

## 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, wainscoting, 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**