

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

Monday November 19, 2020

9:30 am

City of Hamilton Web Ex Virtual Meeting

---

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

Regrets: K. Stacey,

Also Present: M. Brunton

---

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

**(a) CHANGES TO THE AGENDA**

None

**(b) DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

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

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

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

**October 19, 2020:**

Notes as corrected , approved.

**(d) C.H.I.A. – 1 property**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**Other Comments:**

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

**(e) OTHER BUSINESS**

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

**(f) ADJOURNMENT**

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

**Next meeting date:** To be determined