

**From:** Tim Rosenberger [redacted]

**Sent:** May 15, 2024 12:13 AM

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

**Subject:** RE: NOTICE OF OBJECTION to City of Hamilton Notice of Intention to Designate 84 York Boulevard

---

Dear Ms. Pilon:

**RE: NOTICE OF OBJECTION  
City of Hamilton Notice of Intention to Designate  
84 York Boulevard as a property of cultural heritage value or interest under  
Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O, 1990, Chapter O.18, (the "OHA")  
section 29(5)**

My name is Tim Rosenberger, a resident of the Strathcona Neighbourhood, at 35 Head St.

For full disclosure, I am a member of Philpott Memorial Church and I currently serve on the board of elders, but the following comments are my own private reflections and I do not speak on behalf of the Elders, the trustees, the committee that oversees our facilities much less the congregation as a whole.

Please take this message as notice of objection to the designation of 84 Your Boulevard as being under heritage protection.

While there many grounds for opposition exist, I wish to highlight the following:

First, no building serves as an appropriate or effective representation of Peter Philpott or the Christian Worker's movement. That history is contained in the archives belonging to the congregation, which remains to this day as a live legacy of P.W. Philpott and the movement he led.

Second, the appearance of the building as it exists today is not representative of the original construction or architectural intent. The majority of the building which is subject to consideration is covered with a veneer that mimics stone but is in fact concrete, which shows signs of beginning to fail. This was placed over the original brick in the 1950's. If I understand the attachment process correctly, the original brick has been marred to anchor the overlaid façade. So while a protective designation may preserve the current appearance, that appearance is not that designed by Mills or associated with the times of Peter Philpott.

Thirdly, the interior of the building is also modified from the original, with extensive reconstruction over the years. Some original features may remain but apart from the vaulted ceiling, these features actually work against the conversion of the space in to a fully accessible space, one of the reasons the congregation chose to leave its long occupancy and to move to new spaces that could be constructed and modified to be fully accessible.

Finally, as much as the idea of preserving another piece of our built history may be appealing, I fear that it will become another white elephant, encumbering those associate with the property, locking up capital that was intended to achieve specific social goods for the community – housing, on the part of the developer and on Philpott Memorial Church's part, the funds to build

the accessible facility we want to use to continue to serve the community around us. I am concerned that a heritage designation will lead to the same sort of difficulties experienced by the owners of the Tivoli Theatre, another historic hall with a greater claim to uniqueness and the need to be preserved for its own sake, which languishes.

I respectfully request that Council consider this the objection and withdraw the Notice of Intention to Designate the Subject property. I request that the City provide with all notices including those of meetings, all reports and any decisions respecting designation of the Subject Property.

Yours truly,

Tim Rosenberger