SUBJECT: Recommendation to Designate 9 Kinnell Street, Hamilton, Under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (PED06371) (Ward 1)

RECOMMENDATION:

(a) That the designation of 9 Kinnell Street as a property of cultural heritage value pursuant to the provisions of Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, 1990, be approved.

(b) That the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value and Description of the Heritage Attributes, attached as Appendix ‘A’ to Report PED06371, be approved.

(c) That the City Solicitor be directed to take appropriate action to designate 9 Kinnell Street under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, in accordance with the Notice of Intention to Designate, attached as Appendix ‘B’ to Report PED06371.

Lee Ann Coveyduck
General Manager
Planning and Economic Development Department

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Following a request from the property owner, the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) directed staff to prepare a Cultural Heritage Assessment for the building at 9 Kinnell Street. It has been determined that the 1909 brick residential building possesses cultural heritage value due to its association with the residential development of the City of Hamilton, specifically lands subdivided in the mid-nineteenth century by Sir Allan Napier MacNab. It is an example of vernacular Ontario centre-gabled cottage architecture.
style architecture and contributes to the historic quality and pedestrian scale of the Kinnell streetscape.

The property has been assessed using both the City of Hamilton Criteria and the Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, as defined in Ontario Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act, and is now being recommended for designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.

BACKGROUND:

In March 2005, Ms. Julia M. Creighton, the owner of 9 Kinnell Street, Hamilton, requested the designation of the property under the Ontario Heritage Act (see Location Map attached as Appendix ‘C-1’, Figure 1, to Report PED06371).

At their meeting of April 28, 2005, the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) directed staff to prepare a Cultural Heritage Assessment for the property to determine whether the property is worthy of designation, and further that if the property is determined to be of cultural heritage value or interest, that staff prepare the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value and Description of the Heritage Attributes for consideration by the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee), through its appropriate sub-committee.

The property has since been assessed using a number of criteria and is recommended for designation (see Statement of Cultural Heritage Value and Description of Heritage Attributes attached as Appendix ‘A’ to Report PED06371). The Cultural Heritage Assessment Report is attached as Appendix ‘C’ to Report PED06371.

ANALYSIS/RATIONALE:

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

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

Following the completion of the cultural heritage assessment and evaluation of the subject property, it was determined by the Inventory and Research Subcommittee and heritage staff that there is sufficient cultural heritage value associated with this property to warrant designation under the Ontario Heritage Act.
This assessment is also in compliance with the Ontario Heritage Act, Regulation 9/06: Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest. According to the Criteria, a property may be designated under Section 29 of the Act if it meets one or more of the criteria. The subject property at 9 Kinnell Street satisfies two of the three criteria: 1. design value; and 3. contextual value.

**ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION:**

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

**Decline to Designate**

By declining to designate, the municipality would be unable to provide protection to this heritage resource (designation provides protection against inappropriate changes and demolition). Without designation the property would not be eligible for heritage grant and loan programs from all levels of government. Designation does not restrict the use of property, prohibit alterations and additions, nor does it restrict the sale of a property, or affect its resale value. Accordingly, staff does not consider this an appropriate conservation alternative. This alternative would not be in keeping with the “Triple Bottom Line” and would not move the City closer to the vision for a sustainable community.

**FINANCIAL/STAFFING/LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:**

- Financial – Not applicable.
- Staffing – Not applicable.
- Legal – The designation process will follow the requirements of the Ontario Heritage Act and provide for adequate notice of Council’s intention to designate the property to the owner and the Ontario Heritage Foundation. Formal objections may be made under the Ontario Heritage Act and heard before the Conservation Review Board, prior to Council approving the designating By-law.

**POLICIES AFFECTING PROPOSAL:**

Official Plan policies of the City of Hamilton support the conservation, protection and management of cultural heritage features. Designation of 9 Kinnell Street will be in accordance with these policies.
RELEVANT CONSULTATION:

Pursuant to Subsection 29(s) of the Ontario Heritage Act, Council is required to consult with its Municipal Heritage Committee respecting designation of property under Subsection (1). At its meeting of August 24, 2006, the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) considered the Cultural Heritage Assessment (attached as Appendix ‘C’ to Report PED06371), together with Statement of Cultural Heritage Value and Description of Heritage Attributes (attached as Appendix ‘A’ to Report PED06371), and recommended that Council designate the property at 9 Kinnell Street under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, and that staff be directed to take appropriate action in this regard.

CITY STRATEGIC COMMITMENT:

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

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

Designation helps conserve Ontario's heritage, an irreplaceable resource. Protecting our heritage through designation strengthens a community's identity and distinctiveness. Heritage buildings, districts and landscapes create a unique sense of place and a rooted sense of local identity and continuity.

Environmental Well-Being is enhanced. ☑ Yes ☐ No
Waste is reduced and recycled.

It has been estimated that the rehabilitation of older buildings consumes 23% less energy than new construction, therefore, the drain on renewable and non-renewable resources is significantly lower than for new construction. Designation can, in the long run, ensure conservation of the building. The conservation of heritage properties reduces the strain on dump and landfill sites where up to 60% of available space is currently filled with demolition and construction waste. Conservation of heritage properties is more economically and environmentally sustainable than new construction, and the reuse of historic resources utilizes existing infrastructure. Our built heritage is a non-renewable resource.

Economic Well-Being is enhanced. ☑ Yes ☐ No
Hamilton's high-quality environmental amenities are maintained and enhanced.

Statistics show that designation maintains, if not boosts, the value of property. Heritage conservation not only makes older neighbourhoods more attractive, it also increases their desirability and value.

Does the option you are recommending create value across all three bottom lines? ☑ Yes ☐ No
Value is created across all three bottom lines as per comments above.

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

Designation and protection of the City’s cultural heritage resources exhibits Council’s commitment to an ongoing program of heritage management.
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Attachs. (3)
9 Kinnell Street, Hamilton

STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE AND DESCRIPTION OF HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES

Statement of Cultural Heritage Value
The 1909 brick residence located at 9 Kinnell Street possesses cultural heritage value due to its association with the residential development of the City of Hamilton, specifically lands subdivided in the mid-nineteenth century by Sir Allan Napier MacNab. This workers’ cottage is representative of the housing stock built for the burgeoning working class in the Strathcona Neighbourhood in the early twentieth century. It is an example of vernacular Ontario centre-gabled cottage style architecture and contributes to the historic quality and pedestrian scale of the Kinnell streetscape.

Description of Heritage Attributes
All four elevations and the hipped roof with centre gable, together with all construction materials and all component features and detailing.
CITY OF HAMILTON

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO DESIGNATE

9 Kinnell Street, Hamilton

IN THE MATTER OF THE ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT and the property in the City of Hamilton known municipally as 9 Kinnell Street, Hamilton

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

Statement of Cultural Heritage Value

The 1909 brick residence located at 9 Kinnell Street possesses cultural heritage value due to its association with the residential development of the City of Hamilton, specifically lands subdivided in the mid-nineteenth century by Sir Allan Napier MacNab. This workers’ cottage is representative of the housing stock built for the burgeoning working class in the Strathcona Neighbourhood in the early twentieth century. It is an example of vernacular Ontario centre-gabled cottage style architecture and contributes to the historic quality and pedestrian scale of the Kinnell streetscape.

Description of Heritage Attributes

All four elevations and the hipped roof with centre gable, together with all construction materials and all component features and detailing.

The complete description of heritage attributes may be viewed in the Office of the City Clerk, 2nd Floor, City Hall, 71 Main Street West, during regular business hours.

Any person may, within 30 days after the date of publication of this Notice, serve written notice of his or her objection to the proposed designation together with a statement for the objection and all relevant facts.

Dated at Hamilton, this day of , 2006.

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

9 Kinnell Street, Hamilton

City of Hamilton

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

for the City of Hamilton LACAC
(Municipal Heritage Committee)

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

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

This report is divided into eight sections.

Section 1 comprises an introduction.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This cultural heritage assessment examines the heritage attributes of the property located at 9 Kinnell Street in the City of Hamilton, comprising a one-storey brick residential building constructed in 1909. The building is included on the City of Hamilton’s Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.

The property has been evaluated according to a set of criteria, which was endorsed by the City of Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee on June 19, 2003, and is used to identify the cultural heritage values of a property and to assess their significance. This evaluation assists in determining a property’s merit for designation under the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. 0.18. The property has also been evaluated in compliance with Ontario Heritage Act, Ontario Regulation 9/06: Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest.

2.0 PROPERTY LOCATION

The subject property is located on the south side of Kinnell Street, between Inchbury Street and Dundurn Park (refer to Location Map attached as Appendix C-1, Figure 1). The property has a lot frontage on Kinnell of 8.53 meters (28 feet) and a lot depth of 14.63 meters (48 feet), for a total lot area of 0.012 hectares (0.03 acres), and contains a one-storey, brick residence, the principal focus of this cultural heritage assessment.

3.0 PHYSIOGRAPHIC CONTEXT

The subject property is located within the physiographic region known as the Iroquois Plain, the lowland bordering Lake Ontario which extends around the western end of Lake Ontario, from the Niagara River to the Trent River—the earliest and most densely inhabited area in Ontario. The flat Iroquois Plain easily accommodated land transportation routes and was thus a prime area for historical development. The Lake Iroquois Beach rises above the landward edge of the Plain, forming a prominent bluff through downtown Hamilton, upon which the Dundurn Castle estate is located. The subject property is located slightly below the eastern crest of this ridge.

4.0 SETTLEMENT CONTEXT

First Nation Settlement

With its favourable physiographic setting and ameliorating climate, the Iroquois Plain, and particularly the Iroquois Beach, has attracted human settlement for

---

1 City of Hamilton GISNet, Municipal property assessment rolls (as accessed in February 2006).


approximately 12,000 years. Prehistoric Native settlement of this area occurs early with Paleo-Indian and Early Archaic Cultures (12,000-7,000 BP). Middle and Late Archaic (7,000-3,000 BP) population sizes increased, more substantially in the following Woodland period (3,000-500 BP), typified by large Native villages interspersed with seasonal cabin and hunting sites.  

The intensity of the prehistoric occupation is represented by the density of archaeology in the immediate locale. There are nineteen registered archaeological sites within three kilometres of the subject property, encompassing small campsites through to large villages, and spanning Early Paleo-Indian to late-Woodland Neutral and Iroquoian cultures, in addition to historic Euro-Canadian occupations.

The Iroquois Beach forms a narrow gravel ridge, the first high ground through the swamps that pre-dated the Hamilton settlement, and served as an east-west Mississauga land route around the Head-of-the-Lake. The route was adapted and used as an improved track and later road by early Euro-Canadian settlers. Most registered archaeological sites were identified in archaeological assessments of nearby land-developments or research projects. Additional unregistered sites are present in areas not formally archaeologically assessed. It is likely that sites in the immediate vicinity of the subject property, associated with the Native trail and early York Street, were removed without being recorded during the historical settlement and modern redevelopment of this area within the City of Hamilton.

**Euro-Canadian Settlement**

*The City of Hamilton*

The first Euro-Canadian settlers reached the Head-of-the-Lake, the future site of Hamilton, in 1786. The area, named Barton Township by Lieutenant-Governor John Graves Simcoe, was declared the judicial centre of the District of Gore in 1816, due in large part to the efforts of George Hamilton, a prominent land-owner in the township.

---


5. Ontario Ministry of Culture. Ontario Archaeological Sites Database.


Hamilton was incorporated as a Town by the Legislative Council of Upper Canada in 1833. The boundaries of the new town were Wellington Street on the east, Queen on the west, Burlington Bay on the north, and present day Aberdeen Avenue on the south—thus the location of the subject property was originally beyond the boundaries of the town.\textsuperscript{11} With the opening of the Burlington Canal, Hamilton embarked upon an era of prosperity and expansion. Within a decade, the town of Hamilton had experienced a population explosion and became the “largest and most important centre south and west of Toronto.”\textsuperscript{12}

With the prosperity and expansion of the 1840s, Hamilton was in the position for incorporation as a city in 1846, and, as with many towns and cities in Ontario, continued population and commercial growth was fuelled by the arrival of the railway—the Great Western Railway in 1852 and the Hamilton & Lake Erie Railroad in 1872. The city’s physical expansion, as a result of the General Municipal Act of 1849, extended the limits east to Wentworth Street and west to Paradise Road—thus incorporating the lands where the subject property is now located.\textsuperscript{13}

After suffering through a brief depression in the 1860s, Hamilton again experienced rapid growth during the late Victorian era, accelerating to an unprecedented pace during the industrial expansion of the 1880s and 1890s. As more industries were established, offering permanent employment, there was a rapid increase in population and thus, correspondingly, a great demand for housing. Neighbourhood after neighboured was established in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.\textsuperscript{14}

\textit{Strathcona Neighbourhood and Kinnell Street}

Barton Township was laid out in a formal grid of lots and concessions by land surveyor Augustus Jones in 1791. The Crown awarded the first lots as grants to United Empire Loyalist settlers, with most of these properties disposed of to incoming settlers between 1796 and 1802.

The subject property at 9 Kinnell Street is located on a small portion of what was

\textsuperscript{100} The District of Gore comprised the counties of Wentworth, Brant, Halton, Haldimand and the Township of Puslinch in the County of Wellington.


\textsuperscript{12} Bill Freeman, \textit{Hamilton: A People’s History} (Toronto: J. Lorimer, 2001): 40.


originally Concession 2, Lot 18, which constituted the land between Dundurn and Locke Streets, and between Main and Barton Streets. The Crown Patent for this lot was awarded to Captain Robert Lottridge even prior to Jones' 1791 survey.\textsuperscript{15} By 1791 Lottridge owned virtually all of the property from Paradise Road to Locke Street, and from Main Street, north to the waterfront.\textsuperscript{16} Subsequently, Richard Beasley claimed ownership of part of Lottridge’s land by squatter’s rights—a relatively common means of claiming land in the early years of the Province.\textsuperscript{17} The lands currently occupied by Dundurn Park and the immediately adjacent areas were, in 1832, acquired by Allan Napier MacNab, who proceeded to build his “castle” on the site of Beasley’s home.

MacNab had the remaining lands surveyed, laying out streets and building lots to the east and south of his estate property, forming part of what would later become known as the Strathcona neighbourhood. Among the streets laid out in MacNab’s survey were Inchbury and Kinnell Streets. (Appendix C-1, Figure 2 – Map of 1850-51) Most of the street names in the surveyed area were inspired by MacNab’s Scottish ancestry, including Dundurn, Napier, Ardvorlich, Breadalbane, Lochearne, Inchbury and Devenport.\textsuperscript{18} Kinnell Street, a one block long street running east-west, from Inchbury Street to Dundurn Park, was named after Kinnell House, near Killin, Scotland, which was the ancient seat of the MacNab clan.

Due to the diverse and substantial employment base in the Strathcona neighbourhood, a number of residential streets were established to meet the growing demand for housing. With the Great Western Railway Works and Yards located directly to the north, the streets north of York Street allowed many railway workers to be within walking distance of their place of employment. With the arrival of the Hamilton Street Railway line along York Street in 1876, easy access to and from the residential neighbourhood encouraged further development.\textsuperscript{19} By the third-quarter of the nineteenth century, the streets to the immediate west of Dundurn Park were built up with a number of residences. (Appendix C-1, Figure 3 - Bird’s Eye View 1876)


\textsuperscript{16} Because of his military service, Lottridge was granted 3,000 acres of land at the western end of Lake Ontario. Thomas Melville Bailey, \textit{Dictionary of Hamilton Biography}, 1 (Hamilton: W.L. Griffin Limited, 1981): 129.


The first buildings erected on Kinnell Street were those in 1864 for William Rankin, Engineer for the Great Western Railway, and Robert Allan, Porter, at 6 and 17 Kinnell Street respectively. Another G.W.R. employee followed suit in 1871—James Weatherstone, Track Superintendent—building at 8 Kinnell Street. In the same year, 1871, Robert Herald and John McBean (both carpenters), erected 13 and 14 Kinnell Street respectively. Two buildings on Inchbury, that back onto the south side of Kinnell Street (73-75 Inchbury), were built in 1883, and were occupied by labourers.

The remainder of the buildings, which still stand on Kinnell Street today, were built within the first two decades of the twentieth century, made possible through the severing of property from the existing lots—25-27 Kinnell Street was built in 1915 on a portion of Lot 42 and 18 Kinnell Street was built in 1919 on a portion of Lot 47, facing onto Dundurn Park.

The house at 9 Kinnell Street was built in 1909 on a very small portion of property severed off of the rear of 73 and 75 Inchbury Street (Lot 46 of Sir Allan MacNab’s Survey — refer to Appendix C-1, Figures 2 and 4). The first resident was Frank Smith, whose occupation was recorded in the City of Hamilton Directory as a mechanic/presser, while the Assessment Rolls, by 1910, record Smith as a Tailor. There have been several occupants and owners of the property at 9 Kinnell Street over the course of its history.

All of the buildings on Kinnell Street, with the exception of the early-twentieth century duplex at 25-27 Kinnell Street, are currently listed on the City of Hamilton’s Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Significance.

Contemporary Context

The subject property at 9 Kinnell Street remains today in the same context as when first built. The neighbourhood has continued in its residential use and there have been virtually no major changes to the Kinnell or Inchbury streetscapes over the past 90 years since the building was constructed. (Appendix C-1, Figure 5a and b)

---


21 The Assessment Rolls for 1908 and 1909 show an increase in Real Property value between 1908 and 1909 at 9 Kinnell Street, while the property values at 73 and 75 Inchbury decrease during these years.

22 While oral history has suggested that the home was occupied by the Kennel Keeper for Dundurn Castle, the historical records do not verify this. The wall in the rear of the small backyard that has reputedly been referred to as a wall of the kennel, is in fact of concrete construction and probably dates to the same time as the house. See Susan Evans Shaw, Heritage Treasures: The Historical homes of Ancaster, Burlington, Dundas, East Flamborough, Hamilton, Stoney Creek and Waterdown (Toronto: James Lorimer & Company Ltd., 2004): 75.
5.0 PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

The property located at 9 Kinnell Street comprises a one-storey brick building dating to 1909. (Appendix C-1, Figure 6) This building is an example of vernacular domestic architecture, exhibiting design features of the ubiquitous Ontario centre-gabled cottage. While the Ontario cottage was often fashioned in the Gothic Revival style, especially for buildings dating between 1830 and 1900, this building, dating from the early twentieth century, has a more modest and plain character. In the early Edwardian period, domestic architecture took on a more simplified composition in contrast to the highly colouristic, complicated and often eclectic compositions of the Victorian style architecture of the late nineteenth century.

Modest, vernacular examples of residential architecture, such as this one, are characterized by limited ranges of materials—here, only brick was employed—and by a lack of architectural embellishment—there are no window surround details, nor any decorative woodwork, as may be the case with a late-nineteenth century Gothic Revival cottage. The designer of the building is not known at this time.

Building Evolution

There have been minor changes to the original building in terms of materials, details and finishes. Replacement windows and doors have been inserted in the original window openings and a window on the west elevation, towards the front of the house, is probably a later addition. While no documentation exists, the windows were most likely originally double-hung sash windows. The brick on all elevations (most likely a red brick) has been painted and the lower half of the front façade, along with the front door surround, has been covered with an applied simulated stone—also currently painted out along with the brick. This material was most likely added in the 1960s. The original front stair, which most likely descended straight out from the front door, has been replaced with a small concrete porch and stair, which descends towards to the east. An early covered porch, or rear addition, evident on the 1911 Fire Insurance Plan, has been replaced by another rear addition of frame construction with vinyl cladding.

Building Description

The building is simple in form and plan. Ell-shaped in plan, the rear wing extends along the west side of the building. Within the crux of the ell-plan is the small frame addition noted above. The house is finished with a hipped, asphalt-shingled roof containing a centre gable. The soffits and fascia are vinyl. There are no chimneys. The foundation is parged.


24 This window does not have an arched opening with soldier course brickwork as do all of the other windows on the house.
• North/Front Elevation

The main façade of the building, facing Kinnell Street, is defined by the centre roof gable over the front entrance door. (Appendix C-1, Figure 6) The façade has a symmetrical composition with the centrally placed door and two flanking windows. The windows have a slightly arched brick lintel of soldier coursing and stone sills. A small round-headed window with wood frame is located in the central roof gable. The door and windows on this façade are not original—the windows have been replaced with vinyl units.

• West/Side Elevation

The brick wall of the side elevation is detailed only by asymmetrically located window openings with new vinyl units. (Appendix C-1, Figure 7) The window towards the front is likely a later addition. The window towards the rear has a slightly arched brick lintel of soldier coursing (similar to the front windows), while the sill is constructed of chamfered brick.

• East/Side Elevation

The brick wall of the east elevation is defined only by a single window, with vinyl insert, located near the rear of the house. (Appendix C-1, Figure 8) Also visible from this elevation is the side of the small rear addition, clad in vinyl siding.

• South/Rear Elevation

The rear, brick wing on the west side of the building plan has a hipped, shingled roof and one window opening with vinyl insert. A door leads to the small backyard and exits the house just to the south of the small frame, vinyl clad addition.

6.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE EVALUATION

Since amendment in 2002, the Ontario Heritage Act now enables municipalities to designate property of cultural heritage value or merit that is real property including buildings and structures.

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

6.1 ARCHAEOLOGY

Identified or potential archaeological resources can be considered as values meriting inclusion into the reasons for designation of a property. A set of twelve
criteria is used to evaluate an archaeological site or measure archaeological potential to determine what attributes, if any, warrant designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.

The first eleven criteria for designation of an archaeological site are predicated on the presence of an archaeological site. In the case of 9 Kinnell Street, there are no registered or reported archaeological sites located on the subject property. As a result, only the Archaeological Potential criterion applies in this assessment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Definition: N/A</th>
<th>Site Setting: N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporal Integrity: N/A</td>
<td>Site Socio-political Value: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Size: N/A</td>
<td>Site Uniqueness: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Type: N/A</td>
<td>Site Rarity: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Integrity: N/A</td>
<td>Site Human Remains: N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Association: N/A</td>
<td>Archaeological Potential: Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Archaeological Potential**

The subject property comprises a one-storey building, situated in an urban context first developed in the mid-nineteenth century. Based on the history and intensity of development activity on the subject property, and its minimal yard area, the lot has experienced significant disturbance and therefore has minimal archaeological potential. This criterion is not satisfied.

**6.2 BUILT HERITAGE**

A set of twelve criteria is used to identify and assess the built heritage values of property. All twelve of the criteria were applicable in the case of 9 Kinnell Street and six were satisfied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Associations</th>
<th>Integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thematic: Applicable</td>
<td>Location Integrity: Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event: Applicable</td>
<td>Built Integrity: Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person and/or Group: Applicable</td>
<td>Environmental Context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Merit: Applicable</td>
<td>Landmark: Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Merit: Applicable</td>
<td>Character: Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designer: Applicable</td>
<td>Setting: Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Perception: Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HISTORICAL ASSOCIATIONS

Thematic
The subject property is associated with the residential developments of the City of Hamilton that were a direct result of the economic and industrial prosperity at the end of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Accordingly, this criterion has been satisfied.

Event
Research to date reveals that there are no significant events associated with the subject property.

Person and/or Group
The property is not associated with a significant person or group.

ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN

Architectural Merit
The subject building, in its composition, design and materials, is only a representative example of modest, vernacular residential architecture.

Functional Merit
This building continues today to serve the residential function for which it was built. Accordingly, this criterion has been satisfied.

Designer
To date, research has not been able to determine the architect/builder/designer.

Integrity

Location Integrity
The subject building remains in its original location on Kinnell Street. Accordingly, this criterion has been satisfied.

Built Integrity
The subject building retains its original architectural configuration of the one-storey brick building with hipped roof. However, changes to the building include replacement windows and doors throughout, new roofing, painting of the brick material, application of stone to the front facade, along with new front stairs and porch. Therefore, this criterion is not satisfied.

Environmental Context

Landmark
The residential building is part of the residential streetscape but does not stand as a landmark in the neighbourhood.

**Character**

The subject property is located in an area that retains its historic character. The building thus contributes to the overall character of the streetscape. It is integrated well with its surroundings. (Appendix C-1, Figure 9) Accordingly this criterion has been satisfied.

**Setting**

The setting of the subject property has been little altered from the original. Accordingly, this criterion has been satisfied.

**SOCIAL VALUE**

**Public Perception**

The subject property was included in the former City of Hamilton’s *Inventory of Buildings of Historical and/or Architectural Interest*, and has been a matter of public record since 1983. Indeed almost all of the houses on Kinnell Street are listed on the City’s inventory. Therefore, this criterion has been satisfied.

### 6.3 CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPES

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

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

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

The subject property at 9 Kinnell Street is currently, and was historically, surrounded by residential buildings of similar age and style. However, in the assessment, only the subject building and its immediate lot are being evaluated for
its cultural heritage value. Accordingly, the subject property is not considered to be a cultural heritage landscape for the purposes of this assessment and evaluation.

7.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Conclusions
The subject property satisfies six of the 12 criteria pertaining to built heritage:

**Thematic:** The subject property is associated with the residential/suburban developments of the City of Hamilton which were a direct result of the economic/industrial prosperity at the end of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

**Functional Merit:** This building continues today to serve the residential function for which it was built.

**Location Integrity:** The subject building remains in its original location on Kinnell Street.

**Character:** The subject property is located in an area that retains its historic character. The building thus contributes to the overall character of the streetscape. It is integrated well with its surroundings.

**Setting:** The setting of the subject property has been little altered from the original.

**Public Perception:** The subject property was included in the former City of Hamilton’s *Inventory of Buildings of Historical and/or Architectural Interest*, and has been a matter of public record since 1983. Indeed almost all of the houses on Kinnell Street are listed on the City’s inventory.

7.2 Compliance with Ontario Heritage Act, Ontario Regulation 9/06: Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

According to Subsection 1 (2) of Ontario Regulation 9/06, Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, a property may be designated under section 29 of the Act if it meets one or more of the following criteria:

1. The property has design value or physical value because it,
   i.  is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method,
   ii.  displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or
   iii.  demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.

2. The property has historical value or associative value because it,
i. has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community,
ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or
iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.

3. The property has contextual value because it,
   i. is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area,
   ii. is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or
   iii. is a landmark.

The subject property has design value because it is a representative example of an architectural style; and, it has contextual value because it is significant in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of the area.

7.3 Recommendation

The building located at 9 Kinnell Street, Hamilton, satisfies the City of Hamilton evaluation criteria, but not in a particularly persuasive manner. It is concluded, due to the importance of the building to its contextual setting, that the property is better suited to a designation under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act as one of a number of properties on Kinnell Street. Nevertheless, the property does satisfy the Ontario Heritage Act, Ontario Regulation 9/06 Criteria to be a property of cultural heritage value for the purposes of the Ontario Heritage Act and can be recommended for designation under Part IV.
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