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1.0 Introduction

The City of Hamilton retained MHBC in 2014 to prepare a Cultural Heritage Assessment report for the property at 91 John Street South, Hamilton Ontario. In 2007, owners of 91 John Street South requested designation of the property under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. City of Hamilton Cultural Heritage Planning Staff subsequently prepared a preliminary evaluation of the property using criteria from Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act and recommended that Council direct staff to carry out a Cultural Heritage Assessment to determine whether the property is of cultural heritage value or interest and worthy of designation.

This report has been structured according to the standard process outlined by the City of Hamilton for Cultural Heritage Assessments. It comprises nine (9) sections, as follows:

Section 1.0 comprises this introduction;

Section 2.0 contains a description of the property, including its physical location, legal description, and dimensions of the property;

Section 3.0 provides a description of the physiographic context of the region where the subject property is located;

Section 4.0 contains a summary of the settlement context, or the broad historical development of the settlement of the subject property and surrounding area;

Section 5.0 provides a detailed description of the subject property and its heritage characteristics or attributes;

Section 6.0 contains a detailed evaluation of the subject property using Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act and criteria outlined by the City of Hamilton;

Section 7.0 provides conclusions and recommendations based on the results of the Cultural Heritage Evaluation, and provides a summary of the criteria that have been met, as well as a recommendation on whether the property should be designated, and if so, a list of heritage attributes;

Section 8.0 contains a bibliography of sources consulted during research and production of this report;

Section 9.0 contains CVs outlining the qualification of the report authors.
2.0 Property Location

The subject property is municipally addressed as 91 John Street South, in Downtown Hamilton. The property’s legal description is Part Lot 55 Plan 1431 George Hamilton Survey; Part Lot 56 Plan 1431 George Hamilton Survey as in 176592; City of Hamilton. It is located on the east side of John Street South, between Jackson Street East and Hunter Street East. This section of John Street South contains a number of two to four storey 19th century buildings with commercial space on the ground floor and residential or office space on the upper floors. The shape and massing of the building is an integral part of the streetscape context, but the streetscape is not uniform, as rooflines display different building heights from a consistent streetwall setback. The property is separated from the building to the south by a laneway. The building fronts directly onto the public right-of-way.
Aerial photograph identifying location of 91 John Street South and surrounding context. Source: City of Hamilton Interactive Maps 2014. Subject property denoted by red outline.

Photograph of 91 John Street South at centre of photograph. MHBC, July 2014.
3.0 Physiographic Context

The study area is located within the Physiographic Region identified as the Iroquois Plain. The Iroquois Plain is a large lowland area bordering Lake Ontario, formed when the last glacier was receding, but still present, in the St. Lawrence Valley. The glacier held a body of water known as Lake Iroquois, which emptied in New York State. The Iroquois Plain that includes the study area is part of the lake bottom of Lake Iroquois, and the terrain has been smoothed by waves or deposits, in comparison to areas that were the former shorelines.

The Ontario Lakehead portion of the Plain, where the study area is located, was initially cut off from the rest of Lake Ontario by a sand strip. However, land along the shorelines in many places provided elevated, dry locations ideal for the development of urban areas (Chapman and Putnam 191, 1984).

4.0 Settlement Context

What is now known as the City of Hamilton was initially part of Barton Township in Lincoln County; surveys of Barton Township began in 1791. In the first decade of the 19th century, (between 1805-1809) James Durand acquired Lot 14, Concession 3 and Lot 14, Concession 2 in Barton Township. Durand and nearby landowner Nathaniel Hughson promoted their lots as a potential location for a courthouse, should a new district be formed. In 1815, Durand sold his land to George Hamilton. In 1816, administrative districts in the area changed with the creation of the Gore District (including parts of the former Home and Niagara Districts). As part of this administrative change, two new counties (Halton and Wentworth) were created. Wentworth County included Ancaster, Barton, Beverly, Binbrook, Flamborough, Glanford and Saltfleet Townships (Weaver, 1982).

Between 1815-1820, George Hamilton had the 104 acres of land he purchased from Durand surveyed and laid out as a town site. The town (named for George Hamilton) became the head of the recently created Gore District. The townsite was located south of the historic waterfront, between the shore and the escarpment (Weaver, 1982).

The creation of the District of Gore led to an increase in population and buildings in Hamilton in the 1820s and 1830s, and many European immigrants began arriving at the harbour at this time and settling in Hamilton. By the mid-1840s, Hamilton had grown sufficiently to warrant a lengthy and detailed description in the 1846 publication *Smith’s Canadian Gazetteer comprising statistical and general information respecting all parts of the upper province, or Canada West*. At this time, Hamilton’s trade had been increasing rapidly since the opening of the Burlington Canal, and the establishment of a customhouse and warehouses created a principle market area for importing goods. The Gazetteer noted that by the 1840s, construction more frequently used limestone and freestone collected from the nearby escarpment. Around the time of the Gazetteer publication, the population of Hamilton was 6,475. The Gazetteer entry noted the street-grid layout as well as the connecting roads with stagecoaches to London, Port Stanley, Chatham, Detroit, Port Dover, Galt, Guelph, Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto. Steamboats from the Harbour also connected Hamilton to Toronto,
Queenston and Niagara. As a thriving town, Hamilton also had a court-house, jail, two market-houses, customs house, post office, engine house and several churches.

In 1846, the Gazetteer noted a high number of professions in the Town, including:

*Nine physicians and surgeons, sixteen lawyers, three breweries, ten wholesale importers of dry goods and groceries, five importers of hardware, forty-nine stores, two foundries, four printing offices, three booksellers, three chemists, sixty-five taverns, two tanneries, three coachmakers, two soap and candle factories, four auctioneers, five saddlers, eleven cabinet makers, three watchmakers, six bakers, ten shoemakers, three gunsmiths, three confectioners, fourteen groceries, eleven beer shops, six builders, five stone masons, five tinsmiths, four hatters, fourteen tailors, eight painters, one marble and stone works, thirteen blacksmiths, three ladies’ seminaries, two schools for boys, four banks.*

Hamilton was incorporated as a city in 1847, with a population of 6,832 as recorded in the census. This had grown from just 1,400 in 1833. Railways arrived in the 1850s, and despite a City Bankruptcy and depression that slowed commercial and industrial growth in the mid 1870s, Hamilton continued to grow. By the 1890s, it had established itself as a leader in industry, with numerous factories, foundries and other industrial establishments located near the harbour.

John Street was one of the early streets included in the Hamilton townsite. Along with James, Catharine, Hannah, Maria and Augusta, John Street was named for members of the Hamilton family. In the early years of Hamilton’s development, John Street became a commercial district.
91 John Street South located on an excerpt of the 1850 Marcus Smith map of Hamilton.

91 John Street South located on a detail of the 1898 Fire Insurance Plan.

91 John Street South located on detail of 1911 Fire Insurance Plan.

91 John Street South located on detail of 1947 Fire Insurance Plan.
John Street became a one-way street in the early 1950s, in response to traffic congestion on the downtown streets. It has continued to evolve as a primarily commercial corridor in downtown Hamilton with a mix of buildings from the 19th and early 20th centuries and later construction.

**Site specific history**

The property is located on part of Lots 55 and 56 of the George Hamilton Survey. Hamilton sold the lots to William Cook (date of sale in 1825, registered in 1830). In the following two years, Cook sold portions of the property to David Beasley, Patrick Phelan, and Hugh McMahon. The properties changed hands again several times until the 1860s.

An 1842 map of the Town of Hamilton shows several structures built in the block at the corner of John Street and Tyburn Street (Jackson Street). At the location of the subject property, markings show lines at the corner of John Street and the laneway. It is not clear whether these depict a structure and the full marking is incomplete or washed out, or whether they are intended to depict only two walls. The 1850 Marcus Smith map appears to show a building in the location of the subject property (see maps on previous page). Ownership of the lot is difficult to read, but appears to say Dowell or McDowell. The function or tenancy of the structures is not known.

The subject property is thought to have been constructed in 1860 as part of a commercial row that includes 87 and 89 John Street South as identified by an initial evaluation by the City of Hamilton. Historic mapping from 1850 shows structures located on the subject property. The footprint of the structure in the 1850 map is similar to the footprint shown on the 1898 Fire Insurance Plan, and it is reasonable to conclude that the building was constructed by this date. However, many commercial buildings had similar footprints, and it is possible that the subject property replaced an earlier building. The markings on the 1842 map of the Town of Hamilton are inconclusive to determine if the building on the subject property had been constructed by that time (see maps on previous pages).

Assessment rolls for John Street did not provide conclusive evidence for a date of construction, as known property owner's names appear and disappear over time and construction materials of the associated structure vary between wood and stone.

In 1864, George E. Tuckett purchased part of the lot containing the subject property. Tuckett came from a working class family that emigrated from Exeter, England, in 1842. Tuckett began a cigar making business in London Ontario in 1857, returning to Hamilton a year later making and selling cigars at a shop on York Street. Over the years, Tuckett entered into several partnerships manufacturing and selling tobacco, the longest lasting of which was his partnership with John Billings from 1866 to 1880, when Billings retired. Tuckett renamed the business and carried on until 1890. Tuckett was also a noted member of the community, elected as councillor for St. Mary’s Ward in 1864, and later serving as the 32nd mayor of Hamilton from 1896 to 1900. Tuckett owned the subject property until 1899, when he sold it to his tenant Edwin Pass. Tuckett never ran his own business or shop from 91 John Street South, but rented to a variety of tenants, including the following:
When Edwin K. Pass purchased the property, it included the two units to the north, 87 and 89 John Street South. He rented to commercial tenants, including a butcher immediately next door. When he passed away in 1955, the properties were given to family members. His son, Edwin S. Pass inherited 89 John Street South and sold it to the butcher tenant. Both 87 and 89 John Street south were purchased around the 1970s and combined to form a restaurant. Edwin J. Pass (son of Edwin S., grandson of Edwin K.) operated the shop until 2007, when he retired and sold to a private owner.

5.0 Property Description

The property at 91 John Street South is a two storey commercial structure built to a rectangular plan with a side gable roof. The structure is part of a commercial row with the adjacent property to the north, separated by a firewall. The building is constructed of brick, except for the southern side wall facing the laneway, which is constructed of uneven coursed limestone. The structure has a limestone foundation, approximately three feet thick, containing several large hand chiselled stones.
West elevation

The west elevation features a two-bay facade with a recessed entrance, transom, and a large full length glass display window with wood frame on the first floor, and two two-over-two sash wood frame windows in the second storey.

The entrance is comprised of narrow wooden double doors with round arched windows. A horizontal wooden mullion separates each window into two panes. In the interior of the frame, copper rods have been installed to deter break-ins. The uppermost rod is used as a curtain rod. The lowermost portion of the doors features decorative mouldings in rectangular shapes. The door features a worn metal handle, and lock for a large key. Two additional metal lock/bolt mechanisms have been installed to fasten the doors together with padlocks.

A rectangular transom is located above the door. Half of the transom has been filled with plywood. The south wall of the entrance feature contains simple wooden panel decoration.

The entrance floor features white honeycomb tiles with three decorative flower motifs in brown tile, and brown tile geometric border.
Detail of simple arched trim and spindles, and bracketed cornice. MHBC, July 2014.

The storefront window features a large single fixed pane of glass facing the street, and a narrower rectangular single fixed pane of glass that angles inward to the entrance way. The display windows are wood framed, and feature simple arched wooden trim and spindles.

The second storey features two large two-over-two sash double hung wood frame windows. The windows were recently restored. Brick voussoirs are located above each window.
Historic photograph clearly showing awning and brackets. Late 19th century. Source: *The County of Wentworth 1853-1937, a Pictorial Parade.*

Streetscape photo of John Street South. The stone wall of 91 John Street South is clearly visible. Note the different awning. Date Unknown. Courtesy of Edwin Pass, 2014.

Between the first and second storey there is a cornice supported by a large bracket at either end. The south end once had two large brackets, but the outermost was damaged by truck traffic turning down the laneway in the 20th century. There are 12 smaller brackets along the cornice. An awning is located between the cornice and the display window and entry. Images from the late 19th century show a different awning configuration than what is in place now and it is presumed that the present awning was added at some point in the 20th century. It is not presently being used.

**South Elevation**
The south elevation of 91 John Street South features an uneven coursed limestone wall. Three windows are located on the south elevation: one large rectangular two-over-two sash double hung window on the first storey, and two rectangular vinyl awning-type windows on the second storey. The first storey window appears to have been added at some point in the late 19th or early 20th century. Bricks around the window fill in the space where stones were likely removed in order to install the window. Unlike the windows on the second storey, this one does not feature a brick voussoir, but instead has a tooled stone lintel and sill. Iron grates have been installed in front of the window to prevent break-ins.

The second storey windows were originally much larger, but were removed in the 20th century. The majority of the openings were filled with concrete block, and smaller vinyl windows with concrete sills were installed to prevent break-ins.
An entrance door on the first storey of the south elevation has been filled in with uneven coursed limestone and lime mortar. A timber lintel still remains in the facade. This entrance appears to have been filled in quite some time ago, likely in the 19th century, given the materials used.

Most of the stone on the south elevation is visible, though a portion of it has been painted white. Brick quoins join the stone portion to the brick portion on the west wide, while larger stone quoins join the stone portion to the brick wall on the east side.

**East elevation**

Photograph of east elevation showing outline of former rear wing. November 2006. Courtesy of City of the Hamilton.


Photograph of east elevation with the metal door clearly visible. July 2014.

Detail of east elevation July 2014.

The east elevation of the structure features a brick wall that has been exposed since the 1980s when the rear portion of the structure was removed. The rear portion of the structure had been two storeys, and
was accessed from the rear stairway of the main building. A metal door seals the entranceway and is now exposed on the facade.

Traces of the former rear wing are visible on the walls of the structure, showing the former slope of a gable roof, and divisions of interior rooms through the painted exterior. The red brick chimney is located in the centre of the east elevation.

**Interior Features**


- Detail of embossed tin wall ceiling July 2014.

- Cherry wood and glass partition November 2006, City of Hamilton.

- Detail photograph of safe MHBC July 2014.
Access to the interior of the property was granted by the property owner on July 11, 2014. The interior of the main first storey features embossed tin wall covering and ceiling tiles. The tin wall coverings contain a diamond pattern with fleur-de-lis in every other row. The tin ceiling features a crown moulding with an arch and fan motif, and a border around the outer edge with a cross and eight-pointed flower/star design. The main ceiling contains a design with large diamond panels containing four concentric circles and a leaf motif. The elaborate tin walls and ceiling have a high degree of integrity and appear to be in good repair. The interior of the former jewellery shop also contains two large solid cherry and glass jewellery display cases, which were reportedly built for the shop, work desks used by the watchmakers, and an ornate display window feature, partition, and safe.

The window display is flush with the entrance to the building, and provides a decorative backdrop to the display area at the storefront window. It features a row of four sliding panels of cherry wood, each with acid etched glass with the floral border and floral urn motif. The panels slide to the sides to allow access to the display area. One of the decorative glass panels was damaged in an act of vandalism and has not been replaced. Five fixed pane plain glass panels are located above the decorative sliding glass. A cherry frame mirror with decorative scrollwork atop is located in front of the sliding glass panels on a short pulley system providing access to the display panel.

A cherry wood and textured glass partition is located between the front entrance and the display window and work area. The partition is connected between the doorframe and the first display case, and features one hinged panel that permits access to the workshop area.
6.0 Cultural Heritage Evaluation

6.1 Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation of this property is consistent with the framework provided by the City of Hamilton in the City of Hamilton Framework for Cultural Heritage Evaluation. Specifically, this evaluation uses the framework provided for built heritage features (Section 3). The criteria by which the property is evaluated are identified below (descriptions and the full evaluation criteria can be found in Appendix A). The criteria below have been developed from, and expand on, Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical Associations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Thematic: how well does the feature or property illustrate a historical theme that is representative of significant patterns of history in the context of the community, province or nation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Event: is the property associated with a specific event that has made a significant contribution to the community, province or nation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Person/Group: is the feature associated with the activities of a person or group that has made a significant contribution to the community, province or nation?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Architecture and Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Architectural merit: what is the architectural value of the resource?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Functional metric: what is the functional quality of the resource?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Designer: what is the significance of this structure as an illustration of the work on an important designer?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integrity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Location integrity: is the structure in its original location?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Built integrity: is the structure and its components parts all there?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Landmark: is it a visually conspicuous feature in the area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Character: what is the influence of the structure on the present character of the area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Setting: what is the integrity of the historical relationship between the structure and its immediate surroundings?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. Public perception: is the property or feature regarded as important within its area?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Evaluation of 91 John Street South

Evaluation of 91 John Street South using Ontario Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act

The following table shows which criteria of Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act the property at 91 John Street South meets. Further elaboration is provided in the description below, using the City of Hamilton criteria.
Design or Physical Value – the property...

| is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method | ✓ |
| displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit | ✗ |
| demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. | ✗ |

Historical or Associative Value – the property...

| has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community, | ✓ |
| yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or | ✓ |
| demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community. | ✗ |

Contextual Value – the property...

| is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area, | ✓ |
| is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or | ✓ |
| is a landmark. | ✗ |

Historical Association:

The property at 91 John Street South is associated with the theme of 19th century commercial development on John Street. The building was originally part of the three-unit row and appears to have been constructed by or before the 1850s. Beginning in the mid-1860s when the property was purchased by George Tuckett, it had a steady stream of tenants including tailors, cabinet makers, watchmakers and jewelers. Edwin Pass, a watchmaker from Coventry, England became the tenant in 1889, and purchased the property in 1899. His son and grandson (both named Edwin) also worked as watchmakers in the shop.

The Pass shop served the local community for 120 years, making and repairing watches and clocks and selling jewellery. The historical value of the building is vested in its association with the multi-generational family-run Pass jewellery business.

While the structure was owned by prominent tobacco merchant and public figure George Tuckett, he did not operate his own business from the building.

Architecture and Design

The building at 91 John Street South is a representative example of an early-to-mid-19th century vernacular commercial building. The simplicity of the design, side-facing gable and the relative symmetry of the facade show some influence of Georgian architectural style that was common in Ontario from the late 18th century to the mid 19th century. There are few other intact discernible examples of this type of commercial structure remaining in Hamilton, making it a rare example. The rounded arches of the door, the arched detailing on the storefront window and the bracketed cornice
above the storefront and entrance are more representative of later 19\textsuperscript{th} century Italianate design and may have been added to the structure during this time period. The structure was built to serve a functional purpose as a commercial structure, and has done so for well over a century. The second storey and rear addition would initially have provided living quarters or additional commercial space. The architect, designer or builder of the structure is not known.

\textbf{Integrity}

The integrity of the structure at 91 John Street South is high. The property is located in its original position, and the integrity of its 19\textsuperscript{th} century design is particularly good on the west facade visible from the street. The west facade retains its simple, Georgian-influenced design as well as Italianate window and door features from the 19\textsuperscript{th} century. The wood-frame windows on the second storey have been restored. On the south side, the uneven coursed stone wall is still primarily visible, though a part of it has been painted over. Some window and door features have been filled in, but these are reversible changes. The door appears to have been filled in long ago and is a change that can be considered part of the structure’s historical evolution, as can the additional window on the first floor which appears to have been added in the later 19\textsuperscript{th} or early 20\textsuperscript{th} century. The second storey windows have been altered and the rear wing of the building has been removed but overall many important components and details from the structure’s early history have been retained.

The integrity of the interior of the main room is also relatively high. The tin wall panelling and tin ceiling have been retained. According to Edwin Pass III, these were likely installed c.1910. Also remaining are the acid etched glass window display, cherry wood and textured glass partition, and cherry wood display cases. The exact dates of these fixtures are not known, but they have been a long-standing part of the former shop’s history.

\textbf{Environmental Context}

The property at 91 John Street South is distinctive in the streetscape. It has value as a representative mid-19\textsuperscript{th} century commercial structure that forms part of a varied street wall. The property contributes to the character of the area by its cohesion with the commercial streetscape. The building contributes to maintaining a historic character of the streetscape – where many original or historic elements have been removed or altered from surrounding commercial facades, this structure and others like it maintain a sense of time and place with their restored or remaining historical features. The property retains its relationship to the laneway to the south. The laneway provided access and parking areas to the rear of the property and others in this block.

Unlike public buildings (post offices, courthouses), many commercial blocks were not designed to be landmarks, but to serve specific or changing business needs. The property at 91 John Street South is not a landmark by definition, but is still an important contributor to the street wall. The building is representative not just of vernacular commercial architecture, but of service industries that were the backbone of emerging 19\textsuperscript{th} century towns.
Social Value

The property demonstrates some community value, having been recognized in the Hamilton Spectator in 2007 just before Edwin J. Pass’s retirement. The article discussed the history of the shop and the three generations of the Pass family who worked there. The current property owner was recognized in 2011 with an award from the Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee for restoration of the property and its contribution to Hamilton’s built heritage. Widespread community value of the building has not been documented.

7.0 Cultural Heritage Value: Conclusions and Recommendations

The property at 91 John Street South is representative of early commercial buildings in Hamilton. It is a rare remaining example, most likely constructed before the 1850s. The structure retains numerous 19th century features, including the double wooden doors, a large display window framed by wood spindles, restored two-over-two sash wood frame windows, and bracketed cornice. The interior also includes many historic (likely late 19th or early 20th) features, including the pressed tin wall and ceiling panels, acid etched glass windows, cherry wood partitions and display counters. Overall, the integrity of the structure is high, being in its original location and retaining numerous historical elements as described above. The property is directly associated with three generations of watchmakers named Edwin Pass, who operated the shop for nearly 120 years, from 1889 to 2007. The property’s 19th century features contribute to the character of the area, providing reminder of John Street’s historical past as one of the main commercial streets in Hamilton. Some community/social value of the property is apparent in newspaper articles and a local award for restoration of the property.

As demonstrated in the detailed evaluation in Section 6.2, the property meets at least one criteria in each of the categories identified by the City of Hamilton and based on Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act: Historical Associations (thematic and person/group); Architecture and Design (architectural merit and functional merit); Integrity (location integrity, built integrity); Environmental Context (character, setting); and Social value.

Based on the conclusions above and results of the evaluation, it is recommended that the property at 91 John Street South be designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. The following Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and Description of Heritage Attributes should be included in the designation by-law.

It should be noted that the building houses an intact collection of interior fittings or features, such as the display cases, watch-maker’s desk, window display, and partition and safe are of cultural heritage value or interest. It is recommended that these interior fittings be valued as part of the building and uses on site. If this proves impossible to accommodate future, appropriate uses that sustain the life of the building, then it is recommended that the sale, loan or donation of these pieces to a local museum or library should be considered so that the features may continue to provide a useful function, and their origins may be interpreted.
Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

Description of Historic Place

The property at 91 John Street South is a mid-19th century commercial structure that was once part of a three-unit commercial row. The property is located on the east side of John Street South, in a commercial urban area in Hamilton. A laneway is located directly south of the property. It is a two storey structure with side gable roof. The south side wall is constructed of limestone, and the building has a limestone foundation. The remainder of the building is constructed of brick. It has a two-bay facade with a large glass display window, historic wooden door, and two over two sash wood frame windows in the second storey. The 19th century form and decorative details of the facade are generally intact or have been restored. In 1889, Edwin Pass, a watchmaker became the tenant of the property. He purchased it in 1899. Three generations of the Pass family owned and operated the watch repair and jewellery store in this location, closing in 2007. The building at 91 John Street South is a remarkable example of both a multi-generation local business and an intact example of 19th century commercial establishment. The Statement of Cultural Heritage Value pertains to the exterior of the building as visible from the street, and several interior features of the first storey.

Heritage Value

The property at 91 John Street South demonstrates design value, historical value, contextual value, social value, and has a high degree of integrity.

The property at 91 John Street south demonstrates design or physical value as it is an intact example in the City of Hamilton of mid 19th century commercial design. The exact date of construction is not known, but a matching building footprint appears on maps by at least 1850. The property is representative of vernacular design, but shows influence of the simplicity and formal arrangement common to many buildings influenced by classically-inspired design. The west, street-facing facade also features 19th century elements more reflective of the Italianate influence, including large storefront window with wooden trim and spindles, recessed entrance with a pair of narrow wooden doors with round arched windows, and a bracketed cornice.

The property at 91 John Street South demonstrates historical value due to its association with the theme of 19th and 20th century commerce in Hamilton, and particularly for its long-standing multi-generational ownership and operation by the Pass family, spanning over 100 years. The Pass family was valued by the local community that they served for more than 100 years. In 1864 the property was purchased by George Tuckett, tobacco manufacturer/retailer and later Mayor of Hamilton. From 1866 to 1889, the property housed a number of trades and businesses, including cabinet makers, trunk

The property has contextual value as it is retains its relationship to John Street South, an important commercial corridor in Hamilton, and to the laneway directly to the south. The property is located on the former lots 55 and 56 in the George Hamilton Survey, which laid out early streets, laneways and building lots in Hamilton (including the laneway directly south of the property). John Street was one of the main commercial thoroughfares in Hamilton in the 19th century.

**Heritage Attributes**

**Exterior attributes**

- Two storey massing, rectangular plan;
- Side facing gable;
- Brick construction on west side, including quoins and voussoirs;
- Stone construction on south wall, including quoins;
- Limestone foundation;
- Two-over-two sash double hung wood frame windows in rectangular openings on the second storey;
- Large display window with arched wooden trim and spindles;
- Pair of narrow double entrance doors with round arched windows and rectangular mouldings;
- Rectangular transom opening above front entrance;
- Rectangular wooden panels beside the entrance feature;
- Floral and geometric tile design at front entrance; and,
- Bracketed cornice with two large end brackets and 12 small brackets.

**Interior attributes**

- Interior pressed tin wall covering and ceiling (including crown moulding);
- Cherry wood and acid etched glass sliding display windows and mirror;
- Cherry wood and textured glass partition; and,
- Baseboard and wooden window surrounds in second storey front room.
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Appendix A

City of Hamilton Framework for Cultural Heritage Evaluation
A Framework for Evaluating the Cultural Heritage Value or Interest of Property for Designation under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*

1. *Introduction*

The following evaluation criteria seek to provide a consistent means of examining and determining the cultural heritage value or interest of real property. They will be used by staff and the City of Hamilton’s Municipal Heritage Committee (formerly the Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee or LACAC) in determining whether to designate property under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

It is anticipated that properties to be designated must have one or more demonstrated attributes of cultural heritage value or interest. The greater the number of attributes the more likely it is that a property will be of significant or considerable cultural heritage value.

These criteria recognize the housekeeping changes made to the *Ontario Heritage Act* as per the *Government Efficiency Act, 2002*. Municipalities are enabled to designate those properties of *cultural heritage value* and to identify those heritage attributes that account for the property’s cultural heritage value or interest.

In keeping with contemporary heritage conservation and management practice these are considered to be those properties that have cultural heritage value expressed in the following forms:

- Archaeological sites and areas;
- Built heritage features; and,
- Cultural heritage landscapes.

These categories follow the direction and guidance in the Provincial Policy Statement issued pursuant to the Ontario Planning Act. No guidance is yet provided under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

2. *Archaeology*

2.1. *Introduction*

The designation of archaeological sites under the Ontario Heritage Act (OHA) has traditionally been at the discretion of the Provincial Government, until the recent amendments to the OHA under the *Government Efficiency Act, 2002*. Among other
effects, these changes extend this capacity to municipalities, hence the process herein of defining the City of Hamilton criteria for OHA designation of archaeological sites.

2.2. Hamilton Archaeology

The City of Hamilton has approximately 735 archaeological sites currently (2001) registered by archaeologists on the Ontario Archaeological Sites Database, maintained by the Ontario Ministry of Culture (MCL). Numerous other sites are known to exist, but are not as yet registered on the OASD. Further, a large number of unknown sites exist, but have not yet been identified. Many of these sites, whether registered or not, are too small to warrant significant investigation, other than to establish and map their presence and general nature.

The registration of known sites by licensed archaeologists under the OHA serves to record the sites’ presence, cultural affiliation, and status. Sites, which have been fully excavated, and therefore exist only in the form of excavation records, removed artifacts and reports, remain registered.

The overall pattern in the data is that the highest density of registered sites occurs in areas that have been the focus of survey, whether driven by development proposals and Planning Act requirements or academic research.

2.3. Archaeological Work

Archaeology is by its nature a destructive discipline. Sites are identified through survey, arising from some form of soil disturbance, which informs the archaeologist that a site or sites are present. Apart from establishing a site presence and some broad ideas of site boundaries and cultural horizons, however, the nature of a site is largely unknown until excavation activities take place.

The difference between the archaeological excavation of a site and its undocumented removal by construction activities lies in the records retained and reported on by the archaeologists. The knowledge of the archaeological site persists, however, and while it may be absent, the former presence indicates that the area in which it occurs is one of archaeological potential, if the landscape remains relatively intact.

Soil disturbance can take many forms, and has varied effects on the archaeological resource. Much of archaeology in Ontario occurs in the topsoil horizon, with some extending into the subsoil, which affects its visibility and sensitivity to disturbance.

Most of the archaeology in Hamilton has been identified as a result of over a hundred years of agricultural activities, namely tilling the soil. While cultivation disturbs sites, it does so with only moderate loss of site information. More intensive forms of agricultural, such as tree or sod farms, have a more substantial and deleterious effect. Soil disturbances such as grade alteration or compaction essentially obliterate archaeological resources.
2.4. Archaeologists

Terrestrial and aquatic archaeology in Ontario is administered through the MCL, while some authority has been downloaded to municipalities. In addition to maintaining the site registry, MCL is responsible for licensing archaeologists: only licensed archaeologists are permitted to carry out archaeological fieldwork (Section 4.48.1), or alter archaeological sites through the removal or relocation of artifacts or any other physical evidence of past human use or activity, from the site (Section 4.48.2).

While recognizing this, much archaeological work has been conducted in the past by unlicensed archaeologists. This group falls into two categories: avocational or lay archaeologists, and “pothunters.” Avocational archaeologists typically work in association with licensed archaeologists or the MCL. Pothunters tend to avoid working with archaeologists or the Ministry and are known to loot sites for artifacts, either to add to collections or sell on the open market. Such activities are illegal under the OHA.

2.5. Designation of Archaeological Sites

As with other types of cultural heritage resources, “designation” is one of many conservation tools that a municipality may use to wisely manage its cultural heritage. With respect to archaeological sites, there are a number of unique aspects arising from the designation of archaeological sites. The protection of archaeological sites or areas of archaeological potential is possible through designation, and is also a means by which to flag such properties for closer scrutiny through the development application process. The amended components of Part VI of the OHA also provide stronger and more appropriate means by which the resource can be protected.

The designation of existing sites may serve as a flag, which could result in unauthorized excavation, inferring some potential responsibility of the City of Hamilton to protect such sites. However, sites of sufficient significance to warrant designation are likely already well known to the pothunter population. In turn, the fact that many registered sites have already been fully excavated, primarily as part of the development process, does play a factor in the designation process and goals (i.e. inferring the recognition of a site no longer present).

While there is no official Ministry policy on the municipal designation of archaeological sites, the existence of provincially designated archaeological sites suggests that the recognition of such significant resources is warranted. The criteria below are to be used either as “stand-alone” criteria for the evaluation of archaeological sites and areas of archaeological potential suitable for designation or are to be used in conjunction with other criteria in the designation of heritage properties, such as heritage buildings and cultural heritage landscapes.

2.6. Determination of Significance

1. Cultural Definition: is the site used to define a cultural complex or horizon at the local or regional scale?
Select archaeological sites are used to define specific cultural complexes or horizons, to which similar sites are compared for closeness of fit and relative position in cultural chronology and site function. Their identification as type-sites is typically achieved through academic discourse, for example the Princess Point site in Cootes Paradise.

2. Temporal Integrity: does the site represent one or more readily distinguished cultural horizons, or a multi-component mixture of poorly-defined occupations?
Archaeological sites are frequently re-occupied over a long period of time by different cultural groups. While soil stratification may separate these sequences and provide valuable information, agricultural and other activities can cause admixture of these separate components, resulting in a loss of information.

3. Site Size: is the site a large or high-density occupation, or a small, low-intensity occupation?
A higher level of importance tends to be placed on larger archaeological sites, as they generally represent larger or more frequent/long-term occupations. They also tend to yield more diagnostic material objects or settlement patterns, and so can be better defined chronologically and culturally, but can likewise be less clearly defined. Smaller sites can also yield diagnostic artifacts, and are typically the predominant site size of earlier Native and Euro-Canadian occupations, and may be subject to lower degrees of stratigraphic mixture.

4. Site Type: is the site of a distinctive and well-defined type, with respect to its function or the activities carried out at the site?
Sites range in nature from highly specialized to generalized, with a related range of interpretability: sites where many activities occur can make it hard to differentiate these activities, such as a pioneer farmstead. Sites where limited activities took place tend to show more identifiable patterns, like point manufacturing sites. While both end of this continuum represent similarly important parts of their inhabitants’ lifeways, information may be more readily derived from those of lower complexity.

5. Site Integrity: is the site largely intact?
Sites that remain primarily intact retain significant levels of data, while degree of impact closely correlates with the extent of data-loss, particularly when all or some of the site has been impacted or removed through excavation, mitigation or other activities.

6. Historical Association: does the site represent the archaeological remnants of a significant historical event, person, or group?
The direct association of an archaeological site with a historical event, person, family or group can have a bearing on the significance of an archaeological site, depending on the significance to the community, province or nation of the event or person(s) involved. The nature of the association, such as transitory or long-term, also has a bearing on whether this association is of little or considerable significance.
7. **Setting: what is the integrity of the context surrounding the site?**

Sites do not exist independently, but rather are embedded (at varying scales) within the landscape encompassing them. As such, some semblance of the physiography (cultural heritage landscape) and relevant built culture concurrent to the site’s occupation can provide an important context to the information derived from the site.

8. **Socio-political value: is there significant public value vested in the site?**

Real or perceived social or political value may be imparted to an archaeological site for various reasons by the public as a whole, or subsets of stakeholders and interest groups. Regardless of the origin of the value(s) ascribed the site, perception and expediency may play a large role in its identification as a significant feature.

9. **Uniqueness: is this a unique archaeological site?**

While all sites are by their nature unique, some are more so than others by nature of their distinctive type, role or character, which identifies them as “one-of-a-kind” within a specified frame of reference. The recognition of a site having such a unique nature as to warrant this distinction essentially refers to the information value implicit in such an identification. As a result, this will largely be the result of professional discourse.

10. **Rarity: is this a rare archaeological site?**

   Rarity may be a measure of cultural affiliation, site type, function, location, artifact assemblage, and age, to mention some potential elements. This can take two forms: either because they occurred only very rarely as a site type originally, or because only a small number remain extant owing to destruction of the original set of sites. In both cases, the rarity of these sites warrants their identification as a result of their information value regarding such a limited resource. Evaluation of the distinct nature of such sites will largely originate through professional discourse.

11. **Human Remains: are there identified or probable burials on the site?**

   Human remains can be encountered in a variety of circumstances, including within an archaeological site. Depending on the context, these can take the form of an approved cemetery, unapproved cemetery, unapproved Aboriginal Peoples cemetery, or irregular burial site. Regardless of the specific circumstance, burials carry a high cultural value in and of themselves. In addition, their significance can be evaluated as a sub-set of archaeological sites in complement with the standard cemetery management process. Native and pioneer cemeteries in particular can be assessed in reference to other archaeological sites and communities, as well as specific persons and events.

12. **Archaeological Potential: is the area of substantially high potential?**

   The archaeological potential of a property is determined through an evaluation of a variety of factors. These include proximity to physiographic features, known
archaeological sites, historic features, and degrees of landscape alteration/disturbance. If a property is identified as having very high potential, designation may be warranted prior to field survey, or further impact.

3. Built Heritage

3.1. Introduction

For the past 25 years Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act primarily concerned itself with the designation and hence protection and management of buildings of architectural or historic value or merit. The Ontario Heritage Act now enables municipalities to designate property, i.e., real property including buildings and structures. This may now include not only buildings but also plantings, landscaping elements and archaeological features (See preceding section 2.2).

As with archaeological evaluation the criteria below are to be used either as “stand-alone” or are to be used in conjunction with other criteria in the designation of heritage properties.

Historical Associations

1. Thematic: how well does the feature or property illustrate a historical theme that is representative of significant patterns of history in the context of the community, province or nation?

   The criterion evaluates the resource in the context of broad themes of community history. In assessing a resource, the evaluation should relate its importance specifically and with some precision to relevant themes usually of some duration, such as agricultural settlement, village or town development, recreational activities, suburbanization and industrial growth.

2. Event: is the property associated with a specific event that has made a significant contribution to the community, province or nation?

   This criterion evaluates the resource with respect to its direct association with events, (i.e., the event took place in the building or on the property). The significance of the event must be clearly and consistently evaluated by examining the impact the event had on future activities, duration and scale of the event and the number of people involved. Battles, natural disasters and scientific discoveries are frequently recognized under this criterion.

3. Person and/or Group: is the feature associated with the life or activities of a person or group that has made a significant contribution to the community, province or nation?

   This criterion evaluates the feature with respect to its direct association with a person or group, (i.e., ownership, use or occupancy of the resource). The significance of the person or group must be clearly described such as the impact on future activities, duration and scale of influence and number and range of people
affected, e.g., the Calder or Book family in Ancaster. Public buildings such as post offices or courthouses though frequented by many important persons will seldom merit recognition under this criterion.

Architecture and Design

4. Architectural merit: what is the architectural value of the resource?

This criterion serves to measure the architectural merit of a particular structure. The evaluation should assess whether the structure is a notable, rare, unique, early example or typical example of an architectural style, building type or construction techniques. Structures that are of particular merit because of the excellence and artistic value of the design, composition, craftsmanship and details should be identified whether or not they fall easily into a particular stylistic category (i.e., vernacular architecture).

5. Functional merit: what is the functional quality of the resource?

This criterion measures the functional merit of the structure apart from its aesthetic considerations. It takes into account the use or effectiveness of materials and method of construction. The criterion is also intended to provide a means of giving value to utilitarian structures, engineering works and industrial features that may not necessarily possess a strict "architectural" value.

The evaluation should note whether the structure is a notable, rare, unique, typical or early example of a particular material or method of construction.

6. Designer: what is the significance of this structure as an illustration of the work of an important designer?

This criterion evaluates the importance of the building in a designer's career. "Designer" may include architects, builders or engineers, either in private and public practice, or as individuals or professional firms. The evaluation will have to account for or describe whether or not a designer is important in terms of the impact that the person had on trends in building and activities in the community, province or nation before evaluating the importance of the specific structure in the designer's career. Comparisons should focus on surviving examples of the designer's work.

Integrity

7. Location integrity: is the structure in its original location?

The integrity of a resource relies in part on its relationship to its original site of construction. Original sites or locations of structures are benchmarks in the past physical, social, economic and cultural development of any area. The continued presence of heritage structures often contributes to a strong sense of place. Those features that have been moved from their original sites are considered to be of lesser cultural heritage value.
8. **Built integrity: is the structure and its components parts all there?**

The integrity of a resource may affect the evaluation of the built heritage feature particularly where there have been either:

- adverse alterations, such as the loss of significant or noteworthy building elements; or
- unsympathetic additions, that obscure or detract from original building fabric.

Properties that remain intact or that have been systematically and sensitively added to over a number of decades (such as farmhouses) are considered to have greater value than those that have experienced detrimental effects. Building ruins may warrant special consideration where there are other important cultural heritage values, e.g., “The Hermitage”, Ancaster.

**Environmental Context**

9. **Landmark: is it a visually conspicuous feature in the area?**

This criterion addresses the physical importance of a structure to its community. The key physical characteristic of landmarks is their singularity, some aspect that is unique or memorable in its context. Significant landmarks can have a clear form, contrast with their background or have prominent locations. Landmarks are often used by people as reference points, markers or guides for moving or directing others through an area.

10. **Character: what is the influence of the structure on the present character of the area?**

This criterion measures the influence of the resource on its surroundings. The character of the immediate area must be established before the site’s contribution can be assessed. (In the case of complexes, “area” may be defined as the complex itself, e.g., hospital, university, industrial plant.) Areas can convey a sense of cohesion through the similarity and/or dissimilarity of their details. Cohesion can be established by examining such things as scale, height, proportion, siting, building materials, colours and relationships to other structures and spaces.

11. **Setting: what is the integrity of the historical relationship between the structure and its immediate surroundings?**

This criterion examines the degree to which the immediate environment enhances the structures physical value or prominence. It assesses the importance of the site in maintaining familiar edges, districts, paths, nodes and landmarks that assist in movement and orientation. Structures or sites may exhibit historic linkages such as those between a church and cemetery or a commercial block and service alleys. Other examples are original settings that provide the context for successive replacement of bridges at the same location or traditional relationships such as those between a station and hotel located next to a rail line.
Social Value

12. Public perception: is the property or feature regarded as important within its area?

This criterion measures the symbolic importance of a structure within its area to people within the community. “Community” should not solely reflect the heritage community but the views of people generally. Examination of tourist brochures, newspaper articles, postcards, souvenirs or community logos for the identification of a site as a prominent symbolic focal point is sometimes useful.

4. Cultural Heritage Landscapes

4.1. Introduction

Prior to defining evaluation criteria, it is worthwhile to enumerate several general principles for understanding cultural heritage landscapes. The Provincial Policy Statement issued under the Planning Act states in 2.5.1, Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Resources that:

> Significant built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes will be conserved.

> “Cultural heritage landscape” is specifically defined to mean:

> a defined geographical area of heritage significance which has been modified by human activities. Such an area is valued by a community, and is of significance to the understanding of the history of a people or place.

In addition, “Significant” is also more generally defined. It is assigned a specific meaning according to the subject matter or policy context, such as wetlands or ecologically important areas. As cultural heritage landscapes and built heritage resources may be considered an “other matter”, the following definition of “significant” applies:

> in regard to other matters, important in terms of amount, content, representation or effect.

These formal quasi-legislative definitions are important in defining the scope and limitations of what constitutes a significant cultural heritage landscape. The word “culture” or “cultural” is used here and in the context of the policy statement to differentiate between those environmental features that are considered to originate in “nature” and have “natural” forms or attributes. The use of the word culture in this context should not be misconstrued to indicate a refined or developed understanding of the arts or civilization.

Typically cultural heritage landscapes comprise many items or objects that have been made or modified by human hands. Importantly, cultural heritage landscapes reflect human activity (including both the intended and accidental results of development,
conservation and/or abandonment) and thus all landscape artifacts reflect “culture” in some way, shape or form. Accordingly, for the purposes of understanding a cultural landscape, most components of the landscape are usually equally important in giving some insight into the culture or historical past of an area (fields, farmsteads, treelines, woodlots, mill ponds, raceways, manufactories, etc.) Present landscapes that are inherited from the past typically represent the aspirations, value, technology and so on of previous generations. Many present-day cultural heritage landscapes are relics of a former age. Small towns and rural hamlets, for instance, often represent nineteenth century rural lifeways that are no longer being built.

In order to understand the cultural heritage significance of a landscape it is important to understand not only the physiographic setting of an area but importantly the broader historical context of change. The role of technology and communications is particularly important at any given time as these often provided the physical artifacts or means available to permit change to occur within the landscape.

In the evaluation of cultural landscapes for the purpose of heritage conservation, the establishment of criteria is essentially concerned with attempting to identify those landscapes that have particular meaning, value or importance and consequently require some form of active conservation management including informed municipal decision making through the designation process. Traditionally, “landscapes” have tended to be evaluated on the basis of some measure of scenic merit, particularly those considered to be views of “nature”, free from the effects of noticeable human activity. In identifying cultural heritage landscapes there is less a concern for assigning value based solely on scenic attributes. Attributes that address historical associations and social value are also equally important. The following criteria provide a broader base for evaluation.

4.2. Applying the Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation framework for cultural heritage landscapes is a set of criteria to be used in the assessment of cultural heritage landscapes throughout the City of Hamilton. These criteria are based on established precedents for the evaluation of heritage resources. It is anticipated that this framework will be applied to a broad range of landscapes in a consistent and systematic manner. It may be utilized either on a long-term basis as part of continuing survey and assessment work or on an issue oriented case-by-case manner. The evaluation criteria are also to serve the purposes of determining cultural heritage value or interest for the purposes of designation under the Ontario Heritage Act.

The criteria recognize the value and merit of all types of cultural heritage landscapes. If at any time it is proposed to undertake a comparative evaluation amongst many landscapes such comparative analysis should be used only to compare like or similar landscapes. An industrial landscape, for example must be assessed through comparison with other industrial landscapes, not with a townscape or rural landscape. The intent in applying the criteria is not to categorize or differentiate amongst different types of landscape based upon quality. In using and applying the criteria it is important that particular types of cultural heritage landscapes are each valued for their inherent character and are consistently evaluated and compared with similar or the same types.
4.3. The Evaluation Criteria for Cultural Heritage Landscapes

Historical Associations

1. Themes: how well does the cultural heritage landscape illustrate one or more historical themes representative of cultural processes in the development and/or use of land in the context of the community, province or nation?

This criterion evaluates the cultural landscape in the context of the broad themes of the City’s history. In assessing the landscape, the evaluation should relate the landscape specifically to those themes, sub-themes and material heritage features, e.g., ports/industrial areas and cottage and resort communities.

2. Event: is the cultural landscape associated with a specific event that has made a significant contribution to the community, province or nation?

This criterion evaluates the cultural landscape’s direct association with an event, i.e., the event took place in the area. The significance of the event must be evaluated by explicit description and research such as the impact event had on future activities, the duration and scale of the event and the number of people involved. Battle sites and areas of natural disasters are recognized under this criterion.

3. Person and/or Group: is the cultural landscape associated with the life or activities of a person, group, organization or institution that has made a significant contribution to the community, province or nation?

This criterion evaluates the cultural landscape’s direct association with a person or group, i.e., ownership, use or development of the cultural landscape. The significance of the person or group must be considered in the context of impact, scale and duration of activities. Cultural landscapes resulting from resource based activities such as forestry, mining or quarrying, etc. may be identified with a particular corporate group. Conversely, individuals may play a pivotal role in the development of cultural landscapes such as a town site, industrial operation or resort complex.

Scenic Amenity

4. Sense of place: does the cultural heritage landscape provide the observer(s) with a strong sense of position or place?

This criterion evaluates the sensory impact to an observer either viewing the cultural heritage landscape from within or from an exterior viewpoint. Such landscapes are recognizable as having a common, identifying character derived from buildings, structures, spaces and/or natural landscape elements, such as urban centres, ports, villages and cottage communities.

5. Serial Vision: does the cultural heritage landscape provide the observer(s) with opportunities for serial vision along paths of pedestrian or vehicular movement?
This criterion measures the visual impact to an observer travelling through the cultural landscape. Sidewalks or streets in urban areas and roads or water routes in rural or beach areas often provide an observer with a series of views of the landscape beyond or anticipated to arrive within view. Such serial vision may be observed at a small scale in an urban area, moving from residential street to commercial area; or at a larger scale from urban to rural.

6. Material Content: is the cultural heritage landscape visually satisfying or pleasing to the observer(s) in terms of colour, texture, style and scale?

This criterion attempts to evaluate the visual impact to an observer of the content of the cultural landscape in terms of its overall design and appearance, however formally or informally, consciously or unconsciously planned. Material content assesses whether the landscape is pleasing to look at regardless of historical completeness.

Integrity

7. Integrity: is it all there?

The evaluation of the integrity of a cultural heritage landscape seeks to identify the degree to which adverse changes have occurred. Landscapes that have suffered severe alterations, such as the removal of character defining heritage features and the introduction of intrusive contemporary features, may be weaker in overall material content, serial vision and the resultant sense of place that it provides.

Design

8. Design: has the landscape been purposefully designed or planned?

This criterion applies only to those landscapes that have been formally or purposefully designed or planned and includes examples such as “planned” communities, public parks, cemeteries, institutional grounds and the gardens of residences. Typically, they are scarce in comparison to evolving or relict landscapes. This criterion evaluates the importance of the landscape in the designer’s career. “Designer” may include surveyors, architects, or landscape architects, both private and public, either as individuals or as professional firms. The evaluation assesses whether or not a designer is important in terms of the impact on trends in landscape design before evaluating the importance of the specific landscape in the designer’s career. Comparisons should focus on surviving examples of the designer’s work.

Social Value

9. Public perception: is the landscape regarded as having importance within the City?

This criterion measures the importance of the landscape as a cultural symbol. Examination of advertisements of the day, popular tourism literature and artifacts, public interviews and local contacts usually reveal potential landscapes of value.