Detail of survey of the Property showing proposed severance .....	52
Figure 33: Examples of Compatible Infill along Beach Boulevard.....	56

## List of Tables

Table 1: City of Hamilton's Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment Terms of Reference Requirements .....	5
Table 2: Urban Hamilton Official Plan Relevant Policies .....	14
Table 3: Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District Plan Relevant Guidelines .....	18

Table 4: Zoning By-law 6593 C/S-1436a Permitted Uses..... 20

Table 5: Zoning By-law 6593 C/S-1436a Regulations ..... 20

Table 6: Adjacent Heritage Properties..... 47

Table 7: *Ontario Regulation 9/06* Evaluation for 940-946 Beach Boulevard ..... 50

Table 8: Compliance with Relevant Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District Plan Guidelines  
..... 53

*This page has been left blank deliberately*



## 1.0 INTRODUCTION TO THE PROPERTY

LHC was retained 14 November 2021 by Shahzad Zia (**the "Owner"**) to undertake a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (**CHIA**) for the property located at 940-946 Beach Boulevard (**the "Property"**) in the City of Hamilton (**the "City"**), Ontario.

The Property Owner is proposing to demolish the existing dwelling and detached garage to allow for the severance of the property into three parcels. This CHIA is being prepared to evaluate the cultural heritage value or interest of the Property and to outline heritage planning constraints and potential adverse impacts of the proposed demolition and severance. This CHIA was undertaken in accordance with the recommended methodology outlined within the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism, and Culture Industries' (**MHSTCI**) Ontario Heritage Toolkit and the City of Hamilton's 2020 *Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment Terms of Reference (CHIA ToR)*.

### 1.1 Property Owner

The Property is owned by Shahzad Zia of 202-2260 Bovaird Drive East, Brampton, Ontario.

### 1.2 Property Location

The Property is located on the west side of Beach Boulevard between 3<sup>rd</sup> Avenue and 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue in the Hamilton Beach area of the City of Hamilton, Ontario (Figure 1).

### 1.3 Property Description

The Property is an irregularly shaped polygon lot with the northern property line measuring 51.6 meters (m) and the southern property line measuring 48.5 meters (m). The eastern and western property lines taper slightly. The eastern property line measures 37.1 m and the western property line measures 38 m. The area of the lot is 0.46 acres (Figure 2). There are two buildings associated with the municipal address: a one-storey residence and a one-storey detached garage. A circular driveway extends from the road at the eastern corner of the property to the detached garage on the southern portion of the property.

### 1.4 Property Heritage Status

The property located at 940-946 Beach Boulevard is currently *designated* as part of the Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District under *Section 41 Part V* of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The property is also included as part of the Hamilton Beach HCD cultural heritage landscape (designated), the Hamilton Beach Strip cultural heritage landscape (inventoried), and the Hamilton Beach historic neighbourhood inventory.



SCALE 1:1,500,000




**Legend**



● Property

**NOTE(S)** 1. All locations are approximate.

**REFERENCE(S)**  
 1. Service Layer Credits: Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), (c) OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community  
 Portions of this document include intellectual property of Esri and its licensors and are used under license. Copyright (c) Esri and its licensors. All rights reserved.

TITLE <b>Location Plan</b>	
CLIENT Shahzad Zia	
PROJECT Heritage Impact Assessment 940–946 Beach Boulevard, Hamilton, Ontario	
PROJECT NO. LHC0283	
CONSULTANT	YYYY-MM-DD 2022-02-16
	PREPARED LHC
	DESIGNED JG
	FIGURE # 1



<p><b>Legend</b></p> <p> Property</p>	<p>TITLE <b>Current Conditions</b></p>	
	<p>CLIENT Shahzad Zia</p>	
	<p>PROJECT Heritage Impact Assessment 940–946 Beach Boulevard, Hamilton, Ontario</p>	
	<p>PROJECT NO. LHC0283</p>	
<p><b>NOTE(S)</b> 1. All locations are approximate.</p> <p><b>REFERENCE(S)</b> 1. Service Layer Credits: Source: Esri, Maxar, GeoEye, Earthstar Geographics, CNES/Airbus DS, USDA, USGS, AeroGRID, IGN, and the GIS User Community Portions of this document include intellectual property of Esri and its licensors and are used under license. Copyright (c) Esri and its licensors. All rights reserved.</p>	<p>CONSULTANT</p>	<p>YYYY-MM-DD</p> <p>2022-02-16</p>
		
	<p>PREPARED</p> <p>LHC</p>	
		<p>DESIGNED</p> <p>JG</p>
		<p>FIGURE #</p> <p><b>2</b></p>

## 2.0 STUDY APPROACH

LHC follows a three-step approach to understanding and planning for cultural heritage resources based on the understanding, planning and intervening guidance from the Canada's Historic Places *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada* and MHSTCI *Ontario Heritage Tool Kit*.<sup>1</sup> Understanding the cultural heritage resource involves:

- 1) Understanding the significance of the cultural heritage resource (known and potential) through research, consultation, and evaluation—when necessary.
- 2) Understanding the setting, context, and condition of the cultural heritage resource through research, site visit and analysis.
- 3) Understanding the heritage planning regulatory framework around the cultural heritage resource.

The impact assessment is guided by the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit, Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process, Information Sheet #5, Heritage Impact Assessments and Conservation Plans. A description of the proposed development or site alteration, measurement of development or site impact and consideration of alternatives, mitigation and conservation methods are included as part of planning for the cultural heritage resource.<sup>2</sup> The HIA includes recommendations for design and heritage conservation to guide interventions to the Properties.

### 2.1 City of Hamilton Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment Terms of Reference (2020)

According to the City's Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) Terms of Reference (ToR):

...shall be required where the proposed development, site alteration, or redevelopment of lands has the potential to adversely affect the following cultural heritage resources through displacement or disruption:

- Properties designated under any part of the *Ontario Heritage Act* or adjacent to properties designated under any part of the *Ontario Heritage Act*;
- Properties that are included in the City of Hamilton's Municipal Heritage Register or adjacent to properties included in the Register;
- A registered or known archaeological site or areas of archaeological potential;
- Any area for which a cultural heritage conservation plan statement has been prepared; or,
- Properties that comprise or are contained within cultural heritage landscapes that are included in the City of Hamilton's Municipal Heritage Register.

---

<sup>1</sup> Canada's Historic Places, "Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada", 2010, 3; MHSTCI, "Heritage Property Evaluation" Ontario Heritage Tool Kit, 2006, 18.

<sup>2</sup> MHSTCI, "Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process" Ontario Heritage Tool Kit, 2006

Requirements of a CHIA submitted to the City include the following:

Table 1: City of Hamilton's Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment Terms of Reference Requirements

Requirement	Location
Location Plan showing and describing the contextual location of the site.	Figure 1
Existing site plan including current floor plans of built structures, where appropriate.	Figure 2
Concise written and visual description of the site identifying significant features, buildings, landscapes and views including any yet unidentified potential cultural heritage resources and making note of any heritage recognition of the property (ie. National Historic Site, Municipal Designation, etc.).	Section 5.0
Concise written and visual description of the context including adjacent properties and their recognition and any yet unidentified potential cultural heritage resource(s).	Section 5.0
Present owner and contact information.	Section 1.1
Comprehensive written and visual research and analysis of the cultural heritage value or interest of the site (both identified and not yet identified): physical or design, historical or associative, and contextual (for the subject property).	Section 6.0
Development history of the site including original construction, additions, and alterations with substantiated dates of construction (for the subject property).	Section 4.0
Relevant research material, including historic maps, drawings, photographs, sketches/renderings, permit records, land records, assessment rolls, Vernon's directories, etc. (for the subject property).	Section 2.3
Concise written and visual research and analysis of the cultural heritage value or interest of the adjacent properties, predominantly physical or design and contextual value (for adjacent properties).	Section 5.3
Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest identifying the cultural heritage attributes. This statement will be informed by current research and analysis of the site as well as pre-existing heritage descriptions. This statement is to follow the provincial guidelines set out in the <i>Ontario</i>	Section 6.2 and 6.3

Requirement	Location
<p><i>Heritage Tool Kit.</i> The statement of cultural heritage value or interest will be written in a way that does not respond to or anticipate any current or proposed interventions. The City may, at its discretion and upon review, reject or use the statement of cultural heritage value or interest, in whole or in part, in crafting its own statement of cultural heritage value or interest (Reasons for including on Register or Designation) for the subject property.</p>	
<p>Written and visual description of the proposed development or site alteration, including a proposed site plan, proposed building elevations, and proposed interior plans, where applicable.</p>	Section 7.0
<p>Description of the negative impacts upon the cultural heritage resource(s) by the proposed development or site alteration as identified in the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit, including but not limited to destruction of significant heritage attributes or features; alteration that is not sympathetic or is incompatible; shadows that alter the appearance of heritage attributes or change in the viability of associated natural features; isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship; direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features; change in land use where the change in use negates the property's cultural heritage value; and, land disturbances that adversely affects a cultural heritage resource.</p>	Section 8.0
<p>Description of the alternatives or mitigation measures necessary to mitigate the adverse impacts of the development and/or site alteration upon the cultural heritage resource(s) including the means by which the existing cultural heritage resources shall be integrated and the manner in which commemoration of cultural heritage resources to be removed shall be incorporated.</p>	N/A
<p>The preferred strategy recommended to best protect and enhance the cultural heritage value and heritage attributes of the on-site and adjacent cultural heritage resource(s) including, but not limited to, a mitigation strategy, a conservation scope of work, an implementation and monitoring plan, recommendations for additional</p>	Section 9.2

Requirement	Location
studies/plans, and referenced conservation principles and precedents.	
A detailed list of cited materials including any photographic records, maps, or other documentary materials	Section 11.0

## 2.2 Legislative/Policy Review

The HIA includes a review of provincial legislation, plans and cultural heritage guidance, and relevant municipal policy and plans. This review outlines the cultural heritage legislative and policy framework that applies to the Property. The impact assessment considers the proposed project against this framework.

## 2.3 Historic Research

Historical research was undertaken to outline the history and development of the Property and its broader community context. Primary historic material, including air photos and mapping, were obtained from:

- Library and Archives Canada;
- Hamilton Maps;
- McMaster University Digital Archive; and,
- Hamilton Public Library.

Secondary research was compiled from sources such as: historical atlases, local histories, architectural reference texts, available online sources, and previous assessments. All sources and persons contacted in the preparation of this report are listed as footnotes and in the report's reference list.

## 2.4 Site Visit

A site visit was conducted by Colin Yu on 10 December 2021. The primary objective of the site visit was to document and gain an understanding of the Property and its surrounding context. The site visit included a documentation of the surrounding area and exterior and interior views of the structures.

## 2.5 Impact Assessment

The MHSCTI's *Information Sheet #5: Heritage Impact Assessments and Conservation Plans*<sup>3</sup> outlines seven potential negative impacts to be considered with any proposed development or property alteration. The impacts include, but are not limited to:

- a) **Destruction** of any part of any significant heritage attribute or features;

---

<sup>3</sup> MHSCTI "Heritage Impact Assessments and Conservation Plans, Info Sheet #5" in *Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology Policies of the Ontario Provincial Policy Statement, 2005* (Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2006)

- b) **Alteration** that is not sympathetic or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance;
- c) **Shadows** created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or planting, such as a garden;
- d) **Isolation** of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context, or a significant relationship;
- e) **Direct or indirect obstruction** of significant views or vistas within, from, or built and natural features;
- f) **A change in land use** such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces; and
- g) **Land disturbances** such as a change in grade that alters soils, drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource.

The HIA includes a consideration of direct and indirect adverse impacts on adjacent properties with known or potential cultural heritage value or interest in Section 8.0.



## 3.0 POLICY FRAMEWORK

### 3.1 Provincial Planning Context

In Ontario, cultural heritage is considered a matter of provincial interest and cultural heritage resources are managed under Provincial legislation, policy, regulations, and guidelines. Cultural heritage is established as a key provincial interest directly through the provisions of the *Planning Act*, the *OHA*, and the *PPS*. Other provincial legislation deals with cultural heritage indirectly or in specific cases. These various acts and the policies under these acts indicate broad support for the protection of cultural heritage by the Province. They also provide a legal framework through which minimum standards for heritage evaluation are established. What follows is an analysis of the applicable legislation and policy regarding the identification and evaluation of cultural heritage.

#### 3.1.1 The Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.13

*The Planning Act* is the primary document for municipal and provincial land use planning in Ontario and was consolidated on 2 December 2021. This Act sets the context for provincial interest in heritage. It states under Part I (2, d):

The Minister, the council of a municipality, a local board, a planning board and the Municipal Board, in carrying out their responsibilities under this Act, shall have regard to, among other matters, matters of provincial interest such as...the conservation of features of significant architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological or scientific interest.<sup>4</sup>

Under Section 1 of *The Planning Act*:

A decision of the council of a municipality, a local board, a planning board, a minister of the Crown and a ministry, board, commission or agency of the government, including the Tribunal, in respect of the exercise of any authority that affects a planning matter...shall be consistent with [the *PPS*].<sup>5</sup>

Details about provincial interest as it relates to land use planning and development in the province are outlined in the *PPS* which makes the consideration of cultural heritage equal to all other considerations concerning planning and development within the province.

#### 3.1.2 Provincial Policy Statement (2020)

The *PPS* provides further direction for municipalities regarding provincial requirements and sets the policy foundation for regulating the development and use of land in Ontario. Land use planning decisions made by municipalities, planning boards, the Province, or a commission or agency of the government must be consistent with the *PPS*. The Province deems cultural heritage and archaeological resources to provide important environmental, economic, and social benefits, and *PPS* directly addresses cultural heritage in Section 1.7.1e and Section 2.6.

---

<sup>4</sup> Province of Ontario, "Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13," Last modified December 2, 2021, <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90p13>, Part I (2, d).

<sup>5</sup> Province of Ontario, "Planning Act," Part I S.5.

Section 1.7 of the *PPS* regards long-term economic prosperity and promotes cultural heritage as a tool for economic prosperity. The relevant subsection states that long-term economic prosperity should be supported by:

1.7.1e encouraging a sense of place, by promoting well-designed built form and cultural planning, and by conserving features that help define character, including built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes.

Section 2.6 of the *PPS* articulates provincial policy regarding cultural heritage and archaeology. The subsections state:

- 2.6.1 Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.
- 2.6.2 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential unless significant archaeological resources have been conserved.
- 2.6.3 Planning authorities shall not permit development and site alteration on adjacent lands to protected heritage property except where the proposed development and site alteration has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved.
- 2.6.4 Planning authorities should consider and promote archaeological management plans and cultural plans in conserving cultural heritage and archaeological resources.
- 2.6.5 Planning authorities shall engage with Indigenous communities and consider their interests when identifying, protecting and managing cultural heritage and archaeological resources.<sup>6</sup>

The definition of significance in the *PPS* states that criteria for determining significance for cultural heritage resources are determined by the Province under the authority of the *OHA*.<sup>7</sup> The *PPS* makes the consideration of cultural heritage equal to all other considerations and recognizes that there are complex interrelationships among environmental, economic and social factors in land use planning. It is intended to be read in its entirety and relevant policies applied in each situation.

A HIA may be required by a municipality in response to Section 2.6.1 and 2.6.3 to conserve built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes, and the heritage attributes of a protected heritage property.

### **3.1.3 Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.O.18**

The *OHA* (consolidated on 19 October 2021) and associated regulations establish the protection of cultural heritage resources as a key consideration in the land-use planning

---

<sup>6</sup> Province of Ontario, "Provincial Policy Statement," last modified May 1, 2020, <https://files.ontario.ca/mmah-provincial-policy-statement-2020-accessible-final-en-2020-02-14.pdf>, 29.

<sup>7</sup> Province of Ontario, "Provincial Policy Statement," 51.

process, set minimum standards for the evaluation of heritage resources in the province, and give municipalities power to identify and conserve individual properties, districts, or landscapes of cultural heritage value or interest.<sup>8</sup>

Part I (2) of the *OHA* enables the Minister to determine policies, priorities, and programs for the conservation, protection, and preservation of the heritage of Ontario. The *OHA* and associated regulations establish the protection of cultural heritage resources as a key consideration in the land-use planning process, set minimum standards for the evaluation of heritage resources in the province, and give municipalities power to identify and conserve individual properties, districts, or landscapes of cultural heritage value or interest.<sup>9</sup> *O. Reg. 9/06* and *Ontario Regulation 10/06 (O. Reg. 10/06)* outline criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest and criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest of provincial significance.

Individual heritage properties are designated by municipalities under Section 29, Part IV of the *OHA*. A municipality may list a property on a municipal heritage register under Section 27, Part IV of the *OHA*. A municipality may designate heritage conservation districts under Section 41, Part V of the *OHA*. An *OHA* designation applies to real property rather than individual structures.

Amendments to the *OHA* were announced by the Province under Bill 108: *More Homes, More Choices Act* and came into effect on July 1, 2021. Previously, municipal council's decision to protect a property determined to be significant under the *OHA* was final with appeals being taken to the Conservation Review Board, who played an advisory role. With Bill 108 proclaimed, decisions are appealable to the Ontario Land Tribunal for adjudication.

Sections 33 and 34 Part IV and Section 42 Part V of the *OHA* require owners of designated heritage properties to obtain a permit or approval in writing from a municipality/municipal council to alter, demolish or remove a structure from a designated heritage property. These sections also enable a municipality to require an applicant to provide information or material that council may need to decide, which can include a CHIA.

Under Section 27(3), a property owner must not demolish or remove a building or structure unless they give council at least 60 days notice in writing. Under Section 27(5), council may require plans and other information to be submitted with this notice which may include a CHIA.

### 3.1.4 Places to Grow Act, 2005, S.O. 2005

The *Places to Grow Act* guides growth in the province and was consolidated 1 June 2021. It is intended:

- a) to enable decisions about growth to be made in ways that sustain a robust economy, build strong communities and promote a healthy environment and a culture of conservation;

---

<sup>8</sup> Province of Ontario, "Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18," last modified October 19, 2021, <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90o18>.

<sup>9</sup> Province of Ontario, "Ontario Heritage Act."

- b) to promote a rational and balanced approach to decisions about growth that builds on community priorities, strengths and opportunities and makes efficient use of infrastructure;
- c) to enable planning for growth in a manner that reflects a broad geographical perspective and is integrated across natural and municipal boundaries;
- d) to ensure that a long-term vision and long-term goals guide decision-making about growth and provide for the co-ordination of growth policies among all levels of government.<sup>10</sup>

This act is administered by the Ministry of Infrastructure and enables decision making across municipal and regional boundaries for more efficient governance in the Greater Golden Horseshoe area.

### 3.1.5 A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2020)

The Properties are located within the area regulated by *A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (the Growth Plan)*, which came into effect on 16 May 2019 and was consolidated on 28 August 2020.

In Section 1.2.1, the *Growth Plan* states that its policies are based on key principles, which includes:

Conserve and promote cultural heritage resources to support the social, economic, and cultural well-being of all communities, including First Nations and Métis communities.<sup>11</sup>

Section 4.1 Context, in the *Growth Plan* describes the area it covers as containing:

...a broad array of important hydrologic and natural heritage features and areas, a vibrant and diverse agricultural land base, irreplaceable cultural heritage resources, and valuable renewable and non-renewable resources.<sup>12</sup>

It describes cultural heritage resources as:

The *GGH* also contains important cultural heritage resources that contribute to a sense of identity, support a vibrant tourism industry, and attract investment based on cultural amenities. Accommodating growth can put pressure on these resources through development and site alteration. It is necessary to plan in a way that protects and maximizes the benefits of these resources that make our communities unique and attractive places to live.<sup>13</sup>

Policies specific to cultural heritage resources are outlined in Section 4.2.7, as follows:

---

<sup>10</sup> Province of Ontario, "Places to Grow Act, 2005, S.O. 2005, c. 13," last modified June 1, 2021, <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/05p13>, 1.

<sup>11</sup> Province of Ontario, "A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe," last modified August 2020, <https://files.ontario.ca/mmah-place-to-grow-office-consolidation-en-2020-08-28.pdf>, 6.

<sup>12</sup> Province of Ontario, "A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe," 39.

<sup>13</sup> Province of Ontario, "A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe," 39.

1. Cultural heritage resources will be conserved in order to foster a sense of place and benefit communities, particularly in strategic growth areas;
2. Municipalities will work with stakeholders, as well as First Nations and Métis communities, in developing and implementing official plan policies and strategies for the identification, wise use and management of cultural heritage resources; and,
3. Municipalities are encouraged to prepare archaeological management plans and municipal cultural plans and consider them in their decision-making.<sup>14</sup>

Amendment 1 to *A Place to Grow* aligns the definitions of *A Place to Grow* with PPS 2020.

### 3.1.6 Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25

The *Municipal Act* was consolidated on 29 November 2021 and enables municipalities to be responsible and accountable governments with their jurisdiction.<sup>15</sup> The *Municipal Act* authorizes powers and duties for providing good government and is administered by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

Amongst the many powers enabled by the *Municipal Act* is the power to create by-laws within the municipality's sphere of jurisdiction.<sup>16</sup> Under Section 11 (3), lower and upper tier municipalities are given the power to pass by-laws on matters including culture and heritage.<sup>17</sup> This enables municipalities to adopt a by-law or a resolution by Council to protect heritage, which may include requirements for an HIA.

### 3.1.7 Provincial Planning Context Summary

In summary, cultural heritage resources are considered an essential part of the land use planning process with their own unique considerations. As the province, these policies and guidelines must be considered by the local planning context. In general, the province requires significant cultural heritage resources to be conserved.

Multiple layers of municipal legislation enable a municipality to require a HIA for alterations, demolition or removal of a building or structure from a listed or designated heritage property. These requirements support the conservation of cultural heritage resources in Ontario following provincial policy direction.

## 3.2 Local Planning Context

### 3.2.1 Urban Hamilton Official Plan (2013)

The *Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP)* was approved by Council on 9 July 2009, approved by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing on 16 March 2011, and can into effect on 16 August 2013. However, some policies, schedules, maps, and appendices are still under appeal

---

<sup>14</sup> Province of Ontario, "A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe," 47.

<sup>15</sup> Province of Ontario, "Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25," last modified December 9, 2021, <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/01m25>.

<sup>16</sup> Province of Ontario, "Municipal Act," 11.

<sup>17</sup> Province of Ontario, "Municipal Act," 11(3).

by the Ontario Municipal Board (now the Ontario Land Tribunal).<sup>18</sup> The *UHOP* guides the management of the city, land use change, and physical development in the urban areas to 2043.<sup>19</sup>

Section 3.4 of Chapter B is dedicated to cultural heritage as indicated in the following section goal:

3.4.1.2 Encourage a city-wide culture of conservation by promoting cultural heritage initiatives as part of a comprehensive environmental, economic, and social strategy, where cultural heritage resources contribute to achieving sustainable, healthy, and prosperous communities.<sup>20</sup>

Policies related to cultural heritage resources as well as general policies pertaining to heritage are outlined by Section 3.4 of Chapter B and Section 3.4.3 of Chapter F of the *UHOP*. Policies most relevant to the Property and proposal have been included in Table 2 below. Any policies that are currently under appeal by the Ontario Land Tribunal and, therefore, are not in full force and effect have not been included in this table.

Table 2: Urban Hamilton Official Plan Relevant Policies<sup>21</sup>

Policy	Policy Text
<b>B3.4.2.1</b>	<p>The City of Hamilton shall, in partnership with others where appropriate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Protect and conserve the tangible cultural heritage resources of the City, including archaeological resources, built heritage resources, and cultural heritage landscapes for present and future generations.</li> <li>b) Promote awareness and appreciation of the City's cultural heritage and encourage public and private stewardship of and custodial responsibility for the City's cultural heritage resources.</li> <li>c) Ensure the conservation and protection of cultural heritage resources in planning and development matters subject to the Planning Act, R.S.O., 1990 c. P.13 either through appropriate planning and design measures or as conditions of development approvals.</li> <li>d) Conserve the character of areas of cultural heritage significance, including designated heritage conservation district and cultural heritage</li> </ul>

<sup>18</sup> City of Hamilton, "Urban Hamilton Official Plan," last modified 2 December 2021, <https://www.hamilton.ca/city-planning/official-plan-zoning-by-law/urban-hamilton-official-plan>.

<sup>19</sup> City of Hamilton, "Chapter A – Introduction", accessed 7 January 2022, <https://www.hamilton.ca/sites/default/files/media/browser/2015-01-15/urbanhamiltonofficialplan-volume1-chaptera-intro-feb2021.pdf>.

<sup>20</sup> City of Hamilton, "Chapter B – Communities", accessed 7 January 2022, <https://www.hamilton.ca/sites/default/files/media/browser/2015-01-15/urbanhamiltonofficialplan-volume1-chapterb-communities-feb2021.pdf>.

<sup>21</sup> City of Hamilton, "Chapter B – Communities"; City of Hamilton, "Chapter F – Implementation," accessed 7 January 2022, <https://www.hamilton.ca/sites/default/files/media/browser/2017-08-01/urbanhamiltonofficialplan-volume1-chapterf-implementation-nov2021.pdf>.

Policy	Policy Text
	<p>landscapes, by encouraging those land uses, development and site alteration activities that protect, maintain and enhance these areas within the City.</p> <p>e) Use all relevant provincial legislation, particularly the provisions of the Ontario Heritage Act, the Planning Act, R.S.O., 1990 c. P.13, the Environmental Assessment Act, the Municipal Act, the Niagara Escarpment Planning and Development Act, the Cemeteries Act, the Greenbelt Act, the Places to Grow Act, and all related plans and strategies in order to appropriately manage, conserve and protect Hamilton's cultural heritage resources.</p>
<b>B3.4.2.2</b>	<p>The City consists of many diverse districts, communities, and neighbourhoods, each with their own heritage character and form. The City shall recognize and consider these differences when evaluating development proposals to maintain the heritage character of individual areas.</p>
<b>B3.4.2.9</b>	<p>For consistency in all heritage conservation activity, the City shall use, and require the use by others, of the following criteria to assess and identify cultural heritage resources that may reside below or on real property:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Prehistoric and historical associations with a theme of human history that is representative of cultural processes in the settlement, development, and use of land in the City;</li> <li>b) Prehistoric and historical associations with the life or activities of a person, group, institution, or organization that has made a significant contribution to the City;</li> <li>c) Architectural, engineering, landscape design, physical, craft, or artistic value;</li> <li>d) Scenic amenity with associated views and vistas that provide a recognizable sense of position or place;</li> <li>e) Contextual value in defining the historical, visual, scenic, physical, and functional character of an area; and,</li> <li>f) Landmark value.</li> </ul>
<b>B3.4.2.10</b>	<p>Any property that fulfills one or more of the foregoing criteria listed in Policy B3.4.2.9 shall be considered to possess cultural heritage value. The City may further refine these criteria and provide guidelines for their use as appropriate.</p>
<b>B3.4.2.12</b>	<p>A cultural heritage impact assessment: (OPA 57 and OPA 64)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Shall be required by the City and submitted prior to or at the time of any application submission pursuant to the Planning Act, R.S.O., 1990 c. P. 13 where the proposed development, site alteration, or redevelopment of</li> </ul>

Policy	Policy Text
	<p>lands (both public and private) has the potential to adversely affect the following cultural heritage resources through displacement or disruption:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Properties designated under any part of the Ontario Heritage Act or adjacent to properties designated under any part of the Ontario Heritage Act;</li> <li>v. Properties that are comprised or are contained within cultural heritage landscapes that are included in the Register of Property of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest</li> </ul>
<b>B3.4.2.13</b>	Cultural heritage impact assessments shall be prepared in accordance with any applicable guidelines and Policy F.3.2.3 – Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments. The City shall develop guidelines for the preparation of cultural heritage impact assessment.
<b>B3.4.2.14</b>	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.
<b>B3.4.3.6</b>	The City shall protect established historical neighbourhoods, as identified in the cultural heritage landscape inventory, secondary plans and other City initiatives, by ensuring that new construction and development are sympathetic and complementary to existing cultural heritage attributes of the neighbourhood, including lotting and street patterns, building setbacks and building mass, height, and materials.
<b>B3.4.3.7</b>	Intensification through conversion of existing built heritage resources shall be encouraged only where original building fabric and architectural features are retained and where any new additions, including garages or car ports, are no higher than the existing building and are placed to the rear of the lot or set back substantially from the principal façade. Alterations to principal façades and the paving of front yards shall be avoided.
<b>B3.4.4</b>	The City shall require the protection, conservation, or mitigation of sites of archaeological value and areas of archaeological potential as provided for under the Planning Act, R.S.O., 1990 c. P.13, the Environmental Assessment Act, the Ontario Heritage Act, the Municipal Act, the Cemeteries Act, or any other applicable legislation.
<b>B3.4.5.2</b>	The City shall encourage the retention and conservation of significant built heritage resources in their original locations. In considering planning applications under the Planning Act, R.S.O., 1990 c. P.13 and heritage permit applications



Policy	Policy Text
	under the Ontario Heritage Act, there shall be a presumption in favour of retaining the built heritage resource in its original location.
<b>B3.4.6.1</b>	A cultural heritage landscape is a defined geographical area characterized by human settlement activities that have resulted in changes and modifications to the environment, which is now considered to be of heritage value or interest. Cultural heritage landscapes may include distinctive rural roads, urban streetscapes and commercial mainstreets, rural landscapes including villages and hamlets, designed landscapes such as parks, cemeteries and gardens, nineteenth and twentieth century urban residential neighbourhoods, as well as commercial areas and industrial complexes.
<b>B3.4.6.5</b>	The City may in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act by by-law prohibit or set limitations with respect to property alteration, erection, demolition, or removal of buildings or structures, or classes of buildings or structures, within the heritage conservation district study area.
<b>F3.2.3.1</b>	<p>Where the City requires a proponent to prepare a cultural heritage impact assessment it shall be undertaken by a qualified professional with demonstrated expertise in cultural heritage assessment, mitigation and management, according to the requirements of the City's Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment Guidelines, and shall contain the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Identification and evaluation of all potentially affected cultural heritage resource(s), including detailed site(s) history and a cultural heritage resource inventory containing textual and graphic documentation;</li> <li>b) A description of the proposed development or site alteration and alternative forms of the development or site alteration;</li> <li>c) A description of all cultural heritage resource(s) to be affected by the development and its alternative forms;</li> <li>d) A description of the effects on the cultural heritage resource(s) by the proposed development or site alteration and its alternative forms; and,</li> <li>e) A description of the measure necessary to mitigate the adverse effects of the development or site alteration and its alternatives upon the cultural heritage resource(s).</li> </ul>

### 3.2.2 Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District Plan (2000)

The Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District Plan was prepared and submitted to the City of Hamilton by Archaeological Services Inc. and Wendy Shearer Landscape Architect Limited in July 2000. This document builds on the heritage characteristics of Hamilton Beach and the rationale for the chosen boundary that were identified in the Heritage Assessment Report of June 2000 by "provid[ing] guidance in the care and protection of the heritage

character"<sup>22</sup> of the district. The intent, as described in the document, is to direct change in a way that protects heritage buildings and their defining features as well as streetscape and landscape features including grass boulevards, street trees, hedgerows, front yard plantings, and mature boundary plantings. In terms of new construction, the district plan expects this "on newly created lots primarily on the west or harbour side of Beach Boulevard"<sup>23</sup> and lays out the following guidelines:

Only single detached residences are to be permitted. These residences will not be dominant elements in the streetscape and are to be designed in a manner that encourages development in depth on the lot rather than in horizontal width across the lot front. Residences will not exceed two storeys in height and garages will be located to the rear. Front gable and hip roofs will be encouraged. Porches and verandahs, (traditional building features), will also be encouraged utilizing contemporary designs.<sup>24</sup>

Guidelines most relevant to the Property and proposal have been included in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District Plan Relevant Guidelines<sup>25</sup>

Guideline	Guideline Text
3.2	<p>The designation of the <i>Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District</i> seeks to ensure the wise care and management of the heritage character of the area. Physical change and development are to be managed in a way that the component buildings, streets, beach and open spaces are either <b>protected</b> or <b>enhanced</b>.</p> <p><b>1) Land use and development</b></p> <p>The existing low density, low profiles, single detached residential environment within the Beach Heritage Conservation District will be maintained and encouraged. Other forms of residential development and new uses will be discouraged.</p> <p><b>2) Heritage buildings</b></p> <p>Existing heritage buildings will be protected and enhanced and individual property owners will be encouraged to maintain and repair individual heritage buildings. City Council and staff will provide guidance on funding sources and appropriate conservation practices as requested. Demolition of heritage structures will be actively and vigorously discouraged.</p>

<sup>22</sup> Archaeological Services Inc. and Wendy Shearer Landscape Architect, *The Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District: Guidelines for Conservation and Change*, July 2000, p.1.

<sup>23</sup> Archaeological Services Inc. and Wendy Shearer, *The Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District*, p. 2.

<sup>24</sup> Archaeological Services Inc. and Wendy Shearer, *The Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District*, p. 2.

<sup>25</sup> Archaeological Services Inc. and Wendy Shearer, *The Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District*.

Guideline	Guideline Text
	<p><b>3) Landscape character</b></p> <p>In addition to principles 1 and 2 the landscape character of the Hamilton Beach will be protected and enhanced by maintaining and managing individual traditional or historical street tree species, tree lines and grass boulevards and protecting public spaces from unsympathetic change and uses.</p> <p><b>4) New development, construction and public works</b></p> <p>All new development, construction and any public works will be encouraged only where it is clearly demonstrated that such changes will have both no adverse effects upon the heritage attributes of the district and will positively contribute to the character of the area.</p>
<b>5.2 New Lots</b>	Where new lots are to be created within the Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District they should be of similar width and depth as adjacent occupied lots.
<b>5.3 New construction</b>	<p>Construction on newly created lots or vacant lots will be required to be compatible with the character of adjoining properties and the streetscape of Beach Boulevard.</p> <p>As each existing building within the district is unique in appearance each new structure to be constructed within the <i>Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District</i> will be constructed in a manner that <b>avoids replication</b> of any single style, type or appearance whether of heritage or contemporary design. The intent is that no two buildings should look alike.</p> <p>New construction should also appear to be “new” and not pretend to be historical or simply old by copying historic details that have no relevance in contemporary construction such as shutters and multi-paned sash windows.</p>

The district plan contains further design considerations for new construction within the Hamilton Beach HCD, which should be consulted for the design of the new residences on the new and retained lots.

### 3.2.3 City of Hamilton Zoning By-law 6593 (1950, consolidated 12 April 2019)

The present City of Hamilton is an amalgamation of former municipalities (Ancaster, Dundas, Flamborough, Glanbrook, Hamilton, and Stoney Creek) and, as a result, currently has a total of eight zoning by-laws. Each former municipality has its own zoning by-law.<sup>26</sup> The City of Hamilton’s *Comprehensive Zoning By-law No. 05-200* came into effect on 25 May 2005 and is

<sup>26</sup> City of Hamilton, “Zoning By-law”, last modified 5 June 2018, <https://www.hamilton.ca/city-planning/official-plan-zoning-by-law/zoning-by-law>.

currently being implemented in stages.<sup>27</sup> The Property is not yet subject to the comprehensive zoning by-law and is currently subject to *Zoning By-law 6593*. The Property is zoned C/S-1436a Urban Protected Residential Etc. which supports the following uses and regulations as shown in Table 4 and Table 5. This zoning does not have accompanying cultural heritage regulations.

Table 4: Zoning By-law 6593 C/S-1436a Permitted Uses<sup>28</sup>

Permitted Use	Permitted Use	Permitted Use
Single Family Dwelling with accommodation of no more than three lodgers	Foster Home	Residential Care Facility for no more than six residents
Retirement Home for no more than six residents	Day Nursery	School of learning with exceptions
Seminary	Library, art gallery, museum, observatory, community centre or other cultural, recreational or community building or structure except as a business	Bowling green, tennis court, playground, playfield, play lot or other recreational use except as a business
Urban Farm	Community Garden	Private Garage
Parking Spaces	Storage Garage	

Table 5: Zoning By-law 6593 C/S-1436a Regulations<sup>29</sup>

Regulation	Requirements
Maximum Height	Two-and-a-half storeys (building) or 11 metres (structure)
Minimum Front Yard Depth	6 metres
Minimum Side Yard Width	1.7 metres or 1.5 metres with a common swale
Minimum Rear Yard Depth	7.5 metres
Minimum Lot Width	12 metres
Minimum Lot Area	360 square metres

<sup>27</sup> City of Hamilton, "Zoning By-law No. 05-200", last modified 13 December 2021, <https://www.hamilton.ca/city-planning/official-plan-zoning-by-law/zoning-by-law-no-05-200>.

<sup>28</sup> City of Hamilton, "Section Nine," Zoning By-law 6593, accessed 7 January 2022, <https://www.hamilton.ca/sites/default/files/media/browser/2015-03-30/hamilton-zoning-by-law-6593-june13-2019.pdf>, 9-1 to 9-5.

<sup>29</sup> City of Hamilton, "Section Nine," Zoning By-law 6593, 9-1 to 9-5.

It is important to note that policy 6.4 states that:

No lot or tract of land shall be reduced in area, by alienation, building construction or otherwise, so as to make any yard, either of a building or structure hereafter erected or of an existing building or structure, less than as required for a building or structure hereafter erected, nor shall any lot or tract of land upon which an existing building or structure is situate, and which provides less than the yard requirements would be for such existing building or structure if it were one hereafter erected, be further reduced by building construction, alienation or otherwise, but this provision shall not be deemed to prohibit the sale of one dwelling of a pair of semi-detached dwellings or of any dwelling of a row of attached dwellings, provided all the rooms of the same are lighted and ventilated from a yard upon the premises so sold, and from a street, (8835/59).<sup>30</sup>

### 3.2.4 Local Planning Context Summary

The City considers cultural heritage resources to be of value to the community and values them in the land use planning process. Through its *OP* policies, the City has committed to identifying and conserving cultural heritage resources including archaeological resources. A CHIA is required when a proposed development is on or adjacent to a recognized heritage property.

---

<sup>30</sup> City of Hamilton, "Section 6," Zoning By-law 6593, accessed 7 January 2022, <https://www.hamilton.ca/sites/default/files/media/browser/2015-03-30/hamilton-zoning-by-law-6593-june13-2019.pdf>, 6-2.

---

## 4.0 RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

### 4.1 Physiographic Context

The Property is located on the Iroquois Plain physiographic region, bordering western Lake Ontario that once formed the body of water known as Lake Iroquois. Lake Iroquois was formed during the last glacial recession.<sup>31</sup>

The Iroquois Plain includes, but is not limited to, portions of Toronto, Scarborough, and the Niagara Fruit Belt and varies in its physiographic composition. The City of Hamilton is largely within the Ontario lakehead portion of the Iroquois Plain and, as such, is highly suited to the development of ports and the formation of urban centers such as Dundas, Burlington, and Hamilton.<sup>32</sup>

The area covered by the Iroquois Plain contains a significant portion of the province's population.<sup>33</sup> It is also an area of specialized farming. For example, the Niagara Fruit Belt produces the majority of the province's tender fruit crop, and the same area contains a variety of vineyards.<sup>34</sup> As of 2008, major specialized agricultural sectors among the western lakehead of Lake Ontario include, among others, horse and pony ranches, mushroom farms, and a variety (and substantial quantity) of greenhouse vegetable operations.<sup>35</sup> The proximity of Lake Ontario produces some climatic influences and the area has very fertile soil.<sup>36</sup> Moreover, offshore areas of sand and long-lasting sandbars act as aquifers, providing freshwater to many farms and villages.<sup>37</sup> Deposits of gravel have been essential sources for roadbuilding, while the recession of the old lakebed has resulted in sources of clay for brick manufacture.<sup>38</sup>

### 4.2 Early Indigenous History

#### 4.2.1 Paleo Period (9500-8000 BCE)

The cultural history of southern Ontario began around 11,000 years ago following the retreat of the Wisconsin glacier.<sup>39</sup> During this archaeological period, known as the Paleo period (9500-8000 BCE), the climate was like the present-day sub-arctic and vegetation was dominated by spruce and pine forests.<sup>40</sup> The initial occupants of the province had distinctive stone tools. They

---

<sup>31</sup> L.J. Chapman and D.F. Putnam, *The Physiography of Southern Ontario* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition), (Toronto: university of Toronto Press, 1973), 324.

<sup>32</sup> Chapman and Putnam, *The Physiography of Southern Ontario*, 326.

<sup>33</sup> Chapman and Putnam, *The Physiography of Southern Ontario*, 335.

<sup>34</sup> Chapman and Putnam, *The Physiography of Southern Ontario*, 336.

<sup>35</sup> City of Hamilton, "Hamilton Agricultural Profile 2008, 2.14," last modified 2008, <http://www2.hamilton.ca/NR/rdonlyres/4196D9CB-29AD-4865-8BA1-3F6444C1D7CE/0/Jan12PED09021.pdf>

<sup>36</sup> Chapman and Putnam, *The Physiography of Southern Ontario*, 336.

<sup>37</sup> Chapman and Putnam, *The Physiography of Southern Ontario*, 336.

<sup>38</sup> Chapman and Putnam, *The Physiography of Southern Ontario*, 336.

<sup>39</sup> Christopher Ellis and D. Brian Deller, "Paleo-Indians," in *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650*, ed. Christopher Ellis and Neal Ferris (London, ON: Ontario Archaeological Society, London Chapter, 1990), 37.

<sup>40</sup> EMCWTF, "Chapter 3: The First Nations," in *Greening Our Watersheds: Revitalization Strategies for Etobicoke and Mimico Creeks* (Toronto: TRCA, 2002). <http://www.trca.on.ca/dotAsset/37523.pdf>.

were nomadic big-game hunters (i.e., caribou, mastodon, and mammoth) who lived in small groups and travelled over vast areas, possibly migrating hundreds of kilometres in a single year.<sup>41</sup>

#### 4.2.2 Archaic Period (8000-1000 BCE)

During the Archaic archaeological period (8000-1000 BCE), the occupants of southern Ontario continued their migratory lifestyles, although living in larger groups and transitioning towards a preference for smaller territories of land – possibly remaining within specific watersheds. People refined their stone tools during this period and developed polished or ground stone tool technologies. Evidence of long-distance trade has been found on archaeological sites from the Middle and Later Archaic times including items such as copper from Lake Superior, and marine shells from the Gulf of Mexico.<sup>42</sup>

#### 4.2.3 Woodland Period (1000 BCE – CE 1650)

The Woodland period in southern Ontario (1000 BCE – CE 1650) represents a marked change in subsistence patterns, burial customs, and tool technologies, as well as the introduction of pottery making. The Woodland period is sub-divided into the Early Woodland (1000–400 BCE), Middle Woodland (400 BCE – CE 500) and Late Woodland (CE 500 - 1650).<sup>43</sup> The Early Woodland is defined by the introduction of clay pots which allowed for preservation and easier cooking.<sup>44</sup> During the Early and Middle Woodland, communities grew and were organized at a band level. Peoples continued to follow subsistence patterns focused on foraging and hunting.

Woodland populations transitioned from a foraging subsistence strategy towards a preference for agricultural village-based communities around during the Late Woodland. During this period people began cultivating maize in southern Ontario. The Late Woodland period is divided into three distinct stages: Early (CE 1000–1300); Middle (CE 1300–1400); and Late (CE 1400–1650).<sup>45</sup> The Late Woodland is generally characterised by an increased reliance on cultivation of domesticated crop plants, such as corn, squash, and beans, and a development of palisaded village sites which included more and larger longhouses. By the 1500s, Iroquoian communities in southern Ontario – and more widely across northeastern North America –organized themselves politically into tribal confederacies. Communities south of Lake Ontario at this time included the Haudenosaunee Confederacy, made up of the Mohawks, Oneidas, Cayugas, Senecas, Onondagas, and Tuscarora, and groups including the Anishinaabe and Neutral (Attiwandaron).<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup> EMCWFT, "Chapter 3: The First Nations," (Toronto: TRCA, 2002).

<sup>42</sup> EMCWFT, "Chapter 3: The First Nations," (Toronto: TRCA, 2002).

<sup>43</sup> EMCWFT, "Chapter 3: The First Nations," (Toronto: TRCA, 2002).

<sup>44</sup> EMCWFT, "Chapter 3: The First Nations," (Toronto: TRCA, 2002).

<sup>45</sup> EMCWFT, "Chapter 3: The First Nations," (Toronto: TRCA, 2002).

<sup>46</sup> Six Nations Elected Council, "Community Profile," Six Nations of the Grand River, last modified 2013, accessed May 7, 2021, <http://www.sixnations.ca/CommunityProfile.htm>; University of Waterloo, "Land acknowledgment," Faculty Association, accessed May 7, 2021, <https://uwaterloo.ca/faculty-association/about/land-acknowledgement>; Six Nations Tourism, "History," accessed May 7, 2021, <https://www.sixnationstourism.ca/history/>.

### 4.3 Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century Historic Context

French explorers and missionaries began arriving in southern Ontario during the first half of the 17th century, bringing with them diseases for which the Indigenous peoples had no immunity. Also contributing to the collapse and eventual dispersal of the Huron, Petun, and Attiwandaron, was the movement of the Haudenosaunee Confederacy from south of Lake Ontario. Between 1649 and 1655, the Haudenosaunee Confederacy waged military warfare on the Huron, Petun, and Attiwandaron, pushing them out of their villages and the general area.<sup>47</sup> Many of the Attiwandaron merged with Haudenosaunee groups to the west and south. More than forty Attiwandaron settlements have been identified by archaeologists within 40 km of the City of Hamilton. These settlements were large, fenced-in villages; however, their influence and settlement extended across southwestern Ontario.<sup>48</sup>

In the eighteenth century, the Mississauga moved into the Attiwandaron's territory and established Lake Ontario as a French fur trading post. Following the Battle of the Plains of Abraham in 1759, the British gained control of the area and began to purchase large sections of land from the Mississaugas.<sup>49</sup> Hamilton, as well as a large portion of southwestern Ontario, was one of these sections of land that was purchased in the Between the Lakes Purchase of 1792.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation, "The History of the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation," Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation, last modified 2018, <http://mncfn.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/The-History-of-MNCFN-FINAL.pdf>.

<sup>48</sup> William C. Noble, "The Neutral Confederacy," *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, accessed 25 January 2022, <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/neutral>.

<sup>49</sup> John C. Weaver, "Hamilton," *The Canadian Encyclopedia*, accessed 25 January 2022, <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/hamilton>.

<sup>50</sup> Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation Land Cessions, 1781-1820 and Rouge Tract Claim, 2015. Accessed December 4, 2018. <http://mncfn.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Treaty-Map-Description.jpg>.






Figure 3: Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation Land Cessions<sup>51</sup>

#### 4.4 City of Hamilton

In the late eighteenth century, the British Crown sought to settle the Niagara region and offered two hundred acres of land to any Loyalist family that settled in the area.<sup>52</sup> In 1791, Augustus Jones surveyed Barton (Township No. 8) and Saltfleet Townships and laid out lots and concessions; however, the area remained largely undeveloped and unoccupied for a number of years.<sup>53</sup> In 1815, George Hamilton, a veteran of the War of 1812, purchased 257 acres in Barton Township (known as Head of the Lake at the time) from James Durand for 1750 pounds, and began planning streets and selling parcels of his estate to new arrivals. When Head of the Lake became the administrative seat of the Gore District in 1816, it was renamed Hamilton.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>51</sup> Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation Land Cessions, 1781-1820 and Rouge Tract Claim, 2015.

<sup>52</sup> Weaver, "Hamilton."

<sup>53</sup> Bill Manson, *Footsteps in Time: Exploring Hamilton's Heritage Neighbourhoods* (Burlington, ON: North Shore Publishing, 2003).

<sup>54</sup> Weaver, "Hamilton."

Growth began in the late 1820s with the construction of a new canal through Burlington Beach that provided entry into Burlington Bay.<sup>55</sup> By 1823, there were around 1,000 residents<sup>56</sup>, a significant increase from the 31 families recorded in 1792.<sup>57</sup> The canal provided a boost to the community and transformed Hamilton into a significant port. This was complimented by extensive migration from the United Kingdom in the following decade. These new residents brought with them building technology and institutions that were well suited to the landscape, including mercantile houses, granaries, and manufacturing plants.<sup>58</sup>

In 1833, Hamilton was incorporated as a town. The following year, Allan McNab and other prominent residents raised money to fund the construction of a railway. However, economic concerns and the Rebellions of 1837 delayed construction until 1851. The railway attracted new industries like stove and farm-implement foundries, ready-made clothing, and sewing machine manufacturing. Expansion of the railway network in the early 1900s sparked an industrial and residential construction boom, which lasted until 1913. The focus on wartime products during the world wars shifted post-war production to appliances, automobiles, and houses. The closure of textile mills and knit-wear factories in the 1950s and 1960s making Hamilton dependent on steel and its related industries. Manufacturing continues to play an important role in Hamilton's economy.<sup>59</sup>

Hamilton incorporated as a city in 1846.<sup>60</sup> In January 2001, Hamilton amalgamated with the surrounding municipalities of Flamborough, Glanbrook, Stoney Creek, Ancaster, and Dundas to form the modern boundaries of the City of Hamilton.<sup>61</sup>

#### 4.5 Burlington Beach

The Township of Saltfleet and the City of Hamilton aided the development of the Beach Strip throughout the 1800s; however, it remained entirely independent of both. The provincial government created the Beach Commission as a special form of government to address local concerns including enforcing local by-laws, collecting taxes, and supervising the police and fire departments. The area remained independent until 1957 when the City of Hamilton annexed the portion of the Beach Strip south of the canal. The City of Burlington annexed the section of the Beach Strip north of the canal in 1964.<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> Weaver, "Hamilton."

<sup>56</sup> Hamilton Public Library, "A History of the City of Hamilton," accessed January 28, 2022, [http://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/200/301/ic/can\\_digital\\_collections/cultural\\_landmarks/hamhist.htm](http://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/200/301/ic/can_digital_collections/cultural_landmarks/hamhist.htm).

<sup>57</sup> Manson, *Footsteps in Time*.

<sup>58</sup> Weaver, "Hamilton."

<sup>59</sup> Weaver, "Hamilton."

<sup>60</sup> Weaver, "Hamilton."

<sup>61</sup> Waterloo Region Record, "Hamilton got stronger after amalgamation," last updated April 13, 2020, accessed January 28, 2022, <https://www.therecord.com/news/waterloo-region/2018/09/14/hamilton-got-stronger-after-amalgamation.html>.

<sup>62</sup> Hamilton Beach Millennium Project, "A Proud Community," accessed January 28, 2022, <https://www.flickr.com/photos/-jm/6615289599/in/album-72157625341450228/>.

The Hamilton Beach Canal was completed in 1832 and required constant maintenance (dredging) to prevent sand build-ups and to allow entrance into Burlington Bay for larger ships<sup>63</sup> (see Figure 4 and Figure 5). In the 1870s, prominent and wealthy Hamilton residents constructed summer homes on the Beach Strip<sup>64</sup> (see Figure 6). In 1876, the Hamilton and Northwestern railway established a streetcar line along the Beach Strip allowing all Hamilton residents to enjoy the area's recreational activities (fishing, swimming, picnicking, and strolling). Its popularity sparked the establishment of resorts, an amusement park, a yacht club, and other attractions along the Beach Strip (Figure 5). After World War I and the introduction of the automobile and improved roads, tourists started travelling further for weekend trips and holidays resulting in the decline of the Beach Strip as a recreational and vacation space and the conversion to a year-round residential community (Figure 6).<sup>65</sup> Streetcars were replaced with automobiles and buses in 1929.<sup>66</sup> (see Figure 7).



Figure 4: Canal and Beach Boulevard c. 1880s (HPL Archives)




---

<sup>63</sup> Hamilton Beach Millennium Project, "A Hub of Activity," accessed January 28, 2022, <https://www.flickr.com/photos/-jm/5147977228/in/photostream/>.

<sup>64</sup> Hamilton Beach Millennium Project, "Hamilton's Playground," accessed January 28, 2022, <https://www.flickr.com/photos/-jm/6615106795/in/album-72157625341450228/>.

<sup>65</sup> Hamilton Beach Millennium Project, "Hamilton's Playground."

<sup>66</sup> Hamilton Beach Millennium Project, "A Hub of Activity."



**Legend**

Property

**TITLE**  
Historic Maps Showing the Property

**CLIENT**  
Shahzad Zia

**PROJECT**  
Heritage Impact Assessment 940–946 Beach Boulevard, Hamilton, Ontario

**PROJECT NO.** LHC0283

**NOTE(S)** 1. All locations are approximate.

**REFERENCE(S)**

1. Russell, A., "Burlington Beach, Flamboro Township", ([http://ao.minisisinc.com/SCRIPTS/MW/MAIN.DLL/121620400/2/1/34637?RECORD&DATABASE=IMAGES\\_WEB](http://ao.minisisinc.com/SCRIPTS/MW/MAIN.DLL/121620400/2/1/34637?RECORD&DATABASE=IMAGES_WEB): accessed February 28, 2022), digitized map, Archives of Ontario, scale 1:31,680, Kingston: Surveyor General's Office, 1843.

2. Surtees, R. "Map of the County of Wentworth Canada West", (<https://www.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=8cc6be34f6b54992b27da17467492d2f>: accessed February 24, 2022), digitized map, Hamilton: Hardy Gregory, 1859.

3. Page & Smith, "Township of Saltfleet", In: Page & Smith, "Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth", (<https://digital.library.mcgill.ca/countyatlas/searchmapframes.php>: accessed February 28, 2022), digitized sheet, scale unknown, Toronto: Page & Smith, 1875.

Portions of this document include intellectual property of Esri and its licensors and are used under license. Copyright (c) Esri and its licensors. All rights reserved.

<b>CONSULTANT</b>	YYYY-MM-DD	2022-02-28
	PREPARED	LHC
	DESIGNED	JG
	FIGURE #	5



Figure 6: The Beach, Hamilton Ont., Canada. c. 1890s Postcard (HPL Archives)



Figure 7: Beach Boulevard c. 1940s (HPL Archives)



Figure 8: Beach Boulevard c. 1958 (HPL Archives)

#### 4.6 Property History

Registered Plan 318, dated 19 March 1878, indicates that the Property is among a large parcel owned by John Brown. Prior to this, historic mapping shows little development in the vicinity of the Property, although several residences had been constructed along Beach Boulevard prior to 1875 (Figure 5). It is unclear when the Property was first subdivided and developed; however, the 1900 Fire Insurance Plan for Burlington Beach shows the Property as two separate parcels; lots 422 and 424.

In 1900, "Heath Cottage" a one-storey frame residence with a wrap-around porch and one storey outbuilding or shed is shown on the northern half of the Property, while a two-storey wood frame structure with two outbuildings is shown on the south half of the Property in the approximate location of the extant garage (Figure 9). Heath Cottage, appears to be the structure shown as late as 1934 on aerial imagery. The two-storey residence on the south half of the Property is not visible on the 1934 air photo (Figure 10).

Heath Cottage was removed and replaced with the current residence some time before 1954.<sup>67</sup> By 1960, the rear addition and back patio had been added.<sup>68</sup> The garage, which is not present in any of the retrieved aerial images was not built until sometime after 1967.<sup>69</sup> Interestingly, the 1963 image appears to show a fence dividing the northern (house) and southern (garage) portions of the property. This suggests that the property was once two parcels that were later merged, potentially when the garage was added (Figure 10).<sup>70</sup> The property abstracts have not been located in the land registry documents.




Figure 9: Overlay of 1900 Fire Insurance Plan over modern air photo.

<sup>67</sup> Publisher Unknown, "Greater Hamilton Area, from Caledonia to Vineland, 1934-10-09," Flightline A4866-Photo 73, accessed February 16, 2022, <http://digitalarchive.mcmaster.ca/islandora/object/macrepo%3A71876.>; Publisher Unknown, "Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth and surrounding area, 1954," Flightline 4313-Photo 131, accessed February 16, 2022, <https://digitalarchive.mcmaster.ca/islandora/object/macrepo%3A73015.>

<sup>68</sup> Canadian Aero Service Ltd., "Wentworth County, excluding most of the City of Hamilton, 1960-05-21," Flightline 60134-Photo 192, accessed February 16, 2022, <http://digitalarchive.mcmaster.ca/islandora/object/macrepo%3A77000.>

<sup>69</sup> Ontario Department of Lands and Forests, Division of Surveys and Engineering, Aerial Surveys Section, "Parts of southwest Hamilton, including Ancaster, the Hamilton Beach Strip and part of Burlington, 1967," Flightline 675-Photo 78, accessed February 16, 2022, <https://digitalarchive.mcmaster.ca/islandora/object/macrepo%3A81754.>

<sup>70</sup> Publisher Unknown, "Queen Elizabeth Way and Highway 2 corridor, 1963-11-01," Flightline J2633-Photo 136, accessed February 16, 2022, <http://digitalarchive.mcmaster.ca/islandora/object/macrepo%3A79921.>



**Legend**

Property

---

**TITLE**  
Aerial Photos of the Property

**CLIENT**  
Shahzad Zia

**PROJECT**  
Heritage Impact Assessment 940–946 Beach Boulevard, Hamilton, Ontario

**PROJECT NO.** LHC0283

**NOTE(S)**  
1. All locations are approximate.

**REFERENCE(S)**

Portions of this document include intellectual property of Esri and its licensors and are used under license. Copyright (c) Esri and its licensors. All rights reserved.

<b>CONSULTANT</b>	YYYY-MM-DD	2022-02-16
	<b>PREPARED</b>	LHC
	<b>DESIGNED</b>	JG
	<b>FIGURE #</b>	10



## 5.0 ASSESSMENT OF EXISTING CONDITIONS

### 5.1 940-946 Beach Boulevard

The property municipally known as 940-946 Beach Boulevard is comprised of a mid-century vernacular bungalow on a concrete foundation with a small gabled, rectangular rear addition on a cinder block foundation (Figure 11 and Figure 14) and a one-storey, rectangular detached garage with a concrete foundation (Figure 21). The property is accessed from Beach Boulevard by the circular driveway in front of the detached garage at the southern end of the property (Figure 25). The interior of the structure is modern in design; however, the design of the fireplace, the floor in front of it, the flooring in the front foyer, and the shower are uncharacteristic of modern design (Figure 17 and Figure 18).

The residence is constructed of red brick laid in running bond with cut stone cladding on the east elevation and a medium-pitch side gable roof with vinyl cladding beneath each gable, a central red brick chimney, and overhanging eaves (Figure 11 and Figure 12). The building can be accessed through a main, central contemporary door with an exterior glass and metal door located in the inset covered porch on the east elevation (Figure 11), a contemporary door with an exterior glass and metal door at the northern end of the inset covered porch on the east elevation (Figure 19), a central contemporary door with a large window and a wooden screen door on the west elevation (Figure 14), and a contemporary door adjoined to three windows with an exterior glass and metal door on the southern elevation of the rear addition. The rear addition's door windows are boarded up from the outside (Figure 13 and Figure 20). Windows are found on all elevations.

The north elevation has a central rectangular, paired casement window with a stone lug sill, a rectangular fixed window divided into four sections with a stone lug sill and a tall, thin rectangular fixed window with a stone lug sill at the eastern end of the elevation (Figure 15). The east elevation has a large picture window divided into three sections immediately north of the main entrance and two long rectangular windows divided into three sections with a picture window in the centre flanked by casement windows, stone lug sills and decorative wood shutters at both ends of the elevation (Figure 11). The south elevation has a small rectangular, paired casement window with a stone lug sill at the eastern end of the elevation and a tall rectangular, paired casement window with a stone lug sill near the western end of the elevation (Figure 12).

The southwestern corner of the residence features a small sunroom area with six tall single hung vinyl windows (three on the south elevation, three on the west elevation) with a red brick lug sill. Immediately north of the sunroom windows on the west elevation is a tall rectangular 10-pane fixed window with an air-conditioner sized gap between the bottom of the window and the red brick lug sill shared with the sunroom windows (Figure 12 and Figure 14). The western elevation also features a rectangular, paired casement window with a stone lug sill, a small rectangular fixed window with a stone lug sill and an awning, and a long rectangular window divided into three sections with a central picture window flanked by a casement window and a single hung sash window and a stone lug sill (Figure 14). The rear addition has a long rectangular window divided into three sections with a central picture window flanked by two

single hung sash windows and a stone lug sill on the south elevation (Figure 13), a long rectangular window divided into three sections with a central picture window flanked by two single hung sash windows and a stone lug sill on the west elevation (Figure 14), and a small, thin rectangular fixed window with a stone lug sill on the north elevation (Figure 15).

The detached garage is constructed of red brick laid in running bond with cut stone cladding on the east elevation and has a shallow pitch gable roof with overhanging eaves (Figure 21). The building can be accessed through the two garage doors on the east elevation, a contemporary door covered in plywood sheets on the west elevation, and a wood door with a window at the eastern end of the north elevation (Figure 21, Figure 23 and Figure 24). The north and south elevations each feature a central rectangular sliding window with stone lug sills (Figure 22 and Figure 24).



Figure 11: View of the east elevation of the residence



Figure 12: View of the south elevation of the residence



Figure 13: View of the south elevation of the rear addition



Figure 14: View of the west elevation of the residence and its rear addition



Figure 15: View of the north elevation of the residence and its rear addition; Source: Google Streetview November 2016



Figure 16: View of the residence's concrete foundation



Figure 17: View of the fireplace and the front foyer floor



Figure 18: View of the shower



Figure 19: View of the inset covered porch



Figure 20: View of the interior of the boarded-up door



Figure 21: View of the east elevation of the detached garage



Figure 22: View of the south elevation of the detached garage





Figure 23: View of the west elevation of the detached garage



Figure 24: View of the north elevation of the detached garage; Source: Google Streetview February 2021



Figure 25: View of the circular driveway from the north side of the detached garage

## 5.2 Surrounding Context

The Property is located in the northeast portion of the City of Hamilton. It is approximately 124 metres (m) from the southwestern shore of Lake Ontario, approximately 7.4 kilometres (km) northeast of downtown Hamilton, and approximately 4.2 km southeast of downtown Burlington.

The topography of the area is flat and is defined by the size and shape of the land bridge and the location of the Queen Elizabeth Way (QEW). The Property is situated on a strip of land that forms an almost complete bridge between the City of Hamilton and the City of Burlington with a canal situated approximately in the center of the land bridge. Along the western edge of the land bridge is the QEW. The vegetation of the area consists of young and mature deciduous trees and landscaped yards fronting residential properties (Figure 26 and Figure 27).

The Property is bounded by Beach Boulevard to the east, the QEW to the west, and residential properties to the north and south. Beach Boulevard is a local road running the length of the southern portion of the land bridge. It is a two-lane road with a bike lane in the southbound lane flanked by sidewalks and curbs on both sides of the street and streetlights on the east side of the street (Figure 28 and Figure 29).

The surrounding area is comprised of residential properties that are one to two storeys in height with shallow to moderate setbacks. Parcel lots are generally 13 m to 27 m wide and 44 m to 50 m deep. Building materials primarily consist of wood with some stone and brick, and some modern materials like vinyl siding (Figure 30 and Figure 31).

Recognized as a Locally Significant Cultural Heritage Resource, the Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District Cultural Heritage Landscape (CHL) extends the length and breadth of the HCD and is bounded by Beach Boulevard Park #2, Dieppe Park, the QEW, and the southwestern shoreline of Lake Ontario, ending approximately 61 metres (m) south of Fourth Avenue. In addition, the Property is located within the Hamilton Beach Strip Cultural Heritage Landscape, which is comprised of the same area as the other CHL.



Figure 26: View north along Beach Boulevard from the sidewalk in front of the Property



Figure 27: View south along Beach Boulevard from the sidewalk in front of the Property



Figure 28: View south along Beach Boulevard from in front of 930 Beach Boulevard



Figure 29: View south along Beach Boulevard from north of the corner of Fourth Avenue



Figure 30: View south along Beach Boulevard from in front of 957 Beach Boulevard



Figure 31: View north along Beach Boulevard from in front of 957 Beach Boulevard

### 5.3 Adjacent Heritage Properties

The Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP) has a definition for adjacency with respect to cultural heritage. Chapter G defines adjacent as “in regard to cultural heritage and archaeology, those lands contiguous to, or located within 50 metres of, a *protected heritage property*.”<sup>71</sup> The *PPS* defines adjacent as “those lands contiguous to a protected heritage property or as otherwise defined in the municipal official plan”.<sup>72</sup> Using the UHOP definition, there are thirteen adjacent heritage properties within 50 m of the Property.

Table 6 presents adjacent heritage properties along Beach Boulevard in an approximately 50 m area surrounding the Property. Images are sourced from Google Streetview. All adjacent properties are either designated under Part V of the OHA as part of the Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District or under Section 29 Part IV of the OHA.

---

<sup>71</sup> City of Hamilton, “Chapter G – Glossary,” accessed 11 February 2022, <https://www.hamilton.ca/sites/default/files/media/browser/2015-01-15/urbanhamiltonofficialplan-volume1-chapterg-glossary-nov2021.pdf>.

<sup>72</sup> Province of Ontario, “Provincial Policy Statement,” 39.

Table 6: Adjacent Heritage Properties

Address	Heritage Recognition	Notes	Image
<b>903 Beach Boulevard</b>	Part V Designation – Hamilton Beach HCD	c. 1910 <sup>73</sup>	
<b>913 Beach Boulevard</b>	Part IV Designation	c. 1891 <sup>74</sup>	
<b>919 Beach Boulevard</b>	Part V Designation – Hamilton Beach HCD	c. 1905 <sup>75</sup>	
<b>924 Beach Boulevard</b>	Part V Designation – Hamilton Beach HCD	c. 1880 <sup>76</sup>	

<sup>73</sup> City of Hamilton, *Interactive Cultural Heritage Mapping*, <https://spatialolutions.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=ef361312714b4caa863016bb a9e6e68f>.

<sup>74</sup> City of Hamilton, *Interactive Cultural Heritage Mapping*.

<sup>75</sup> City of Hamilton, *Interactive Cultural Heritage Mapping*.

<sup>76</sup> City of Hamilton, *Interactive Cultural Heritage Mapping*.

Address	Heritage Recognition	Notes	Image
925 Beach Boulevard	Part V Designation – Hamilton Beach HCD	c. 1948 <sup>77</sup>	
929 Beach Boulevard	Part V Designation – Hamilton Beach HCD	c. 1920 <sup>78</sup>	
930 Beach Boulevard	Part V Designation – Hamilton Beach HCD	c. 2012 <sup>79</sup>	
935 Beach Boulevard	Part V Designation – Hamilton Beach HCD	c. 1880 <sup>80</sup>	
936 Beach Boulevard	Part V Designation – Hamilton Beach HCD	c. 1900 <sup>81</sup>	

<sup>77</sup> City of Hamilton, *Interactive Cultural Heritage Mapping*.

<sup>78</sup> City of Hamilton, *Interactive Cultural Heritage Mapping*.

<sup>79</sup> City of Hamilton, *Interactive Mapping Air Photo Base Maps*,

<https://spatialolutions.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=ef361312714b4caa863016bb a9e6e68f>.

<sup>80</sup> City of Hamilton, *Interactive Cultural Heritage Mapping*.

<sup>81</sup> City of Hamilton, *Interactive Cultural Heritage Mapping*.



Address	Heritage Recognition	Notes	Image
<b>954 Beach Boulevard</b>	Part V Designation – Hamilton Beach HCD	No date indicated in the interactive mapping; however, it is depicted in the 1999 Air Photograph <sup>82</sup>	
<b>958 Beach Boulevard</b>	Part V Designation – Hamilton Beach HCD	c. 2017 <sup>83</sup>	
<b>962 Beach Boulevard</b>	Part V Designation – Hamilton Beach HCD	c. 2017 <sup>84</sup>	
<b>966 Beach Boulevard</b>	Part V Designation – Hamilton Beach HCD	c. 2019 <sup>85</sup>	

<sup>82</sup> City of Hamilton, *Interactive Cultural Heritage Mapping*.

<sup>83</sup> City of Hamilton, *Interactive Mapping Air Photo Base Maps*.

<sup>84</sup> City of Hamilton, *Interactive Mapping Air Photo Base Maps*.

<sup>85</sup> City of Hamilton, *Interactive Mapping Air Photo Base Maps*.

## 6.0 EVALUATION

### 6.1 Ontario Regulation 9/06 Evaluation

The property at 940-946 Beach Boulevard was evaluated against *O. Reg. 9/06* under the *OHA* using research and analysis presented in Section 4.0 and 5.0 of this CHIA.

Table 7: *Ontario Regulation 9/06* Evaluation for 940-946 Beach Boulevard

Criteria	Criteria Met	Justification
<b>1. The property has design value or physical value because it,</b>		
i. is a rare, unique, representative, or early example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method,	No	The Property is not a unique, representative, and early example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method.
ii. displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or	No	The Property does not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit. The building exhibits vernacular and simple building methods common at the time of construction.
iii. demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.	No	The Property does not demonstrate a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. It was constructed using common building methods at the time of construction.
<b>2. The property has historical or associative value because it,</b>		
i. has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community,	No	The Property does not have direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community.
ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or	No	The Property does not yield, or have the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture.
iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect,	No	The Property does not demonstrate or reflect the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a

Criteria	Criteria Met	Justification
artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.		community. The building was built using common materials and methods at the time of construction. It is unknown who constructed the building.
<b>3. The property has contextual value because it,</b>		
i. is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area,	No	The Property is not important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of the Beach Boulevard streetscape.  The Property's location on Beach Boulevard is defined by one to two storey residential properties with shallow to moderate setbacks that are constructed of primarily wood.
ii. is physical, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings, or	No	The Property is not physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings.  The Property's location on Beach Boulevard is defined by one to two storey residential properties with shallow to moderate setbacks that are constructed of primarily wood.
iii. is a landmark.	No	The Property is not a landmark. The MHSTCI defines landmark  ...as a recognizable natural or human-made feature used for a point of reference that helps orienting in a familiar or unfamiliar environment; it may mark an event or development; it may be conspicuous... <sup>86</sup>  The building does not meet this criterion.

### 6.1.1 Summary

In LHC's professional opinion, the property municipally known as 940-946 Beach Boulevard does not meet *O. Reg. 9/06* criteria and is not a contributing heritage building within the Beach Boulevard streetscape.

<sup>86</sup> MHSTCI, *Standards & Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties: Heritage Identification & Evaluation Process*, 2014, [http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/heritage/MTCS\\_Heritage\\_IE\\_Process.pdf](http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/heritage/MTCS_Heritage_IE_Process.pdf), 17.

## 7.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The proposal for the Property is to demolish the existing dwelling and detached garage in order to allow for the severance of the Property into three parcels of similar size (Figure 32). The retained parcel to the north would measure approximately 13 m by 50 m with an approximate area of 625 m<sup>2</sup>. The new parcel would comprise an area of approximately 12 m x 49 m with an approximate area of 588 m<sup>2</sup>. The retained parcel to the south would measure approximately 13 m x 48 m with an approximate area of 600m<sup>2</sup>. The existing parcel lot—originally two separate properties—is approximately double the size of the adjacent properties (Figure 27).

The current proposal seeks demolition of the extant structures with a view to constructing detached, single dwellings on the two retained parcel and the new severed parcel. Design of the new dwellings has not commenced.




Figure 32: Detail of survey of the Property showing proposed severance

## 8.0 IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ON HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES

The MHSTCI's *Info Sheet #5 Heritage Impact Assessments and Conservation Plans* outlines seven potential negative impacts to be considered with any proposed development or site alteration. The impacts include:

1. **Destruction** of any part of any significant heritage attribute or features;
2. **Alteration** that is not sympathetic or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance;
3. **Shadows** created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or planting, such as a garden;
4. **Isolation** of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context, or a significant relationship;
5. **Direct or indirect obstruction** of significant views or vistas within, from, or built and natural features;
6. **A change in land use** such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces; and
7. **Land disturbances** such as a change in grade that alters soils, drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource.

940-946 Beach Boulevard was not found to meet *O. Reg. 9/06* and neither the dwelling or detached garage were determined to be heritage structures contributing to the streetscape characters. As such, the proposed demolition and severance will not result in an adverse impact to the cultural heritage value or interest of the Property.

The proposed demolition and severance will not result in any direct impact on adjacent properties. Potential impacts on the larger HCD and streetscape character were also considered as they relate to compliance with guidance from the Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District Plan (the **HCD Plan**), which provides guidance for conservation of the character of the HCD. Table 8 provides an overview of compliance.

Table 8: Compliance with Relevant Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District Plan Guidelines

Guideline	Guideline Text	
3.2	<p><b>1) Land use and development</b></p> <p>The existing low density, low profiles, single detached residential environment within the Beach Heritage Conservation District will be maintained and encouraged. Other forms of residential</p>	<p>The proposal complies with this guideline. It seeks to demolish the existing dwelling and detached garage to allow for the severance of the Property into three parcels. Although design has not commenced, the intent of the severance is to allow for the construction of three single detached residences.</p>

Guideline	Guideline Text	
	development and new uses will be discouraged.	
3.2	<p><b>2) Heritage buildings</b></p> <p>Existing heritage buildings will be protected and enhanced and individual property owners will be encouraged to maintain and repair individual heritage buildings. City Council and staff will provide guidance on funding sources and appropriate conservation practices as requested. Demolition of heritage structures will be actively and vigorously discouraged.</p>	<p>The proposal complies with this guideline. The existing dwelling and detached garage have been reviewed and evaluated and found to not constitute heritage buildings within the context of the HCD.</p>
3.2	<p><b>3) New development, construction and public works</b></p> <p>All new development, construction and any public works will be encouraged only where it is clearly demonstrated that such changes will have both no adverse effects upon the heritage attributes of the district and will positively contribute to the character of the area.</p>	<p>The proposed demolition and severance comply with this guideline.</p> <p>Design has not progressed to a stage where compliance with this guideline can be assessed for future new dwellings. The new dwellings must be design with the character of the HCD in mind.</p>
<b>5.2 New Lots</b>	<p>Where new lots are to be created within the Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District they should be of similar width and depth as adjacent occupied lots.</p>	<p>The proposed severance is consistent with this guideline. It will result in three lots. The frontage of each lot will range from approximately 12 m to 13 m. Lots in this section of Beach Boulevard do vary; however, this width is similar to a number of surrounding lots, including 908, 912, 916, 920, 974, and 978 Beach Boulevard. The depth of the new lots will</p>

Guideline	Guideline Text	
		remain consistent with the existing lot.
<b>5.3 New construction</b>	<p>Construction on newly created lots or vacant lots will be required to be compatible with the character of adjoining properties and the streetscape of Beach Boulevard.</p> <p>As each existing building within the district is unique in appearance each new structure to be constructed within the <i>Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District</i> will be constructed in a manner that <b>avoids replication</b> of any single style, type or appearance whether of heritage or contemporary design. The intent is that no two buildings should look alike.</p> <p>New construction should also appear to be “new” and not pretend to be historical or simply old by copying historic details that have no relevance in contemporary construction such as shutters and multi-paned sash windows.</p>	<p>Design has not progressed to a stage where compliance with this guideline can be assessed for future new dwellings. The new dwellings must be design with the character of the HCD in mind.</p>

## 8.1 Summary of Potential Impacts and Compliance

Potential adverse impacts were not identified for the Property or any adjacent cultural heritage resources. Therefore, alternatives and mitigation measures are not required.

The proposed demolition and severance are generally consistent with HCD guidelines. Design of new dwellings on the proposed lots must progress with HCD Plan guideline 5.3 in mind. The new single detached dwellings will be required to be compatible with the streetscape character. Design, massing, setback, and materials should take cues from the surrounding buildings, while avoiding replication (Figure 33).

The district plan contains further design considerations for new construction within the Hamilton Beach HCD, which should be consulted throughout the design process (see Appendix C). It is recommended that design be reviewed for compliance with the HCD Plan early in the process to allow for flexibility in the event alternatives are recommended to better conform with the HCD Plan and to conserve the streetscape character.



Figure 33: Examples of Compatible Infill along Beach Boulevard



## 9.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Owner is proposing to demolish the existing dwelling and detached garage to allow for the severance of the Property into three parcels. This CHIA has been prepared to evaluate the cultural heritage value or interest of the Property and to outline heritage planning constraints and potential adverse impacts of the proposed demolition and severance. It was undertaken in accordance with the recommended methodology outlined within the MHSTCI's Ontario Heritage Toolkit and the City of Hamilton's *Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment Guidelines* (2020).

In LHC's professional opinion, the property municipally known as 940-946 Beach Boulevard **does not meet** the criteria of *O. Reg. 9/06* and is not a heritage structure which contributes to the character of the HCD.

In addition, no potential direct or indirect adverse impacts on the cultural heritage value or interest of the Property or adjacent properties were identified. Given that no impacts were identified, alternatives and mitigation measures were not explored.

It should be stressed that this CHIA reviewed the proposal to demolish the extant structures and sever the Property. Design of future single detached residences on the retained and severed lots has not commenced. Any new dwellings are required to comply with HCD Plan guidelines and will be required to be compatible with the streetscape character. Design, massing, setback, and materials should take cues from the surrounding buildings, while avoiding replication.

It is recommended that design be reviewed for compliance with the HCD Plan early in the process to allow for flexibility in the event alternatives are recommended to better conform with the HCD Plan and to conserve the streetscape character (see Appendix C). An updated CHIA or Addendum may be required.

## SIGNATURE



Christienne Uchiyama, MA, CAHP  
Principal, Manager Heritage Consulting Services  
LHC

## 10.0 REFERENCES

### 10.1 Policy and Legislation Resources

Archaeological Services Inc. and Wendy Shearer Landscape Architect. *The Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District: Guidelines for Conservation and Change*. July 2000.

City of Hamilton. "Chapter A – Introduction." Accessed 7 January 2022.  
<https://www.hamilton.ca/sites/default/files/media/browser/2015-01-15/urbanhamiltonofficialplan-volume1-chaptera-intro-feb2021.pdf>.

City of Hamilton. "Chapter B – Communities." Accessed 7 January 2022.  
<https://www.hamilton.ca/sites/default/files/media/browser/2015-01-15/urbanhamiltonofficialplan-volume1-chapterb-communities-feb2021.pdf>.

City of Hamilton. "Chapter F – Implementation." Accessed 7 January 2022.  
<https://www.hamilton.ca/sites/default/files/media/browser/2017-08-01/urbanhamiltonofficialplan-volume1-chapterf-implementation-nov2021.pdf>.

City of Hamilton. "Chapter G – Glossary." Accessed 11 February 2022.  
<https://www.hamilton.ca/sites/default/files/media/browser/2015-01-15/urbanhamiltonofficialplan-volume1-chapterg-glossary-nov2021.pdf>.

City of Hamilton. "Section 6." Zoning By-law 6593. Accessed 7 January 2022.  
<https://www.hamilton.ca/sites/default/files/media/browser/2015-03-30/hamilton-zoning-by-law-6593-june13-2019.pdf>.

City of Hamilton. "Section Nine." Zoning By-law 6593. Accessed 7 January 2022.  
<https://www.hamilton.ca/sites/default/files/media/browser/2015-03-30/hamilton-zoning-by-law-6593-june13-2019.pdf>.

City of Hamilton. "Urban Hamilton Official Plan." Last modified 2 December 2021,  
<https://www.hamilton.ca/city-planning/official-plan-zoning-by-law/urban-hamilton-official-plan>.

City of Hamilton. "Zoning By-law." Last modified 5 June 2018. <https://www.hamilton.ca/city-planning/official-plan-zoning-by-law/zoning-by-law>.

City of Hamilton. "Zoning By-law No. 05-200." Last modified 13 December 2021.  
<https://www.hamilton.ca/city-planning/official-plan-zoning-by-law/zoning-by-law-no-05-200>.

Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism, and Culture Industries. "Heritage Conservation Principles for Landuse Planning." Last modified 2007.  
[http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/publications/InfoSheet\\_Principles\\_LandUse\\_Planning.pdf](http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/publications/InfoSheet_Principles_LandUse_Planning.pdf)

Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism, and Culture Industries. "Heritage Property Evaluation: A Guide to Listing, Researching and Evaluating Cultural Heritage Property in Ontario Communities." The Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2006.  
[http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/publications/Heritage\\_Tool\\_Kit\\_HPE\\_Eng.pdf](http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/publications/Heritage_Tool_Kit_HPE_Eng.pdf).

- Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism, and Culture Industries. "PPS Info Sheet: Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process." The Queen's Printer for Ontario, 2006. [http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/publications/Heritage\\_Tool\\_Kit\\_Heritage\\_PPS\\_infoSheet.pdf](http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/publications/Heritage_Tool_Kit_Heritage_PPS_infoSheet.pdf).
- Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism, and Culture Industries. "Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties." Last modified April 28, 2010. [http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/publications/Standards\\_Conservation.pdf](http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/publications/Standards_Conservation.pdf).
- Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport. *Standards & Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties: Heritage Identification & Evaluation Process*. Last modified 2014. [http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/heritage/MTCS\\_Heritage\\_IE\\_Process.pdf](http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/heritage/MTCS_Heritage_IE_Process.pdf).
- Parks Canada. "Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition." Canada's Historic Places. Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, 2010. <https://www.historicplaces.ca/media/18072/81468-parks-s+g-eng-web2.pdf>.
- Province of Ontario. "Municipal Act, 2001, S.O. 2001, c.25." Last modified December 9, 2021. <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/01m25>.
- Province of Ontario. "*Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18." Last modified October 19, 2021. <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90o18>.
- Province of Ontario. "*O. Reg. 10/06: Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest of Provincial Significance - Under Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18.*" Last modified January 25, 2006. <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/regulation/060010>.
- Province of Ontario. "Places to Grow Act, 2005, S.O. 2005, c. 13." Last modified June 1, 2021. <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/05p13>.
- Province of Ontario. "A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe." Last modified August 2020. Accessed January 21, 2022. <https://files.ontario.ca/mmah-place-to-grow-office-consolidation-en-2020-08-28.pdf>.
- Province of Ontario. "*Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13." Last modified December 2, 2021. <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90p13>.
- Province of Ontario. "Provincial Policy Statement 2020 – Under the *Planning Act*." Last modified May 1, 2020. Accessed January 21, 2022. <https://files.ontario.ca/mmah-provincial-policy-statement-2020-accessible-final-en-2020-02-14.pdf>.

## 10.2 Mapping Resources

- Canadian Aero Service Ltd. "Wentworth County, excluding most of the City of Hamilton, 1960-05-21." Flightline 60134-Photo 192. Accessed February 16, 2022. <http://digitalarchive.mcmaster.ca/islandora/object/macrepo%3A77000>.
- City of Hamilton. *Interactive Cultural Heritage Mapping*. <https://spatialolutions.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=ef361312714b4caa863016bba9e6e68f>.

City of Hamilton. *Interactive Mapping Air Photo Base Maps*.

<https://spatialolutions.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=ef361312714b4caa863016bba9e6e68f>.

Ontario Department of Lands and Forests, Division of Surveys and Engineering, Aerial Surveys Section. "Parts of southwest Hamilton, including Ancaster, the Hamilton Beach Strip and part of Burlington, 1967." Flightline 675-Photo 78. Accessed February 16, 2022.

<https://digitalarchive.mcmaster.ca/islandora/object/macrepo%3A81754>.

Publisher Unknown. "Greater Hamilton Area, from Caledonia to Vineland, 1934-10-09."

Flightline A4866-Photo 73. Accessed February 16, 2022.

<http://digitalarchive.mcmaster.ca/islandora/object/macrepo%3A71876>.

Publisher Unknown. "Queen Elizabeth Way and Highway 2 corridor, 1963-11-01." Flightline J2633-Photo 136. Accessed February 16, 2022.

<http://digitalarchive.mcmaster.ca/islandora/object/macrepo%3A79921>.

Publisher Unknown. "Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth and surrounding area, 1954." Flightline 4313-Photo 131. Accessed February 16, 2022.

<https://digitalarchive.mcmaster.ca/islandora/object/macrepo%3A73015>.

### 10.3 Additional Resources

Chapman, L.J. and D.F. Putnam. *The Physiography of Southern Ontario* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1973.

City of Hamilton. "Hamilton Agricultural Profile 2008, 2.14." Last modified December 2008.

<http://www2.hamilton.ca/NR/rdonlyres/4196D9CB-29AD-4865-8BA1-3F6444C1D7CE/0/Jan12PED09021.pdf>.

Ellis, Christopher and D. Brian Deller. "Paleo-Indians." In *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650*, ed. Christopher Ellis and Neal Ferris. London, ON: Ontario Archaeological Society, London Chapter, 1990.

EMCWTF. "Chapter 3: The First Nations." In *Greening Our Watersheds: Revitalization*

*Strategies for Etobicoke and Mimico Creeks*. Toronto: TRCA, 2002.

<http://www.trca.on.ca/dotAsset/37523.pdf>.

Hamilton Beach Millennium Project. "A Hub of Activity." Accessed January 28, 2022,

<https://www.flickr.com/photos/-jm/5147977228/in/photostream/>.

Hamilton Beach Millennium Project. "A Proud Community." Accessed January 28, 2022,

<https://www.flickr.com/photos/-jm/6615289599/in/album-72157625341450228/>.

Hamilton Beach Millennium Project. "Hamilton's Playground." Accessed January 28, 2022.

<https://www.flickr.com/photos/-jm/6615106795/in/album-72157625341450228/>.

Hamilton Public Library. "A History of the City of Hamilton." Accessed January 28, 2022.

<http://epe.lac->

[bac.gc.ca/100/200/301/ic/can\\_digital\\_collections/cultural\\_landmarks/hamhist.htm](http://epe.lac-bac.gc.ca/100/200/301/ic/can_digital_collections/cultural_landmarks/hamhist.htm).

Manson, Bill. *Footsteps in Time: Exploring Hamilton's Heritage Neighbourhoods*. Burlington,

ON: North Shore Publishing, 2003.

Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation. "The History of the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation." *Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation*. Last modified 2018. <http://mncfn.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/The-History-of-MNCFN-FINAL.pdf>.

Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation. Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation Land Cessions, 1781-1820 and Rouge Tract Claim, 2015." Accessed January 21, 2022. <http://mncfn.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/Treaty-Map-Description.jpg>.

Noble, William C. "The Neutral Confederacy." *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Accessed 25 January 2022. <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/neutral>.

Six Nations Elected Council. "Community Profile." *Six Nations of the Grand River*. Last modified 2013. Accessed January 21, 2022. <http://www.sixnations.ca/CommunityProfile.htm>.

Six Nations Tourism. "History." Accessed January 21, 2021. <https://www.sixnationstourism.ca/history/>.

University of Waterloo. "Land acknowledgment." *Faculty Association*. Accessed January 21, 2022, <https://uwaterloo.ca/faculty-association/about/land-acknowledgement>.

Waterloo Region Record. "Hamilton got stronger after amalgamation." Last updated April 13, 2020. Accessed January 28, 2022. <https://www.therecord.com/news/waterloo-region/2018/09/14/hamilton-got-stronger-after-amalgamation.html>.

Weaver, John C. "Hamilton." *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Accessed 25 January 2022. <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/hamilton>.

## APPENDIX A: QUALIFICATIONS

### Christienne Uchiyama, MA CAHP – Principal, LHC

Christienne Uchiyama MA CAHP is Principal and Manager - Heritage Consulting Services with LHC. She is a Heritage Consultant and Professional Archaeologist (P376) with two decades of experience working on heritage aspects of planning and development projects. She is currently President of the Board of Directors of the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals and received her MA in Heritage Conservation from Carleton University School of Canadian Studies. Her thesis examined the identification and assessment of impacts on cultural heritage resources in the context of Environmental Assessment.

Since 2003 Chris has provided archaeological and heritage conservation advice, support, and expertise as a member of numerous multi-disciplinary project teams for projects across Ontario and New Brunswick, including such major projects as: all phases of archaeological assessment at the Canadian War Museum site at LeBreton Flats, Ottawa; renewable energy projects; natural gas pipeline routes; railway lines; hydro powerline corridors; and highway/road realignments. She has completed more than 100 cultural heritage technical reports for development proposals at all levels of government, including cultural heritage evaluation reports, heritage impact assessments, and archaeological licence reports. Her specialties include the development of Cultural Heritage Evaluation Reports, under both O. Reg. 9/06 and 10/06, and Heritage Impact Assessments.

### Lisa Coles, B.A. – Junior Heritage Planner

Lisa Coles is a Junior Heritage Planner with LHC. She holds a B.A. (Hons) in History and French from the University of Windsor and a Graduate Certificate in Museum Management & Curatorship from Fleming College. Lisa is currently a Master of Arts in Planning candidate at the University of Waterloo and has over five years of heritage sector experience through various positions in museums and public sector heritage planning. She is excited to have the opportunity to work in all aspects of the heritage field and to build on her previous experience as part of the LHC team.

### Jordan Greene, BA – Mapping Technician

Jordan Greene is a mapping technician with LHC. She holds a Bachelor of Arts in Geography with a Certificate in Geographic Information Science and a Certificate in Urban Planning Studies from Queen's University. The experience gained through the completion of the Certificate in Geographic Information Science allowed Jordan to volunteer as a research assistant contributing to the study of the extent of the suburban population in America with Dr. David Gordon. Prior to her work at LHC, Jordan spent the final two years of her undergraduate degree working in managerial positions at the student-run Printing and Copy Centre as an Assistant and Head Manager. Jordan has had an interest in heritage throughout her life and is excited to build on her existing professional and GIS experience as a part of the LHC team.

## APPENDIX B: GLOSSARY

Definitions are based on the *Ontario Heritage Act*, (**OHA**), the *Provincial Policy Statement* (**PPS**), and the *Urban Hamilton Official Plan* (**UHOP**).

**Adjacent Lands** means those lands contiguous to a protected heritage property or as otherwise defined in the municipal official plan. (**PPS**).

**Adjacent** in regard to cultural heritage and archaeology, those lands contiguous to, or located within 50 metres of, a *protected heritage property* (**UHOP**).

**Alter** means to change in any manner and includes to restore, renovate, repair, or disturb and "alteration" has a corresponding meaning ("transformer", "transformation") (**OHA**).

**Archaeological resources** include artifacts, archaeological sites and marine archaeological sites. The identification and evaluation of such resources are based upon archaeological fieldwork undertaken in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act (**UHOP**)

**Areas of Archaeological Potential** a defined geographical area with the potential to contain *archaeological resources*. Criteria for determining archaeological potential are established by the Province, this Plan and the City's Archaeological Master Plan. Archaeological potential is confirmed through archaeological fieldwork undertaken in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act (**UHOP**)

**Areas of Archaeological Potential** means areas with the likelihood to contain *archaeological resources*. Criteria to identify archaeological potential are established by the Province. The Ontario Heritage Act requires archaeological potential to be confirmed by a licensed archaeologist (**PPS**)

**Built heritage resources** means one or more *significant* buildings, structures, monuments, installations or remains associated with architectural, cultural, social, political, economic or military history and identified as being important to the community. These resources may be identified through inclusion in the City's Register of Property of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, designation or heritage conservation easement under the Ontario Heritage Act, and/or listed by local, provincial or federal jurisdictions (**UHOP**)

**Built Heritage Resource** means a building, structure, monument, installation or any manufactured or constructed part or remnant that contributes to a property's cultural heritage value or interest as identified by a community, including an Indigenous community. Built heritage resources are located on property that may be designated under Parts IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act, or that may be included on local, provincial, federal and/or international registers. (**PPS**).

**Conserve** means the identification, protection, use and/or management of cultural heritage and archaeological resources (**UHOP**)

**Conserved** in the context of cultural heritage resources, means the identification, protection, use and/or management of cultural heritage and archaeological resources in such a way that their heritage values, attributes, and integrity are retained. This may be addressed through a conservation plan or heritage impact statement (**UHOP**)

**Conserve** means the identification, protection, management and use of built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources in a manner that ensures their cultural heritage value or interest is retained. This may be achieved by the implementation of recommendations set out in a conservation plan, archaeological assessment, and/or heritage impact assessment that has been approved, accepted or adopted by the relevant planning authority and/or decisionmaker. Mitigative measures and/or alternative development approaches can be included in these plans and assessments (*PPS*)

**Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment** A document comprising text and graphic material including plans, drawings and photographs that contains the results of historical research, field work, survey, analysis, and description(s) of cultural heritage resources together with a description of the process and procedures in deriving potential effects and mitigation measures as required by official plan policies and any other applicable or pertinent guidelines. A cultural heritage impact assessment may include an archaeological assessment where appropriate. (*UHOP*).

**Cultural heritage landscape** A defined geographical area of heritage significance which has been modified by human activities and is valued by a community. It involves a grouping(s) of individual heritage features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites and natural elements, which together form a significant type of heritage form, distinctive from that of its constituent elements or parts. Examples may include, but are not limited to, heritage conservation districts designated under the Ontario Heritage Act; and villages, parks, gardens, battlefields, mainstreets and neighbourhoods, cemeteries, trailways and industrial complexes of cultural heritage value (*UHOP*).

**Cultural Heritage Landscape** means a defined geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Indigenous community. The area may include features such as buildings, structures, spaces, views, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or association. Cultural heritage landscapes may be properties that have been determined to have cultural heritage value or interest under the Ontario Heritage Act, or have been included on federal and/or international registers, and/or protected through official plan, zoning by-law, or other land use planning mechanisms (*PPS*).

**Cultural Heritage Conservation Plan Statement** A document comprising text and graphic material including plans, drawings and photographs that contains the results of historical research, field work, survey, analysis, and description(s) of cultural heritage resources together with a statement of cultural heritage value, interest, merit or significance accompanied by guidelines as required by the policies of this Plan. A cultural heritage conservation plan statement shall be considered a conservation plan as including in the *PPS* (2005) definition of conserved (*UHOP*)

**Cultural Heritage Properties** are properties that contain cultural heritage resources (*UHOP*)

**Cultural Heritage Resources** Structures, features, sites, and/or landscapes that, either individually or as part of a whole, are of historical, architectural, archaeological, and/or scenic value that may also represent intangible heritage, such as customs, ways-of-life, values, and activities (*UHOP*)



**Development (Urban)** means the creation of a new lot, a change in land use, or the construction of buildings and structures requiring approval under the Planning Act, R.S.O., 1990 c. P.13 but does not include:

- a) activities that create or maintain infrastructure used by a public body and authorized under an environment assessment process; or,
- b) b) works subject to the Drainage Act (*UHOP*).

**Development** means the creation of a new lot, a change in land use, or the construction of buildings and structures requiring approval under the Planning Act, but does not include:

- a) activities that create or maintain infrastructure authorized under an environmental assessment process;
- b) b) works subject to the Drainage Act; or
- c) c) for the purposes of policy 2.1.4(a), underground or surface mining of minerals or advanced exploration on mining lands in significant areas of mineral potential in Ecoregion 5E, where advanced exploration has the same meaning as under the Mining Act. Instead, those matters shall be subject to policy 2.1.5(a). (*PPS*).

**Established Historical Neighbourhood** means a physically defined geographical area that was substantially built prior to 1950 (*UHOP*)

**Existing** when used in reference to a use, lot, building or structure, means any use, lot, building or structure legally established or created prior to the day of approval of this Official Plan (*UHOP*)

**Heritage Attributes** means the principal features, characteristics, context and appearance that contribute to the cultural heritage significance of a protected heritage property (*UHOP*)

**Heritage Attributes** means the principal features or elements that contribute to a protected heritage property's cultural heritage value or interest, and may include the property's built, constructed, or manufactured elements, as well as natural landforms, vegetation, water features, and its visual setting (e.g. significant views or vistas to or from a protected heritage property). (*PPS*).

**Historic** means a time period, starting approximately 200 years ago, during which European settlement became increasingly widespread in the Hamilton area and for which a written (or 'historic') record has been kept (*UHOP*)

**Property** means real property and includes all buildings and structures thereon (*OHA*)

**Protected Heritage Property** means real property designated under Parts IV, V or VI of the Ontario Heritage Act; heritage conservation easement property under Parts II or IV of the Ontario Heritage Act; and property that is the subject of a covenant or agreement between the owner of a property and a conservation body or level of government, registered on title and executed with the primary purpose of preserving, conserving and maintaining a cultural heritage feature or resource, or preventing its destruction, demolition or loss (*UHOP*).

**Protected Heritage Property** means property designated under Parts IV, V or VI of the Ontario Heritage Act; property subject to a heritage conservation easement under Parts II or IV of the Ontario Heritage Act; property identified by the Province and prescribed public bodies as provincial heritage property under the Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties; property protected under federal legislation, and UNESCO World Heritage Sites (*PPS*)

**Significant** In regard to cultural heritage and archaeology, means cultural heritage resources that are valued for the important contribution they make to our understanding of the history of a place, an event, or a people (*UHOP*)

**Significant** means in regard to cultural heritage and archaeology, resources that have been determined to have cultural heritage value or interest. Processes and criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest are established by the Province under the authority of the Ontario Heritage Act. (*PPS*).

**APPENDIX C: HAMILTON BEACH HERITAGE CONSERVATION  
DISTRICT: DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR NEW INFILL  
CONSTRUCTION**

## 5.0 HAMILTON BEACH HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT: DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR NEW INFILL CONSTRUCTION

### 5.1 Introduction

The *Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District* is unique amongst Ontario's heritage districts as there is considerable potential for the construction of new residential development on newly created lots. These are generally restricted to the west side of Beach Boulevard. Existing buildings on this side of the Boulevard are typically set back some distance from the road. The east side of Beach Boulevard is characterized by a substantial and consolidated building mass and streetscape.

While not prohibited by the *Ontario Heritage Act* the demolition of existing heritage structures and the creation of new buildings will be actively discouraged within the *Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District*. As in many heritage districts throughout Ontario, residents of the Hamilton Beach are encouraged to work with existing buildings through sensitively adapting and altering them rather than demolishing and constructing new structures. Guidelines for alteration and additions to heritage and non-heritage buildings are contained in Section 4. Guidelines for new construction are described in the following subsections

### 5.2 New lots

Where new lots are to be created within the *Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District* they should be of similar width and depth as adjacent occupied lots.

### 5.3 New construction

Construction on newly created lots or vacant lots will be required to be compatible with the character of adjoining properties and the streetscape of Beach Boulevard.


As each existing building within the district is unique in appearance each new structure to be constructed within the *Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District* will be constructed in a manner that **avoids replication** of any single style, type or appearance whether of heritage or contemporary design. The intent is that no two buildings should look alike.

New construction should also appear to be "new" and not pretend to be historical or simply old by copying historic details that have no relevance in contemporary construction such as shutters and multi-paned sash windows.

Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District  
Guidelines for conservation and change

## DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR NEW INFILL CONSTRUCTION

### Guiding Principles



#### 5.4 Design considerations in new construction

General factors governing visual relationships between an infill building, its neighbours and the streetscape should be reviewed carefully and used as the basis for new construction including consideration of: building height, width, setbacks, roof shape, number of bays, and materials. Specific guidance is described below:

**Height:** The majority of buildings within the Beach District are two storeys or less. Accordingly to maintain this profile new buildings should be no higher than two storeys, particularly if there are high basement and foundation walls. Required living space should be provided in a building mass that extends rearwards in depth on the lot rather than upwards in height.

**Width:** New dwellings should be designed in a manner that provide living space in a building mass that extends rearwards in depth on the lot rather than in horizontal width across the lot. Cross-gable or "L" plans may be used where appropriate.

**Setback:** Residences on the west side (or harbour side) of Beach Boulevard tend generally to be set back further than their eastern counterparts. Those constructed pre-1900 appear closer to the Boulevard. Accordingly, new construction should be set back from the road in keeping with the post-1900 construction.

On the east (or lake side) any new construction should ensure traditional facade frontage is oriented towards Beach Boulevard with building setbacks that are the same as adjoining lots. Where adjacent buildings are staggered from one another the new intervening building facade should be:

- located so that it does not extend beyond the front facade of the forwardmost building, or
- located so that it does not sit behind the front facade of the rearward building.

**Proportion and massing** New infill should be developed with horizontal to square facades with three bays comprising an entranceway and two window bays. Facades with a vertical emphasis should be avoided.

Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District  
Guidelines for conservation and change

## DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR NEW INFILL CONSTRUCTION

### Guiding Principles

#### FRONT GABLE


Front gables are encouraged in new construction. Asphalt or wood shingles are appropriate for new construction

#### WINDOWS

New window designs that generally reflect vertical and rectangular dimensions are encouraged

#### TRELLIS

Trellises and porches are important elements of the principal elevations.



#### WALL CLADDING

Wall materials for use in new construction are encouraged to be wood cladding (board-and-batten or shingles), stucco, pebble-dash or rough cast. Very limited use or very small areas of synthetic cladding may be permitted, particularly when used with traditional materials.



CITYSENSE  
URBAN DESIGN

Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District  
Guidelines for conservation and change

## DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR NEW INFILL CONSTRUCTION

### Guiding Principles

#### CLADDING MATERIALS

This example: shingles

#### ROOFS AND ROOF FEATURES

One of the roof types which is encouraged is cross-gable shown bellow. Roof vents, satellite dishes, chimneys, flues and other venting devices and roof features are best located to the rear of new buildings.



ONE AND A HALF STOREY



CITYSENSE  
URBAN DESIGN

#### WALL MATERIALS

This example: stucco in combination with shingles.

#### WINDOWS

On facades that face the street, windows should maintain proportions of neighbouring properties. Large, multi-storey windows should be avoided.



Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District  
Guidelines for conservation and change

## DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR NEW INFILL CONSTRUCTION


### Guiding Principles

#### ENTRANCES AND PORCHES

Entrances are usually an important element of the principal elevation, frequently highlighted with architectural detailing such as door surrounds and porches and recessed or projected from the wall face for emphasis.

#### ROOFS : CROSS GABLES

Cross gables with windows may be appropriate in front elevations on Beach Boulevard provided that they do not overpower the façade. Dormers should only be encouraged at the rear or side elevations. This example: asphalt shingles.



#### CLADDING MATERIALS

Wall materials for use in new construction are encouraged to be wood cladding, either as board-and-batten or wood shingles, stucco and pebble-dash or rough cast. This example: board-and-batten.



CITYSENSE  
URBAN DESIGN

Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District  
Guidelines for conservation and change

## DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR NEW INFILL CONSTRUCTION


### Guiding Principles

#### WINDOWS AND BAY WINDOWS

The windows should be arranged in a variety of ways, either individually, pairs, groups or composing a bay

#### PROPORTION AND MASSING

New infill should be developed with horizontal to square facades with three bays comprising an entranceway and two window bays. Facades with a vertical emphasis should be avoided



#### CLADDING MATERIALS

This example: wood cladding



CITYSENSE  
URBAN DESIGN

Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District  
Guidelines for conservation and change

## DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR NEW INFILL CONSTRUCTION

### Guiding Principles

#### ROOF MATERIALS


This example with cedar shingles.

#### HIPPED ROOF

One of the roof types encouraged in new construction is hipped roof.

STUCCO FACADE

WOOD SHINGLES



TWO-STORIES Max.

#### TWO-STORY VERANDAH

Entrances are an important element of the principal orientation, frequently highlighted with architectural elements such as porches, and verandahs.



CITYSENSE  
URBAN DESIGN

**Roofs** Roof types encouraged in new construction are front gable, cross- or centre gable and hipped or truncated hip. Side gable, mansard, gambrel and flat roofs are not typical of the Beach District and should be avoided. Asphalt or wood shingles are appropriate for new construction. Concrete, clay tile, slate, metal or composite materials are discouraged.

Roof vents, skylights, satellite dishes, solar panels, chimneys, flues, other venting devices and roof features are best located to the rear of new buildings.

Cross or centre gables with windows may be appropriate in front elevations on Beach Boulevard provided that they do not overpower the facade. Dormers should only be encouraged at the rear or side elevations.

**Materials** The majority of buildings in the *Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District* are of frame construction with a variety of cladding materials. Cladding materials include stucco, rough cast and pebble-dash, clapboard, board-and-batten and wood shingles. Synthetic materials such as metal or vinyl siding have also been used, either in whole or in part, to patch or cover former historical cladding. Brick and stone are used sparingly.

Wall materials for use in new construction are encouraged to be wood cladding, either as board or shingles, stucco and pebble-dash or rough cast. Very limited use or very small areas of synthetic cladding may be permitted, particularly when used with traditional materials. Use of brick, concrete or other masonry blocks should be avoided.

**Windows:** A range of window and entrance types are evident in the existing late nineteenth and twentieth century architectural styles represented in the *Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District*. The overall appearance of building facades is more wall surface (solids) than windows (voids). Generally window openings are vertical and rectangular. There are also examples of semi-circular, segmental and round headed openings. The windows are arranged in a variety of ways, either individually, pairs, groups or composing a bay. New window designs that generally reflect vertical and rectangular dimensions are encouraged. On facades that face the street, windows should maintain proportions of neighbouring properties. Large, full-length, multi-storey or picture windows are best avoided.



Hamilton Beach Heritage Conservation District  
Guidelines for conservation and change

## DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR NEW INFILL CONSTRUCTION

### Guiding Principles

#### GARAGES

Garages and ancillary structures are best located away from the main façade and should be located in traditional areas for these functions, usually towards the rear of the lot. Garages, in particular, should not form part of the front façade of the main building.



CITYSENSE  
URBAN DESIGN

***Entrances:*** Entrances are usually an important element of the principal elevation, frequently highlighted with architectural detailing such as door surrounds and porches and recessed or projected from the wall face for emphasis. Accordingly, full size double doors and large amounts of glazing in entranceways should be avoided.

***Garages and ancillary structures*** Garages and ancillary structures are best located away from the main facade and should be located in traditional areas for these functions, usually towards the rear of the lot. Garages, in particular, should not form part of the front facade of the main building.