SUBJECT: Recommendation to Designate 1059 Highway 8, Stoney Creek, Under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (PED07207) (Ward 11)

RECOMMENDATION:

(a) That the designation of 1059 Highway 8, Stoney Creek, 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 PED07207, be approved.

(c) That the City Solicitor be directed to take appropriate action to designate 1059 Highway 8, Stoney Creek, under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, in accordance with the Notice of Intention to Designate, attached as Appendix B to Report PED07207.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) directed staff to prepare a Cultural Heritage Assessment for the building at 1059 Highway 8, Stoney Creek, following a request by the property owner to have the property designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. It has been determined that the 1888 brick residence possesses cultural heritage value due to its association with the growth and prosperity of Saltfleet Township in the nineteenth century. In its composition, design and materials, the building is an excellent example of Queen Anne style residential architecture and retains almost all of its original architectural features and ornamentation. Located in an area that contains a number of surviving nineteenth century residences, 1059 Highway 8 serves as a reminder of the importance of the area, then known as the “Garden of Canada,” which put the Township on the international market scene. The building was once home to a key contributor to the area’s fruit growing and shipping industry—Thomas H.P. Carpenter.

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 February 2006, Mary Stallbohm, the owner of 1059 Highway 8, Stoney Creek, requested the designation of the property under the Ontario Heritage Act (see Location Map attached as Appendix C-1 to Report PED07207, Figure 2, Page 2 of 17).

At their meeting of April 2006, 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 PED07207). The Cultural Heritage Assessment Report is attached as Appendix C to Report PED07207.

ANALYSIS/RATIONALE:

The intent in designating property is to enable a process of cultural resource management and conservation of identified, valued heritage features. This is usually undertaken through the consideration of subsequent heritage permit applications for alterations and additions to a property.
Designation is typically guided by the process of cultural heritage evaluation and assessment. The process, as evidenced in the attached Appendix C to Report PED07207, 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 three criteria. The subject property at 1059 Highway 8, Stoney Creek, satisfies all three criteria—historical value, design value and 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 former City of Stoney Creek (Subsections E.5.1, E.5.2) support the preservation, enhancement and or rehabilitation of cultural heritage resources. Designation of 1059 Highway 8, Stoney Creek, will be in accordance with these policies.

**RELEVANT CONSULTATION:**

Pursuant to Subsection 29 (2) 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 June 28, 2007, the Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) considered this request for designation, together with a staff report and the Cultural Heritage Assessment (attached as Appendix C to Report PED07207), together with Statement of Cultural Heritage Value and Description of Heritage Attributes (attached as Appendix A to Report PED07207), and recommends that the designation of 1059 Highway 8, Stoney Creek, under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, be supported.

**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. The conservation of designated properties reduces the strain on dump and landfill sites where up to 60% of available space is currently filled with demolition and construction waste. Conservation of designated properties is more economically and environmentally sustainable than new construction, and the reuse of historic resources utilizes existing infrastructure. 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.

Designated properties can be recycled to lead useful and economically viable lives. When buildings are rehabilitated, the projects are labour intensive, usually using local trades and materials, thus serving as ideal sources of employment. In addition, 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.

:SV
Attachs. (4)
STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE AND DESCRIPTION OF HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES

Statement of Cultural Heritage Value

The 1888 brick residence located at 1059 Highway 8, Stoney Creek, possesses cultural heritage value due to its association with the growth and prosperity of Saltfleet Township in the nineteenth century. The residence contributes to the understanding of the community’s history in serving as a visual reminder of the importance of this area, then known as the “Garden of Canada,” which put the Township on the international market scene. The building was once home to a key contributor to the area’s fruit growing and shipping industry—Thomas H.P. Carpenter.

Carpenter had built for him a two and one-half storey residence befitting a citizen of his stature and this Queen Anne Revival style house in its composition, design and materials is an outstanding example of this popular nineteenth century style. The building continues to retain almost all of its original architectural features including the decorative wood porches, the gingerbread trim, soffits, brackets, windows, doors, slate roofing material, and brick chimneys, all fashioned with a high degree of craftsmanship. Several other late nineteenth century Queen Anne style brick residences can be found along this stretch of Highway 8, making this residence part of an overall context of heritage resources in the City.

Description of Heritage Attributes

The south, west, east and north elevations of the building along with the hipped roof with dormer and gables; together with all original construction materials (brick, stone and wood) and all component architectural features and detailing, including the decorative wood porches, the gingerbread trim, soffits, brackets, windows, doors, slate roofing material, and brick chimneys. On the interior, the heritage attributes include the original wood staircase of the main entrance hall.
CITY OF HAMILTON

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO DESIGNATE

1059 Highway 8, Stoney Creek

IN THE MATTER OF THE ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT and the property in the City of Hamilton known municipally as 1059 Highway 8, Stoney Creek

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 1888 brick residence located at 1059 Highway 8, Stoney Creek, possesses cultural heritage value due to its association with the growth and prosperity of Saltfleet Township in the nineteenth century. The residence contributes to the understanding of the community’s history in serving as a visual reminder of the importance of this area, then known as the “Garden of Canada,” which put the Township on the international market scene. The building was once home to a key contributor to the area’s fruit growing and shipping industry—Thomas H.P. Carpenter.

Carpenter had built for him a two and one-half storey residence befitting a citizen of his stature and this Queen Anne Revival style house in its composition, design and materials is an outstanding example of this popular nineteenth century style. The building continues to retain almost all of its original architectural features including the decorative wood porches, the gingerbread trim, soffits, brackets, windows, doors, slate roofing material, and brick chimneys, all fashioned with a high degree of craftsmanship. Several other late nineteenth century Queen Anne style brick residences can be found along this stretch of Highway 8, making this residence part of an overall context of heritage resources in the City.

Description of Heritage Attributes

The south, west, east and north elevations of the building along with the hipped roof with dormer and gables; together with all original construction materials (brick, stone and wood) and all component architectural features and detailing, including the decorative wood porches, the gingerbread trim, soffits, brackets, windows, doors, slate roofing material, and brick chimneys. On the interior, the heritage attributes include the original wood staircase of the main entrance hall.
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 , 2007.

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

1059 Highway 8, Stoney Creek

City of Hamilton

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

for the City of Hamilton LACAC
(Municipal Heritage Committee)

April 2007
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 1059 Highway 8 in the City of Hamilton, formerly Stoney Creek, in the Saltfleet Township, containing a two and one-half storey brick residential building constructed in 1888. (Appendix C-1, Figure 1). The building is included on the City of Hamilton’s Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest, and was recognized by the Stoney Creek LACAC as early as 1994 as a property worthy of designation.

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 north side of Highway 8, just east of McNeill Road, west of Lewis Road (Ward 11) (refer to Location Map attached as Appendix C-1, Figure 2). The property has a lot frontage on Highway 8 of 40.986 metres (134.47 feet) and a lot depth of 102.452 metres (336.13 feet), for a total lot area of 0.202 hectares (0.5 acres).1 The irregularly shaped lot, part of Lot 8, Concession 2, Saltfleet Township, contains the two and one-half storey, brick residence, the principle focus of this cultural heritage assessment, along with a small, brick shed at the rear of the property.

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.2 The Lake Iroquois Beach rises above the landward edge of the Plain, forming a prominent bluff through the region. And, in this area of the Niagara fruit belt, higher terraces rise adjacent to the escarpment. The flat Iroquois Plain easily accommodated land transportation routes and was thus a prime area for historical development. Highway 8 (on which the subject property is built) closely follows the Iroquois bluff from Queenston to Hamilton. This Highway, formerly a regional road, passes over the beach west of Stoney Creek—an area whose soil later supported numerous orchards which thrived on the gravelly soil.3 From Stoney Creek to Hamilton there are broad gravel

---

1 City of Hamilton GISNet, Municipal property assessment rolls (as accessed in January 2007).


ridges upon which well-drained loams developed. This soil condition, along with the favourable climate, made this area a prime fruit growing region.

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 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 not fully represented by the density of archaeology in the immediate locale. There are no registered archaeological sites within the immediate area of the subject property. However, the area retains both historic and prehistoric archaeological potential as sites may be present in areas that have not been formally archaeologically assessed. The area’s archaeological potential is indicated by proximity to a historic transportation corridor, a historic settlement area and individual farmsteads, the Iroquois Beach Ridge and the Niagara Escarpment. The subject property retains little archaeological potential due to its small area and level of disturbance.

Euro-Canadian Settlement

Saltfleet Township

Saltfleet was one of seven townships laid out in 1788 by the Surveyor Augustus Jones at the direction of the Lieutenant-Governor John Graves Simcoe. Bounded by Barton Township (later Hamilton) on the west, Grimsby on the east, Lake Ontario on the north, and stretching south above the escarpment to Binbrook Township, the area of Saltfleet in the County of Wentworth became a settlement location for many United Empire Loyalists. Although a few Loyalist squatters occupied land below the escarpment even prior to Jones’ surveying the land into a formal grid of lots and concessions, these settlers arrived in greater numbers as the Crown awarded the 100 acre lots as land grants. Many Loyalists received more than one land grant and ultimately amassed great swaths of land throughout

---


5 Ontario Ministry of Culture. Ontario Archaeological Sites Database.

the Township. Officially formed in 1850, the Township of Saltfleet continued as a political entity until 1974 at which time it was renamed The town of Stoney Creek.7

Concession 2, Lot 8

The subject property at 1059 Highway 8 is located on a very small portion of Concession 2, Lot 8. Concession 2, Lot 8 is today bounded by McNeilly Road to the west, Barton Street to the north, and the base of the escarpment to the south. The eastern boundary is not defined by a road allowance, rather it is half-way between McNeilly and Lewis Road.8 Highway 8, once the major east-west route from Barton Township towards Niagara, cuts diagonally across the southern portion of this lot. (Appendix C-1, Figure 3 – Map of 1859)

The Crown Patent for Concession 2, Lot 8 was one of many awarded to Jacob Smith in 1801. In total, Smith and his son owned approximately 1000 acres in Saltfleet Township.9 Another prominent landowner at this time was Gersham Carpenter, whose Crown Patents totalled over 800 acres, including the 100 acre property neighbouring Smith’s on the east—Concession 2, Lot 7.10

In 1814 Gersham Carpenter acquired Concession 2, Lot 8 from Jacob Smith.11 Upon Gersham’s death in 1844, the lot, along with a portion of the lot directly to the south (Concession 3, Lot 8), was willed to Gersham’s son Jonathan P. Carpenter.12 (refer to Appendix C-1, Figure 3) Several other Carpenter family members also owned a number of other Township lots as evidenced on the map of 1859.13

7 In 1984 the town of Stoney Creek was incorporated as a city. Kay Dwyer, Saltfleet—Then and Now, 1792-1973 (Hamilton: D.G. Seldon Printing Limited, 1975): 10.

8 The basic pattern of lots and road allowances as laid out in the eighteenth century remains today. The road allowances were laid out after every second 100 acre lot, therefore lots 7 and 8 did not have a road separating them.

9 Smith’s land in Saltfleet included Concession 2, Lots 8, 9, 10, 11; Concession 3, Lots 9, 10, 11; Concession 1, Lot 8; and the Broken Front concession, Lot 8. Burkholder and Woodhouse (1965): 36-39. Smith also had land grants in Glanford and Flamborough. Jacob Smith Jr’s house, at 982 Highway 8 (Concession 2, Lot 9), has been designated under the Ontario Heritage Act (By-law 4356-95) and is, in 2007, still owned by a Smith family member.


11 Land Registry – Abstract of Index Books, 1867: 82.

12 Land Registry – Abstract of Index Books, 1867: 82. The neighbouring lot to the east (Concession 2, Lot 7) was willed to another son by the name of John.

13 Other Carpenter-owned lands in 1859 include Concession 4 and 5, Lots 2 and 3 (Alexander); Concession 2, Lot 15 and Broken Front Concession, Lots 13 and 14 (Charles); Concession 8, Lot 16 (C. Carpenter); Concession 1 and Broken Front Concession, Lot 8 (Joseph); Concession 1, Lots 13, 14 and 15, and Broken Front Concession, Lot 13 (Gersham); and, Concession 1, Lot 2 (Smith).
In the 1870s, Concession 2, Lot 8 was transferred to Charles P. Carpenter just as he was establishing his fruit growing and shipping business with his son Thomas H.P. Carpenter.14 (Appendix C-1, Figure 4 – Map of 1875) Since a major transportation route traversed the lot, this was a prime location for the establishment of a business enterprise. The orchards were planted on both the north and south sides of the road, as is visible on the map of 1875. This road, which began as a native trail and was later Regional Road 81, would, in 1918, become King’s Highway 8.

In 1887 a portion of this land was transferred to Charles’ son and business partner, Thomas H.P. Carpenter.15 This date corresponds to around the time that Thomas was beginning to supersede the elder Charles as the head of the successful family fruit growing and shipping business. It was also at this time that Thomas erected his own residence, one that befitted his position and stature in the Saltfleet farming community.16 Thomas Carpenter’s house, on the north side of Highway 8, across from his father’s house, is the focus of this cultural heritage assessment.17

The Carpenter Family

The Carpenter name was well-known in Saltfleet Township along with the Orrs, Tweedles, Pettits, Smiths and Nashs. Stemming from the New Jersey born Ashman Carpenter, the seven sons and five daughters settled in Saltfleet in the eighteenth century, the daughters in turn marrying into other prominent Loyalist families such as the Pettits and the Smiths.18 By the third-quarter of the nineteenth century there were no less than 18 members of the Carpenter Family living in the area, descendants from three branches of the founding family.19

Various Carpenter family members played key roles in the commerce and politics of the Township. For example, Alexander Carpenter sat on the inaugural Saltfleet Township Council in 1850 and was Reeve from 1860 to 1862.20 A number of other

---

14 Wentworth County Land Registry Office Abstract: 82. The Voters list of 1879 notes both C.P. and T.H.P. Carpenter on Concession 2, Lot 8.

15 C.P. Carpenter divided off 10 acres of land into a separate parcel in 1885 but retained ownership until 1888. Assessment Rolls, 1885: 6 and Wentworth County Land Registry Office: 82.

16 Assessment Rolls show a marked increase in real property value in 1888 suggesting the erection of a substantial building on the lot at that date.

17 C.P. Carpenter’s house is that at 1080 Highway 8.

18 Dwyer (1975): 123.

19 Refer to the Voters’ List for 1877, Municipality of Saltfleet (Hamilton: Spectator Printing Company, 1877)

Carpenters followed in Alexander’s political footsteps.\textsuperscript{21} And, as one of the wealthiest farmers in the area, Franklin M. Carpenter donated land in 1830 at the corner of Fruitland Road and Barton Street (Concession 2, Lot 14) for the use of Fruitland School.\textsuperscript{22} Throughout the Township, these important Carpenter family members erected substantial houses that befit their status in the community. (Appendix C-1, Figure 5)

Yet the Carpenters contributed most significantly to the growth of Saltfleet Township through their very successful fruit growing and shipping operations, the most successful business being the C.P. Carpenter and Sons Orchard, founded in 1878 by Charles P. and his son Thomas H.P. Carpenter, owner of the subject property.\textsuperscript{23}

Due to the temperate environment and the soil conditions on the lands between Lake Ontario and the escarpment, Saltfleet Township was a prime fruit growing location, part of the Niagara fruitbelt, which was known, in the nineteenth century, as the “Garden of Canada.” By 1880, orchards comprised about 8\% of the land in Saltfleet.\textsuperscript{24} Many people gained great wealth due to their farming enterprise, the acreage becoming more and more valuable by the end of the nineteenth century as others realized the potential of the land.

C.P. Carpenter and Sons became so successful that in 1897 the Canadian Horticulturalist Journal referred to Thomas Carpenter (the owner of the subject property) as being key in the development of the fruit industry in Canada.\textsuperscript{25} By that date, the Carpenter farm on Concession 2, Lot 8 and Concession 3, Lot 8, consisted of approximately 175 acres and was well-stocked with vineyards, orchards and nursery stock. (Appendix C-1, Figure 6)

C.P. Carpenter and Sons not only grew and harvested produce but they were major distributors as well. Smaller growers in the area regularly sold their produce to the Carpenters for shipping, which saved them from shipping to “commission houses” in larger centres like Toronto, London or Montreal.\textsuperscript{26} Their distribution

\textsuperscript{21} Joseph was on Council in 1853; Franklin M. was Reeve from 1872 to 1881 and was Clerk/Treasurer from 1901 to 1907; and, G.H. Carpenter was on Council from 1911 to 1912 and was Reeve from 1921 to 1923. Dwyer (1975): 8-10 and 12.

\textsuperscript{22} Dwyer (1975): 230.

\textsuperscript{23} Other Carpenter enterprises included Jonathan Carpenter, Stock Raiser and Fruit Grower (W.T. Goffe, Grimsby, Ontario, Canada: Illustrated and Descriptive Souvenir (Hamilton, Times Print, 1901): 27 and 35 and Canadian Horticulturalist, 20: 3 (1897): 165).

\textsuperscript{24} Dwyer (1975): 42.

\textsuperscript{25} Canadian Horticulturalist 20:4 (1897): 126. They also reference E.D. Smith as another key contributor to the economic development of the Country.

\textsuperscript{26} Goffe (1901): 29.
business excelled due to the large warehouse or shipping station alongside two very important transportation routes—the Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Electric Railway line and the Great Western Railway. (Appendix C-1, Figure 7)

The Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Electric Railway Company (H.G. & B.) was formed in 1891. While “elegant” passenger cars serviced recreational stops through the area then known as the “Garden of Canada,” the Railway was primarily established to move the local produce to the markets, and indeed the majority of the railway revenue was derived from fruit shipping. By 1896 the route covered 23 miles, commencing at the Radial station at Main and Catharine Streets in Hamilton, traversing through Saltfleet, and ending in Beamsville. (Appendix C-1, Figure 8) The tracks followed the road right-of-way on a meandering route, south of the Great Western Railway track, which ran in a straight line adjacent to the shoreline. (Appendix C-1, Figure 9 – Map of 1903). The H.G. & B. line passed through hundreds of orchards and vineyards and “by the very doors of dozens upon dozens of palatial residences belonging to the fruit growers,” including the residence and business of Thomas H.P. Carpenter. Ever the shrewd businessmen, Charles Carpenter, and his son Thomas, sold a strip of their land on Concession 2, Lot 8 to the H.G. & B. Electric Railway Company in 1896, thus ensuring their success as one of the dominant fruit shipping companies in the entire region.

The importance and prominence of C.P. Carpenter and Sons is undeniable by the turn of the twentieth century. A publication of 1901 noted:

This firm were the pioneers in the line of fruit shipping to these distant Provinces (New Brunswick and Nova Scotia) and practically control the trade there. The Canadian Empress Company appreciated the enterprise shown, and built for them specially constructed refrigerator cars to ensure safe arrival of the fruit, and these shipments always reach their destination in splendid marketable condition. They have also shipped fruit to the United States, and even so far as the British West Indies and the Argentine.

---

27 There were four electric radial railway lines that extended out of Hamilton in the nineteenth century—the Hamilton and Dundas Street Railway; the Hamilton Radial Electric; and, the Brantford and Hamilton electric Railway. These later came under the ownership of the Dominion Power and Transmission Company.

28 Goffe (1901): 27.

29 The H.G. & B. was profitable until about 1915 at which time there was a general decline in freight and passenger traffic. The railway closed in 1930 and was dismantled in 1932. Only small portions of the route were maintained to allow the Canadian National Railway access into some of the fruit industries previously only serviced by the H.G & B.

30 Goffe (1901): 29.
Contemporary Context

The T.H.P. Carpenter house at 1059 Highway 8 remained in the Carpenter family until the 1940s. Since then it has had a number of owners, was at one time a boarding house, and is currently (at the time of writing in 2007) in residential use.

The surrounding environment of the subject property at 1059 Highway 8 has been altered from its original context. The original Carpenter orchards have been diminished, but while severed from the property, orchards do still fill the fields to the north of the property. A very large greenhouse complex of temporary construction has been erected to the west, while a road-side restaurant with large paved parking surface has been constructed immediately abutting the subject property on the east. (Appendix C-1, Figure 10)

Highway 8, once a major east-west route across the former Township, became a secondary route after 1940 when the Queen Elizabeth Way was constructed between Stoney Creek and Niagara Falls. Nevertheless, Highway 8 was widened at some point and has thus impacted the current context of the house. Originally set back from the road with an expansive, landscaped lawn area, the building now has a diminished set back, and a circular drive on which a gravel cover has been laid. Land severance has also reduced the side yards, particularly that to the east where the current lot line runs very close to the east side of the house. Due to this severance, the original coach house is now part of the neighbouring property. While greatly altered today, the coach house building is visible in the early photographs of the homestead. (Appendix C-1, Figure 11) Further alterations to the current context have taken place across Highway 8—a commercial/industrial building has been erected, and sits amongst residential buildings.

Although its immediate context has been altered, the building does continue to relate to a number of other late nineteenth century houses along this stretch of Highway 8 in the former Saltfleet Township—many having belonged to other prominent members of the early community. As already mentioned, the C.P. Carpenter home still exists on the south side of Highway 8, only a few metres east from the subject property (1080 Highway 8). Several other houses are very similar in style and date to the subject property, such as those at 1344 Highway 8 and 1491 Highway 8. Others from the same era, have already been recognized with heritage designations—these include 982 Highway 8 (Jacob Smith House/Langside); 1317 Highway 8 (Pettit House/Evanleigh); 1420 Highway 8 (Fred B. Henry House/Spruceway); and 1446 Highway 8 (the VanDuzer House). (Appendix C-1 Figure 12)

5.0 PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

The building located at 1059 Highway 8, Stoney Creek is a two and one-half storey brick building built in 1888 and is an exceptional example of Queen Anne style of
architecture popular in the late-nineteenth century. (Appendix C-1, Figure 13) Typical of the Queen Anne style is the irregular outline or silhouette, projecting two-storey bays, ornate verandas, multisloped roofs and a number of tall decorated chimneys.\textsuperscript{31} Brick was a common material for Queen Anne houses, however a variety of other materials also came into play, such as wood or terracotta. Trim is often intricate and complex. Windows vary in size and shape but are commonly rectangular, while round or oval windows often accentuate a particular building feature.

Given the building’s location and use, it would not be unusual that neither a designer nor an architect were involved in the project. The building was most likely designed from pattern books as these were readily available in Ontario in the nineteenth century. Journals such as the \textit{Canadian Architect and Builder} began to circulate in the late-nineteenth century just as the Queen Anne style was emerging in the country and therefore a fair number of illustrations of this style could be found in this journal. While the farmers and tradespeople of the area may not have had access to high-style architectural journals, they certainly had at their disposal the \textit{Canadian Farmer} journal, which, for the benefit of its readers, often published detailed descriptions, plans and drawings of suitable architecture in a number of styles, sizes and building forms.\textsuperscript{32}

When employing the Queen Anne style, builders had the ability to adjust materials, details and forms to suit their particular clients’ needs. For example, modest, rural buildings could be simply detailed with only brick decoration. But in other instances, when required (either by the client or due to the financial opportunities) the designer could create quite elaborate compositions with a wide range of materials, shapes and details. The subject property at 1059 Highway 8 falls somewhere between the modest version and the overly ornate designs more often found in urban centres, such as that illustrated in the Canadian Architect and Builder in 1888. (Appendix C-1, Figure 14) The expansive porch structures on the subject building add to the ornate quality of the farmhouse and would have provided a covered seating area for the family to look out over their orchards. (see period photograph in Appendix C-1, Figure 1)

\textbf{Building Evolution}

Very little of the building has been altered since its construction in 1888 as early photographs attest. One of the two minor additions is a small, one-storey, flat-roof structure on the east side, towards the rear. The use of a similar brick to the main house suggests that this was a very early addition, probably within 10 or 20 years of the building’s erection. Another later addition at the rear/north is a wood frame, single-storey, gable roof structure currently covered in aluminium siding. Its date is


\textsuperscript{32} The \textit{Canadian Horticulturist} also included illustrations and brief summaries of architectural styles.
unknown, however the use of slate shingles and stone foundation suggests that it too is fairly early in the building’s evolution. Two other wood porches exist which may or may not have been original—these being on the east side of the rear wing (a lean-to wood and glass structure perhaps used as a small summer kitchen) and a small wood porch covering the side door on the west side.

**Building Description**

The building has a complex and varied plan resulting in asymmetrical facades along with a broken and varied roofline. The red brick building with stone foundation is finished with a hipped roof with a number of gables. Covered with the original scalloped, slate shingles, the timber-frame roof has a prominent overhang with detailed wood cornice, fascia and soffit, supported and ornamented with brackets in several locations—all painted out in white. Four brick chimneys punctuate the roofline—one on the east, two on the west, and one centrally located—and all are detailed with brick patterning. Projecting bays dominate the east and west facades. These bays extend above the roof and are defined by decorative gable ends below the chimneys. The large numbers of windows—over 17 in all—varies in size but are generally of a long and narrow proportion. Most windows are wood frame yet they differ in configuration—some are double hung, while others have divided lights, and three have small stained-glass inserts along the top. In most cases the window lintels and sills are stone (currently painted white), but there are a few windows on the rear and sides that have soldier courses of brick in a slightly arching configuration over the window heads as opposed to the flat stone lintels. Smaller basement windows, also with slightly arched heads defined by brick coursing, are cut into the stone foundation. Several doors provide entry into the building on all four elevations—the primary entrance on the south consisting of the original wooden double doors. And several porch structures, with white-painted, gingerbread trim, define the front/south and side/east elevations.

- **South (Front) Elevation**

  The main façade of the building, facing Highway 8, is dominated by the wood porch which runs along the entire plane of the front façade. (Refer to Appendix C-1, Figure 13) Another side porch, attached to the projecting wing on the east, continues this front detail beyond the primary wall plane. The wood deck of the porch is raised on a stone foundation. Four, ornamental, turned posts support the porch roof which is covered in slate shingles. Intricate gingerbread trim and brackets run along the top of the porch and turn at the ends to meet with engaged ornamental posts along the front wall. (Appendix C-1, Figure 15 a) Two wood frame windows, which stretch from the porch deck to the porch roof, are located to the left (west) of the door. These windows have small, stained-glass inserts in the top panel. The front door is comprised of wood and glass, double-doors, with decorative recessed panels and original hardware. (Appendix C-1, Figure 15 b)
Above the porch roof, three, long, narrow rectangular windows define the second floor, while a unique, ocular window with stone hood-moulding and keystone provides light into the large attic space. (Appendix C-1, Figure 16) The roof cornice with wood brackets is broken by this centrally located gable, which is ornamented with gingerbread trim.

- East (Side) Elevation

The east façade is the most complex of all of the facades. (Appendix C-1, Figure 17) The projecting east wing is set back from the front façade, creating an L-shaped area for the side porch. (Appendix C-1, Figure 18) A side door is located on the south wall of the wing. The side porch is identical in detail to that on the front, with the ornamental posts, gingerbread trim and brackets and a slate shingled roof.

This east wing is enhanced with an angular bay with windows on the angled walls and a decorated chimney breast on the outside plane. The chimney breast is detailed with corbelled brick patterns and stone capstones—the chimney extending above the roofline supported with decorative wood brackets springing from the brick wall below and meeting with the overhanging cornice and soffit. (Appendix C-1, Figure 19) The attic of the east wing is lit by a dormer window which also has intricate wood gingerbread trim.

Another additional building block on the east façade is the rectangular, flat-roofed, brick addition further to the rear, with windows arranged on all three sides.

- West (Side) Elevation

The plane of the west façade is broken by a projecting angled bay with windows on the angled walls and an ornamented chimney breast on the outside plane—identical to the materials and configuration on the east elevation. (Appendix C-1, Figure 20) A second, simpler, chimney breast divides an otherwise blank brick wall towards the front of the house. Towards the rear, the wall is punctuated with three asymmetrically located windows. This is also the location of a small, wood, lean-to structure which shelters the side entrance beside the projecting bay.

Also visible on the west façade is the rear, wood-frame addition.

- North (Rear) Elevation

The rear façade is dominated by the wood-frame, currently aluminium clad, gable roofed addition which extends from the main brick body of the house. (Appendix C-1, Figure 21) This addition has only one window opening on the west façade. Only one window punctuates the rear/north brick wall. Another small wood and glass lean-to addition (perhaps a small summer kitchen at one time) is located on the east side of the rear wing.
Many of the original features of the interior remain today in the residence. These include extensive wood trim around doors, windows, and baseboards. Many of the original doors are still in place, including eight wood and glass, sliding, pocket doors on the main floor. The original wood staircase with newel post and spindles occupies the main front hall. (Appendix C-1, Figure 22)

### 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 1059 Highway 8, 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 two and one-half storey building and a small brick shed in the rear. There is little undisturbed land on the property and therefore there is minimal archaeological potential. Accordingly 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 1059 Highway 8, Stoney Creek, and seven were satisfied and two were partially 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>Architecture and Design</td>
<td>Landmark: Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Merit: Applicable</td>
<td>Character: Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional Merit: Applicable</td>
<td>Setting: Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designer: Applicable</td>
<td>Social Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Perception: Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HISTORICAL ASSOCIATIONS

Thematic

The subject property is associated with the growth and prosperity of Saltfleet Township, later the City of Stoney Creek. This building, once the home to a major figure in the Township’s commercial development, also serves as a reminder of the “Garden of Canada” where fruit growing and the shipping of produce put the Township on the international market scene. 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 associated with a very significant family—the Carpenter’s—whose business was a driving economic force in the development of Saltfleet Township. The Carpenters were prominent members of the community serving in political and social capacities. The original owner of this house, Thomas H.P. Carpenter was once considered the key person in the development of the fruit industry in Canada. Accordingly, this criterion has been satisfied.
ARCHITECTURE AND DESIGN

Architectural Merit
The subject building, in its composition, design and materials, is an outstanding example of Queen Anne style residential architecture dating to 1888. Accordingly, this criterion has been satisfied.

Functional Merit
This building continues to serve a residential function. Therefore, this criterion is satisfied.

Designer
The building’s designer is not known and was most likely designed by a builder referring to architectural and popular journals of the day.

Integrity

Location Integrity
The subject building remains in its original location on a major east-west route across the former Township. Accordingly, this criterion has been satisfied.

Built Integrity
The subject building retains its original architectural configuration of the two and one-half storey brick building with hipped roof and gables. Almost all of its original architectural features are intact, including the wood porches, the gingerbread, soffits, brackets, trim, windows, doors, slate roofing material, chimneys and foundation. Therefore, this criterion has been satisfied.

Environmental Context

Landmark
The building is notable on this stretch of Highway 8, due to its location in close proximity to the road. The open space to the east and west further elevates its visibility. Therefore, this criterion is partially satisfied.

Character
The subject property is located in an area whose historic character has been altered since the building’s construction. However, the area continues to reveal remnants of the farming past, including the expansive orchards and greenhouses to the north and west. The building stands as a part of an historic landscape which comprises a number of other late-nineteenth century brick farmhouses along both sides of this stretch of Highway 8. Accordingly, this criterion has been partially satisfied.
Setting
The setting of the subject property has been altered from the original context as the property has been severed over time and neighbouring properties have been greatly altered. A large greenhouse operation is located directly to the west, where fields and orchards would have once surrounded the house. And, on the east, a large paved area for the later restaurant, has altered the rural setting of the building.

SOCIAL VALUE
Public Perception
The subject property was included in the former City of Stoney Creek’s Inventory of Buildings of Historical and/or Architectural Interest, and was recognized of being worthy of designation as early as 1994. 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 1059 Highway 8 was originally sited on an expansive orchard and farm complex which included structures across (on the south side) of Highway 8 as well.

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 seven of the 12 criteria, and partially satisfies two of the 12 criteria, pertaining to built heritage:

Thematic: The subject property is associated with the growth and prosperity of Saltfleet Township, later the City of Stoney Creek. This building, once the home to a major figure in the Township’s commercial development, also serves as a reminder of the “Garden of Canada” where fruit growing and the shipping of produce put the Township on the international market scene.

Person and/or Group
The property is associated with a very significant family—the Carpenters—whose business was a driving economic force in the development of Saltfleet Township. The Carpenters were prominent members of the community serving in political and social capacities. The original owner of this house, Thomas H.P. Carpenter was once considered the key person in the development of the fruit industry in Canada.

Architectural Merit: The subject building, in its composition, design and materials, is an outstanding example of late-nineteenth century, Queen Anne style residential architecture.

Functional Merit: This building was built to serve a residential function and continues today to serve a residential use.

Location Integrity: The subject building remains in its original location on a major east-west route across the former Township.

Built Integrity: The subject building retains its original architectural configuration of the two and one-half storey brick building with hipped roof and gables. Almost all of its original architectural features are intact, including the wood porches, the gingerbread, soffits, brackets, trim, windows, doors, slate roofing material, chimneys and foundation.

Landmark: The building is notable on this stretch of Highway 8, due to its location in close proximity to the road. The open space to the east and west further elevates its visibility.

Character: The subject property is located in an area whose historic character has been altered since the building’s construction. However, the area continues to reveal remnants of the farming past, including the expansive orchards and greenhouses to the north and west. The building stands as a part of a historic landscape which comprises a number of other late-nineteenth century brick farmhouses along this stretch of Highway 8.
Public Perception: The subject property was included in the former City of Stoney Creek’s Inventory of Buildings of Historical and/or Architectural Interest, and was recognized of being worthy of designation as early as 1994.

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 displays a high degree of craftsmanship; it has historical value because it has direct associations with an activity that is significant to the community and it has the potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community; and, it has contextual value because it is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of the area and it is historically linked to its surroundings.

7.3 Recommendation

The building located at 1059 Highway 8, Stoney Creek, satisfies the City of Hamilton evaluation criteria for properties of cultural heritage value and also satisfies the Ministry criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest.
under the Ontario Heritage Act. Thus this property at 1059 Highway 8, Stoney Creek is recommended for designation.
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Figure 1: Residence of T.H.P. Carpenter, 1059 Highway 8, from the *Canadian Horticulturist*, 20: 4 (1897): 126.
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Figure 8: Hamilton, Grimsby and Beamsville Electric Railway advertisement, 1901
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Figure 9: Property of C. P. Carpenter & Sons showing the H.G & B Railway line traversing the property and the Great Western Railway Track to the north. Detail from the Imperial Atlas of Wentworth County, Ontario (J.W. Tyrrell), 1903
Figure 10: A view of property looking west from neighbouring property to the east (2007)
Figure 11 a): Photograph of 1059 Highway 8, c1935 (Erland Lee Museum) – the coachhouse is visible in the far right of the photograph

Figure 11 b): The Coachhouse as altered today (2007)
Figure 12 a): 1420 Highway 8 (Fred B. Henry House/Spruceway), Stoney Creek (Designated under the Ontario Heritage Act, By-law 4422-96)

Figure 12 b): 1446 Highway 8 (the VanDuzer House), Stoney Creek (Designated under the Ontario Heritage Act, By-law 3638-92)
Figure 13: 1059 Highway 8, View of the South Façade (2007)
Figure 14: Queen Anne Style architecture, as represented in *Canadian Architect and Builder* 1:3 (1888): 15.
Figure 15 a): Front porch (2007)

Figure 15 b): Front door (2007)

Figure 16: Front façade, upper level (2007)
Figure 17: East façade (2007)

Figure 18: Porch on east side of front

Figure 19: Chimney breast on east
Figure 20 a): West façade (2007)

Figure 20 b): Detail of west façade (2007)
Figure 21: North/Rear façade – Wood and glass lean-to addition on the left (2007)
Figure 22: Interior staircase (2007)