SUBJECT: Recommendation to Designate 191 Barton Street East, Hamilton, Under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (PED05197) (Ward 2)

RECOMMENDATION:

(a) That the designation of 191 Barton Street East as a property of cultural heritage value pursuant to the provisions of Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, 1990, be approved.

(b) That the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value and Description of the Heritage Attributes, attached as Appendix A to Report PED05197, be approved.

(c) That Corporate Counsel be directed to take appropriate action to designate 191 Barton Street East under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, in accordance with the Notice of Intention to Designate, attached as Appendix B to Report PED05197.

Lee Ann Coveyduck
General Manager
Planning and Economic Development Department

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

At a special City Council Meeting, February 3, 2004, Council approved the following motion: “that Staff be directed to begin discussions with the HHSC to ensure the “Smart-Turner Building” on Barton Street East is designated as a Heritage Building under the Ontario Heritage Act and that any future development on the site retain the character and architectural integrity of the building.” The property at 191 Barton Street East, containing a one-storey stone building dating 1876-1877 (known as the Smart-Turner
Building), has been evaluated against a number of criteria and is concluded to be worthy of heritage designation (see Location Map attached as Appendix C-1 to Report PED05197). Through designation, the building will be recognized as an important resource for the community and the alterations to the historic resource will be managed through the Heritage Permit process to ensure that the changes required for the adaptive reuse preserve the past while building for the future.

BACKGROUND:

At their meeting February 3, 2004, Council directed staff to ensure that the building at 191 Barton Street East, Hamilton, be designated under the Ontario Heritage Act. This direction was the result of discussions on the future redevelopment of lands at Wellington Street North and Ferguson Ave North (Report ECO03006c and FCS03076a), at which time the Hamilton Health Sciences presented a proposal for the lands. The Council motion was: “that Staff be directed to begin discussions with the HHSC to ensure the “Smart-Turner Building” on Barton Street East is designated as a Heritage Building under the Ontario Heritage Act and that any future development on the site retain the character and architectural integrity of the building.”

At its meeting on June 24, 2004, the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) discussed designation with Beth Manganelli, Director of Economic Development, Hamilton Health Sciences. Further discussions were held in July 2005 between Planning staff and the Hospital Family Houses of Ontario, the charitable not-for-profit organization that will be purchasing the property from HHSC.

Following on this direction of Council, a Cultural Heritage Assessment of the property was prepared and presented to the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) in August 2005 (attached as Appendix C to Report PED05197). At the request of the Hospital Family Houses, the Committee deferred the consideration of the staff report and recommendation in order to provide the organization time to complete their environmental assessment of the lands. An environmental assessment was undertaken in August 2005 concluding that no soil remediation would be required. The Hospital Family Houses submitted a report (attached as Appendix D to Report PED05197) and made a presentation as a delegation at the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) meeting of October 27, 2005. The Committee considered the draft report and concurred with the recommendation to designate the property.

ANALYSIS/RATIONALE:

The intent in designating property is to enable a process of cultural resource management and conservation of identified, valued heritage features. This is usually undertaken through the consideration of subsequent heritage permit applications for alterations and additions to a property.

Designation is typically guided by the process of cultural heritage evaluation and assessment. The process, as evidenced in the attached Appendix C to Report PED05197, attempts to clearly identify those heritage values associated with a property.
Those properties with clearly defined and distinctive heritage attributes are considered to be more worthy of designation than those where heritage attributes are poorly demonstrated or non-existent.

Following the completion of the cultural heritage assessment that included detailed architectural and historical analysis and evaluation of the subject property, it was determined by the Inventory and Research Subcommittee and heritage staff that there is sufficient cultural heritage value associated with this property to warrant designation under the Ontario Heritage Act.

As the building is currently being considered for adaptive reuse that will necessitate the conversion of the former industrial building into a living space (short-term stay, hotel-like accommodations), it is anticipated that physical changes to the building fabric will be undertaken. It is important to note that alterations to designated buildings under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act are allowed. These changes are assessed through the Heritage Permit process. Changes that will most likely be required by the potential future owners include additional openings for light to penetrate the internal space. Also required would be a new entrance, which will result in an addition or additions to the existing structure.

This proposed adaptive reuse of this former industrial building would allow for the preservation of the past, while building for the future. Recycling of buildings has become a common occurrence in communities which strive for environmental sustainability. The most successful built heritage adaptive reuse projects are those that best respect and retain the building’s heritage significance and add a contemporary layer that provides value for the future. Adaptive reuse is sometimes the only way for a building’s fabric to be properly cared for where a building can no longer function with its original use (as is the case with the Smart-Turner Building).

For these reasons, it is acknowledged that alterations and additions will be considered in the future through the Heritage Permit process. In ensuring successful and viable adaptive reuses to heritage buildings, with each heritage permit, staff considers the best conservation approach, while weighing financial implications of each option.

**ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION:**

Under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, the designation of property is a discretionary activity on the part of Council. Council, as advised by its Municipal Heritage Committee, may consider two alternatives: agree to designate property or decline to designate property.

**Decline to Designate**

The alternative of declining to designate is not recommended for the following reasons: the process for designation of this property was instigated at the request of Council in February 2004 when staff was directed to ensure the designation of the building within the redevelopment of the lands at Wellington Street North and Ferguson Avenue North;
the detailed Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (attached as Appendix C to Report PED05197) provides evidence of the historic and architectural importance of the building in the City of Hamilton; and, the sensitive management of identified heritage resources is identified in the City’s Official Plan. Accordingly, staff does not consider this an appropriate alternative as it would not be in keeping with the “Triple Bottom Line” which, among other values, makes a commitment to supporting and enhancing cultural heritage.

For the most part, designations in the City of Hamilton have taken place due to the initiation of, and with the consent of, the owner of the property. The case of 191 Barton Street East is unique in that the request for designation was put forward by Council in consultation with the owner. While it has been the general practice in the City of Hamilton for the owners’ support for designation, this is not required under the legislation. A recent court decision (Divisional Court File No.: 189/03) has shown that Municipal Councils must consider designation even if the owner is not in support of that designation. (Tremblay v. Lakeshore (Town), 2003 CanLII 6354 (ON S.C.D.C.)). In this case, a group of concerned citizens asked the Town of Lakeshore to designate a building under the Ontario Heritage Act. A number of Town Council meetings ensued, during which the Town refused the designation. The Town took the position that it could not entertain a request without the consent of the owner. It was determined by the Superior Court of Justice that requiring the consent of the owner is not consistent with an overall reading of the Ontario Heritage Act or its purpose. Indeed, the Act contemplates notice to the owner, possible objections, and a hearing process. Accordingly, in requiring the consent of the owner as a pre-condition to designation, the Town placed an unreasonable obstacle on its own discretionary powers thereby fettering its discretion and aborting the process intended by the Act.

**FINANCIAL/STAFFING/LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:**

Financial - Not applicable.

Staffing - Not applicable.

Legal - The designation process will follow the requirements of the Ontario Heritage Act and provide for adequate notice of Council’s intention to designate the property to the owner and the Ontario Heritage Foundation. Formal objections may be made under the Ontario Heritage Act and heard before the Conservation Review Board, prior to Council approving the designating By-law.

**POLICIES AFFECTING PROPOSAL:**

Official Plan policies of the City of Hamilton support the conservation, protection and management of cultural heritage features. It is intended that those resources of historic, architectural, archaeological and aesthetic merit will be preserved, where feasible, to retain the City’s distinctive character. It is further intended that the appropriate measures be established to meld preservation with rehabilitation to ensure that these
resources will be recycled for active use. Designation of 191 Barton Street East will be in accordance with these policies.

In addition, Setting Sail, the West Harbour Secondary Plan, further defines the policies regarding heritage resources within this area. This Plan specifically refers to the importance of the industrial history and the preservation of these important remnants of the past (Section A.6.3.2.7). A photograph of the building at 191 Barton Street East is included in this report and Section A.6.3.5.3.3 v) states: Redevelopment shall incorporate the preservation, restoration and reuse of the historic building on Barton Street.

RELEVANT CONSULTATION:

Pursuant to Subsection 29 (2) of the Ontario Heritage Act, Council is required to consult with its MHC respecting designation of property under Subsection (1). At its meeting of August 25, 2005, the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) considered this request for designation, together with a staff report and cultural heritage assessment. The recommendation was deferred at the request of the representatives of Hospital Family Houses.

At their meeting October 27, 2005, the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) recommended that Council designate the subject property and that staff be directed to take appropriate action in this regard.

Further consultation took place between Planning staff and the current owner (Hamilton Health Sciences) and future owner (Hospital Family Houses of Ontario) of the property. The Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) discussed the issue with Beth Manganelli, Director of Economic Development, Hamilton Health Sciences at its meeting on June 24, 2004. Planning staff met with representatives of the Hospital Family Houses of Ontario organization in July 2005 and October 2005 to discuss the designation process and to explain that the designation would not restrict their goal of stabilizing and re-using the building for a new use.

CITY STRATEGIC COMMITMENT:

By evaluating the “Triple Bottom Line”, (community, environment, economic implications) we can make choices that create value across all three bottom lines, moving us closer to our vision for a sustainable community, and Provincial interests.

Community Well-Being is enhanced. ☑ Yes ☐ No
Arts, culture, archaeological and cultural heritage are supported and enhanced.

Designation helps conserve Ontario’s heritage, an irreplaceable resource. Protecting our heritage through designation strengthens a community’s identity and distinctiveness.

Environmental Well-Being is enhanced. ☑ Yes ☐ No
Waste is reduced and recycled.
It has been estimated that the rehabilitation of older buildings consumes 23% less energy than new construction, therefore, the drain on renewable and non-renewable resources is significantly lower than for new construction. The conservation of designated properties reduces the strain on dump and landfill sites where up to 60% of available space is currently filled with demolition and construction waste. Conservation of designated properties is more economically and environmentally sustainable than new construction, and the reuse of historic resources utilizes existing infrastructure.

**Economic Well-Being is enhanced.** ☑ Yes  ☐ No

Hamilton’s high-quality environmental amenities are maintained and enhanced.

Designated properties can be recycled as useful and economically viable components of the City. When buildings are rehabilitated, the projects are labour intensive, usually using local trades and materials, thus serving as ideal sources of employment and investments in the community. In addition, statistics show that designation maintains, if not boosts, the value of property.

**Does the option you are recommending create value across all three bottom lines?** ☑ Yes  ☐ No

Designation of properties creates value across all three bottom lines as noted above.

**Do the options you are recommending make Hamilton a City of choice for high performance public servants?** ☑ Yes  ☐ No

Designation and protection of the City’s cultural heritage resources exhibit Council’s commitment to an ongoing program of heritage management.
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191 Barton Street East, Hamilton

STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE AND DESCRIPTION OF HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES

Statement of Cultural Heritage Value

191 Barton Street East, containing the former Smart-Turner Building, possesses cultural heritage value expressed in its historical associations with the industrial growth of the City of Hamilton. The Smart-Turner Machine Company, a prominent manufacturer in the City, occupied the building for more than 90 years, starting at the turn of the twentieth century. The subject building, built 1876-77 as a malthouse, is a notable example of Victorian industrial vernacular stone architecture and it remains in its original location on Barton Street East providing insight into the physical and economic development of that area of the City. The building is a landmark on the streetscape and retains its original architectural configuration of a one and one-half storey stone building with gambrel roof and dormer windows. The property has potential archaeological value related to both the former industrial remnants and precontact settlement activity.

Description of Heritage Attributes

All elevations and the roof, including all facades, entranceways and window openings, together with the stone construction material and the building features of the former Smart-Turner building, specifically:

South (Front) Elevation
- Rubble stone façade and all window and door openings
- Cut stone window and door lintels and sills
- Gambrel roof with dormer windows

East (Side) Elevation
- Exterior wall

West (Side) Elevation
- Exterior stone wall and window openings

South (Rear) Elevation
- Exterior stone wall and window and door openings
- Gambrel roof with dormer windows
The lands, which have high archaeological potential, specifically:

- buried soil-horizons
- buried historical remnants
CITY OF HAMILTON

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO DESIGNATE

191 Barton Street East, City of Hamilton

IN THE MATTER OF THE ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT and the property in the City of Hamilton known municipally as 191 Barton Street East

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City of Hamilton intends to designate this property as being a property of cultural heritage value.

Statement of Cultural Heritage Value
191 Barton Street East, containing the former Smart-Turner Building, possesses cultural heritage value expressed in its historical associations with the industrial growth of the City of Hamilton. The Smart-Turner Machine Company, a prominent manufacturer in the City, occupied the building for more than 90 years, starting at the turn of the twentieth century. The former Smart-Turner Building, built 1876-77 as a malthouse, is of cultural heritage value as a notable example of Victorian industrial vernacular stone architecture and it remains in its original location on Barton Street East providing insight into the physical and economic development of that area of the City. The building is a landmark on the streetscape and retains its original architectural configuration of a one and one-half storey stone building with gambrel roof and dormer windows. The property has potential archaeological value related to both the former industrial remnants and precontact settlement activity.

Description of Heritage Attributes
All elevations and the roof, including all facades, entranceways and window openings, together with the stone construction material and the building features of the former Smart-Turner Building and the lands, which have high archaeological potential.

The complete description of heritage attributes may be viewed in the Office of the City Clerk, 2nd Floor, City Hall, 71 Main Street West, during regular business hours.
Any person may, within 30 days after the date of publication of this Notice, serve written notice of his or her objection to the proposed designation together with a statement for the objection and all relevant facts.

Dated at Hamilton, this ______ day of ______, 2005.

K. Christenson
City Clerk
Hamilton, Ontario
CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT REPORT

191 Barton Street East

City of Hamilton

Smart-Turner Building

Prepared by Sharon Vattay, Cultural Heritage Planner
Community Planning and Design Section
(Heritage and Urban Design)
Development and Real Estate Division
Planning and Economic Development Department

for the City of Hamilton LACAC
(Municipal Heritage Committee)

August 2005
CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT REPORT: A READER’S GUIDE

This cultural heritage assessment report is prepared as part of a standard process that assists in determining the cultural heritage value of properties and their prospective merit for designation under the Ontario Heritage Act.

This report is divided into eight sections.

Section 1 comprises an introduction.

Section 2, Property Location, briefly describes the physical location, legal description and dimensions of the property.

Section 3, Physiographic Context, contains a description of the physiographic region in which the subject property is located.

Section 4, Settlement Context, contains a description of the broad historical development of the settlement in which the subject property is located as well as the development of the subject property itself. A range of secondary sources such as local histories and a variety of historical and topographical maps are used to describe settlement history the subject property’s key heritage characteristics. Primary sources such as oral histories are sometimes used.

Section 5, Property Description, describes the subject property’s key heritage characteristics that provide the base information to be used in Section 6.

Section 6, Cultural Heritage Evaluation, comprises a detailed evaluation of the subject property using the three sets of evaluation criteria: archaeology; built heritage; and, cultural heritage landscapes.

Section 7, Cultural Heritage Value: Conclusions and Recommendations, comprises a brief summary of the Cultural Heritage Evaluation and provides a list of those criteria that have been satisfied in determining cultural heritage value. It also contains a recommendation as to whether or not the subject property should be designated under the Ontario Heritage Act.

Section 8, Bibliography, comprises a list of sources used in the compilation of the report.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

This cultural heritage assessment examines the heritage attributes of the property located at 191 Barton Street East in the City of Hamilton (commonly referred to as the Smart-Turner Building), comprising a one and one-half storey industrial stone structure constructed circa 1876-77. The building is included on the City of Hamilton’s Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.

The property has been evaluated according to a set of criteria, which was endorsed by the City of Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee on June 19, 2003, and is used to identify the cultural heritage values of a property and to assess their significance. This evaluation assists in determining a property’s merit for designation under the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.O.18, as amended by the Government Efficiency Act, 2002.

2.0 PROPERTY LOCATION

The subject property at 191 Barton Street East is currently identified as Part of Lot 112, Lots 113 to 120, Part of Lots 121 to 124 and Part of Lots 126 to 129 on Plan 287, and is defined historically as part of Concession 1, Lot 13 of the former Barton Township. The property is situated on the north side of Barton Street, just east of Ferguson Avenue North (refer to Location map attached as Appendix C-1, Figure 1). The property has a lot frontage on Barton Street East of 87.58 metres (287.33 feet) and a lot depth of 114.3 metres (375 feet), for a total area of 0.902 hectares (2.23 acres). It contains a one and one-half storey stone building, the principal focus of this cultural heritage assessment.

3.0 PHYSIOGRAPHIC CONTEXT

The subject property is located within the physiographic region known as the Iroquois Plain, and is situated at the southwest terminus of historic “Land’s Inlet” located immediately to the north. (Appendix C-1, Figure 2 – Map of Burlington Bay) This inlet formed the eastern boundary of the headland on which Sir Allan MacNab’s Wharf was situated. The property is between approximately 82 and 84 metres (270 to 277 feet) above sea level. Both the flat Iroquois Plain and the now-filled water lots on the original southern shore of Hamilton Harbour are now

---

1 City of Hamilton GISNet, Municipal Property Assessment Rolls (as assessed in June 2005).


4 Ibid.
densely industrialized and urbanized areas of the City of Hamilton.\textsuperscript{5}

\section*{4.0 SETTLEMENT CONTEXT}

\textbf{First Nation Settlement}

With the favourable physiographic setting and ameliorating climate, the Iroquois Plain and Hamilton Harbour have attracted human settlement for over 12,000 years. Prehistoric Native settlement of this area occurs early with Paleo-Indian and Early Archaic Cultures (12,000-7,000 BP). Middle and Late Archaic (7,000-3,000 BP) population sizes increased, more substantially in the following Woodland period (3,000-500 BP), typified by large Native villages interspersed with seasonal cabin and hunting sites.\textsuperscript{6}

The intensity of the prehistoric occupation is partially represented by the density of archaeology in the immediate locale. There are eighteen registered archaeological sites within five kilometres of the subject property, encompassing small campsites through to large villages, and spanning Early Paleo-Indian to late-Woodland Neutral and Iroquoian cultures, in addition to historic Euro-Canadian occupations.\textsuperscript{7} Typically, these occur close to watercourses, beside Cootes Paradise, or, on nearby historic estates.\textsuperscript{8}

Additional unregistered but reported sites are present in areas not yet archaeologically assessed: the registered sites were identified during the survey for nearby infill developments, utility corridors, and research in Cootes Paradise.\textsuperscript{9} It is likely that sites in the immediate vicinity of the subject property were destroyed without being recorded during the historical settlement and modern redevelopment of the City of Hamilton, while any in close proximity to this portion of Land’s Inlet would be capped by historic fill.

\textbf{Euro-Canadian Settlement}

\textit{The City of Hamilton}

\textsuperscript{5} The Iroquois Plain and the original historical inlets on Hamilton Harbour are related to the glacial waters of Lake Iroquois, the pre-cursor of present-day Lake Ontario. Watercourse erosion began with the drop of Lake Iroquois levels due to the drainage of Lake Algonquin, approximately 10,400 years ago, and subsequently the inlets became flooded valleys with the rise of Lake Ontario to modern levels. The historic landscape would have comprised a bluff overlooking the flooded inlet, now a filled water lot as part of Hamilton’s industrial harbour district. M.J. Dear, J.J. Drake and L.G. Reeds. \textit{Steel City: Hamilton and Region} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1987): 23.


\textsuperscript{7} Ontario Ministry of Culture. Archaeological Sites Database (current to January, 2004).

\textsuperscript{8} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{9} Ibid.
In 1786 the first Euro-Canadian settlers reached the Head-of-the-Lake, the future site of Hamilton. Laid out into a formal grid of lots and concessions by land surveyor Augustus Jones in 1791, the area was named Barton Township by Lieutenant Governor John Graves Simcoe. The first lots were awarded by the Crown as grants to United Empire Loyalist settlers, with most of these properties allocated between 1796 and 1802. Concession 1, Lot 13, the location of the subject property, was one small part of a large Crown Patent awarded to Colonel Ralfe/Ralph Clench, a Niagara District Court judge who served under General Isaac Brock in the War of 1812. Clench received a total of 610 acres stretching from present day Wellington Street to Bay Street, from Main Street, north to the shoreline. In 1802 Concession 1, Lot 13 was included in the land transfer of 175 acres to Peter Ferguson—an early settler who farmed the land and erected his home at the corner of Cherry Street (now Ferguson) and Robert Street (one block southwest of the subject property).

When Hamilton was incorporated as a Town by the Legislative Council of Upper Canada in 1833, the boundaries were Wellington Street on the east, Queen Street on the west, Burlington Bay on the north, and present day Aberdeen Avenue on the south. The majority of the lands were primarily in agricultural use, including the Ferguson property at Concession 1, Lot 13, which eventually was transferred to Ferguson’s son, Archibald.

Hamilton was in the position for incorporation as a city in 1846. Having experienced an era of prosperity and expansion in the 1830s and early 1840s, Hamilton became “the largest and most important centre south and west of Toronto.” Continued population and commercial growth was fuelled by the arrival of the railways—the Great Western Railway in 1852 and the Hamilton and Lake Erie Railroad in 1872. After suffering through a brief economic depression in the 1860s, Hamilton again experienced rapid growth during the late Victorian period, accelerating to an unprecedented pace during the industrial expansion of the 1880s and 1890s. The success of Hamilton as an industrial resulted from its geographical location with respect to raw materials, proximity to markets, low costs of power and transportation, and a plentiful and skilled labour supply. It was during this time that the subject building was constructed.

---


13 The 1850-51 Map of the City of Hamilton in the County of Wentworth, Surveyed and drawn by Marcus Smith includes the annotation “the Late Archibald Ferguson Farm.”

**Barton Street**

Until the second half of the nineteenth century the large tract of land owned by the Ferguson family running north-south between Mary and Wellington Streets (Concession 1 and 2, Lot 13) remained largely undeveloped, serving mainly an agricultural purpose. The land was, in fact, difficult to develop, given the numerous river beds and creek inlets that cut through the property. (Appendix C-1, Figure 3 – Map of Hamilton, 1842)

Barton Street was laid out across the Ferguson property in 1837 when some of the freeholders of the town petitioned the Board to have the 1st and 2nd Concession roads of Barton Township through Lot 13 opened up. Shortly thereafter, a few buildings were erected on Barton Street, these being mainly to the west of Mary Street on the north side of Barton. (Appendix C-1, Figure 3 – Map of Hamilton, 1842) Occupied mainly by labourers, the neighbourhood was primarily industrial with a number of factories in the immediate vicinity—such as the Canada Sewing Machine Works at Barton and Mary Streets.

By the mid-nineteenth century, city lots were laid out in this eastern section of the city—at first only to the east and west of the Ferguson lands, that is, west of Mary Street and east of Wellington Street, and, mainly south of Barton. (Appendix C-1, Figure 4 – 1850-51 Map of Hamilton) Twenty years later, by the 1870s, the Ferguson lands had been subdivided and construction began on a number of buildings along Barton Street, including the property that is the subject of this assessment. (Appendix C-1, Figure 5 – Wentworth County Atlas, 1875) Also developed at this time was the new City and County Gaol, erected in 1872, on a plot of land on the north side of Barton Street, just west of Ferguson. Later in 1882, the City Hospital would be erected on Barton at Victoria.

Further development in this area occurred when the Hamilton & Lake Erie Railway Co. (established 1869) laid their tracks through the former Ferguson tract, crossing Barton Street at Cathcart Street (immediately adjacent to the subject property). This track followed in part the river beds northward across the property.

**Site at 191 Barton Street East**

Located between the train tracks and Ferguson Avenue, the property at 191 Barton Street East was undeveloped until the 1870s. The earliest buildings on the property were workers’ housing and shops for trades, such as blacksmiths, scale makers and engineers—indeed the entire stretch of Barton Street East was

---

15 Campbell (1966): 75.

16 Campbell (1966): 133.

populated with skilled trades and craftsmen of varying kinds, this due to the proximity of numerous manufacturing and commercial ventures.

The site at 191 Barton Street East was a highly desirable location for industrial development. Not only did the Hamilton & Lake Erie Railway line run adjacent to the property, but the main Grand Trunk Railway line ran east-west just a few blocks north of Barton Street. This allowed for the companies operating at the site to have ready access to the shipping and receiving of goods and raw materials.

The stone building at 191 Barton Street East was built between 1876 and 1877 by the maltster, William Osborne. (Appendix C-1, Figure 6 – Bird’s Eye View, 1876) The building was thus most likely used for the purpose of germinating and drying the malt. The earliest known malt houses were simple structures with massive stone walls with floors of stone. Small windows set in these heavy walls were the only means of ventilation.

In 1884, Osborne entered into a partnership with Joseph H. Killey, an engineer with a business in Hamilton, forming the Osborne, Killey Manufacturing Company, manufacturers of engines, boilers, steam fire engines and scales. At this time a number of foundry buildings were constructed on the site and the original malt house was easily adapted to the manufacturing use given its large floor-plate and open concept plan. (Appendix C-1, Figure 7 – Bird’s Eye View, 1893)

The former malt house became the home of the Smart Eby Company in 1900. Founded in 1899 by William G. Smart and Albert H. Eby, the Smart Eby Machine Company Limited manufactured engines and boilers in the stone building at 191 Barton Street East. In 1902 the company was renamed Smart-Turner, with William G. Smart serving as President and John A. Turner serving as Vice-President, until succeeding Smart as President upon his death in the 1930s. At the time of its incorporation, Smart-Turner was among a small group of machinists operating in the City of Hamilton, among them the Hamilton Tool and Optical Co., Limited on Murray Street, and the George Webster Company on King Street East—neither of which exists today.

By 1910 the Smart-Turner Company employed 75 skilled mechanics and was considered to be standing at the head of the many large and substantial industries of Hamilton in the importance and immensity of its business interests—no small feat given that Hamilton was one of the greatest manufacturing centres in Canada. Smart-Turner was the leading producer of pumping machinery of all kinds, not only in Hamilton but across the country.

---


19 Vernon’s City of Hamilton Directory, 1901.


The Smart-Turner plant on Barton Street East soon expanded beyond the 1876-77 stone building as is evidenced in the 1911 Fire Insurance Plan. (Appendix C-1, Figure 8) According to the 1910 Souvenir Edition of the Magazine of Industry, the company operated out of “a group of strong stone buildings erected for this heavy work, having an enormous floor space and the best and most modern machinery installed in all departments.”

The 1876-77 stone building was, by this time, used as the pattern storage, while the machine shop was located in a long narrow brick building behind (this building is no longer extant).

The company continued to expand during WWII and again in 1960 when it briefly amalgamated with the Hamilton-Thomas Corporation of Hamilton, Ohio. This merger broadened the product lines manufactured at the plant and, as evidenced on the 1964 Fire Insurance Plan, numerous additions were appended to the brick buildings to the rear of the plant and the original stone building (the subject of this assessment) was used as barrel storage, in association with the Erie Steel Barrel Company. (Appendix C-1, Figure 9 – Fire Insurance Atlas, 1964)

By 1968 the plant consisted of 40,000 square feet of space and employed 60 people.

In 1996 the Smart-Turner Building ceased being used as an industrial building and was later purchased by the Niagara Peninsula Aboriginal Area Management Board with the intention of converting it to an aboriginal entrepreneurial centre, but the plan was never completed. The company itself continued to operate elsewhere under new ownership and currently the Smart-Turner Pump Company maintains its head office, plant and main sales office in Brantford, Ontario.

Contemporary Context

The building at 191 Barton Street East is the last vestige of the large industrial complex that once dominated this area of Barton Street. All of the ancillary buildings on the site have been demolished—many after a fire in the 1990s—and the former industrial lands directly across Barton Street are also vacant. The extent of building demolition and subsequent disruption of subsurface historic

---


23 Hamilton Spectator, 18 April 1962; and 7 January 1960. The President, W.A.T. Gilmour, the nephew of J.A. Turner, brought the company back into sole Canadian ownership in 1962. Another merger created the Smart-Turner Hayward Limited company in 1964 (Hamilton Spectator, 17 June 1968). Hayward owned the company until the end of the 1970s, at which time the company reverted back to the Smart-Turner name.

24 Hamilton Spectator, 17 June 1968.

archaeological features is unknown. It is conjectured that there may still be subsurface remains of this nineteenth century industrial complex on site.

The context continues to be largely industrial to the north of Barton Street, while some commercial and institutional development has taken place immediately to the east of the subject property. To the west, the Barton Street Jail stands on the location of the former 1872 Gaol.

5.0 PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

Stylistic Analysis

The property at 191 Barton Street East comprises a masonry load-bearing, one and one-half storey industrial building of rubble fieldstone construction with an asphalt shingled gambrel roof with five dormers. (Appendix C-1, Figure 10) The building is unadorned in keeping with its utilitarian and industrial use. The designer of the building is unknown.

The industrial building type is primarily a modern development—it has only been since the middle of the eighteenth century that buildings for manufacturing were built. The introduction of manufacturing on a large scale during the Industrial Revolution precipitated the need for this new building type.

Of utmost importance in the programme of the industrial building type was the efficient layout of the space for the manufacturing or assembly operations—vertical or horizontal building forms were dictated by the type of manufacturing undertaken in the building. However, in the case of 191 Barton Street East the building was erected for the purposes of malting and therefore the architectural prototype is that of the rural vernacular tradition of malting houses. As noted, malt houses were simple structures with substantial stone walls and small windows.

Nineteenth century industrial buildings tend to have regular grid of fenestration, bay by bay. In this instance the building is 9 bays wide. The gambrel roof provides usable space above the main ground floor level. The long, narrow rectangular nature of the building allowed access to window walls which then lit the interior of the building. The ideal plan was to open the floor space up as much as possible to allow for the maximum amount of well-lit, usable work space.

Given the loss over time of a number of early industrial buildings, the subject property serves as an excellent example of early industrial vernacular architecture in Hamilton.

26 This description is based solely on an external analysis. Access was not available to the interior of the building at the time of writing.
Materials

The power and strength of these industrial buildings was emphasized in the materials—in this case, stone. Indeed many architectural theorists of the modern period felt that factories should look simple and solid.

Hamilton was for many years known as the city of stone buildings with a wealth of supply quarried locally from the escarpment. Numerous skilled stone masons had emigrated to Hamilton and by 1851, 43% of the stone masons in Hamilton were Scottish. Indeed the Scottish played a major role in the development of Hamilton, both commercially and architecturally, their legacy architecturally being evident in the number of stone buildings erected in the nineteenth century. Hamilton’s “Stone Age” came to an end when a depression hit in the late 1850s and 1860s—brick replaced stone as the building material of choice to suit the Victorian style of architecture.

The use of stone at 191 Barton Street East creates a forceful architectural expression. With decoration all but absent and only the punctuations of window and door openings to provide relief, the stone walls become the building’s dominant motif.

The subject building in fact exists as a rare surviving example of industrial stone architecture. Stone buildings with a similar use—for example, the Grant-Lottridge Brewing Company at Bay and Mulberry Streets—no longer exist.  

Building Description

Front (South) Elevation

While built for an industrial purpose, the building is rather domestic in its character. The primary façade is set close to the street and the scale is comfortably domestic.

The fenestration is of a somewhat symmetrical arrangement—slight variations such as the width of one door and of one window have altered this symmetry. (Appendix C-1, Figure 11) Two entrance doors flank a set of three windows and two further window openings complete both the east and west ends of the building for a total of nine openings. Cut stone, of various finishes, defines the sides, sills and lintels of these openings (some of the stone sills have been replaced). (Appendix C-1, Figure 12 and 13) Currently all of these openings are boarded over and the original window and door styles are not known, although it is probable that the windows were double-hung sash windows and that the doors had transom lights. The only architectural embellishments are the stone corbels at the east and west ends at the roofline. (Appendix C-1, Figure 14) The soffit reveals a simple timber frame roof construction. (Appendix C-1, Figure 15) The roof, now shingled in asphalt, was most likely originally of wooden shingles.

**Side (East) Elevation**

The east elevation, which faces the culvert that forms the former train track route, has been covered with a corrugated metal material masking the material underneath. (Appendix C-1, Figure 16) The partial basement is visible at the rear of this elevation.

**Side (West) Elevation**

The west elevation is a dominant feature of the building, clearly visible on approaches from the west. The large stone wall is relieved only by four symmetrically placed window openings (also currently boarded over). (Appendix C-1, Figure 17)

**Rear (North) Elevation**

The rear elevation has been altered over time as is evidenced by the bricking-up of some openings. Currently one entrance door, most likely a former a window, is asymmetrically located with five window openings on the western end of the building. A larger window opening to the east of the door has been closed in. (Appendix C-1, Figure 18) The rear elevation has four dormer windows as opposed to the five on the front façade.

A slightly sloping site to the northeast exposes the partial basement on the northeast corner of the building.
6.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE EVALUATION

Since 1975, Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act primarily concerned itself with the designation and hence protection and management of buildings of architectural or historic value or merit. Since amendment in 2002, the Ontario Heritage Act now enables municipalities to designate property of cultural heritage value or merit that is real property including buildings and structures.

On June 19, 2003, the City of Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee endorsed a set of evaluation criteria for use in assessing cultural heritage resources. The application of these criteria assists in determining the cultural heritage value of a property and its prospective merit for designation under the Ontario Heritage Act. The subject property has been evaluated against these criteria (Archaeology, Built Heritage, and Cultural Heritage Landscapes) as follows:

6.1 ARCHAEOLOGY

Identified or potential archaeological resources can be considered as values meriting inclusion into the Reasons for Designation of a property. A set of twelve criteria is used to evaluate an archaeological site. The criteria assist in measuring the archaeological potential of a property and determining what attributes warrant designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.

The first eleven criteria for evaluating an archaeological site are predicated on the presence of an archaeological site. In the case of the subject property, it contains no registered archaeological sites.

As a result, only the archaeological potential criterion applies in this assessment, as noted below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Definition: Not Applicable</th>
<th>Site Setting: Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporal Integrity: Not Applicable</td>
<td>Site Socio-political Value: Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size: Not Applicable</td>
<td>Site Uniqueness: Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Type: Not Applicable</td>
<td>Site Rarity: Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Integrity: Not Applicable</td>
<td>Site Human Remains: Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Association: Not Applicable</td>
<td>Archaeological Potential: Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Archaeological Potential

The subject property contains a one and one-half storey stone building and surrounding lot, situated in an urban industrial context first developed in the nineteenth century. Based on the history and intensity of commercial activity both on the subject property and in the area overall, the lot has experienced disturbance arising from the infilling of Land’s Inlet, the installation of civic infrastructure, building construction and demolition. The property is located in an area of very high archaeological potential, as it is situated adjacent to the infilled
Land’s Inlet, a likely location for historic and prehistoric settlement and activities. The potential for deeply buried archaeological resources remains very high as similar areas in both Cootes Paradise and Hamilton Harbour were frequently reoccupied during prehistoric and early historic times. Archaeology associated with the construction and use of the Smart-Turner Building and associated nineteenth century industrial activity located elsewhere on the subject property, is likewise of high potential.\textsuperscript{28}

These factors warrant a description of the property as being of “very high archaeological potential”, and therefore this criterion has been satisfied.

### 6.2 BUILT HERITAGE

A set of twelve criteria is used to identify and assess the built heritage values of property. Of the twelve, ten of the criteria were applicable. Of the ten criteria, six have been satisfied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Associations</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thematic: Applicable</td>
<td>Location Integrity: Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event: Not Applicable</td>
<td>Built Integrity: Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person and/or Group: Applicable</td>
<td>Environmental Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture and Design</td>
<td>Landmark: Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Merit: Applicable</td>
<td>Character: Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Merit: Applicable</td>
<td>Setting: Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designer: Not Applicable</td>
<td>Social Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Perception: Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### HISTORICAL ASSOCIATIONS

**Thematic**

The subject property is associated with the industrial growth of the City of Hamilton, which plays a significant role in the city’s history and its economic and social development. Originally erected as a malt house, the building was subsequently adaptively reused as part of an evolving industrial pattern of development from 1870 through into the late twentieth century. Accordingly, this criterion has been applied and is satisfied.

**Event**

There are no known significant events associated with the subject property. Therefore, this criterion is not applicable.

\textsuperscript{28} The former buildings on site are defined on the 1911 Fire Insurance Plan. Refer to Figure 8.
Person and/or Group

While the building was initially owned and occupied by the maltster William Osborne and then by a number of machinists, the building was for the most part occupied by the Smart Eby Machine Company and then Smart-Turner, a prominent and noteworthy manufacturer of heavy machinery in the City of Hamilton. Smart-Turner occupied the building for over 90 years. Accordingly, this criterion has been applied and is satisfied.

ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN

Architectural Merit

The subject building is a notable example of the Victorian industrial vernacular building type, a type whose survival is quite rare. It is also a fine example of stone construction, which was once a dominant building form in the City of Hamilton. Accordingly, this criterion has been applied and is satisfied.

Functional Merit

While the materials and method of construction are notable in the history of the industrial vernacular building type, the subject building no longer serves its original function. Therefore this applied criterion has not been satisfied.

Designer

The subject building is not associated with a notable designer, architect, engineer or builder, although it may have been the work of the Scottish stonemasons who figured prominently in the mid-nineteenth century building industry in Hamilton. Therefore this criterion is not applicable.

Integrity

Location Integrity

The subject building remains in its original location on Barton Street East and thus serves to mark the location of a formerly industrial area. This provides insight into the physical and economic development of the area. The continued presence of this former industrial building contributes to the sense of place. Accordingly, this criterion has been applied and is satisfied.

Built Integrity

The subject building retains its original architectural configuration of a one and one-half storey stone building with gambrel roof and dormer windows. Alterations from its original form are minimal. There have been no unsympathetic additions that obscure or detract from the original building fabric. Some damage to the stone is
evident, notably on the south façade at the foundation level, and the roof (which is likely a replacement material from the original) is in a poor state of repair. Even so, this applied criterion has been satisfied.

Environmental Context

Landmark

The subject building is a visually conspicuous feature in the area and may be considered a landmark on Barton Street East, being prominent on the streetscape for over 120 years. Its setting close to the street and its stone construction contributes to its highly visible character. Accordingly, this criterion has been applied and is satisfied.

Character

The subject building is located in an area that has experienced an evolution of the built environment and does not have a cohesive character. The area comprises a variety of structures of various historical periods. A modern jail structure that replaced the nineteenth century structure stands to the west and further to the east, the Hamilton General Hospital. This building’s relationship with the character of the environmental context and its surroundings is compromised by the vast changes that have occurred since the mid-nineteenth century. Accordingly, this applied criterion has not been satisfied.

Setting

The setting of the subject property has been altered from its original as most of the ancillary buildings of the Smart-Turner plant, once located in the rear, have been demolished. Buildings to the immediate west of the building have also been demolished leaving an empty lot on the west side. Similar changes have taken place across Barton Street East where further industrial structures once stood. Accordingly, this applied criterion has not been satisfied.

SOCIAL VALUE

Public Perception

The subject property is included in the former City of Hamilton’s Inventory of Buildings of Historical and/or Architectural Interest. It has been considered an important component of Hamilton’s industrial heritage. Therefore, this criterion has been applied and is satisfied.
6.3 CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPES

Cultural Heritage Landscapes can be considered as values meriting inclusion into the reasons for designation of property. A set of nine criteria is used to determine which cultural heritage landscape values and attributes, warrant designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act as a Cultural Heritage Landscape.

The application of criteria for designation of a property as a Cultural Heritage Landscape depends upon the property’s characteristics. Types of cultural heritage landscapes that have been identified for prospective inventory and evaluation work are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farm complex</th>
<th>Waterscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamlet</td>
<td>Railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial core/streetscape</td>
<td>Abandoned road r.o.w.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial complex</td>
<td>Public park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery/church/rectory or other religious complex</td>
<td>Private garden/estate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadscape</td>
<td>Agricultural fairground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only the 0.902 hectare (2.23 acre) lot containing the building is being evaluated. Accordingly, the subject property is not considered to be a cultural heritage landscape for the purposes of this assessment and evaluation.

7.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Conclusions

191 Barton Street East, the former Smart-Turner Building, possesses cultural heritage value vested primarily in its built heritage attributes. Also, based on the above review of the designation criteria, archaeological potential is considered a heritage value for 191 Barton Street East. Specifically, archaeological potential is to be considered a feature of designation in close proximity to the building, former buildings and in buried soil horizons capped by fill across the property.

The subject property satisfies the following evaluation criteria pertaining to built heritage:

**Thematic:** The subject property is associated with the industrial growth of the City of Hamilton, which plays a significant role in the city’s social and economic history and development.

**Person and/or Group:** The subject property was occupied by the Smart-Turner Machine Company, a prominent and significant industry in the City of Hamilton, for
over 90 years. The historical associations with this industry provide a strong argument for heritage designation.

**Architectural Merit:** The subject building is a notable example of the Victorian industrial vernacular building type and of stone architecture, which was once a dominant building form in Hamilton.

**Location Integrity:** The building remains in its original location on Barton Street East and thus provides insight into the physical and economic development of that area of the city.

**Built Integrity:** The subject building retains its original architectural configuration of a one and one-half storey stone building with gambrel roof and dormer windows. Alterations from the original are minimal. Additions have not compromised the original building fabric.

**Landmark:** The subject building may be considered a landmark on Barton Street East being visually prominent on the streetscape for over 120 years. Its setting close to the street and its stone construction makes it highly visible.

**Public Perception:** The subject building is included in the former City of Hamilton’s *Inventory of Buildings of Historical and/or Architectural Interest*. It has been considered an important component of Hamilton’s industrial heritage.

### 7.2 Recommendation

The building located at 191 Barton Street East, Hamilton, the former Smart-Turner building, is concluded to be a property of cultural heritage value for the purposes of the *Ontario Heritage Act* and is recommended for designation under Part IV of the Act.
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HOSPITAL FAMILY HOUSES OF ONTARIO
Report to the Municipal Heritage Committee
City of Hamilton
October 20, 2005

RECOMMENDATION

That the Municipal Heritage Committee defer the issue of cultural heritage designation of the Smart Turner building at 191 Barton Street East, until April 2006 to enable Hospital Family Houses of Ontario to develop a plan for the building, for its use as the Mark Preece Family House and report back to the Committee at that time.

BACKGROUND

The Municipal Heritage Committee voted at its August 2005 meeting to defer the decision of cultural heritage designation of the Smart Turner Building. This decision was made to allow time for Hospital Family Houses of Ontario (HFHO) to receive the Environmental Phase 11 Site Assessment Report on the property at 191 Barton Street East, obtain more information on the viability of the building, and report back to the committee in October.

CURRENT STATUS

The Environmental Phase 11 Site Assessment Report was received. Findings in the report noted that results were innocuous on the property surrounding the building, that the site can be filled and capped, and that the Mark Preece Family House project could proceed as a hotel facility, which meets an industrial/commercial land use; the approved use specified in the report.

The next step is to confirm that the cost of using the current building, as opposed to building a new structure, is a sound use of donated dollars and good stewardship of donor investment which has been given to provide accommodation and support to families. HFHO has not yet done this work.
The following process and analysis would enable HFHO to make that decision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
<th>RESPONSIBILITY</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HFHO Board approval to allocate up to $10,000 to engage specialists to do required analyses of the building and technical reports.</td>
<td>Board, Staff, Project Consultant; Specialists (e.g., Quantity Surveyor/cost consultant, Structural engineer (foundations), Structural engineer (wood framing), Masonry (stone rubble) repair/restoration expert.)</td>
<td>November 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation work and subsequent reports</td>
<td>Staff, Project Consultant, analysis (prepare elemental cost analysis to reuse the structure vs building new) e.g., Structural, mechanical, electrical, architectural, masonry, concrete, finishes, site services</td>
<td>November/December, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report to HFHO Board, review and redesign/changes of plans to meet building and site conditions</td>
<td>Board, Staff, Project consultant, Architect</td>
<td>January/February, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval by HFHO Board</td>
<td>Board, Staff, Project Consultant</td>
<td>March 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to HHS</td>
<td>Board, HHS representatives</td>
<td>March 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to Municipal Heritage Committee</td>
<td>HFHO, HHS</td>
<td>April 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BENEFITS OF THIS APPROACH**

A collaborative approach on behalf of the City of Hamilton, Hospital Family Houses of Ontario, and Hamilton Health Sciences would enable HFHO to present a plan for the Mark Preece Family House to the Municipal Heritage Committee, based on sound research and true costs of adapting the historic structure to an adaptive use prior to designation. We need to demonstrate that an historic warehouse can be transformed into a “home away from home”. This plan could expedite the efficiency of the process for HFHO and the City over the long term. It could mean that using the opportunity for proactive planning, we may be able to minimize the need for additional permit applications and potential costs of time and other resources. It would be a more proactive solution than to be required to be back and forth to the Committee and Council. It would be preferable to having a designation now, and potentially a confrontational relationship between the City, the property owner (HHS) and the potential user/owner; Hospital Family Houses of Ontario.

**CONCLUSION**

Hospital Family Houses of Ontario, a charitable not for profit organization has raised over $500,000 over the past eight years to provide a service to families of patients in hospital; the Mark Preece Family House. The organization is a steward of the public trust. It is imperative that resources of funds, staff and volunteers are utilized to the best advantage to achieve our mission. We ask to have the opportunity to present our findings and plan to the Municipal Heritage Committee before the designation is made.