

August 18, 2020

**Written Delegation Submission to the Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee
Regarding the Notice of Intention to Designate the Property at 1389 Progreston
Road, former Town of Flamborough**

From Leah Wallace, MA MCIP RPP, Heritage Planner

Members of the Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee

Thank you for the opportunity to address you with respect to the Notice of Intention to Designate the property at 1389 Progreston Road, Carlisle. My remarks are directed specifically to the house on the property and are contained in the conclusion to my report which is included in your agenda package and which I will reiterate here.

I would respectfully suggest that no additional research was undertaken on the property at 1389 Progreston Road by City staff or the heritage committee beyond the preliminary notes provided by the Inventory and Research Working Group in August, 2019. The working group's research appears to be derived from previous research undertaken by such groups as the Waterdown-East Flamborough Heritage Society. At no time did any committee member or any City staff attend at the property to make on site observations and notes before the Notice of Intention to Designate (NOID) was issued. No additional reports or historical research was provided between December 2019 when City Council approved adding the property to the City of Hamilton Municipal Register of Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest as a non-designated property and when the ward councillor tabled a motion to proceed with issuing the NOID on April 22, 2020. There is also no evidence that the Municipal Heritage Committee was consulted before Council's decision, although this is a requirement under the Section 29(2) of the OHA.

On April 27, 2020, during a site visit, I determined that the house had suffered unsympathetic alterations over the years including later additions and interior alterations that obliterated any original features that might remain. Any restoration of the structure would result in removal of most of the remaining original features which would have to be replaced in kind resulting in a facsimile of the original house.

Some of the heritage attributes listed in the Statement of Significance published by the City on April 30, 2020 do not exist or are modern interventions of no architectural or historical significance including the covered porch with wooden columns and decorative bargeboard. The semi-circular windows below the front gables are modern replacements added in 1982 by the current owner. A site visit by City staff and heritage

committee members could have determined these facts and also confirmed that the log cabin built by James Kievel was not incorporated into the house when it was constructed in the second half of the 19th century. A separate site visit by Mark Shoalts also determined that the log cabin was not incorporated into the house and that the porch was a modern and unsympathetic intervention.

The Regulation 9/06 review of the house undertaken and included in my report concluded that, on its own, it does not meet the criteria of Historical/Associative, Design/Physical or Contextual Value. However, the setting of the house, not the house itself, on a promontory overlooking Bronte Creek and Progreston Road, has some value within the context of the entire property and its landscape and in the context of the development of the community of Progreston. With the understanding the much of the original features still extant on the exterior of the existing house cannot be salvaged and would have to be replaced; a new house, located in the same place on the property with a similar mass and scale, design and materials, will afford the same contextual value to the landscape as the existing structure.

I would respectfully recommend that the committee consider Mr. Dennison's preferred position, to rescind the NOID and to undertake additional research in the interim to further confirm my findings and observations and those of Mr. Shoalts or to consider other options with respect to the property that would better reflect and protect its cultural heritage value or interest.