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**SUBJECT:** Register of Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and the City’s Heritage Inventory (PED08053) (City Wide)

### RECOMMENDATION:

(a) That the City of Hamilton continue to maintain and manage the *Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest* as the current data base respecting built heritage properties in the City;

(b) That Council directs staff to prepare a work program detailing a pilot study of inventoried properties in Downtown Hamilton in order to review and update data on these properties contained in the *Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest* including field surveys, data compilation and other appropriate documentation;

(c) That Council directs staff to prepare a budget submission for the work described in Recommendation (b), to be brought forward as part of the 2009 budget deliberations;

(d) That Council directs staff and the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) to review the findings of the pilot study described in Recommendation (b) and report back to Council advising on:

(i) Appropriate nominations of non-designated heritage properties to the Register of Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest under the *Ontario Heritage Act* for short-term protection against demolition;

(ii) Priority properties that may be worthy of designation under the *Ontario Heritage Act* for long-term conservation purposes;

(iii) Public consultation procedures respecting Recommendations (d)(i) and (d)(ii); and,
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(iv) Further actions, programs and initiatives necessary to update data on remaining heritage properties in the *Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest* on a City Wide basis and to establish any priorities for further registering or designating of properties under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

(e) That Council directs staff and the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) to continue to update the data in the City of Hamilton’s Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest on an ongoing basis as time and existing resources permit.

(f) That Council requests the Ontario Minister of Culture to consider extending the time period that non-designated properties are afforded protection from demolition, when included in the register established under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, from 60 days to up to 180 days for the reasons identified in Report PED08053.

(g) That this matter respecting the Register of Buildings of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest be removed from the Outstanding Business list.

__________________________________________
Tim McCabe
General Manager
Planning and Economic Development Department

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

Up until the 2006 *Ontario Heritage Act*, municipalities that designated property under Part IV of the Act were obliged to include all details of that property designation and the designating By-law in a register that was to be maintained by the Clerk of the municipality. In essence, the register was maintained solely as an administrative, record-keeping device.

In 2006, the *Ontario Heritage Act* was amended to enable municipalities to include additional properties in the register that were not formally designated under the Act. The amended Act allowed inclusion of property that the Council of a municipality “believes” to be of cultural heritage value or interest. Once non-designated properties are included in the register, the Act provides that an owner of a property shall not demolish a building or structure on that property unless the owner gives the Council of the municipality at least 60 days notice, in writing.
In addition to simply being a record-keeping device, the municipal register may now potentially function as a conservation management tool by allowing temporary protection of non-designated properties from demolition.

This report reviews and examines the potential use of “registering” non-designated heritage properties as a conservation management tool and its potential for future use by the City. The staff report reviews the collection and use of heritage data by the six former local municipalities from 1975 to 2000, during which time approximately 6,800 heritage properties were identified. In particular, it highlights the use of that data for the establishment and administration of funding programs established by the former City of Hamilton in the Downtown Core from 1998 to 2001.

The effectiveness of including non-designated heritage properties in the register and its potential use as a conservation management tool is also evaluated. Staff has concluded that the 60-day delay of building or structure demolition may be generally ineffective for any form of focussed municipal action across the entire City.

Given the specific issues regarding the number of inventoried heritage properties in the Hamilton Downtown, the report also addresses the relationship between heritage conservation initiatives, the progress of new development and the potential effects of possible future inclusions in the register. Staff is advising that a one-year pilot or case study be initiated to re-evaluate those approximately 800 heritage properties (out of approximately 1,100 properties located in the Downtown) that are currently identified in the City of Hamilton’s Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest. This initiative will also include public consultation. The results of the pilot study, including staffing and volunteer costs and time involved, will be reviewed and reported back to Council for further direction on any future “registering” activities, not only within the Downtown but elsewhere in the City. The pilot study will require funding for temporary staff and must be considered as part of the 2009 budget deliberations.

Staff has also concluded that the City of Hamilton’s Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest regardless of municipal “registering” or “designating” activities continues to have merit as a valuable source of data about heritage properties. Generally, it represents a 25 year compilation of data and knowledge that has informed funding programs, provided the context for designations under Parts IV and V of the Ontario Heritage Act, as well as informed and educated the public. Staff is recommending that the legacy data in the inventory continue to be reviewed for accuracy, be actively maintained as an important planning tool, and updated as time and staff or volunteer resources permit.

**BACKGROUND:**

At Council’s meeting of September 12, 2007, correspondence was received from the Chair, Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) advocating the protection of heritage buildings by inclusion in the City’s “Register of Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest”. This matter was received and referred to the Economic Development and Planning Committee.
Since being proclaimed in 1975, the Ontario Heritage Act has enabled municipalities to designate properties either individually under Part IV or collectively as heritage conservation districts under Part V of the Act. The Act required that a municipality maintain a publicly accessible register of those properties designated under Part IV.

The register was originally required to contain a list of all these designated properties together with a legal description of the property, the name and address of the owner and a short statement of the reason for designation of the property. (This was amended in 2006 to a “statement explaining the cultural heritage value or interest of the property and a description of the heritage attributes of the property”). There is no other direction in the Act as to the form or content of the register. In 2005, the Act was amended to make provision for the inclusion of designated heritage conservation districts under Part V of the Act, as well as any properties designated by the Minister of Culture.

Currently, the City of Hamilton has 241 Part IV designated properties and 355 Part V properties (contained within seven Heritage Conservation Districts), all of which now comprise the City’s “Register.” As required by the Act, the City’s “Register” contains the legal description of the property, the name and address of the property owner, and the By-laws for these designations, which includes the “Reasons for Designation” (as they were known prior to 2005) or the description of “Cultural Heritage Attributes” (as they are now known). Much of this information is also widely available to the public and property owners on the City of Hamilton’s website in the form of two publications: Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 1: List of Designated Properties and Heritage Conservation Easements under the Ontario Heritage Act and Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 5: Reasons for Designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. These publications are also available from the Planning and Economic Development Department.

The “Register” is held by the City Clerk, as required by the Act. Its primary function up until 2005 was as an administrative, record-keeping device that could be readily accessed by the public and property owners.

As part of several changes to the Ontario Heritage Act, municipalities may now include non-designated properties in the register where the municipality “believes” such property is of cultural heritage value or interest.

Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, Conservation of Property of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, clearly describes the function of the register in Section 27 as follows:

“27.(1) The Clerk of a municipality shall keep a register of property situated in the municipality that is of cultural heritage value or interest. 2005, c.6, s.15.

(1.1) The register kept by the Clerk shall list all property situated in the municipality that has been designated by the municipality or by the Minister under this Part and shall contain, with respect to each property,

(a) a legal description of the property;
(b) the name and address of the owner; and,

(c) a statement explaining the cultural heritage value or interest of the property and a description of the heritage attributes of the property. 2005, c.6, s.15.

(1.2) In addition to the property listed in the register under Subsection (1.1), the register **may include property that has not been designated** under this Part **but that the Council of the municipality believes to be** of cultural heritage value or interest and shall contain, with respect to such property, a description of the property that is sufficient to readily ascertain the property. 2005, c. 6, s. 15.

(1.3) Where the Council of a municipality has appointed a Municipal Heritage Committee, the Council shall, before including a property that has not been designated under this Part in the register under Subsection (1.2) or removing the reference to such a property from the register, consult with its Municipal Heritage Committee. 2005, c.6, s.15.”

With these most recent amendments to the Ontario Heritage Act, non-designated properties included in the City “Register” are afforded protection from demolition for a period of up to 60 days. Section 27 provides as follows:

“(3) If property included in the register under Subsection (1.2) has not been designated under Section 29, the owner of the property shall not demolish or remove a building or structure on the property or permit the demolition or removal of the building or structure unless the owner gives the Council of the municipality at least 60 days notice, in writing, of the owner’s intention to demolish or remove the building or structure or to permit the demolition or removal of the building or structure. 2006, c.11, Sched.B, s.11(2).

(4) Subsection (3) applies only if the property is included in the register under Subsection (1.2) before any application is made for a permit under the **Building Code Act, 1992** to demolish or remove a building or structure located on the property. 2006, c.11, Sched.B, s.11(2).

(5) The notice required by Subsection (3) shall be accompanied by such plans and shall set out such information as the Council may require. 2006, c.11, Sched. B, s.11(2).”

The potential 60 day delay period allowable under the **Ontario Heritage Act** for non-designated properties included in the register was anticipated by the Province as permitting the municipality time to pursue conservation options, most notably to begin the designation process.
ANALYSIS/RATIONALE:

The following section of this report examines these new register provisions of the Ontario Heritage Act and a number of issues related to heritage conservation management and practice in the City of Hamilton, including the following:

- The efficacy of the 60 day demolition delay period afforded by “registering” as a conservation management tool;

- The history, development and use of the City of Hamilton’s *Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest*, and its potential use as basis for registering cultural heritage properties;

- The unique and specific challenges of registering cultural heritage properties and related conservation and development matters within the Hamilton Downtown core; and,

- A discussion of the relationship of the Inventory to Registering and Designating under the Ontario Heritage Act.

Adequacy of Interim Protection for Registered Properties Under the Ontario Heritage Act as an Effective Conservation and Management Tool

The most recent amendments to the Ontario Heritage Act (June 2006) enabled municipalities to include non-designated heritage properties to be included in the “Register of Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest”. The results of such “registering” was intended to provide short-term, interim, protection of heritage properties from demolition.

Owners of non-designated, registered, heritage properties must now provide the Council of a municipality with at least 60 days notice of their intention to demolish or remove a building or structure from a registered property. The 60 day period commences on the day that written notice is received by the City from the owner requesting permission to demolish. This 60-day period was enacted as a partial response to the changes to the Ontario Building Code Act, which took effect January 1, 2006. Accelerated building permit review timeframes under the changes to the Building Code Act allow little time for municipalities and their Municipal Heritage Committees to assess properties that are potentially of cultural heritage value and that face demolition.

The Ministry of Culture identified the purported benefits of maintaining such a Register as follows:

1. The register allows Council to recognize and endorse a list of properties of cultural heritage value in the community.

2. The register promotes knowledge and enhances an understanding of the community’s cultural heritage.
3. The register is a planning document that can be consulted by Council and all municipal departments when reviewing development proposals or permit applications.

4. The register provides easily accessible information about cultural heritage properties for land-use planners, property owners, developers, the tourism industry and the general public.

5. The register helps to prioritize future designations.

6. The register provides interim protection for listed properties.

The 60 day period under the Ontario Heritage Act for properties on the “Register of Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest” was intended to allow a municipality and their Municipal Heritage Committee time to pursue a number of options. These include:

- A period of time to allow for discussions with the owner respecting retention, adaptive re-use and any financial assistance.
- Interim protection allowing time for proper photo-documentation to be undertaken prior to demolition of the heritage resource.
- A period of time during which designation under the Ontario Heritage Act could be processed.

Since amalgamation, the City of Hamilton has issued approximately 974 demolition permits, and of these, approximately 94 were for properties contained in the Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest. In examining whether “registering”, is an effective heritage conservation management tool, planning staff has attempted to identify what might be reasonably accomplished during a 60 day time period. The 60 day limit on any demolition activity is certainly sufficient time to allow for discussions and photo-documentation and, to date, staff has been generally successful in recording or arranging for the recording of cultural heritage properties.

With respect to successfully processing and administering potential designations during a two-month time frame, it is doubtful that sufficient time exists to enable a comprehensive, sound and defendable process of designation to occur. Given staff’s existing work program, the City’s existing heritage staff complement is capable of processing approximately four (4) designations per year that include the following steps:

- Preparation of a detailed cultural heritage assessment research report that provides the rationale for designation and that satisfies the criteria established by regulation under the Ontario Heritage Act;
- Preparation of a designating By-law including a statement of cultural heritage value and an accompanying statement of heritage attributes;
In examining whether the two-month period is sufficient, staff has concluded that the above process, comprising a minimum of 8 weeks of in-house report processing (i.e., processing a report to Committees, and eventually Council, not including the time in preparing the cultural heritage assessment research and writing) and final publication of notices (minimum 1 week) is simply insufficient to designate property under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

Accordingly, staff concludes that the registering of non-designated cultural heritage properties respecting the prevention of demolition offers no measurable advantage and does not provide any critical advancement of heritage conservation objectives.

### The Former Municipal Heritage Inventories

Shortly after the passing of the *Ontario Heritage Act* in 1975, each of the former local municipalities of the amalgamated City of Hamilton began to undertake heritage surveys of buildings and structures. This work typically resulted in the compilation of “lists” or “inventories” of heritage properties. The properties included in the municipal inventories comprised a wide range of rural and urban properties and building types including residential, ecclesiastical, public and institutional buildings.

As there were no requirements under the *Ontario Heritage Act* for this type of heritage survey work, none of the former municipalities had their heritage inventories, or additions to the inventories, approved by their respective Councils. From review of the material now on file with the City, and communication with past Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee (LACAC) members, it is evident that all of the respective heritage survey and inventory work was “approved” through the respective municipal LACACs. Upon amalgamation, these lists were brought together by staff to form one data source for the entire amalgamated City and is now referred to as the City of Hamilton’s Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest. In 2002, it was published by the City as Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 2: Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest and was also included as an on-line resource accessible through the City’s web page.

Generally, this inventory has been used since amalgamation as a data base and resource tool for heritage properties in development planning, secondary and neighbourhood planning, environmental assessments, real estate matters, film shoots and property enquiries. Details of the purpose and compilation of the municipal inventory as well as the Federal inventory are described below.
Currently, the amalgamated City of Hamilton has approximately 6,779 properties on the inventory. These inventoried properties account for approximately 2.6% of the total number of structures in the City of Hamilton based on a total count of a minimum of 250,000 structures. (Source: Department’s GIS Support Services Team).

The inventory primarily contains data on “buildings” that exhibit architectural or historical attributes. “Buildings” of architectural and/or historical interest for the purposes of the inventory comprise a variety of features including dwellings, churches, town halls, mills, industrial buildings and commercial structures. These forms of built heritage incorporate not only classically designed public buildings and residential structures, but also more modest reminders of the past including farmsteads, worker’s housing and simple manufactories. Such features usually incorporate a diversity of architectural and stylistic variations, varied construction techniques and building materials, as well as a variety of historical associations with people, places, events or activities. Architectural attributes typically include examples of vernacular building, as well as polite architectural styles. Historical value includes associations with themes of historical human activity, events, groups or people.

For the purposes of this report, staff undertook an extensive review of the compiled data, photographic materials, and research that contributed to the formation of the inventory and that had been compiled by the respective municipal staff, professional advisors and volunteers. A brief summary of the survey results is provided below and examples of their property evaluation reports are attached as Appendix A.

Ancaster:

At the time of amalgamation, the Town of Ancaster had accumulated data on approximately 188 properties. The bulk of the survey work was completed during the period from 1976 to 1985 and comprised a compilation of separate research papers on each individual property. Many of these were extensive in scope and included photographs, historical and architectural descriptions, sketch maps and plans of property and building interiors.

There is no documentary indication as to the precise scope, program or priorities relating to compilation of the inventory. Evidence suggests that there are numerous buildings that were not subject to inventory and analysis, including notable heritage properties such as Mount Mary Academy (“Wynstay”), designed by nationally renowned architect John Lyle (High Level Bridge, Central Presbyterian Church), and the equally renowned landscape design firm of Dunington-Grub (Whitehern, Gage Park).

The data is currently boxed in six volumes and held on file in the Community Planning and Design Section.
Dundas:

By 2001, the former Town of Dundas had compiled data on approximately 329 properties. Commenced in 1978, the heritage property data was initially compiled by the members of LACAC. Each property was documented with information including a brief description of the property history together with reference to source material. The data is currently contained in individual property folders held on file in the Community Planning and Design Section.

It appears that an update was undertaken in 1994-95, but not to the same level of evaluation. These have not been included on the current City inventory. As with Ancaster, there is no documentary indication as to the precise scope, program or priorities relating to compilation of the inventory. The data is currently stored in two volumes and individual property file folders held by the Community Planning and Design Section.

Flamborough:

The former Town of Flamborough compiled an inventory of approximately 1,469 cultural heritage properties. Started in the mid-1970's, updates were regularly undertaken in 1982, 1991, 1997, 1998, and 2003, all under the supervision of the Flamborough LACAC, the Waterdown East Flamborough Heritage Society or the Flamborough Archives. Each property was photographed, dated, researched and documented. The inventory has been used and referenced as part of environmental assessments undertaken for Highway improvements (notably, Highways 5, 6 and 8), as well as background material for the Mill Street Heritage Conservation District Study. The inventory appears to be comprehensive, but may not have included ancillary rural structures such as barns and drive shed.

The data is currently contained in multiple volumes, together with a catalogued system of photographic documentation contained in acid free envelopes, all held by the Community Planning and Design Section.

Glanbrook:

The Township of Glanbrook’s inventory comprised approximately 417 properties at amalgamation. The data was compiled in 1984 by members of the Town of Glanbrook LACAC and summer students. The project was financially assisted through a Canada Works Grant, in the amount of $10,000. The data was compiled in a series of volumes and included multi-page detailed building and architectural descriptions of the buildings together with historical information. The original materials are currently held at the Glanbrook archives. Copies of the data are currently contained in two-volumes held by the Community Planning and Design Section.

There is an indication that this was intended to be comprehensive in scope.
Hamilton:

At the time of amalgamation, the former City of Hamilton had evaluated and included approximately 4,839 properties in the City’s inventory. Originating in the mid-1970’s, the inventory was regularly updated through recommendations from the City’s LACAC Research Sub-committee. Properties added to the list were researched by the City of Hamilton’s architectural historian and heritage staff and presented to the Research Sub-committee of LACAC. These volunteer Sub-committee members included practicing architects, heritage planners, academics and other knowledgeable individuals. Recommendations from the Sub-committee regarding the addition of properties to the inventory flowed through the Director of Planning to LACAC. From at least 1998, extensive criteria were applied to buildings prior to inclusion in the inventory, and prior to that, a three-page Heritage Inventory research sheet was completed.

The inventory data is contained in numerous files and extensive volumes and comprises historical research, architectural descriptions and photographic documentation, all of which is held by the Community Planning and Design Section.

Stoney Creek:

At the time of amalgamation the City of Stoney Creek had approximately 49 properties in their inventory. The data was continually updated with additions through recommendations from the Director of Planning to the LACAC, based on research undertaken by the research Sub-committee.

The Canadian Inventory of Historic Building

The Canadian Inventory of Historic Building was an architectural archive created and maintained by the National Historic Parks and Sites Branch of Parks Canada. At the time it was developed in 1970, this was a research tool of international reputation and had one of the most advanced computerized systems to survey a nation-wide stock of buildings.

The project was undertaken in collaboration with provinces and municipalities using a computerized architectural inventory form. It was intended as a research and planning tool that would permit the judicious assessment of buildings within a National context of the country’s built heritage. Over the course of the project, over 169,000 buildings were recorded, of which Ontario contained approximately 63,000. At the time of amalgamation the Canadian Inventory of Historic Building included 2,152 properties located in the amalgamated City of Hamilton. In 2003, it was published by the City as Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 3: Canadian Inventory of Historic Building.

Use and Validity of the City of Hamilton’s Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest

An inventory, by definition, constitutes a comprehensive identification, description, and aggregation of all resources, features or items. Any “inventory”, whether used in a commercial sense (quantities of goods in a store at any one time) or more broadly
“resources” existing in any geographical area, should be capable of answering two fundamental questions: What do we have? Where is it located? In planning for cultural heritage properties, these two questions are answered usually through a system of field survey, the results of which are recorded in some form of cataloguing device. The resulting inventory may then be used in a variety of ways for the purposes of planning and management. Many key provincial planning directives (see discussion under Policies Affecting Proposal later in this report) now see the compilation of inventories as a fundamental building block of a successful conservation strategy.

It is important to note that the heritage survey work and the lists formerly compiled by the municipalities were not consistent from one municipality to another, nor were they comprehensive in the scope of cultural heritage properties surveyed. For a number of reasons such as lack of staff and volunteer time, changing perceptions of what constitutes heritage value, nineteenth century heritage properties versus twentieth century heritage, for example, the data collected does not include all properties of cultural heritage value. Indeed, it may be construed that the approximately 7000 inventoried structures represents only a portion of the minimum 250,000 structures that exist within the City.

The current City of Hamilton’s Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest (the amalgamated data of the former six local municipalities), together with the property data contained in the Canadian Inventory of Historic Building, have been used successfully by municipal staff for the past seven years in a number of ways as follows:

- Data has been used as the basis for a variety of applications for designation under the Ontario Heritage Act. Using the research and other documentation, this data is often the starting point for more in-depth analysis and research to support the detailed description for designation description required by the Act.

- The inventory has been used by consultants in undertaking heritage assessment studies pursuant to the Environmental Assessment Act and related Class Environmental Assessment procedures. The data contained in the inventory often contributes to cost savings in consultant time.

- In matters under the Planning Act, the Provincial Policy Statement, and other planning legislation, approval authorities are specifically directed to consider heritage features in their deliberations and determination of applications on planning matters. The inventory, despite its non-comprehensive nature, is a sound first basis to flag those issues that may entail heritage concerns and to which the approval authority is obliged to balance or weigh in planning matters.

- Many inventoried heritage properties were the recipient of grant aid from the former City of Hamilton’s Core and Gore financial assistance programs to boost revitalization efforts during the 1998-2002 period (see later discussion).

- Private property owners, local historians, media, film companies and others routinely use the data, documentation and photographs for purposes of research and publication.
In using the former municipality's data over the past seven years, it is readily apparent to staff that the inherent quality of the data collected is sound and is capable of standing up to scrutiny. The matter of the inventory with respect to its comprehensiveness or simply the quantity of buildings, structures, features and properties surveyed is somewhat different. As some heritage surveys were undertaken only at one time or during a limited period (a static snapshot at a particular moment) and looked at only certain feature types, it may be surmised that the current inventory, despite its seemingly large numbers (in gross terms) may, in reality, be a conservative number. Current conservation practice and policies used by the Federal and Provincial governments suggest, for example, that any property that is over forty years old from the present day may have the potential to be of cultural heritage value. Recently engineered structures and “modern” buildings now routinely attract interest and actions to conserve and protect such structures. Examples include Veteran Housing, Ranch Style construction and buildings of the International Style.

Accordingly, staff has concluded that the evaluation criteria and standards of research and documentation that formed the basis of the inventory are generally consistent with current practice to maintain the validity of the established data. It is apparent that this current data represents a significant investment of many thousands of hours of staff and volunteer time over more than three decades. This material would be difficult and expensive to replicate. Staff is of the opinion that the data is sufficiently sound, such that it would satisfy the “believes” test in the Ontario Heritage Act, i.e., “that the Council of the municipality believes it to be of cultural heritage value or interest” and could be moved in its entirety to the register. Staff is not recommending this course of action and this is discussed later.

Any deficiencies in the inventory centre upon the lack of consistent monitoring or recent field checking to ascertain whether properties identified in previous years are still in the same condition as when originally recorded, e.g., that a rural Glanbrook property surveyed in 1984, for instance, actually still exists today (some rural farmhouses and barns may have succumbed to loss through fire) or that in urban situations some inventoried properties may have been physically altered beyond recognition since first being recorded. Ongoing field checking and monitoring by staff and/or volunteers would effectively address this issue.

Accordingly, staff is advising in Recommendations (a) and (e) that the City continue to maintain and manage the data base on an ongoing basis.

**Downtown Hamilton, inventoried heritage properties and the register**

Downtown Hamilton is bounded by Queen Street (west), Cannon Street (north), Wellington Street (east) and Hunter Street (south) and comprises approximately 1,069 parcels of land. The 2001 Council approved Secondary Plan for this area is founded upon “respecting design and heritage” and there are a number of supporting policies that seek to conserve and protect the heritage character of the Downtown. Given this broad mandate, City staff prepared a *Downtown Heritage Profile* (Unpublished staff document: 2001) to more fully understand the nature of this heritage conservation
interest. The profile identified 789 inventoried heritage properties that were located within the Downtown area, approximately 74% of the total land parcels.

The strategic implications of this relatively large proportion and the perception that the number of inventoried heritage properties could possibly affect or hamper new development in the Downtown core, particularly if included in the register, suggested that this area may require closer scrutiny and a more finely tuned management approach.

Accordingly, the following addresses the relationship between heritage conservation initiatives, the progress of new development and the potential effects of possible future inclusions in the register. A specific strategy is recommended that forms the basis for Recommendation (b), (c) and (d).

**Designations under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act**

Of the 789 properties that are contained in the City of Hamilton's *Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest*, and that are located in the Downtown, 24 properties (approximately 3% of the inventory and approximately 2% of the land parcels) have been designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, as follows:

- 72 George St.
- 107 George St.
- 111-113 Hughson St. North (Tivoli)
- 41 Jackson St. W (Whitehern)
- 28-50 James St. North (Lister)
- 42 James St. S (Sun Life)
- 52 James St. S (Bank of Montreal)
- 98 James St. S (James Baptist)
- 10 John St. S (Dominion)
- 66-70 King St. E (Victoria Hall)
- 276-278 King St. W (Commercial)
- 71 Main St. W (City Hall)
- 74 George St.
- 109 George St.
- 34-36 Hess Street South
- 163 Jackson St. West (CHCH)
- 36-40 James St. S (Pigott)
- 47 James St. S (Landed Bank)
- 64 James St. S (St. Paul's)
- 112-116 John St. N (Stewart Memorial)
- 35-41 King St. E (Right House)
- 320 King St. E (Commercial)
- 55 Main St. W (Carnegie Library)
- 14 Mary St. (Century Theatre)

Designation of these structures has not prohibited investment in or re-development of these properties and several have either been adaptively re-used (e.g., The Right House, the Pigott building and Whitehern) or enlarged and re-used for contemporary purposes (the former Carnegie Library as the Unified Family Court, the former Dominion Building as the John Sopinka Court House and the former Bank of Montreal for office space).

**Demolition of inventoried heritage structures**

With respect to the loss of heritage properties within the Downtown, staff is aware of twelve (12) inventoried structures that have been demolished since 2001 and four (4) that are expected to be demolished by 2008-9 as follows:
89 Park Street North: 2007, one residence (1890's); to allow for an extension of parking lot adjacent to Philpott Memorial Church.

14 Mary Street: 2004, industrial structure (1890's) Hamilton Brass Manufacturing; to permit the creation of a parking lot for new residential units within the adjacent designated property, 12 Mary Street, former Lyric/Century Theatre.

69 – 75 Mary Street: 2003, four residences (1890's); to facilitate site remediation on lands owned by MTO.

68 – 72 Catharine Street North: 2003, three residences (1890's); to facilitate site remediation on lands owned by MTO.

266-68 King Street East: 2006, Simcoe Hotel (1886); to permit construction of an apartment building.

270-280 King Street East: 2006, St. Denys Apartments (1911); to permit construction of an apartment building.

40 Bay Street South: 2007, McLaughlin Carriage Factory (1910); to permit construction of a Hilton Hotel.

120,124, 128-30 Hunter Street West: Expected in 2008-9; one 1917, one 1860, two 1890’s residences; to permit construction of an apartment building.

These losses represent approximately 2% of the 789 Downtown heritage properties.

Investment in inventoried heritage properties

The former City of Hamilton’s interest in promoting investment in the City’s downtown heritage properties was exemplified in the Core and Gore heritage programs (1998-2000) that made grant funds available to owners of both designated and inventoried heritage properties. By the time the two programs were wound down in 2003, approximately $558,000 had been invested in direct grant aid to 32 inventoried heritage properties (approximately 4% of 789 properties). These grants spurred not only investment in caring for heritage property, improving building condition and the appearance of the core, but also in providing employment for local contractors and the trades. These heritage properties were seen as assets to the Downtown and a vital component of downtown renewal initiatives.
Accordingly, a clear and measurable benefit of investing in these heritage properties is that it aids and assists in the overall development and enhancement of the Downtown and does not harm or prejudice future development.

**Heritage impact assessments and inventoried heritage properties**

The Downtown Secondary Plan, approved in 2001, provides for heritage impact assessments (HIA) to be undertaken when it is anticipated that designated or properties contained in the inventory may be impacted directly or indirectly by development activity that is subject to Planning Act approvals. The requirements for City HIAs are discretionary. Planning staff has judiciously utilised these provisions only when complex planning and heritage conservation issues need to be fully examined and documented.

In the matter of properties contained in the City of Hamilton’s *Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest*, the requirement for a HIA has been required only once in the past seven years at 120,124, 128-30 Hunter Street West. The HIA explored the potential for retention and incorporation of heritage residences into new apartment construction. Staff recognizes that these studies have the potential to involve additional cost, but in the overall financing of planning studies associated with land development activities, these costs are not considered to be a prohibitive expense.

Given the small number of HIA’s that have been undertaken over the past seven years, it can be concluded that the existence of heritage buildings and properties, their inclusion as data in the City of Hamilton’s *Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest*, and the discretionary use of HIA’s as part of the development approvals process, does not jeopardize development opportunities.

**Updated survey and analysis for informed decision making within the Downtown**

Three-quarters of the Downtown Core is composed of heritage structures. It is highly likely that most redevelopment and renewal efforts will directly or indirectly have to address heritage conservation issues as a matter of course, now and in the long-term future of the Downtown. This will occur either as part of matters directly related to the Ontario Heritage Act, specifically or more generally to those issues that arise from required approvals under the Planning Act and directives contained in the Provincial Policy Statement 2005.

As the Council approved Downtown Secondary Plan is founded upon “respecting design and heritage”, and there are now a number of heritage based financial incentive programs being advanced by the City, it is important that these be supported by an updated survey of heritage structures to enable informed advice and decision making within the Core. Using the data that resides in existing City files, together with heritage evaluation criteria and a consistent method of data collection and recording, staff is recommending that a pilot study be initiated and undertaken for 2009 that will update the existing data contained in the City of Hamilton’s *Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest* as it pertains to the Downtown Core and have a number of objectives:
- Compile an updated, consistent and comprehensive survey of cultural heritage properties within the Downtown Core;
- Undertake a field survey;
- Prepare a new inventory of consistent data sets;
- Analyse and identify from the new and updated inventory those properties and structures that may be under threat and suitable for inclusion in the register as non-designated properties affording short-term protection from demolition;
- Identify cultural heritage properties that may be suitable candidates for formal designation under Parts IV and V of the Ontario Heritage Act;
- Undertake appropriate public consultation to solicit views and advice on any statutory initiatives; and,
- Review and assess the results of the pilot project as the basis for determining the application of the survey and inventory techniques across the entire City.

Accordingly, staff is recommending (in Items b, c and d in the Recommendation portion of this report) that the City budget appropriate resources to support such an initiative for 2009. If this initiative is approved, staff will prepare a work schedule, an appropriate inventory program and evaluation criteria, together with project terms of reference for commencement in 2009.

**Relationship of the Inventory to Registering and Designating under the Ontario Heritage Act**

The City of Hamilton’s *Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest* is an important body of data that has been compiled over a quarter of a century. As data, it carries no legal encumbrance. The data when appropriately used, as noted previously, guides and informs a variety of heritage conservation, management and planning activities. Importantly, the inventorying, registration and designation of cultural heritage properties should not be conceived or misconstrued as distinct and different levels of heritage significance or importance. The *Ontario Heritage Act* makes no such differentiation. It is also erroneous to assume that the relationship between an inventoried, registered or designated property is simply one of a linear progression of advancement from one form to another.

By way of clarification, an inventoried heritage property is simply an assemblage of data with no inherent encumbrances relating to its status. A non-designated heritage property, once registered under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, is subject to a legislated conservation technique that enables a limited macro-management of heritage buildings, essentially a short-term prohibition against demolition. A heritage property, when formally designated under the Act, enables the micro-management of that property through the heritage permit application process with a long-term objective to protect and conserve heritage buildings material and the designated structure.
Accordingly, the relationship of the inventory to registering or designating is analogous to the inventory being literally a hub of data, from which many “conservation management” spokes radiate including the provisions of the Ontario Heritage Act, the Planning Act, the Environmental Assessment Act, the Provincial Policy Statement, the Niagara Escarpment Plan, the Greenbelt Plan, Places to Grow, and so on. Each management “spoke” is used or called into appropriate action as each particular planning or development circumstance dictates. The process of inventory, registering and designating can be seen as independent, but inter-related, conservation management strategies. It is expected that the pilot study previously referred to will amplify and clarify these relationships.

**ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION:**

Staff has examined three alternatives as follows:

1. **Do Nothing**

   The “do nothing” or *status quo* alternative assumes no pro-active action. The City’s “Register of Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest,” currently satisfies its required function as required by statute and provides a record-keeping device of the 241 individually designated properties under Part IV and the 355 properties designated in the City's seven (7) Part V Heritage Conservation Districts. (225 James Street South that was formally assigned to the Register in Summer 2007 as a non-designated heritage property was subsequently demolished and no longer forms part of the Register). Accordingly, the Register would continue to serve its record-keeping function with the possibility of occasional nominations of non-designated heritage property being made by the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee). It is assumed that this may occur as a reaction to individual situations where property may be threatened in some manner. There would be no formal program of proactive registering. The current *Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest* would continue to be used by staff as a data source and serve its function as described earlier (see Page 11).

   These inventoried properties, being neither non-designated nor non-registered, would not be legally protected from demolition. The City would not be able to legally enforce any delay of demolition above and beyond the provisions of the Building Code Act and any other applicable City By-laws. Limited experience to date has shown that property owners will either demolish a structure regardless of any statutory or municipal provisions (Dynes Tavern), or willingly provide adequate enough time for potential recording (225 James Street South) or exploration of other conservation options.

   This option gives the appearance of not being pro-active and advancing heritage conservation objectives. It does not entail any substantial financing costs for new staffing or building an enhanced or new program.
2. **Transfer the current Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest into the Register**

This alternative entails the integration of the existing inventory into the Register. This would acknowledge the extensive amount of surveying, research and analysis devoted to the listing process by the Municipal Heritage Committees, staff and volunteers of the former municipalities, over the past 30 years. In preparing this report, Heritage staff has reviewed the files, research, documentation and other materials, and believes that the evaluation and criteria, although not necessarily consistent among the municipalities, is of a generally consistent quality to satisfy the test provided in the Act for registering: the amended Act allows inclusion of property where the Council of a municipality “believes” it to be of cultural heritage value or interest.

It appears that none of the former municipalities formally consulted with the owners prior to including properties in their inventories. This is not unexpected as data collection carried no encumbrances. There are no provisions in the Act that stipulate that the owner be notified of any municipal actions with respect to inclusion in the Register. Additionally, the Act does not provide any appeal or hearing process to evaluate objections to or support for the registering of property.

If this alternative was acted upon (and regardless of the Act being silent on this matter), public notification could be initiated in two ways:

- Newspaper advertisements describing the function of the Register, the consequences of being included and directing property owners to supporting information on the City’s website, or at City Clerks, together with a description of a municipal hearing process, if appropriate; and,

- Individual notification by mail-out to all affected property owners, together with a description of the ramifications of registering and a description of a municipal hearing process, if appropriate.

Assuming a municipal hearing process was initiated by the City, requests for removal from the list could be considered based on either:

- Property owners providing adequate documentation that the property and structure(s) do not have any cultural heritage value or interest; or,

- Property owners providing documentation showing that the structure(s) no longer exist.

This alternative is a recognizably pro-active heritage strategy and meaningfully builds upon the investments of staff and volunteer time over the past quarter century from 1975 to 2000. Over the long term, it does not entail any substantial financing costs for new staffing or founding an enhanced or new program. The efficacy of the register as an effective management tool would still remain in doubt.
as the 60-day demolition delay period remains questionable as a reasonable duration of time to pursue meaningful conservation objectives.

In the short term, depending on the public response (either objecting to or in support of registering initiatives), there may be substantial staff time and costs in adjudicating and advising Council on additions to or deletions from the register.

It is anticipated as part of this alternative that new research, data collection and inventory work would continue as part of Planning staff’s work program, together with participation by volunteers. Future additions to the register could be brought forward on annual or semi-annual basis with opportunities for public input.

3. Re-evaluate the current Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest undertake new inventory work and included in the Register

This alternative generally sets aside all the inventory work and data collected previously due to its inconsistent format, but uses the property addresses as the basis for the re-evaluation of the current inventory by staff and further review by the Research and Inventory Sub-committee of the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee). Assuming this is completed within three years (see details below), staff would then commence a second and new stage of comprehensive field survey work, possibly on a two-to three year time frame.

This alternative would have to proceed in a multi-phased approach over a number of years as follows:

**Phase 1**

- All 6,779 non-designated heritage properties currently contained in the City’s Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest, together with those heritage properties contained in the Canadian Inventory of Historic Building and located within the City, would be evaluated and assessed as to their cultural heritage value for prospective nomination to the Register of Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest as enabled under Subsections 27 (1.1) and (1.2) of the Ontario Heritage Act.

- In order to maintain consistency, traceability and transparency heritage criteria for the evaluation and assessment of non-designated heritage properties would be derived from the three general categories contained in Ontario Regulation 9/06 namely, design or physical value, historical or associative value, and contextual value.

- The re-evaluation and assessment of all the previously inventoried heritage properties could be undertaken over an initial three year period on a priority basis with the Hamilton Downtown and surroundings, being considered as the priority area in 2009, the City’s other downtowns and surrounding residential
areas as priorities in 2010 and the rural area in 2011 (approximately 2000 properties being examined every year).

- The work described above is beyond the capacity of existing heritage staff and funds would have to be made available though the City's 2009 budget deliberations for the establishment of two (2) temporary full-time staff positions and associated expenses to be committed for a period of three years. It is anticipated that this would result in annual staff costs of $130,000, and expenses of $30,000, totalling approximately $500,000 in total program costs. Alternatively, consultants could be retained for such work, which would result in substantially higher costs, possibly doubling required funding for this work.

- It is anticipated that as part of Phase 1, staff and the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) would report back on an annual basis in 2009, 2010 and 2011 with advice and recommendations respecting nominations of the non-designated heritage properties to the Register. As part of the evaluation and assessment process, staff would also notify and consult with affected property owners including the use of newspaper advertisements, individual notification and public information centres. Public comments and input would then be considered in recommending non-designated properties to the Register, as well as identifying priority properties for designation.

**Phase 2 and beyond**

- Assuming further inventory work is undertaken involving structures from the 1920's to the 1950's, it is probable, (as a conservative estimate), that an additional 4,000 potential properties could be subject to evaluation and assessment. Assuming similar costs of Phase 1, this would result in additional program costs of approximately $320,000. Similar processes of data collection, evaluation and public notification employed in Phase 1 would be used again in Phase 2.

- On completion of Phase 2, it is anticipated that any new additional research, data collection and inventory work would continue as part of Planning staff's work program, together with participation by volunteers. Future additions to the register could be brought forward on an annual or semi-annual basis with opportunities for public input.

This third alternative is a recognizably pro-active heritage strategy and assumes a comprehensive, consistent, traceable and transparent approach. It partially builds upon past staff and volunteer time from 1975 to 2000. Over the long term, possibly a five year program, it entails new financial costs for staffing and the founding of an enhanced and new program.

The efficacy of the register as an effective management tool as with previous alternatives would still remain in doubt. The creation of a “state-of-the-art” data base, however, would satisfy a number of provincial conservation and planning directives. The data base, if suitably incorporated to the City’s GIS, as well as
being available on line to the public, researchers, consultants and other professionals could potentially realize longer term benefits in cost savings in planning staff time in its plans review functions, bringing certainty to other planning and economic initiatives and generally responding to consultant and public enquiries.

**FINANCIAL/STAFFING/LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:**

**Financial:** The staffing of a short term pilot project for the Downtown core, advised in Recommendation (c), would be subject to detailed review as part of the preparation for the 2009 budget. If the pilot project focused only on the Downtown and not the surrounding areas as well, it is expected that this would not exceed $100,000 for 1 FTE, which includes project expenses such as public consultation, graphic and report printing.

**Staffing:** Additional staff resources, as noted above, would be required to undertake the pilot project in Recommendations (b) and (c). The management of any public participation program, any appeals process and addressing support and objections from affected property owners would also require the time commitment of existing staff.

**Legal:** Section 27 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* enables municipalities to include property that has not been designated under, but that Council of the municipality believes to be of cultural heritage value or interest on the “Register of Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest.” The recommendations would not contravene any legislative provisions of the Act.

**POLICIES AFFECTING PROPOSAL:**

**Provincial Planning Directives and Policies**

The Planning Act recognizes cultural heritage conservation as a key component of good land use planning and lays out a process through which this translates into local policy. Section 2 of the Act provides an extensive listing of those matters of provincial interest that shall be regarded when certain authorities, including the Council of a municipality, carry out their responsibilities under the Act. Such responsibilities include all land use planning activities, such as the processing of development applications and policy development. One of these provincial interests (Subsection 2(d)) is directly concerned with:

“The conservation of features of significant architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological or scientific interest...”
The Planning Act is the legislative basis, not only for discrete planning activities detailed in the Act, but also for the provincial issuance of policy statements. Policy statements, assembled as the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) (2005) further identify matters of provincial interest and provide policy direction which municipalities must implement at the local level. All municipal actions under the Planning Act must be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.

The PPS clearly delineates the wise use and management of cultural heritage and archaeological resources as a provincial interest, and thus an important consideration for municipal planning policy development and decisions:

*The Province’s…cultural heritage and archaeological resources provide important environmental, economic and social benefits. The wise use and management of these resources over the long term is a key provincial interest.*

Those PPS policies of particular relevance for the conservation of cultural heritage resources are found in *Section 2, Wise Use and Management of Resources:*

*Ontario’s long-term prosperity, environmental health, and social well-being depend on protecting natural heritage, water, agricultural, mineral and cultural heritage and archaeological resources for their economic, environmental and social benefits.*

The PPS significantly influences the manner in which municipalities approach cultural heritage resources, including alterations not only to the heritage resources themselves, but also to adjacent properties. Accordingly, Subsection 2.6 sets out provincial policy regarding cultural heritage and archaeological resources:

2.6.1 Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.

2.6.2 Development and site alteration shall only be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential if the significant archaeological resources have been conserved by removal and documentation, or by preservation on site. Where significant archaeological resources must be preserved on site, only development and site alteration which maintain the heritage integrity of the site may be permitted.

2.6.3 Development and site alteration may be permitted on adjacent lands to protected heritage property where the proposed development and site alteration has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved.
Mitigative measures and/or alternative development approaches may be required in order to conserve the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property affected by the adjacent development or site alteration.

The PPS defines “conserved” to mean:

*The identification, protection, use and/or management of cultural heritage and archaeological resources in such a way that their heritage values, attributes and integrity are retained. This may be addressed through a conservation plan or heritage impact statement.*

The notion of “identification” as part of meaningful action directed to conserve clearly supports the concept of inventorying such resources, features and properties and their “protection” through a variety of other mechanisms.

The Greenbelt Act (2005) is one of the key elements of the Provincial Government’s agenda to protect greenspace and agricultural land in the Greater Golden Horseshoe (GGH). The Greenbelt Plan (2005), issued under the Greenbelt Act, generally protects natural heritage features and agricultural land within the GGH from urban development. Municipal Official Plans must conform to the Greenbelt Plan. The Plan designates certain lands around the periphery of the City of Hamilton as Protected Countryside Area, where the intent is to permanently protect environmentally sensitive areas and agricultural land while supporting agriculture, and providing opportunities for recreation and natural resource extraction. There are also designations under the Greenbelt Plan for Towns and Villages, as well as Hamlets, and some areas in the east of the City of Hamilton which are Tender Fruit and Grape Lands.

As part of this protection mandate, Section 4.4 of the Plan, *Cultural Heritage Resources*, states that for lands within the Protected Countryside Area the following policies shall apply:

1. *Cultural heritage resources are defined as man-made or natural features, including structures, objects, neighbourhoods, landscapes and archaeological sites that have been identified as significant by the local municipality or the province for being meaningful components of a community’s cultural heritage or identity.*

2. *Greenbelt municipalities should work with aboriginal groups and other stakeholders to identify and protect cultural heritage resources and plan toward maintaining, developing and using these resources in a manner that will benefit the local community and be compatible with the Greenbelt’s vision and goals.*
3. **Municipalities should build cultural components into their municipal plans and planning processes, including creating inventories of cultural heritage resources** and planning for their ongoing protection and appropriate use. Municipal cultural plans should draw from and promote an integrated vision of local cultural development that emphasizes connections across the full range of arts, heritage, cultural industries, libraries, and other cultural activity.

The Greenbelt Plan’s directive to municipalities to inventory their cultural heritage resources is also consistent with the intent of the PPS’s definition of “conserved”.

The **Places to Grow Act (2005)** provides the legal framework for provincial designation of a geographic area of the province as a growth plan area and the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2006), which addresses population growth, economic expansion, and the protection of valuable environmental and agricultural lands. Municipal Planning Act and Condominium Act decisions must conform to the Growth Plan and municipal official plans must be brought into conformity with it by June, 2009. The Growth Plan for the GGH outlines a vision and strategy for where and how the region should grow over the next 30 years. Given that the GGH comprises a broad array of unique cultural heritage features and sites, the Growth Plan states that these valuable assets must be wisely protected and managed as part of planning for future growth. Recognizing that there exists a variety of policy and planning initiatives, the Plan seeks to build on these by advocating “a culture of conservation”.

Section 4.2.4 of the Plan specifies that municipalities will develop a culture of conservation through the implementation of official plan policies and other strategies that support the conservation of cultural heritage and archaeological resources as built-up areas are intensified.

The recommendations of this report would be in keeping with these provincial policies.

**Regional Official Plan and Local Official Plan Policies**

The Official Plan for the former Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth contained a policy commitment to the preservation, maintenance and protection of significant heritage resources (Section 9.2) and provided the context for action at the local tier of government.

*Town of Ancaster:*

Subsection 2.5 – **Heritage Conservation** of the former Town of Ancaster Official Plan contains the goal to conserve the heritage of the Town (2.5.1). The stated objectives to fulfil this goal include the identification of sites of architectural and historical value (2.5.1(ii)), with a policy that the municipality shall utilize the LACAC (now the Municipal Heritage Committee) to identify properties of heritage value. Additional policies supporting this initiative are found in Sub-section 2.1 – **Environment** where the Town commits to encourage, where possible, the preservation, conservation and rehabilitation of structures and lands having historical, archaeological, architectural or scenic interest.
**Town of Dundas:**

Sub-section 2.4 – *Historic and Architectural Resources* of the former Town of Dundas Official Plan requires preparing and maintaining an inventory of heritage resources, and to take appropriate measures to publicize the historic elements of the Town, educating the owners on the background of their buildings.

**Town of Flamborough:**

Sub-section E.2 – *Heritage Preservation* of the former Town of Flamborough Official Plan commits to the preservation of structures of historical or architectural importance with a policy of periodically identifying and cataloguing buildings of architectural or historical significance.

**Township of Glanbrook:**

Section A.10 – *Heritage Conservation* of the former Township of Glanbrook Official Plan has the goal to encourage the preservation, conservation and rehabilitation of buildings, structures, and/or lands of architectural, historical and/or archaeological value, with a policy of utilizing the LACAC (now the Municipal Heritage Committee) to identify buildings and areas of architectural and historical value (G.17).

**City of Hamilton:**

Section C.6 – *Heritage Resources* of the former City of Hamilton Official Plan encourages the preservation, maintenance, reconstruction, restoration and management of property considered to have historic, architectural or aesthetic value.

**City of Stoney Creek:**

Sub-section E.5 – *Historic and Architectural Resources* of the former City of Stoney Creek Official Plan has the objective to preserve, enhance, and/or rehabilitate, where feasible, those resources of historic and architectural merit and to promote the interest of the residents in the heritage of their City (5.1.1), with a policy that Council will consider historic and cultural resources in the review of any proposal for development and redevelopment, wherever possible, incorporating these resources into the overall design.

The recommendations of this report would be consistent with the Official Plan policies of the former Town of Ancaster, Town of Dundas, Town of Flamborough, Township of Glanbrook, City of Hamilton, and City of Stoney Creek, as well as the former Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth, which all generally called for the identification, protection, preservation and rehabilitation of heritage resources. Recommendation (e) of this report directs staff and the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) to continue to update the data as time and resources permit.
RELEVANT CONSULTATION:

This report and recommendations, together with a staff presentation, was considered by the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) at its meeting of January 24, 2008. The Committee approved the staff report and supported the accompanying recommendations.

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.

Identifying heritage properties is the first step in protecting the City's heritage which strengthens a community's identity and distinctiveness.

Environmental Well-Being is enhanced. ☑ Yes ☐ No
Identifying heritage properties contributes to the conservation and protection of the environment.

Economic Well-Being is enhanced. ☑ Yes ☐ No
Identifying heritage properties can provide economic opportunities for revitalization and rehabilitation often involving upkeep of properties, employing local trades and contractors and contributing to increases in property values.

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

Do the options you are recommending make Hamilton a City of choice for high performance public servants? ☑ Yes ☐ No
The creation of a respectful, desirable and supportive workplace.

The management and protection of the City's cultural heritage resources attest to Council's commitment to an ongoing program and policy of heritage conservation.

:DC
Attach. (1)
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2332 Powerline Road
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THE GROEN HOUSE
2332 Powerline Road

Introduction

The Groen property is located on Concession 2, Lot 20. The property consists of 100 acres of farmland. The land has never once been subdivided since the crown grant. The architectural style of the house suggests the date of construction took place around 1860, during the time the Howells owned the property. It is not known who exactly built the house. However, it is assumed that this date coincides with other houses which shared the same style and were dated at much the same time. Since, the date of construction, the house has undergone many structural changes.

History

The Crown Patent was granted to Hon. Robert Hamilton in 1804 on the north part of the lot. Since Hon. Robert Hamilton was an absentee landlord, the land was sold by his agent, William Dickson to Jacob Fonger in 1812. Jacob Fonger had settled in Ancaster in 1800 from New Jersey. Later, he married his wife and had three children: William, John and Henry. The property was inherited by son, John Fonger after the death of his father in 1829. In 1838, the property was bought by brother, Henry Fonger. Levi Howell bought it in 1845 and sold it to Francis Boyd in 1861. Francis J. Boyd was born in the West Indies, while his wife was born in The Wales. They settled in Ancaster following their arrival from Ireland. They had fourteen children. Mr. Boyd tragically died after he was attacked by a bull.

The Krouses purchased the land in 1900 and inturn sold it to the Dyments in 1927. The Dyments were ancestors of the late John Dyment. This family settled in Ancaster in 1833 and established a family cemetery in the northwest of the corner of his lot on concession 1. John Dyment gave his various properties to his sons and retired to Lyden where he died in 1878. He was the first to be buried in the family cemetery.
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George sold the property to his son Erland Dyment in 1963. The property was then eventually bought by the Groens in 1979. This was the final transaction to date.
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Architecture

The Groen house is representative of the Neo-Classic style as it was interpreted from America. There is no definite construction date known however, according to the land title search 2 possible builders could have been a member of the Fonger family or Levi Howell. The Fonger family came from New Jersey which would make them probable builders of such an American influenced home.

The house is 1½ storeys high and almost twice as long as it is wide. There is only one addition attached to the house and it was likely the driving shed.

The roof is a medium pitch gable with a centre gable on the front facade. The eaves are decorated with a moulded cornice and plain frieze. At the gable end, the verges are projecting with the same moulded cornice and frieze as the eaves. The eaves on this end and on the centre gable are returned.

The first floor windows are all 6/6 and very large. The second floor windows are narrower than those below with 4/4 double hung sashes. All the windows have slight window sills on the inside and flared lintels with wooden lug sills on the outside. The window found under the gable is of Palladian design with a round headed opening, sidelights and flared lintel. All the lintels are of the contrasting buff brick which is also to be found in the quoins and dentils under the roof line.

The plan of the house has always been divided to accomodate a double apartment; as long as the house has been owned by the Dyment family - before this is unknown. It is due to this division perhaps that there are no hallways in the house on the first or second floor. The front entrance opens directly into the living room of the one apartment. This room may have been the original kitchen when the house was of single occupancy. There are two reasons for this suspicion. The first being the fact that there is a sealed door to the stair
from this room. On the other stair wall was likely an exterior wall as there is a window in this wall on the second floor. If this was the original kitchen, the study was a back bedroom, the second living room was the parlour/ living room and the second kitchen was the parlour. From this stage, what was likely a woodshed, became the present kitchen and the other rooms became the rooms they are now. The sun room and stairwell from the second kitchen are likely modernizations to the original design. There is no proof however to the above ideas, they are ideas that arose from features of the plan.

The basement has a cobblestone floor and seemed unfinished. There are two end chimneys on the house.

One interesting feature of the interior detailing of the front living room #1, is how everything is almost oversize. The windows are large, the baseboards high and the double doors are huge. This may be due to the large size of the house in general, with two exterior doors on the back wall.

On the upstairs, the plan has been greatly altered, and apart from the bedrooms which are original, it is difficult to tell the original layout.

The front porch was likely always there, but appears to have been reconstructed since the original building.
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The front entranceway of the Groen home. Note the 6/6 Palladian window with 3 pane sidelight. The contrasting brick arch above this is unique as the ends are flared. The lugsills of the windows are wooden. The gable has a moulded box cornice with plain frieze and returned eaves.
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A side view of the house with the frame garage and porch that is now enclosed. The use of asymmetric windows and returned eaves is characteristic of the Neo-Classic style.

The rear wall of the house illustrating the pediment style roof with brackets over the door. The use of contrasting brick is found in the flared lintels, quoins and dentils. Note the enclosed outside entrance to the basement.
The back wall of the house with the frame garage. This garage appears quite old but its connection to the house is unknown. Note the sealed door on the back wall.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Date of Instrument</th>
<th>Date of Registration</th>
<th>Grantor, Grantee</th>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Land &amp; Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLANK</td>
<td>25 Feb 1804</td>
<td>15 Feb 1812</td>
<td>Wm. Dickson &amp;</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLANK</td>
<td>23 Nov 1805</td>
<td>26 Nov 1805</td>
<td>John Franklin</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLANK</td>
<td>7 Jan 1845</td>
<td>8 Nov 1846</td>
<td>Henry Franklin</td>
<td>1000.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLANK</td>
<td>18 Oct 1861</td>
<td>22 Oct 1861</td>
<td>John Howell</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLANK</td>
<td>26 Jan 1804</td>
<td>6 Feb 1804</td>
<td>Robert H.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLANK</td>
<td>28 Mar 1800</td>
<td>18 Mar 1800</td>
<td>Hugh P.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLANK</td>
<td>17 Feb 1827</td>
<td>13 Apr 1827</td>
<td>Albert C.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLANK</td>
<td>22 Apr 1861</td>
<td>6 Nov 1861</td>
<td>George W.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLANK</td>
<td>30 Apr 1879</td>
<td>16 May 1879</td>
<td>John Franklin</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Interview with present owner. (see title page)
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CONCESSION: PLAN: BLK: 55 LOT: 8

ADDRESS: 21 Dundas St. (pre-1897: Lot 5; 1897-1918: Lot 7)

STYLE: Victorian

CONDITION OF BUILDING: very good ☑ fair ___ poor ___
much altered ___

DATE OF CONSTRUCTION: 1840's

ORIGINAL OWNER: Benjamin & Samuel Overfield, merchants

ARCHITECT/BUILDER:

********************************************************************HISTORY********************************************************************

1. PERSON: Overfield's; prominent family; donated land on which Town Hall now stands
2. EVENT:
3. CONTEXT: known as "Custom's House"

*****ENVIRONMENT*****

4. CONTINUITY: neighbourhood has mixture of old & new development
5. SETTING: dominant position on hill overlooking Dundas St.

*****INTERIOR*****

6. FEATURES: original flooring
7. ALTERATIONS: renovated; now divided into several apartments

*****DESCRIPTION*****

The Overfield's owned most of the land in this neighbourhood in the early 19th century. #21 Dundas was rented to various tenants over the years. An early tenant was W.B. Gwynne, collector of customs. Tenant in 1875 was Thomas Clark, also collector of customs, & part of the house is listed in assessment rolls as being used as customs house. Alexander Bertram, son of John who was operator of the Town's longest lived machine shops, purchased the property in 1885 for use as his family's home. This is an impressive home whose facade has been altered little over the years. The most outstanding feature is the front entrance with its elaborate doorway. Also of note is the bay window with brackets under the eaves & topped by iron cresting.

*****REFERENCES*****

The Valley Town. pg.153.
Assessment Rolls. 1849. 1860. 1875. 1885. 1919.

DATE OF SURVEY: July 13, 1994
CONDUCTED BY: Julie Galbraith
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ARCHITECTURAL SURVEY

ADDRESS: 21 Dundas Street

PRESENT USE: multi-residential

ORIGINAL USE: single-res.

*******************************
MASSING OF UNITS: single detached
WINGS: side
STOREYS: 2
BASEMENT: full below ground
EXT COMPOSITION: brick-common
EXT MAT-OTHER WALLS: same

PLAN: rectangular
# OF BAYS: 3

BASEMENT MAT: stone
ADD MAT-FACADE: wood
WALL DESIGN/DETAIL: entablature, plinth

****ROOF & CHIMNEY FEATURES****

TYPE: high gable
TRIM-EAVES: moulded soffit, decorated (dentil) frieze
TRIM-VERGES: decorated fascia
TRIM-EAVES MAT: wood
CHIMNEY-LOC-SIDE: centre
CHIMNEY MAT: rear
ROOF TRIM: finial

MATERIAL: asphalt shingle
TRIM-VERGES MAT: wood
CHIMNEY-LOC-FRONT: rear
CHIMNEY-MASSING: single

****WINDOW FEATURES****

LOCATION: second storey
TRIM-OUTSIDE-HEAD: moulded
OUTSIDE-TRIM-MAT: wood
SILL-MAT: stone
# OF SASHES: 1

OPENING SHAPE: flat
TRIM-OUTSIDE-SIDE: moulded
SILL-TYPE: plain lug
OPENING MECH: single or double hung
SPECIAL WINDOWS: semi-circular with keystone; bay with segmental shaped windows

****DOOR FEATURES****

LOCATION: centre
TRIM-OUTSIDE-HEAD: decorated lintel
OUTSIDE-TRIM-MAT: wood
TRIM-WITHIN-HEAD: shaped transom, single light
# OF LEAVES: 2
TRIM-WITHIN-SIDE: plain
# PANELS PER LEAF: 2

OPENING SHAPE: flat
TRIM-OUTSIDE-SIDE: panelled
LEAVES-SPEC FEATURES: shaped panels, etched glass

****OTHER ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES****

STAIRS-LOC: first floor/no rail
STAIRS-DIRECTION: straight
PORCH-TYPE: open
PORCH-MAT: wood
PORCH-HEIGHT: first floor
APPARENT ALTERATIONS/ADDITIONS: upper floor sunroom, extension

owners 1994: J. Wetherell estate
## Sample Heritage Inventory Record: Flamborough
*(Flamborough L.A.C.A.C. Building Survey 1982)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con.</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Code No.</th>
<th>Current Owner and Address</th>
<th>Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>910-14600</td>
<td>Janice Easterbrook and Harold McNeal, Frelton P.O., Frelton, Ont. 659-3959</td>
<td>1½ Storey, Aluminum Siding, built circa 1870.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>910-14800</td>
<td>Kenneth Ego, Frelton P.O., Frelton, Ont. 659-7288</td>
<td>1½ Storey, Frame, built circa 1870.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>910-15200</td>
<td>Lydia Harris, Frelton P.O., Frelton, Ont. 659-7182</td>
<td>1½ Storey, Aluminum Siding, built circa 1865.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>910-17200</td>
<td>Fredrick Marta, c/o 140 Sunrise Dr., Hamilton, Ont. Tenant; Roger Priest, Frelton P.O., Frelton, Ont. 659-1027</td>
<td>1½ Storey, Frame, built circa 1875.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>910-09200</td>
<td>William Lennon, Frelton P.O., Frelton, Ont. 659-3329</td>
<td>1½ Storey, Stucco, built circa 1885.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>910-18200</td>
<td>Peter Kamstra, Frelton P.O., Frelton, Ont. 659-3005</td>
<td>1½ Storey, Aluminum Siding, built circa 1875.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>910-18400</td>
<td>David Graham, Brook Road, Frelton, Ont.</td>
<td>1½ Storey, Aluminum Siding, built circa 1875.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>910-18600</td>
<td>Esther Mooney, Frelton P.O., Frelton, Ont. 659-3009</td>
<td>1½ Storey, Stucco, built circa 1890.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample Heritage Inventory Record: Flamborough
(Village of Waterdown Inventory of Heritage Buildings, 1997)

#293 Dundas St.
Roll Number:
Date of Construction:

Flamborough Archives
- Hoffman, Cheryl J. Historical Report Highway #5, Evans Rd. to Sydenham Rd.
  Toronto: 1983, Heritage Record Form #33.
- Photograph:
  #1127 (Former Carriage house, now garage)

#297 Dundas St. ("White House")
Roll Number:
Date of Construction:

Flamborough Archives
- Hoffman, Cheryl J. Historical Report Highway #5, Evans Rd. to Sydenham Rd.
  Toronto: 1983, Heritage Record Form #33.
- Vertical File:
  Waterdown/Houses: "White house", #297 Dundas St.
  -research notes
- Photograph:
  #699 (Exterior)

L.A.C.A.C. Office
- File: WAT.029

#298 Dundas St. (Former New Connexion Methodist Church/Maycock House)
Roll Number: 300-330-10800
Date of Construction: circa 1855-1858

Flamborough Archives
- Hoffman, Cheryl J. Historical Report Highway #5, Evans Rd. to Sydenham Rd.
  Toronto: 1983, Heritage Record Form #34.
- Vertical Files:
  -Waterdown/Churches: Methodist Churches, History:
    -reference to #298 Dundas St. as the former New Connexion Methodist
     Chapel
  -Waterdown/Houses: Maycock House, #298 Dundas St:
    File #1: -research notes and architectural drawings
    File #2: -architectural and historical reports
Sample Heritage Inventory Record: Glanbrook

**HOUSE:** Blk. 5, Conc. 1, Lot 5.

**Present Owner:** Florencé Lanskai

**Present Tenant:** Philip White
351 Trinity Church Rd.
Binbrook
692-4748

**Crown Patentee:** Stephen Jones in 1802

**First Settler:** William Freeman in 1834

**Foundation:**
- has a full basement under the front part, with stone walls and a cement floor
- the back part is set on stone

**Structure:**
- it is a two storey, single house in the front section and a one storey in the back section
- is a pine timber frame house with the original pine siding
- lath and plaster is on the interior
- all the ceilings are plastered
- the original doors, windows, pine trim and staircase are in the house
- the floors are made of pine
- the original gingerbread trim is on the house

**Roof:**
- asphalt shingles are on the back section, and the front has a metal roof
- there were originally four bracket chimneys, three of which are still standing
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BARN: Blk. 5, Cug. 1, Lot 6

Ent. Owner: Florence Lansai
Patentee: Stephen Jones in 1802
Settler: William Freeman in 1834
Of Construction: 1909

There is no foundation under the barns. The main barn is on a stone wall 7'-8' high above the ground. The original pine beams were used, and were together with wooden pins. The roofs are now metal.
SAMPLE INVENTORY RECORD: Hamilton

INVENTORY OF BUILDINGS
OF ARCHITECTURAL AND/OR HISTORICAL INTEREST

CRITERIA FOR LISTING
(Excerpt from full report)

2. CRITERIA

The architectural-contextual evaluation is based on site visits and photographs of the building’s exterior appearance. No inspection is made of the interior or the structural condition of the building. The following criteria are based on and selected from the Parks Canada booklet, The Evaluation of Historic Buildings by Harold Kalman, which established a standard for architectural evaluation for Canada at the time of its publication in 1979.

2.1 ARCHITECTURE

Under architecture, it is the exterior appearance of a building that is considered; in particular, its public facades as seen from the street.

2.1.1 STYLE

Style and design are closely interrelated aspects of the buildings visual qualities. In terms of style, the assessment measures a building’s relationship to established architectural styles. For example, significance can be based on such aspects as whether a building is a textbook example of a high-style; an unusual, authentic example of a vernacular style; a unique or rare example; or a particularly well-preserved and outstanding example of a characteristic style in Hamilton.

Comparison to buildings of similar styles is recommended.

A • Perfect or extremely early example if many survive
   • Excellent example if few survive; or stylistically unique example

B • Excellent or very early example if many survive
   • Good example if few survive

C • Good example if many survive

D • Fair example if many survive

X • Of no particular interest

2.1.2 BUILDING TYPE

It is the rare building type or unusual structure, which would warrant a high rating in this category, for example, a railway roundhouse or lime kiln magazine. Also of importance is the rare survivor of a formerly common building type, such as the
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one-room rural schoolhouse.

A
- Extremely rare building type or highly unusual structure
- Rare survivor of a formerly common building type

B
- Uncommon building type or structure
- Uncommon survivor of formerly common building type

X
- No rating (standard building type)

2.1.3 AESTHETIC QUALITY

In terms of design, it is the aesthetic quality of the building (taking into consideration both the original and current design) that is being measured. Aspects considered in the overall success of a design may include the following:

- shape, profile and composition
- relationship of mass and void
- sculptural three-dimensional qualities
- proportion and scale
- colour and texture
- decorative elements and all other detailing including windows, doors, wall surfaces, etc.

A
- Excellent

B
- Very Good

C
- Good

X
- Poor

2.1.4 CONSTRUCTION MATERIALS AND METHODS

Evaluation of buildings in terms of the type of construction materials concentrates on the rare, early or exceptional example. No structural investigation is undertaken at this time; evaluation is based only on the visual evidence unless documented information is already available.

A
- perfect, rare or extremely early example if many survive
- excellent example if few survive

B
- excellent or very early example if many survive;
- good example if few survive

C
- good example if many survive

X
- of no particular interest

2.1.5 ARCHITECTURAL INTEGRITY

Architectural integrity is measured in terms of the degree of preservation of the original building and the relative lack of alterations. If changed, these alterations are assessed in terms of their appropriateness and
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compatibility and the degree to which they affect the original building.

Reversible alterations in this sense means those changes or additions which can be removed or changed back without incurring any damage to the original structure.

A  • Unchanged
B  • Change is minor and reversible
C  • Change is major but reversible
X  • Change is irreversible

2.1.6 ARCHITECT/BUILDER

Added value is assigned to a structure if it is designed or built by an architect or builder who has made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation.

A  • Architect or builder of particular importance to the history of the community, province, or nation
B  • Architect or builder of considerable importance to the history of the community or province
C  • Architect or builder of local importance

2.2 CONTEXT

This assessment considers both the contribution of the building to the streetscape and the value of the surrounding streetscape itself.

2.2.1 VALUE OF SURROUNDING STREETSCAPE/LANDSCAPE

This category measures the quality of the natural and built environment of the surrounding streetscape. The evaluation addresses the building group as a whole - its coherence, frequency of occurrence, size, style and design - as well as the quality of the open space and landscape features.

A  • Excellent (very old, rare or distinguished group of buildings, landscape or urban design)
B  • Good (coherent grouping of buildings, identifiable landscape or urban design)
C  • Fair (common grouping of buildings; area in transition which retains considerable original character)
X  • Surrounding streetscape of no value

2.2.2 CONTRIBUTION OF THE BUILDING TO THE
Sample Heritage Inventory Record: Hamilton

STREETSCAPE/LANDSCAPE

This category assumes the dominant character of the streetscape is a positive one; if not, rating does not apply.

- A • Excellent (major factor in establishing the dominant character)
- B • Very Good (contributes to dominant character)
- C • Compatible (with dominant character)
- X • Incompatible (with dominant character)

2.2.3 LANDMARK VALUE

A building may be a landmark if it is a physically prominent or conspicuous structure which is perceived by the community to have a special visual or cultural value that transcends its function.

- A • Outstanding (important to City)
- B • Very Good (important to larger neighbourhood)
- C • Good (important to immediate surroundings)

2.3 HISTORY

Historical significance is based on the building's close association with an important person, event, broad patterns of cultural, social, economic, political, military, or industrial history, and/or with a significant period in the local community's development. Since research of individual buildings is not being undertaken extensively in this first phase of the Inventory, historical rating will be based primarily on information available from site inspections and existing research.

2.3.1 PERSON

The building is associated with the life or activities of a person, group, organization, institution or business which has made a significant contribution to the community, province or nation. In the case of a municipal evaluation such as this Inventory, local significance can be deemed to be of considerable importance.

- A • Primary importance, close association with building
- B • Primary importance, loosely connected with building
- Secondary importance, close association with building
- C • Secondary importance, loosely connected with building

2.3.2 EVENT

The building is associated with an event which has made a significant
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contribution to the community, province, or nation.

A  • Primary importance, close association with building
B  • Primary importance, loosely connected with building
    • Secondary importance, close association with building
C  • Secondary importance, loosely connected with building

2.3.3 BROAD HISTORICAL PATTERNS

The building is effectively illustrative of broad patterns of cultural, social, political, economic, military or industrial history.

A  • Primary importance, close association with building
B  • Primary importance, loosely connected with building
    • Secondary importance, close association with building
C  • Secondary importance, loosely connected with building
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CITY OF HAMILTON • HERITAGE RESEARCH

Summary Sheet

1. BUILDING NAME(S)

2. ADDRESS
   103 King Street East

3. LOT AND PLAN NUMBERS, PRESENT OWNER, TENANTS, AND LAND USE
   Part Lot 10, Nathaniel Hughson
   Owner: D.L. Fowles Developments
   Tenant: Gloaul Restaurants Ltd. (Grapes and Things)
   Use: Commercial (restaurant)

4. DATE OF CONSTRUCTION
   1917

   SOURCE
   City Assessment Rolls, Hamilton Daily Times (article)
   1919, Ward 6, p. 61

5. PHOTOGRAPH
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6. ARCHITECT OR BUILDER  P.H. Secord & Son (construction firm)
   Thomas Lamb (architect)
7. ORIGINAL OWNER  Mills Bros., hardware merchants (land)
   Marcus Loew, theatre owner (building)
8. ORIGINAL TENANT(S)  Marcus Loew's Vaudeville and feature photo-play theatre
9. USES
   The building at 101 King Street East served as the entrance to two theatres:
   Loew's Theatre: 1910-1922
   Capitol Theatre: 1923-1972

10. BUILDING MATERIALS  Limestone front: hollow tile blocks and brick; floor and roof
    solid concrete
11. ARCHITECTURAL FEATURES AND SIGNIFICANCE
    The architect of this building described it in 1917 as "one of the most artistic
    and best constructed (theatres) in Canada". The exterior of the building was
    altered in 1958 when the steel canopy (covering the width of the sidewalk) was
    removed and the limestone façade sandblasted. However, the building is still
    representative of the period, having been influenced by the Sullivan-esque style
    which was popular between 1890 and 1920. It is characterized by the large
    arched window (which is now filled in), the decorative panels, and the flat roof.
    The interior being equally artistic, was adorned with marble and carved Indiana
    Limestone. Thus, the building is a good example of theatre architecture
    being typically decorative. It remains as one of the few older theatre fronts
    left in Hamilton. The canopy adorning the building today, although recently
    added, fits in with this older theatre style.
12. HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE
    When built, Loew's Theatre was the largest theatre in North America in
    proportion to population. The building was heralded as following in the
    "lines of the latest model" with a "ventilation system capable of changing
    all of the air in the auditorium at least once in every 8 min." The new
    $500,000 theatre with its 3,000 seating capacity was the latest addition to the
    Marcus Loew chain of theatre-houses.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION
1. CURRENT CITY ASSESSMENT ROLL  May 1983
2. INSURANCE PLANS 1878
3. INSURANCE PLANS 1896, UPDATED TO 1916
4. HISTORICAL ATLAS OF THE COUNTY OF WENTWORTH
   1875 AND 1903
5. HAMILTON CITY DIRECTORIES (VERNON)  1910-1922
6. CITY ASSESSMENT ROLLS
7. ABSTRACT INDEX - REGISTRY OFFICE
8. LEGAL INSTRUMENTS - REGISTRY OFFICE
9. DICTIONARY OF HAMILTON BIOGRAPHY - BAILEY
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10. "DICTIONARY OF CANADIAN BIOGRAPHY" - MACMILLAN
11. "CANADIAN MEN AND WOMEN OF OUR TIME" - MORGAN
12. "WHO'S WHO" - WALLACE
13. HAMILTON, AN ILLUSTRATIVE HISTORY - WEAVER
14. THE HEAD OF THE LAKE, JOHNSTON
15. A MOUNTAIN AND A CITY - CAMPBELL
16. THE PEOPLE OF HAMILTON, CANADA WEST - KATZ
17. THE HAMILTON CENTENNIAL 1846 - 1946 - WINGFIELD
18. HAMILTON THE BIRMINGHAM OF CANADA, 1892
19. SPECIAL COLLECTIONS - CLIPPING FILE
   SPECIAL COLLECTIONS - PICTURE COLLECTION
20. ART WORK IN HAMILTON, 1899 - CARRE
21. INDUSTRIES OF CANADA, HISTORICAL AND
   COMMERCIAL SKETCHES, 1886
22. HAMILTON THE ELECTRIC CITY
23. HAMILTON, ONTARIO, CANADA'S MANUFACTURING
   AND DISTRIBUTING CENTRE, 1919
24. HAMILTON, THE INDUSTRIAL AND GARDEN CITY
   OF CANADA, 1913
25. HAMILTON, THE INDUSTRIAL CITY, SOUVENIR
   OF HAMILTON, 1906
26. HAMILTON, CANADA: THE CITY OF OVER 400
   VARIED INDUSTRIES, 1914
27. HAMILTON AND ITS INDUSTRIES, 1884
28. HAMILTON - ITS HISTORY, COMMERCE, INDUSTRY
   AND RESOURCES, 1913
29. HAMILTON - THE MANUFACTURING METROPOLIS
   OF CANADA, 1909 - 1910
30. "VICTORIAN ARCHITECTURE IN HAMILTON" - ACO
31. ARCHITECTURAL WALKING TOUR - HAMILTON CORE
   - ACO
32. HAMILTON SPECTATOR, SUMMER CARNIVAL,
   1899 AND 1903
33. MAGAZINE OF INDUSTRY - SOUVENIR EDITION, 1910
34. HAMILTON MANUFACTURER/MADE IN HAMILTON
   QUARTERLY 1906 - 1936
35. HAMILTON SPECTATOR
36. HAMILTON HERALD
37. HAMILTON TIMES
38. CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS
39. OTHER
   Fire Insurance Map, 1947, p. 135
   Construction, 10 (April 1917) p. 142
   10 (June 1917) p. 216
   Nov. 8, 1967
   Hamilton Herald: Jan. 18, 1918, Jan 23, 1918, Article in scrapbook
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CITY OF STONEY CREEK
Potential Sites of Historical and/or Architectural Value
Listed in Alphabetic Order by Street Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Code</th>
<th>Municipal Address</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1313 Baseline Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Single detached dwelling, Glover House, Built in 1809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>1489 Baseline Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Single detached dwelling - 1808 - Ingledale Fifty Point Conservation Area, Former John Inglish's residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Coker's Lane Lot 2, Concession 3,</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Coker Oak in Road allowance between Concessions 2 and 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>29 Edgewater Drive</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Single detached dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>336 Fifty Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Single detached dwelling, pre 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>518 Fruitland Road</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Proposed Restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>2 Glover Mountain Road</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Single detached dwelling built in 1875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Highgate Drive</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Cline Family Cemetery, approximately 1839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>520 Highway No. 8</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>DeWitt House, single family dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>604 Highway No. 8</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Single detached dwelling, Former home of I. W. Orr, built in 1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>631 Highway No. 8</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Fruitland Cemetery, Late 1800s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>651 Highway No. 8</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Wesley United Church, built in 1882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>658 Highway No. 8</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Single detached dwelling, Built in 1891 by the Stewarts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>199 Glover Road</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Royalcrest Lifecare Nursing Home (former Brodie Nursing Home), The Glover House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>916 Highway No. 8</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Single detached dwelling, 1857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>929 Highway No. 8</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Duplex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>933 Highway No. 8</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Single detached dwelling, Built in 1920 by the son of E. D. Smith, Former home of Brigadier Armand Armstrong Smith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sites which have been designated under the Ontario Heritage Act

REVISED: February 3, 1996
(G:\LACAC\PS-ALPHA.DOC) IN
Sample Heritage Inventory Record: Stoney Creek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Code</th>
<th>Municipal Address</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72. ✡</td>
<td>982 Highway No. 8</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Single detached dwelling, 1847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jacob Smith House - Langside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>1059 Highway No. 8</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Single detached dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carpenter Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built in 1887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>1080 Highway No. 8</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Single detached dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Circa 1803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Owned by Jim &amp; Pat Taggart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. ✡</td>
<td>1317 Highway No. 8</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Built in the 1856 by the Pettit Family (Evanleigh House).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accommodated the Saltfleet Library until 1967.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>1344 Highway No. 8</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Duplex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>1400 Highway No. 8</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Single detached dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>1420 Highway No. 8</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Single detached dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. ✡</td>
<td>1446 Highway No. 8</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Single detached dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Van Duzer family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>1454 Highway No. 8</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Single detached dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. ✡</td>
<td>1455 Highway No. 8</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Fifty United Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Established in 1796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Present building built in 1820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>1491 Highway No. 8</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Single detached dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>341 Highway No. 20</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Single detached dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>1967 Highway No. 53</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Elfrieda Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>1969 Highway No. 53</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Hannon Free Methodist Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>2251 Highway No. 53</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Elfrieda United Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Built in 1856, rebuilt in 1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>1 Jones Street</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Single family dwelling. Built 1845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Former home of Augustus Jones, Ontario Land Surveyor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>21 Jones Street</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Old Powerhouse Restaurant. Former H. G. &amp; B. Powerhouse, subsequently Hydro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Generating Station - 1894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>2 King Street East</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Former &quot;Chesnut Tree&quot; gift store</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Sites which have been designated under the Ontario Heritage Act
## Sample Heritage Inventory Record: Stoney Creek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Code</th>
<th>Municipal Address</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>4-6 King Street East</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Stoney Creek Flower Shop, Olde Village Realty, Stoney Creek Y.M.C.A., Community Information Centre. Originally the First Women's Institute in the World. (1897)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>32 King Street East</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>&quot;The Institute Building&quot; formerly Milmine Bldg. now Century Square Built in 1901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>70 1/2 King Street West</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Battlefield Cemetery - &quot;Smith's Knoll&quot; Battle of Stoney Creek, June 6, 1813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>72 King Street West</td>
<td></td>
<td>Property is of historical and archaeological importance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>73 King Street West</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>Single detached dwelling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 35.     | 77 King Street West  | Open Space | • Battlefield House and Monument built 1796 and originally owned by Mary Gage 
|         |                      |            | • Battlefield Monument was erected by Dominion Government and unveiled on 100th Anniversary of Battle of Stoney Creek |
| 67.     | 10 Lake Avenue Drive | Residential | Single detached dwelling and barn, 1900                                   |
| 75.     | 12 Lake Avenue Drive | Residential | Former Methodist Church Manse (now owned by Rev. Barlow)                   |
| 68.     | 25 Lake Avenue Drive |            | Single detached dwelling, 1900                                            |
| 37.     | 23 Lake Avenue South | Institutional | Church of the Redeemer built in 1877                                      |
| 54.     | 39 Lakeview Drive    | Residential | 1840 Regency Cottage, former Baily House                                  |
| 38.     | 265 Lewis Road       | Residential | Lewis House Built in 1843, Georgian-Style Colonial House Originally owned by Levi & Mary Lewis |
| 39.     | 10 Loma Drive        | Residential | Duplex                                                                     |
| 40.     | 11 Manor Place       | Residential | Single detached dwelling built in 1890                                    |
| 74.     | 11 Maple Drive       | Residential | Waterbury Cottage. Built 1901.                                            |
| 41.     | 112 McNeilly Road    | Residential | Single detached dwelling Home of Llewlyn Smith                             |
| 42.     | 120 Mid Street       | Institutional | Felker Cemetery Early 1800s                                              |

 Sites which have been designated under the Ontario Heritage Act
Sample Heritage Inventory Record: Stoney Creek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Code</th>
<th>Municipal Address</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>390 Mud Street</td>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Tapleytown School, built in 1881</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 44.      | 413 Mud Street         | Institutional | • Tapleytown United Church built in 1879  
• Tapleytown Cemetery was established in the early 1800s                                               |
| 45.      | 653 Mud Street         | Institutional | Church/Cemetery  
• The Incumbent and Wardens of St. George's Anglican Church  
• Established in 1857  
• First building was built in 1887. Present building on same site, consecrated on June 29, 1910 |
| 46.      | 1145 Mud Street        | Institutional | • Tweedside Cemetery & Church  
• Established 1874  
• Present building erected in 1898                                                                        |
| 47.      | 7 Placid Place         | Residential | Corman House                                                                                              |
| 53.      | 30 Ridge Road          | Residential | Billy Green House                                                                                         |
| 62.      | 228 Ridge Road         | Residential | Spera House, built 1867                                                                                   |
| 48.      | 131 Ridge Road         | Residential | Single detached dwelling  
Jubilee Hall, Walker House  
Built in 1887                                                      |
| 49.      | 552 Ridge Road         | Residential | Erland Lee (Museum) Home  
Women's Institute Historical Site, 1897  
Plaque acknowledging the First Women's Institute in the World was organized in Stoney Creek (February 19, 1897) |
| 70.      | 1181 Ridge Road        |            | Single detached dwelling, pre 1900                                                                       |
| 71.      | 454 Second Road East   |            | Single detached dwelling, pre 1900                                                                       |
| 56.      | 172 Seventh Rd. E.    | Residential | Wood/Ferrell House built in 1840  
Present owner: Garnet Travis                                                                                 |
| 50.      | 583 Tapleytown Road    | Institutional | Vincmount Christian Assembly  
Former Lee School, built in 1873                                                                           |
| 57.      | 636 Tapleytown Road    | Residential | Single detached dwelling, pre 1900                                                                       |
| 51.      | Upper Mount Albion Road| Institutional | Mt. Albion Cemetery  
Established mid 1800s                                                                                     |

* Sites which have been designated under the Ontario Heritage Act