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**RECOMMENDATION**

That approval be given to Heritage Permit Application (HP2010-053), by Anthony (Tony) DePasquale, of Copper Cliff Metals & Wrecking Corp., as Authorized Agent for LIUNA Local 837 Lister Property Corporation, to permit the disassembly, removal, storage, and re-assembly of the front façade of 46 - 52 James Street North (Hamilton) (William Thomas Building), as shown on Appendix “A”, subject to the following conditions:

(a) That the municipal address of the storage location for the removed heritage elements shall be LIUNA Station, 360 James Street North, Hamilton, and if such storage location is to be changed, the new location and address shall be submitted by the applicant, to the satisfaction and approval of staff, prior to the removal of the heritage elements off-site to a new storage facility.
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(b) That a schedule for regular inspections of all of the heritage elements in storage be submitted for staff approval, and that this inspection plan shall include provisions for monitoring the condition of the heritage elements, and for remedying any unsatisfactory conditions, such as high humidity, should they develop.

(c) That City staff be allowed reasonable access to inspect the heritage elements in storage, at any time.

(d) That plans and elevations of the new structure and re-assembled front façade at 46 - 52 James Street North, Hamilton, shall be provided, to the satisfaction and approval of the Heritage Permit Review Sub-committee and Planning staff, prior to any new construction or the re-assembly of the heritage elements of the front façade.

(e) That implementation of the alterations, in accordance with this approval, shall be completed no later than July 31, 2014. If the alterations are not completed by July 31, 2014, then, subject to Condition (f), this approval expires as of that date, and no alterations shall be undertaken without a new approval issued by the City of Hamilton.

(f) That if the alterations are not completed by July 31, 2014:

(i) Conditions (a), (b), and (c) of this approval remain in force until such time as a new approval, with a new completion date, is issued by the City of Hamilton; and,

(ii) LIUNA Local 837 Lister Property Corporation, and/or authorized agent(s) of the Corporation, shall apply for a new approval no later than August 31, 2014, with a new completion date.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The subject property, located at 46 - 52 James Street North (Hamilton) (William Thomas Building) (see location map, attached as Appendix “A”), is designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act by By-law No. 08-215. A Heritage Permit is required for demolition or removal of a building or structure on a designated property (see the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value and Description of Heritage Attributes, attached as Appendix “B”). The applicant, Anthony (Tony) DePasquale, of Copper Cliff Metals & Wrecking Corp., as authorized agent for LIUNA Local 837 Lister Property Corporation, has applied to permit disassembly, removal, storage, and re-assembly of the front façade of the William Thomas Building (see the Heritage Permit application description
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of removal works, attached as Appendix “C”, and Heritage Consultant’s Report, attached as Appendix “D”). The Heritage Permit Review Subcommittee has reviewed this application, and has advised approval of the proposed work. The Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee reviewed the application and a staff report at its meeting on July 22, 2010, and has advised approval of the proposed work, subject to the conditions contained in the Recommendation of this Report.

Alternatives for Consideration - See Page 8.

**FINANCIAL / STAFFING / LEGAL IMPLICATIONS** (for Recommendation(s) only)

- **Financial:** None.
- **Staffing:** None.
- **Legal:** This Heritage Permit application has been processed and considered within the context of the applicable legislation.

Section 34(1) of the **Ontario Heritage Act** states that: “No owner of property designated under Section 29 shall demolish or remove a building or structure on the property, or permit the demolition or removal of a building or structure on the property, unless the owner applies to the Council of the municipality in which the property is situate and receives consent, in writing, to the demolition or removal.”

Section 34(2) of the **Ontario Heritage Act** states that: “Within 90-days after the notice of receipt is served on the applicant under Subsection (1), or within such longer period as is agreed upon by the owner and the Council, the Council, after consultation with its Municipal Heritage Committee, if one is established,

(a) May,

(i) Consent to the application;

(ii) Consent to the application, subject to such terms and conditions as may be specified by the Council; or,

(iii) Refuse the application;
With respect to the delegation of Council’s approval authority, Section 33(15) of the Ontario Heritage Act states that: “The power to consent to alterations to property under this Section may be delegated by By-law by the Council of a municipality to an employee or official of the municipality if the Council has established a Municipal Heritage Committee, and has consulted with the Committee prior to delegating the power.” The Ontario Heritage Act does not allow for the delegation of Council’s authority to consent to demolition or removal of a building or structure.

An Order to Comply under the Building Code Act was issued by the City’s Building Services Division on March 25, 2010. The order required the completion of an engineering report on the structural integrity of the front façade, rear wall, and interior bearing walls and supporting structure. This Report, by Halsall Associates Limited, was submitted in June, 2010, and identified serious structural faults, particularly related to the rear wall. A Building Permit for the removal of the structure will be required under the Building Code Act.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND (Chronology of events)

The subject property at 46 - 52 James Street North (Hamilton) (William Thomas Building) (see location map attached as Appendix “A”) was designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act by City of Hamilton By-law 08-215. A Heritage Permit is required for demolition or removal of a building or structure on a designated property (see the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value and Description of Heritage Attributes attached as Appendix “B”).

The applicant has applied to permit disassembly, removal, storage, and re-assembly of the front façade of the William Thomas Building (see the Heritage Permit application description of removal works, attached as Appendix “C”, and Heritage Consultant’s Report, attached as Appendix “D”).

The Heritage Permit Review Sub-committee of the City of Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee reviewed this alteration on July 7, 2010, and advised that the proposed work can be supported. The Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee reviewed the application and a staff report at its meeting on July 22, 2010, and has advised approval of the proposed work, subject to the conditions contained in the Recommendation of this Report.
POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Ontario Heritage Act

- See Legal Implications.

RELEVANT CONSULTATION

Pursuant to Subsection 28(1) of the Ontario Heritage Act, the City of Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee (MHC) advises and assists Council on matters relating to Part IV and Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act. At its meeting of July 7, 2010, the Heritage Permit Review Sub-committee of the City of Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee considered this application, and recommended to the Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee and Council that the subject application be approved. The Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee reviewed the application and a staff report at its meeting on July 22, 2010, and has advised approval of the proposed work, subject to the conditions contained in the Recommendation of this Report.

Heritage staff has been in consultation with staff of the Building Services Division and advised them of requirements under the Ontario Heritage Act.

ANALYSIS / RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

Heritage Considerations

According to the Ontario Heritage Act, Section 34(1), no owner of property designated under Section 29 shall demolish or remove a building or structure on the property, or permit the demolition or removal of a building or structure on the property, unless the owner applies to the Council of the municipality in which the property is situate and receives consent, in writing, to the demolition or removal. This permit application is for “removal” of the designated portions of the building.

The Council, after consultation with its Municipal Heritage Committee may, under Section 34(2):

(a) Consent to the application;

(b) Consent to the application, subject to such terms and conditions as may be specified by the Council; or,

(c) Refuse the application.
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If Council refuses to approve the application, the owner can appeal the matter to the Ontario Municipal Board.

**Heritage Assessment Report**

A structural assessment of the subject building by engineering consultants, Halsall Associates Limited, determined that the structural integrity of the entire building mass is compromised and requires stabilization efforts to make it structurally secure.

The Heritage Consultant, retained by the owner, has determined that the designated stone components of the façade, although damaged, can be restored and re-built (see Appendix “D”).

There are two options for retaining the façade:

- The building could be re-habilitated in situ, which would involve shoring-up and re-building large portions of the structure. This option would likely also involve some dismantling and re-building of the front façade; or,

- The base building could be demolished, the front façade salvaged, and a new structure, incorporating the original front façade, could be built on the same footprint.

The first option is cost prohibitive and possibly dangerous, while the second option provides a pragmatic and cost-effective approach to the re-use of the designated front façade. Additionally, at this time there are no specific uses identified for adaptive re-use of either a retained building mass or a new building incorporating the heritage elements.

**Heritage Permit Application**

The applicant has applied for approval to disassemble, remove, store, and re-assemble the front façade of the William Thomas Building, including the following (see Appendix “C”):

1. **Preparation and Documentation:**
   - Provide scaled drawings of entire façade.
   - Use scaled drawings as basis for numbering system and information database.

2. **Disassembly:**
   - Provide structural reinforcement, as required, during disassembly.
• Begin dismantling at cornice level. Dismantle masonry back-up, as required, to expose joints on all sides, and allow maximum raking out of mortar joints.

• Before removal of stone, unique number to be applied to each stone with a waterproof ink marker. Number to be applied on a hidden face, free of mortar, and correlated with scaled drawing database.

• Prepare field notes to scale of any unusual setting or details, in particular, at window openings and trim.

• Vertical and horizontal joint widths to be measured and correlated with scaled drawing database.

• Stone to be moved in appropriate slings and padded scissor claws to avoid damage to surfaces or arises. Stones to be separately bedded and stickered for transportation from site.

3. Storage:

• Stone to be stored in secure and climate-controlled environment.

• The storage facility will be the warehouse located at LIUNA Station, 360 James Street North, Hamilton.

4. Re-assembly:

• Rebuild façade in same location and with same relationship to adjacent buildings and the sidewalk.

• Rebuild, using mortar compatible with type of stone to match original colour and appearance.

• Rebuild, using the same spacing and tooling of mortar joints.

• Rebuild, using detailed inventory map of façade, following original locations of stone and original layout.

• Retain stones that can be repaired and re-used.

• Replace any damaged material that is beyond repair.

• Reconstruct other missing details of the façade, such as the cornice, the hood mouldings, the window sashes and frames, and the storefronts, with reference to...
archival material, and with designs and materials compatible with the original materials of the façade.

- Addition of contemporary structures and materials that are compatible with the heritage features, but identifiable as contemporary additions.

Key factors that are considered in the evaluation of any change affecting a heritage building, or its setting, are 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 the heritage feature).

**Displacement:** The designated heritage features will be temporarily displaced from the site. If the front façade is removed and not reinstalled, then the heritage features will be permanently displaced. Staff has included permit approval conditions to ensure that the re-assembly of the front façade remains a consideration and provides some timelines for this work.

**Disruption:** The designated features will be temporarily removed and there will be initial disruption effects. These effects will be considered in the review of the strategy for re-assembly, and some additional minor disruption effects may be necessary as part of the modification of the main structure to meet contemporary standards.

Accordingly, staff recommends that Heritage Permit Application HP2010-053 be approved, subject to conditions.

It should be noted that due to the current condition of the structure and the structural faults identified by Halsall Associates Limited, work may commence on removing building materials prior to formal consideration of the Heritage Permit application by the Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee and Council. The state, treatment, and condition of the vacant site, following building removal, will be addressed through the requirements of other legislation and City By-laws.

### ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION
(include Financial, Staffing, Legal and Policy Implications and pros and cons for each alternative)

1. **Refuse the Heritage Permit application.**

   Council may deny this application, and the building would not be demolished. However, this alternative is not recommended, as the building has serious structural faults and could be demolished, resulting in the permanent loss of all the designated
heritage façade and elements. Dismantling the structure in a controlled manner represents a viable option for conserving the designated front façade of the building.

2. **Approve the Heritage Permit application without conditions.**

Council may approve this application, without conditions. However, this alternative is not recommended, as the recommended conditions provide a process that will ensure that the building components are appropriately documented, dismantled, and stored. The conditions also provide for a re-construction strategy for the front façade and the construction of a new base structure, which will be reviewed by the Heritage Permit Review Subcommittee to ensure that the heritage features will be conserved, and that the front façade will be re-constructed within a reasonable time period.

---

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN** (Linkage to Desired End Results)


**Healthy Community**

- Plan and manage the built environment.
- **Staff Comment**: Approval of the recommendations will result in the protection of public health and safety, while conserving valuable built heritage resources.

---

**APPENDICES / SCHEDULES**

- Appendix “A”: Location Map
- Appendix “B”: Schedule “B” to By-law No. 08-215
- Appendix “C”: Heritage Permit Application Description of Removal Works
- Appendix “D”: Heritage Conservation Assessment
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Date: July 5, 2010
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Subject Property

46-52 James Street North

Ward 2 Key Map
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STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE AND DESCRIPTION OF HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES

Statement of Cultural Heritage Value

The four-storey building, built 1855-56, located at 46-52 James Street North possesses cultural heritage value due not only to its association with the growth and commercial prosperity of the City of Hamilton in the nineteenth century, but also due to its association with an important nineteenth-century architect, William Thomas. Thomas was considered a key figure in Canadian architecture, designing important buildings throughout Ontario, as well as in other Provinces. Thomas designed a commercial building befitting the prosperity of Hamilton in the 1850's. In its original composition, design and materials, the building was a representative example of Renaissance Revival architecture dating to the pre-Confederation period.

While the building retains only a portion of its original architectural features, confined specifically to the three bays on the southern most section of the property, including the decorative stone window surrounds, its similarities to other extant Thomas buildings, such as Kerr's Block on King Street East, is a testament to the work of this architect and his contribution to the pre-Confederation architectural legacy of stone construction in the City.

The building is an important element in the James Street North streetscape, which is both architecturally and historically significant for downtown Hamilton. Lined with three to four storey commercial row buildings, the buildings on James Street North exemplify early architectural styles and often exhibit high levels of craftsmanship in both design and construction, including such architectural details as cornices, decorative window trim and ornate masonry work. While at one time quite plentiful in Hamilton, this surviving example of a stone, commercial block building type at 46-52 James Street North is nowadays rare in the downtown core.
Description of Heritage Attributes

The heritage attributes of 46-52 James Street North include but are not limited to:

- The west elevation of the southern most section of the building (three bays wide) along with the flat roof; together with all original construction materials (stone and wood) and all component architectural features and detailing, including the fenestration pattern and the decorative window surrounds.

- The west elevation of the northern portion of the building along with the flat roof, including the surviving stone façade, remnant window and door openings and any other surviving architectural features or decorative elements.
Carolyn Samko
Heritage Conservation Consultant

Heritage Permit Application
THE WILLIAM THOMAS BUILDING
#46-52 JAMES STREET NORTH
HAMILTON, ONTARIO

This Heritage Permit Application is submitted on behalf of Copper Cliff Metals & Wrecking Corp, 9093 #20 Rd, Smithville, ON, the agent acting for the owners, LIUNA Local 837.

The intent of this heritage permit application is to ask for permission to dismantle the façade components of #46-52 James Street North as part of the demolition of the whole structure and the re-development of the property. The plan is to restore and re-build the façade in its original location as part of a future new development.

The proposed activities and alterations under this application are the following:

- Catalogue, number and photograph the ashlar stone components of the façade
- Dismantle the façade
- Crate the façade for storage
- Store the façade in a secure warehouse
- Re-assemble façade at a future date

1. **Background:**

The structural assessment report conducted by HALSALL Engineers undertaken in May 2010, concludes that #46-52 James Street North is in poor condition. There are multiple reasons. The main deficiencies of the building are described in section 4, pages 9-11 of the HALSALL report and include the following:

- Damages to the roof and drainpipes allowing rain to infiltrate causing rot of wooden and steel members
- Damage to steel lateral support beams supporting the upper floors
- Alterations to joists causing joists to no longer bear on supporting walls
- Damage by fire to wooden joists
- Condition of mortar is poor: it has lost strength and bond in all walls
- Bulging of the front and rear walls
• Cracks and stress on the rear wall
• Cracks and stress in load bearing walls
• Damage to piers supporting steel beams at rear of building
• Damage to remaining finishes due to water infiltration

A notice to comply because of dangerous conditions within the building was issued by the City of Hamilton, which hastened the need to act. In order to save the façade of the building, work would need to start as soon as possible.

2. Methodology
The following is a methodology for the dismantling of the façade:
The work will be lead by a qualified heritage mason.

Preparation
• Provide scaled drawings of entire façade. Use scaffolding to create accurate measurements of façade.

• Use scaled drawings as basis for numbering system and information database.

• Investigate wall to determine structural stability, including tiebacks to masonry backup and connections to internal structure.

Dismantling
• Provide structural reinforcement as required to avoid partial detachment or collapse during disassembly.

• Begin dismantling at cornice level. Dismantle masonry backup as required to expose joints on all sides and allow maximum raking out of mortar joints.

• Raking of joints to be done with hand tools. Any use of power tools to be based on approved technique and sample.

• For loosening of stone, no point loads from steel pry bars to be permitted under any circumstances. Thin-profile expansion jacks, scissor claws, wood wedges and wide-flange prying devices to be used to dislodge stone.

• Before removal of stone, unique number to be applied to each stone with a waterproof ink marker. Number to be applied on a hidden face, free of mortar, and correlated with scaled drawing database. If number is not applied on top surface, top of stone must be indicated.

• Prepare field notes to scale of any unusual setting or details, in particular at window openings and trim.
• Vertical and horizontal joint widths to be measured and correlated with scaled drawing database.

• Stone to be moved in appropriate slings and padded scissor claws to avoid damage to surfaces or arises. Stones to be separately bedded and stickered for transportation from site.

• For carved stone, do not lay it on its carved surface.

• For cracked stone, use numbering system to indicate relationship of pieces.

Storage
• Stone to be stored in controlled dry environment, protected from physical or environmental damage.

• Condition of each stone to be examined during dismantling and storage, and noted on measured drawing database.

• Copies of database to be circulated to minimum of three parties for safekeeping.

3. Storage Facility:
The storage facility will be the warehouse located at LIUNA Station, 360 James Street North, Hamilton.

Sincerely,

(Original signed by Carolyn Samko)

Carolyn Samko

Submitted on behalf of Copper Cliff Metals and Wrecking, the agent for LIUNA Local 837.
The William Thomas Building
Heritage Conservation Assessment

Carolyn Samko
Heritage Conservation Consultant

June 22nd 2010
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Description of Subject
The William Thomas Building is located at #46-52 James Street North in Hamilton, Ontario. It was built in 1855-56 by William Thomas, a prominent Canadian architect. The four-storey structure is built in the Renaissance Revival style, a popular style in commercial buildings in the middle of the 19th century.

1.2 Scope
This assessment was prepared for LIUNA Local 837 and explores the conditions of the remaining heritage materials of the #46-52 James Street North, Hamilton and suggests an overall approach to its future development. This report also provides a review of the structural condition report undertaken by HALSALL Engineers in May 2010.

1.3 Limitations
The survey was based on visual assessment and includes the façade on the west side of the building, the rear walls on the east side of the building and the interior on all levels. The assessment was limited by conditions in the building. Some areas of the building are not safe. Assessments were conducted where conditions were safe for access at the time.
1.4 Evaluation Standards
Where judgments of conditions are made, the heritage components will be assessed based on whether they exist in their original location as well as for deficiencies, and given a value based on the following:

**Excellent Condition:**
- No damages
- No maintenance needed

**Good condition:**
- No major repairs needed but maintenance needed
- For example: Scraping, priming, painting.

**Fair condition:**
- Needing minor repairs or minor replacement, showing minor decay or damage
- For example: Some replacement of materials, some patching and repair with fillers and painting.

**Poor condition:**
- Needing major repairs or replacement, showing major decay or damage
- For example: replacement of materials, major repair of window sash or replacement of structure
2.0 EXTERIOR AND INTERIOR OF BUILDING

2.1 Building Description

#46-52 James Street North is a commercial building with its west façade visible from James Street North. It has 9 bays: 4 bays with single window units on each side of a central tri-partide window, on each level. The windows on each floor become smaller as the floors progress upwards. The building is 4 storeys high and has a roofline that slopes slightly to the rear of the property. It has a full basement. The rear of the building has a rectangular shaped addition located on the southeast side of the building at unit #46. The walls of the building are built from random rubble limestone and the rear wall of the building is a mixture of buff brick, rubble stone and steel supports that has been parged in places. The mortar is lime-based mixed with an aggregate that incorporates red earth. The mixture also shows large pieces of lime chunk in the mix and this appears throughout the building. The roof and floors are built with wooden joists.
The façade of the building is comprised of cut ashlar sandstone with decorative quoins on each side of the façade and carved stone hoods over each window. The hoods on the second floor are triangular, on the third floor rounded, and the fourth floor rounded with bracketed ends. Each floor is separated by a band course that runs the full length of the façade. The centre tripartite windows have a flat surround on the 4th floor while floors 2 and 3 have surrounds, which correspond to the single window hood design. The window sash configuration is 1 over 1.

The upper cornice molding is no longer in place and has been replaced with concrete block. The cornice molding from between the first and second floors has also been removed and rubble stone and steel are visible.

On ground level there are 3 storefronts divided by decorative pillars incised with lines and floral details. The original storefronts are no longer intact.

Figure 4 View of facade early 20th century

Figure 5 Tripartite windows on floors 3 and 4 showing shapes of missing stonework
Figure 6 Windows on floors 2, 3 and 4 showing intact original stonework

Figure 7 Quoins at side of façade

Figure 8 Stone pillar on 1st floor
2.2 Current Condition Report

2.2.1 Exterior

The William Thomas Building has undergone many alterations since it was built. The most significant changes happened after the fire in 1923 that destroyed the neighbouring Lister Chambers directly to the south. Archival photographs show damages to the façade of the building by fire and water, which appears to have damaged windows, possibly parts of the roof and portions of the interior. The replacement of some of the rear wall with brick, steel and wood supports, and the replacement of interior floor joists indicates that #46 and its rear addition probably had considerable re-building to repair the damages.

The current windows are 1 over 1 double hung wooden sash windows that show a mixture of hardware. Archival photographs from the early 20th century, show, that 1 over 1 window sash were there before the fire in 1923. To support this, some of the sashes have hardware in the Eastlake style, a late 19th century decorative style.

While it is possible that these sash are original, it is probable that they are replacements from the late 19th century. It is more likely that the original windows had wooden sash with divided lights similar to the Lister Chambers building (Figure 1) which had 6 over 6 windows; or the building to the north, which still has some 2 over 2 windows in place.

The second set of major changes happened when the façade was altered to satisfy modern upgrades in 1961. It was at this time that metal siding was installed over a part of the façade. It is indicated on plans made by the architectural firm of Prack and Prack, that the cornices and projecting stone features on the north side of the façade were removed at this time. ¹

The storefronts at street level have had considerable alterations. Steel beams were inserted into the façade, mid-century to allow the span between supports to become larger. All original material has been removed due to this.

There were also many changes to the interior, which tenants did to improve the space throughout the 20th century including in 1953, 1961 and 1985.² This suggests that it is unlikely that any areas of the building maintained original materials without alteration of some kind.

Other than the missing architectural details, the most noticeable deficiency of the façade is the misalignment of the stones both horizontally and vertically. The facade appears to be bending and coming away from its backing wall. There are

¹ See attached plans Appendix I
² See attached plans Appendix II
many areas where tiebacks have been installed to control this problem. The stone also shows several areas of discoloration where the elements, pollution and paint have soiled it over the last century.

Figure 9 #46-52 James Street North early 20\textsuperscript{th} century

Figure 10 Tieback on façade

Figure 11 View of concrete block at cornice level
2.2.2 Interior
#46-52 James Street North was a commercial building with office and retail businesses. The finishes that are still intact show that, with the exception of a few areas, the decorative materials were relatively simple. It appears from archival photographs that the formal office spaces were treated to more expensive decorative schemes and furnishings as can be seen in Figure 14.

Fragments from a portion of a highly decorative plaster ceiling in the rear of unit #50-52 suggests this unit had more formal uses. But the rest of the building shows evidence of relatively simple trim. The conventions of cornice, dado and
base were used throughout the building confirming that this was not a pure
industrial site but utilized the decorative formulas favoured in residential design of
the period.

It also appears that the building was heated by wood stoves that vented through
chimneys rather than by open fireplaces. Many stove thimbles are visible
throughout the building. This was not an uncommon choice in the early 19th
century, as stoves were efficient and were readily available at this time in Upper
Canada and Northern New York State. ³

The interior of this building at the time of this report has been partially
demolished to remove the layers of modern materials and the framed in wall
divisions. Prior to demolition, a walk through was conducted that showed that the
space had been thoroughly renovated with decorative and construction materials
dating to the late 20th century but the demolition was not part of the scope of this
assessment, so any materials exposed at that time were not available for
documentation. At the time of this assessment some finish material from the 19th
and 20th century still remains and can give information as to how the interior may
have appeared. A detailed examination of the remaining heritage materials was
conducted, locations of the materials were noted on plans, extensive
photographs were taken and some samples were taken.

2.2.3 First Floor

Floor Plan
The interior of the building is divided by stone dividing walls, which separate the
spaces into three units: #46, #48 and #50 and 52 together. These three units

³ Jeanne Minhinnick, At Home in Upper Canada (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin and Company
Ltd., 1970), pg. 95.
would have historically been further subdivided to accommodate different uses but when this assessment was done these divisions had been removed. Units #48-52 are connected to each other by way of an arch in the dividing wall but unit #46 is separated from the others and must be accessed from a rear doorway.

The existing spaces are open from the front of the building to the rear of the building. At the front of the building each storefront area has been altered by the addition of a steel beam over the span from column to column in order to open up the individual storefront areas. During this process, which most likely occurred in 1961 when many of the structural changes on the front of the building occurred, any remaining original historic material was destroyed.

Figure 15 Storefront of unit #52, looking northwest

Figure 16 Storefront of unit #48, looking southwest

Walls
In some areas original plaster and cut lath are visible. These are layered beneath more modern finishes from different periods of the 20th century. A wide variety of wall treatments exist. It is likely that the original decorative treatment was wallpaper on plaster and lath. Several samples of wallpaper were collected for documentation but most appear to date from the early 20th century. Paint exists
on some wall surfaces and appears to date from the late 20th century. One area that was hidden beneath the staircase in unit #50 appears to have paint in grey-brown. This could be an early paint finish.

Floors
The floors are plank subfloor and these are covered with terrazzo and linoleum in unit #50-52 and narrow hardwood strip flooring in units #46 and 48.

Ceiling
The ceiling shows white lines that indicate that at one time there was cut lath and plaster installed on the ceiling. In some places there is tin ceiling remnants. This is layered on top of the plaster and lath marks, which indicates that it was a later addition, probably dating to the early 20th century.

In the northeast section of the building in unit #52, remnants of decorative plasterwork were found under the modern finishes. These included deep cornice moldings painted in blue distemper and plaster medallions with scrolls and leaves, which show remnants of a paint treatment. Remaining samples have been collected for documentation.
Figure 19 Remnants of plaster medallion from unit #52, sample #3

Figure 20 Remnant of plaster cornice from unit #52, sample #4

Figure 21 Tin ceiling: squares with diaper pattern at corners unit #46

**Trim**

Unit #46 and 48 show shadow lines where baseboards were located. The shadow line measures 10” high. A length of baseboard with a simple profile measuring 10” high exists in the bathroom area in unit #46 in the rear addition. There is also a shadow line where a wallpaper or applied wooden cornice existed at the ceiling but no material still exists.
Structure
There are eight locations on this level where floor joists have been cut to accommodate stairs or other changes. Only one of them is supported. There is evidence of fire damage in the northwest corner of the building on walls and upper floor joists. There is significant water damage in unit #46 and the floors are not safe to walk on, so further assessment could not be done in this area.

2.2.4 Second Floor

Floor Plan
The 2nd floor is divided into three spaces that run from the front of the building to the rear of the building. Each unit is accessed from the other through large archways in the stone. At the time of this report all framed wall divisions that existed have been removed. In unit #48, the rear floor is elevated most likely to accommodate plumbing.

Walls
The walls on this level are plaster on lath. The most modern materials have been removed by demolition to reveal previous finishes. This has exposed stone in some areas. Many layers of both paint and wallpaper exist. The following describes some of the most interesting materials found.
In Unit #52 the west wall is wallpapered in a black and brown striped paper. A remnant of wallpaper border with a blue strip and swag pattern was hung at dado height on the east wall. The blue paper was collected as a sample.

![Figure 24 Wallpaper dado in unit #52, second floor, sample #6](image)

In unit #48, there are also a number of finishes visible. The walls are composed of a combination of cut lath and expanded metal lath and plaster. The addition of metal lath probably dates to repairs done after 1923. The first finish visible is a deep green paint finish. On top of this are two wallpapers, one with a stippled pattern and the top one with an eagle and swag pattern.

![Figure 25 Showing layers of wallpaper on top of green paint, sample #7](image)

In unit #46, there a number of layers of decorative finishes. The first layer is a grey thinly washed paint with a mark where an applied cornice would have hung. The next layer is a peach sponged paint treatment on paper with a deep green
sponged finish on paper below the dado. It is separated by a space for a chair rail, which is missing. It is similar to the decorative scheme in Figure 14. This is topped with more recent applications of wallpaper.

![Image of sponged paint treatment](image1.png)

**Figure 26** Peach and green sponged paint treatment on paper in unit #46, sample #8

**Floors**
The finish flooring on this level is narrow hardwood strip flooring.

**Ceiling**
The ceiling has been mostly demolished but there is evidence that shows that portions of the ceiling were plaster on cut lath. In another area, there was tongue and groove ceiling board painted white. In one area in Unit #46, there is a small remnant of tin ceiling.

![Image of tongue and groove ceiling](image2.png)

**Figure 27** Tongue and groove ceiling treatment with cornice in unit #50

**Trim**
Most of the trim has been removed but there are some areas where trim work still exists. The north façade window still has trim work. It is a simple flat, butted board with a beaded edge and a shaped backband. There is also baseboard that
remains in place. It is a simple board with a shaped top and measures 10” high. The marks where base, dado and a small cornice were attached are apparent in many places in all units. Close observation shows a small piece of simple wooden cornice where the remains of ceiling board are found. The date when this was applied is unknown; however, it appears that the marks below the wooden treatment are from plaster and cut lath, which indicates that the wooden tongue and groove treatment is not original.

Figure 28 Baseboard on north wall in unit #52

Figure 29 Remnant of tin ceiling in unit #46

Figure 30 Simple butted trim with applied backband

Structure
There is evidence of fire damage in the northwest corner of the building. There are a number of cuts to floor joists that are not supported from below. The separation of the front and rear walls from the rest of the structure is also visible on this level.

2.2.5 Third Floor

Floor Plan
The rooms have had all framed in divisions demolished and they are open from the front to the rear of the building. The units are accessible to each other through a large stone archway in each stone dividing-wall. In unit #48, there is a circular staircase that allows access to the fourth floor.

Walls
The walls on this level are plaster on lath. This has been removed in many places and the bare stone is visible. On the west wall there are areas where expanded metal lath is visible. In all the units there are many layers of paint. In unit #50-52 on the firebreast in the northwest corner, there is a sample of wallpaper with a pink button tufted cushion pattern.
In unit #46, the first layer is light blue paint with remnants of what appears to be a wallpaper border at cornice level. On top of this is nautical-themed wallpaper.

**Floors**
The floors are covered with a combination of narrow and wide strip flooring on wooden subfloor.

**Ceiling**
The ceiling has been demolished but shows marks where plaster and lath would have existed.

**Trim**
Most of the trim is missing on this level. A piece of baseboard that is still in place has a simple flat profile with a shaped top and measures 10” high. The window reveals in unit #46 are still in place. They are composed of tongue and groove strips. The other reveals on the windows on the north side have a flat panel reveal which is most likely the earlier finish. The plaster around the 3rd floor window openings has been repaired with expanded metal lath. Both treatments appear to have been applied at the same time. They probably date from the repairs after 1923 to repair fire and water damages.
Figure 34 Tongue and groove panel reveal, south side

Figure 35 Stairwell to fourth floor in unit #48

Figure 36 Eastlake style hardware of facade window
A portion of the circular stairway still exists. It is a combination of original and modern materials. Tongue and groove panels were added to the original structure to create a boxed in stair. The stringer and trim, the treads, the newel posts and rail, all appear to be original. The condition however of this material is poor.
There is also a paneled door on the east wall of unit #50, which appears to be original. It is in good to fair condition.

Structure
The most noticeable structural problems on this level are the separation of the front and rear walls from the rest of the structure. These cracks are located in the northwest corner and the northeast corner and along the rear wall. There is considerable water damage visible in unit #46.

Figure 39 Separation of facade from structure, northwest corner, third floor

2.2.6 Fourth Floor
Floor Plan
The fourth floor has had the framed wall separations removed and is open from front to rear of the building. The units are accessible to each other through archways in the walls separating the units. The central circular staircase is the access from the third floor and it is located in the centre unit, #48. At one time there was another stairwell located in unit #46 but it has been removed and filled in. The roof slopes slightly to the rear and there are two octagonal framed openings that are visible that may have housed skylights but are now filled in.
Walls
The walls on this level are plaster on cut lath but have had material removed during demolition. Along the southwest corner there is evidence of expanded metal lath. In this area there is brick infill on the side of the Lister Block and concrete block along the top of the west wall where the cornice was located. This is visible from the interior where the plaster has been removed. The walls are covered in layers of paint.

Floor
The floors in unit #50-52 are plank sub-floor. A portion of #52 has hardwood strip where there appears to have been a subdivided room. The floor in unit #48 is soft wood strip flooring on sub-floor and the floor in unit #46 is hardwood strip flooring.

**Ceiling**
The ceiling has been demolished but evidence of plaster and lath is visible.

**Trim**
Most of the trim is missing on this floor. The trim from the stairwell as noted in the previous section, is evident. There are shadows where baseboard would have been in all units. The shadow is consistent with 10" baseboard.

There is also tongue and groove paneled window surrounds in unit #46. On the rear wall of unit #50, there is the remnant of a window. It is the remains of the upper sash of a window and frame. The window had no counterbalance or peg-stops. It had two sashes: the top one was smaller than the bottom. The top one was divided in three vertically. This style of sash pattern was an early 20th century style and was probably a replacement after 1923.

![Figure 43 Remnants of early 20th century window in rear of unit #50](image-url)
Figure 44 Tieback from façade attached on dividing wall between units #48 and #50

**Structure**

The areas of most damage are the areas where the front and rear walls are separating from the main structure and the area where concrete block has been used to replace stone at the cornice level. In unit #50, a tieback from the façade can be seen attached to the dividing wall. As on all levels, unit #46 shows considerable damage by water. There is also evidence of water leaking through the roof on this level.
3.0 STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING REPORT BY HALSALL

The structural engineering report by HALSALL Engineers took place between April 13th and May 25th 2010. The assessment was done by 7 site visits that surveyed the interior of the building on each floor and the exterior of the building by man lift. The assessment was undertaken by one engineer with the assistance of one other individual who was brought in as a second opinion. Observation of the investigation showed that they employed photographic documentation, measurement taking, probing into mortar joints and wooden members on all levels, drilling into wooden supports, inspection of visible supporting systems and foundations, and inspection of the façade by man-lift.

The report is a fair representation of the current conditions of #46-52 James Street North and reflects deficiencies that are apparent by visual observation by any observer.

The main deficiencies of the building are described in section 4, pages 9-11 of the HALSALL report and include the following:

- Damages to the roof and drainpipes allowing rain to infiltrate causing rot of wooden and steel members
- Damage to steel lateral support beams supporting the upper floors
- Alterations to joists causing joists to no longer bear on supporting walls
- Damage by fire to wooden joists
- Condition of mortar is poor: it has lost strength and bond in all walls
- Bulging of the front and rear walls
- Cracks and stress on the rear wall
- Cracks and stress in load bearing walls
- Damage to piers supporting steel beams at rear of building
- Damage to remaining finishes due to water infiltration

All of these deficiencies can be seen by visual inspection and accurately reflect the conditions of the building at the time of assessment.

4.0 HERITAGE VALUE

4.1 Historical overview
William Thomas (1799-1860) is recognized as one of the founders of the architectural profession in Canada and is considered to have laid the groundwork to train Canadian-born architects in this country. His work, which dates from 1843 to 1860, includes important religious, governmental, educational and commercial buildings throughout Ontario. He built structures in Simcoe, Stratford, Chatham, Toronto, Guelph, Niagara, Peterborough, Hamilton, London, and St. Catharines. Examples of his work include St Paul’s Church, London (1844), the Commercial Bank of the Midland District, Toronto (1844), (the facade is now part of BCE Place in Toronto), the St Lawrence Hall and Market, Toronto (1845-50), St Michael's Cathedral and Bishops Palace, Toronto (1845-48), Brock’s Monument, Queenston (1852-59) and the Don Jail, Toronto (1857-64).

Thomas settled in Toronto in 1843, and began building in Hamilton in 1851. In Hamilton, he is responsible for building St. Paul’s Presbyterian Church (1854), Ballinahinch Estate (1848-51), and Inglewood House (1852-54). Commercial structures in Hamilton include the Bank of British North America (1847) and White’s Block (1853), (both built on King Street and both now demolished), Kerr’s Block, 18-22 King Street East, which still stands and #46-52 James Street North.

4.2 City Significance
#46-52 James Street North is one of only two remaining commercial structures built by William Thomas still standing in Hamilton. Because of the prominent location of this building on James Street North, its key role in maintaining the historic streetscape, the pre-Confederation build date, and the architect who built it, this structure is significant to the City of Hamilton.

The #46-52 James Street North is built with its formal features facing James Street North. The most impressive and architecturally significant portion of the building is its façade.

Businesses in early Canadian cities commonly built in a row of terraced buildings joined together; therefore, the most valuable street front area could be utilized to the best advantage. By concentrating the most expensive materials on the front of the building, businesses were able to conceal the less pleasant aspects of industry at the back of the block and present an impressive public front.

---

The front façade of #46-52 James Street North is the identifiable and historically depicted part of this building, and along with its adjacent neighbours creates a block of significant facades. Therefore the conservation and restoration, particularly of the façade of this building, is important to this neighbourhood.

4.3 Designated Features

The following features of #46-52 James Street North, Hamilton, are designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (Ward 2):

• The west elevation of the southern most section of the building (three bays wide) along with the flat roof; together with all original construction materials (stone and wood) and all component architectural features and detailing, including the fenestration pattern and the decorative window surrounds.

• The west elevation of the northern portion of the building along with the flat roof including the surviving stone façade, remnant window and door openings and any other surviving architectural features or decorative elements.7

4.4 Key Heritage Features

Character Defining Elements of #46-52 James Street North

The key elements that define the heritage character of the location include:
- The arrangement of the building at the sidewalk, aligned with the surrounding buildings on either side, as part of the James Street North streetscape.

The key elements that define the heritage character of the exterior include:
- The stone and timber frame structure
- The terraced form and general footprint
- The 4 storey, 9 bay arrangement with 3 distinct storefronts
- The roof which slopes slightly to the rear
- The ashlar stone façade with decorative features
- The double-hung wooden windows, frames and remaining hardware

The key elements that define the heritage character of the interior:
- The general divisions of the storefronts.

---

5.0 STRATEGIES FOR INTERVENTION

5.1 Rehabilitation of Building

#46-52 James Street North is important as part of the remaining historic streetscape that exists on James Street between the mountain and Barton Street and most particularly James Street North. The area along James Street North has seen many recent losses of historic structures that front the street. As part of maintaining the cultural landscape, and the hope of rejuvenation for the neighbourhood, it is important that this building and most particularly, its façade remain in this location and be restored.

The most important reason for keeping this building in this location is as a catalyst to the rest of the neighbourhood. There are a number of buildings that are in need of maintenance in the Beasley neighbourhood. Insuring that #46-52 James Street North, along with its neighbour the Lister Block are filled with tenants, and maintained, will bring people to this area, create a demand for services and a reason for other buildings to be maintained and in some cases, to find a use. The restoration of a long abused façade can have the power to change the face of a neighbourhood.

The best approach for this project is based on rehabilitation as the overall framework. When rehabilitating a building, the important historical features are retained and the ones that are badly damaged are removed and replaced with new compatible, contemporary material. Key features can be restored and be combined with new material imaginatively.

The Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada, define ‘restoration’ and ‘rehabilitation’ as follows:

“‘Restoration’ involves revealing, recovering or representing the state of an historic place or an individual component, as it appeared at a particular period in its history, as accurately as possible, while protecting its heritage value”

‘Rehabilitation involves the sensitive adaptation of an historic place or an individual component for a continuing or compatible contemporary use, while protecting its heritage value. This is achieved through repairs, alterations and/or additions.”8

Complete rehabilitation of the whole building is possible but extensive re-building would be needed because of the poor condition of many of its structural components. According to the structural assessment by HALSALL, some of the supporting walls would need new support, the front and rear walls would need full re-building and most of the mortar joints would need full re-pointing. The roof and

---

floor joists would need to be dismantled and new material would need to be used to replace damaged materials. New floor, wall and ceiling finishes would be needed to replace damaged materials. The façade also would need to be dismantled and re-built. At this time modern building code would necessitate changes to the structure to comply with modern codes.9

It is likely that full restoration of the underlying structure of the building would also be costly. If this building were located in an area that had a strong retail or condominium market, finding a use that would support the cost of a full restoration would be possible. In downtown Hamilton, the rejuvenation of the inner city is just beginning.

In the case of #46-52 James Street North, rehabilitation could involve retaining the historical and architectural values of the building by conserving the identifiable public façade while replacing the damaged structure behind with new, compatible, construction.

While preserving a façade is not the first choice of action when a building is in good condition and can be restored without major interventions, in this case the underlying structure is in poor condition. The causes are multiple and start with the choice of poor quality mortar, followed by damage by fire, poor quality re-building, major structural interventions and a significant amount of time without use, which allowed water infiltration. In this case, where all portions of the building need significant work, the preservation of the façade becomes a more acceptable option because otherwise the building might be completely lost and the space filled in with a modern structure.

This approach makes the conservation of a portion of this building also financially viable. It is critical to this neighbourhood that buildings find an appropriate and affordable ongoing use. This will only happen if a proposed development is economically feasible.

The façade is the identity of this building. It is what people remember and what is depicted in archival photographs. It is completely feasible to conserve the façade and restore it and retain its visual and historic integrity. There is enough representational and archival material to be able to reconstruct missing details and re-built as part of a new structure. The missing components such as the cornices, storefronts and the projecting window hoods could be restored or recreated from contemporary materials.

The neighbourhood could retain a heritage building and encourage new growth at the same time.

---

5.3 Design of Rehabilitation

Whether the choice is made to rehabilitate the whole structure of #46-52 James Street North or to combine rehabilitation of the façade with a new structure behind, it is recommended that the actions conform to the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada for re-habilitation of historic structures which state:

“Repair rather than replace character-defining elements. Where character-defining elements are too severely deteriorated to repair, and where sufficient physical evidence exists, replace them with new elements that match the forms, materials and detailing of sound versions of the same elements. Where there is insufficient physical evidence, make the form, material and detailing of the new elements compatible with the character of the historic place.

Conserve the heritage value and character-defining elements when creating any new additions to a historic place or any related new construction. Make the new work physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to and distinguishable from the historic place.

Create any new additions or related new construction so that the essential form and integrity of a historic place will not be impaired if the new work is removed in the future.

Replace missing features from the restoration period with new features whose forms, materials and detailing are based on sufficient physical, documentary and or/oral evidence.”

5.3.1 Building

Should a new structure be built behind a restored facade, the new taller structure should be recessed in order to allow for the original view of the façade from the street to be unmarred.

The interior spaces should follow the general footprint of the original building to allow for site lines from the original façade windows to be functional and to also allow the original storefronts to function without impediment.

5.3.2 Heritage Features

The design of the façade should combine new and old materials in a compatible way. There should also be a combination of new material and restoration of original details.

A decision should be made to date any restoration work to the façade to an identifiable date. Since so much material is missing, this is necessary. For example, historic photographs from the turn of the 20th century could be used. They show clear views of the 1x1 windows, the cornices and the storefronts. While these pictures do not identify the way the building appeared when it was built, they have the best combination of information available.
During the restoration of the façade, effort should be taken to try to restore details by first using any existing materials that are in good condition and can be restored; second by replicating known materials either gathered by samples or from good archival evidence and thirdly, by choosing compatible materials that compliment the existing original material.

5.3.3 Façade

Both cornices are missing and need replacement. Archival photographs of the top cornice show a simple molding with a slight protrusion above the quoins on each side of the building. More research is needed to determine the exact configuration of molding details. In photographs, it appears not unlike the cornice on the Kerr Building on King Street East, a contemporary building built by William Thomas.

![Figure 45 Kerr Building, King Street at Gore Park](image1)

![Figure 46 Building on King William Street](image2)

![Figure 47 Lower Cornice on King William Street](image3)

The lower cornice is harder to see in the archival photographs. In many images it is covered with signage. Archival images suggest it was a simple molding supported with brackets at regular intervals, perhaps to coincide with the pillars. An existing lower cornice on King William Street shows a similar design.
5.3.4 Windows and Storefronts
The remaining wooden sash windows and hardware should be salvaged and stored and re-used if possible. The original sash can be retrofitted to accommodate thermal efficiency. If re-placement windows are chosen for this building they should be compatible with the original design of the windows and be matched to known archival evidence. There are excellent products manufactured in wood that would meet thermal efficiency needs and be compatible with the original materials of the building.

The lower storefronts should copy the general divisions and design of the storefronts as seen in the archival photographs. While modern materials will be used, details in wood would be more compatible with this structure.

5.4 Salvage of Materials
The following is a list of materials that should be salvaged from the interior and stored for future research should demolition occur:

- All stonework related to the facade of the building
- 3 pieces of baseboard on floors 1, 2 and 3
- Trim work from around window on second floor
- Door at rear of building on floor 3
- Window sash and hardware from facade of building

A heritage consultant should be contracted to be on site during demolition to implement salvage of any materials not visible during this report.
6.0 METHODOLOGY FOR DISMANTLING THE FACADE

In both scenarios, rehabilitation of the whole structure or re-habilitation of the façade only, the façade needs to be dismantled and re-built. This is to facilitate re-attaching the ashlar stones to the supporting structure and also to correct the misalignment of stones across the façade.

With ashlar masonry, unlike coursed rubble stone, it is possible to dismantle and reconstruct a wall and still retain its original visual integrity. Every block can be numbered and keyed to a plan and then returned to its original position. It is recommended that the mason contracted to complete the work have considerable experience working with heritage masonry projects, in particular, dismantling stone structures.

The following information, prepared in conjunction with Julian Smith Architects, gives a proposed strategy for dismantling the façade.

6.1 Preparation

- Provide scaled drawings of entire façade. Use scaffolding to create accurate measurements of façade.
- Use scaled drawings as basis for numbering system and information database.
- Investigate wall to determine structural stability, including tiebacks to masonry backup and connections to internal structure.

6.2 Dismantling

- Provide structural reinforcement as required to avoid partial detachment or collapse during disassembly.
- Begin dismantling at cornice level. Dismantle masonry backup as required to expose joints on all sides and allow maximum raking out of mortar joints.
- Raking of joints to be done with hand tools. Any use of power tools to be based on approved technique and sample.
- For loosening of stone, no point loads from steel pry bars to be permitted under any circumstances. Thin-profile expansion jacks, scissor claws, wood wedges and wide-flange prying devices to be used to dislodge stone.
- Before removal of stone, unique number to be applied to each stone with a waterproof ink marker. Number to be applied on a hidden face, free of mortar, and correlated with scaled drawing database. If number is not applied on top surface, top of stone must be indicated.
- Prepare field notes to scale of any unusual setting or details, in particular at window openings and trim.
• Vertical and horizontal joint widths to be measured and correlated with scaled drawing database.
• Stone to be moved in appropriate slings and padded scissor claws to avoid damage to surfaces or arises. Stones to be separately bedded and stickered for transportation from site.
• For carved stone, do not lay it on its carved surface.
• For cracked stone, use numbering system to indicate relationship of pieces.

6.3 Storage
• Stone to be stored in controlled dry environment, protected from physical or environmental damage.
• Condition of each stone to be examined during dismantling and storage, and noted on measured drawing database.
• Copies of database to be circulated to minimum of three parties for safekeeping.
7.0 METHODOLOGY FOR REBUILDING THE FACADE

7.1 Mason
- Mason and crew must have extensive experience building and repairing heritage structures and be familiar with heritage materials and building techniques.

7.2 Cleaning
- Clean stone using gentlest methods i.e.: low-pressure wash 100psi-300psi and a soft bristle brush
- A non-ionic cleaner may be used where the first method is insufficient.
- Stronger cleaning methods to be used for specific uses such as removing tar and paint, to be approved methods and materials for heritage use and to be tested first in a small inconspicuous area before implementation.

7.3 Re-building
- Rebuild façade in same location and with same relationship to adjacent buildings and the sidewalk.
- Rebuild using mortar compatible with type of stone to match original colour and appearance.
- Rebuild using the same spacing and tooling of mortar joints
- Rebuild using detailed inventory map of façade, following original locations of stone and original layout.
- Retain stones that can be repaired and re-used
- Replace damaged material beyond repair in two ways:
  - Stone damaged beyond repair should be replaced using the same type of stone matched to grain and colour —or— another compatible modern material such as cast stone, matched to grain and colour
  - Replacements should be consistent and be part of a reasoned approach, preserving the original intention of the façade design.
- Reconstruct other missing details of the facade, such as the cornice, the windows and the storefronts, with reference to archival material, and with designs and materials compatible with the original materials of the facade."
- Make any modern additions compatible but identifiably modern.
8.0 CONCLUSION
By conducting a visual condition report and a review of the structural report conducted by HALSALL Engineers, the conclusion is that #46-52 James Street North is in poor condition. There are multiple reasons:

- The choice of poor quality building mortar
- Damage by fire in 1923
- Poor quality re-building after the fire
- Major structural interventions mid-century
- A block of time left empty and unheated
- Water infiltration.

Significant amounts of heritage material on the interior of the building are no longer intact. Exterior materials have also seen damages. Significant repair of all portions of the structure is necessary to allow the building to continue to stand. However, the existing stone components of the façade, although damaged, can be restored and re-built. There is a satisfactory amount of archival information available depicting the façade to allow for restoration.

There are two decisions that can be made and in each scenario the restoration of the façade should be undertaken.

- The building can be completely re-habilitated which would involve re-building large portions of the structure and would also involve dismantling, restoring and re-building the façade, or
- The base building could be demolished, a new structure re-built in the footprint and the façade dismantled, restored and re-built in its original location.

The second scenario allows a more affordable approach to the re-purposing of this building but still allows the most recognized portion, its façade, to be maintained and restored. Despite the significant damages to the structure, the façade of #46-52 James Street North can be retained in its original location and the essential flavour of the historic streetscape of this section of James Street North can be maintained.

Carolyn Samko
Heritage Conservation Consultant, B.A., DipHC
June 22nd 2010.
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