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1.0 Introduction

In February 2016 the City of Hamilton retained MHBC to prepare a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for the proposed plan of subdivision of 65 Guise Street, located in the City of Hamilton. The lands are part of Piers 5-8, formerly owned by the Hamilton Port Authority and conveyed to the City of Hamilton in 2000. The City of Hamilton intends to subdivide the lands for commercial and residential development.

In 2013, a Heritage Impact Assessment for the area was prepared as part of the Environmental Assessment for the proposed sewage pumping facilities for Piers 5-8. The Heritage Impact Assessment focused on assessing potential impacts of the locations of the proposed facilities as well as cultural heritage resources within a 100 metre radius. The impacts of the proposed sewage pumping facilities were confined to the installation locations and there was no loss or removal of cultural heritage resources as a result of those works.

This report assesses the potential impacts of the proposed plan of subdivision of the subject lands, which includes an assumption of demolition of the existing structures on site. Several of the structures on the subject lands were identified in the 2013 Heritage Impact Assessment to have potential cultural heritage value or interest, including:

- 659 Catharine Street North, Boat Maintenance Building (BHR No. 20);
- 17 Discovery Drive, Marine Police Garage (BHR No. 21);
- 1 Guise Street, Hamilton Port Authority (BHR No. 22);
- 595 Bay Street North, Royal Hamilton Yacht Club – Junior Sailing (BHR 23);
- 595 Catharine Street North, Navy League/Sea Corp Cadets (BHR No. 24);
- 1 Guise Street, Hamilton Port Authority Varnish Shed (BHR No. 25);

City of Hamilton Heritage Staff have also requested that the HIA assess a stone retaining wall for potential cultural heritage value and identify impacts as appropriate.

The subject site is also adjacent to properties listed on the City of Hamilton’s Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest and identified through the CHIA, including:

- 2, 4, 6, & 8 Brock Street;
- 28-30 Guise Street;
- 605 James Street North; and,
- 555 Bay Street North, Royal Hamilton Yacht Club – Junior Sailing.
City of Hamilton Heritage Planning Staff have limited the scope of this assessment to assessing only the potential impacts of the proposed plan of subdivision on the properties located within the subject site. As the proposed plan of subdivision will not result in the loss or removal of heritage attributes on adjacent properties, indirect impacts of future development on adjacent properties will be dealt with in later stages through urban design and site plan approval.

2.0 Policy Framework

2.1 The Planning Act

The Planning Act makes a number of provisions respecting cultural heritage either directly in Section 2 of the Act or Section 3 respecting policy statements and provincial plans. In Section 2 The Planning Act outlines 18 spheres of provincial interest, that must be considered by appropriate authorities in the planning process. One of the intentions of The Planning Act is to “encourage the co-operation and co-ordination among the various interests. Regarding Cultural Heritage, Subsection 2(d) of the Act provides that:

The Minister, the council of a municipality, a local board, a planning board and the Municipal Board, in carrying out their responsibilities under this Act, shall have regard to, among other matters, matters of provincial interest such as, ...

(d) the conservation of features of significant architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological or scientific interest;

2.2 The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS)

In support of the provincial interest identified in Subsection 2 (d) of the Planning Act, and as provided for in Section 3, the Province has refined policy guidance for land use planning and development matters in the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 (PPS). The PPS is “intended to be read in its entirety and the relevant policy areas are to be applied in each situation”. This provides a weighting and balancing of issues within the planning process. When addressing cultural heritage planning, the PPS provides for the following:

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

Significant:  e) in regard to cultural heritage and archaeology, resources that have been determined to have cultural heritage value or interest for the important
contribution they make to our understanding of the history of a place, an event, or a people.

Built heritage resource: means a building, structure, monument, installation or any manufactured remnant that contributes to a property’s cultural heritage value or interest as identified by a community, including an Aboriginal community. Built heritage resources are generally located on property that has been designated under Parts IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act, or included on local, provincial and/or federal registers.

Cultural heritage landscape: means a defined geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Aboriginal community. The area may involve features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or association. Examples may include, but are not limited to, heritage conservation districts designated under the Ontario Heritage Act; villages, parks, gardens, battlefields, mainstreets and neighbourhoods, cemeteries, trailways, viewsheds, natural areas and industrial complexes of heritage significance; and areas recognized by federal or international designation authorities (e.g. a National Historic Site or District designation, or a UNESCO World Heritage Site).

Conserved: means the identification, protection, management and use of built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources in a manner that ensures their cultural heritage value or interest is retained under the Ontario Heritage Act. This may be achieved by the implementation of recommendations set out in a conservation plan, archaeological assessment, and/or heritage impact assessment. Mitigative measures and/or alternative development approaches can be included in these plans and assessments.

The subject site or built features on the subject area are not considered to be a protected heritage property under the consideration of the PPS, as they are not designated under any part of the Ontario Heritage Act or subject to conservation easement, and has not been identified by provincial, federal or UNESCO bodies.

2.3 City of Hamilton Policies

Several policies of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, Volume 1, the Setting Sail Secondary Plan, and the Hamilton West Harbour Waterfront Recreation Master Plan apply to the subject site with regard to cultural heritage policies and the requirement for a Heritage Impact Assessment to assess conformity with the policies. The relevant policies are identified in the following sections.
Urban Hamilton Official Plan Volume 1:

B.3.4.1.3 “Ensure that all new development, site alterations, building alterations, and additions are contextually appropriate and maintain the integrity of all on-site or adjacent cultural heritage resources,”

B.3.4.2.1(g) “Ensure the conservation and protection of cultural heritage resources in planning and development matters subject to the Planning Act either through appropriate planning and design measures or as conditions of development approvals.”

B.3.4.2.6 “The City recognizes there may be cultural heritage properties that are not yet identified or included in the Register of Property of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest nor designated under the Ontario Heritage Act, but still may be of cultural heritage interest. These may be properties that have yet to be surveyed or otherwise identified, or their significance and cultural heritage value has not been comprehensively evaluated but are still worthy of protection.”

B.3.4.2.7 “The City shall ensure these non-designated and non-registered cultural heritage resources are identified, evaluated, and appropriately conserved through various legislated planning and assessment processes, including the Planning Act, the Environmental Assessment Act, and the Cemeteries Act.”

B.3.4.2.14 “Where cultural heritage resources are to be affected, the City may impose conditions of approval on any planning application to ensure their continued protection. In the event that rehabilitation and reuse of the resource is not viable and this has been demonstrated by the proponent, the City may require that affected resources be thoroughly documented for archival purposes at the expense of the applicant prior to demolition.”

Setting Sail Secondary Plan:

The West Harbour Setting Sail Secondary Plan was adopted by council in 2005. In 2000 the City of Hamilton acquired Piers 1, 2 and 5-8. The Secondary Plan for the area addresses the opportunities to improve these lands for public use as heavy industry moves from the area, and provides guidance on planning, zoning and development decisions for this area, as well as identifies a framework and priorities for publicly funded initiatives. The following policies of the Secondary Plan apply to this HIA:
A.6.3.2.7 “Conserving and celebrating West Harbour’s heritage is important and should include:

   ii)  conserving, restoring and reusing historic buildings and structures;
   iii)  reflecting and interpreting the city’s industrial, marine and cultural heritage in the design of new buildings and open spaces;
   v)  providing public open spaces for cultural festivals and other celebratory events.”

A.6.3.3.3.6 “The City may require that, as part of development or redevelopment of land, heritage properties be retained on-site and incorporated, used or adaptively reused as appropriate to the proposed development and land use. Retention of a heritage feature on lands subject to development may be a condition of development approval. Specifically, heritage easements pursuant to the *Ontario Heritage Act*, may also be required and negotiated, as well as development agreements.”

A.6.3.3.3.7 “New development adjacent to heritage buildings or in areas containing heritage buildings shall:

   i)  reflect the setbacks, heights and cornice lines of adjacent heritage buildings;
   ii)  support the creation of a continuous street wall;
   iii)  maintain a consistent street orientation and building line;
   iv)  be encouraged to reflect the character, massing and materials of surrounding buildings.”

A.6.3.3.3.8 “The City shall demonstrate leadership by pursuing opportunities to conserve municipally-owned heritage resources in West Harbour.”

**Hamilton West Harbour Waterfront Recreation Master Plan (April 14, 2010):**

The Hamilton West Harbour Waterfront Recreation Master Plan was prepared in 2010. Its purpose is to “define and clarify planning design guidelines that will help shape development of the buildings and landscapes of the west harbour for the foreseeable future”. The master plan builds on the Setting Sail Secondary Plan. The following policies and recommendations of the Master Plan are relevant to this HIA:

Page 19  *Reuse of Port Authority Buildings*
“The Port Authority sheds are easily recognized as the icon of the western waterfront. The larger of the two buildings houses offices, workshops and boat slips. The large interior spaces are ideal for reuse as a multi-purpose public building that can easily animate the lower James and MacNab plaza spaces.”

“The Port Authority dock rental office/management is currently located within a large metal shed. It is intended that these offices would remain in operation while the maintenance area be adapted for public use. Such uses could include a public market or community teaching space.”

**Varnishing Shed**

“It is suggested that the varnishing shed be adapted to become a multipurpose covered space working with the proposed terraced seating to the south. Stripping the structure of its walls and leaving the roof would provide adequate cover for small performances that could easily spill out into the plaza. The protective canopy could also be used as market space.”

**Existing Buildings and Artifacts**

“Old buildings provide historical continuity with the past and are indicative of the distinctive architectural character of the waterfront. Consequently the character-defining elements of the waterfront must be safeguarded to retain its heritage value and extend its physical life. This may include preservation, rehabilitation, restoration or a combination of these actions or processes.”

“When the waterfront was industrial and port-related, it had distinctive waterfront architecture. Remnants of that legacy exist on Pier 8. [...] The Hamilton Port Authority’s storage shed is a remnant of this ongoing legacy. Programming for these buildings should involve minimal or no change to the character-defining elements that are essential to preserving the waterfront character.”

### 3.0 Approach and Methodology

Guidance on the preparation of Heritage Impact Assessments is provided in the City of Hamilton *Infosheet: Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments (March 2014)*. This report has been prepared in accordance with those guidelines and contains the following:
a) a location plan showing and describing the contextual location of the site, an existing site plan, current floor plans of built structures where appropriate, a proposed site plan, proposed building elevations, and proposed interior plans;
b) identification and evaluation of all potentially affected cultural heritage resource(s), including detailed site(s) history and a cultural heritage resource inventory containing textual and graphic documentation;
c) a description of the proposed development or site alteration and alternative forms of the development and/or site alteration;
d) a description of all cultural heritage resource(s) to be affected by the development and its alternative forms;
e) a description of the effects upon the cultural heritage resource(s) by the proposed development and/or site alteration and its alternative forms;
f) a description of the measures necessary to mitigate the adverse effects of the development and/or site alteration and its alternatives upon the cultural heritage resource(s), including:
   • the means by which the existing cultural heritage resources shall be integrated within the proposed development and/or site alteration; and,
   • the manner in which commemoration of cultural heritage resources to be removed shall be incorporated within the proposed development and/or site alteration.
g) any photographic records, maps, or other documentary materials found during the historical research of the property as well as present-day photographs taken during research; and,
h) a detailed list of cited materials.

The preparation of this report has also been guided by the Ontario Ministry of Culture (now the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport) InfoSheet #5 Heritage Impact Assessments and Conservation Plans, part of the 2006 Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process document.

Evaluation of the built features on the subject site uses 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) and cultural heritage landscapes (section 4). Some of the criteria in each section overlap. The criteria have been developed from, and expand on, Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act. The criteria by which the property is evaluated are identified below (descriptions and the full evaluation criteria can be found in Appendix A). The built features are also evaluated using Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act, which identifies potential for cultural heritage value based on three broad categories: Design/physical value, historic/associative value and contextual value. Further details on the evaluation process are found in Section 7.
A site visit to the subject property and built features was undertaken on March 2, 2016. Research for the broader history of the area, the subject site and built features was undertaken at the Hamilton Public Library in 2013 for the Environmental Assessment Heritage Impact Assessment. Additional research to provide more detailed historical information of the built features at the site was undertaken at the Hamilton Public Library and McMaster University.

4.0 Description of Study Area

4.1 Location

The study area is located at Piers 5-8 along the Hamilton Waterfront, and in the mixed use/residential neighbourhood immediately to the south. The proposed works are located north of Burlington Street East, between MacNab Street North and Ferguson Avenue North. The study area is located approximately 3 kilometres from downtown Hamilton, in an area referred to as the North End.

Plate 1: Map of study area, outlined in orange.
4.2 Physiographic context

The study area is located within the Physiographic Region identified as the Iroquois Plain (Chapman and Putnam, 1984). 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 elevates, dry locations ideal for the development of urban areas (Chapman and Putnam 191, 1984).

5.0 Historical Overview

5.1 Hamilton Settlement

Locations near lakes or watercourses typically have high potential for archaeological resources, as these types of locations were often used by aboriginal groups as hunting grounds, encampments or transportation routes. This report focuses on the built and cultural landscape resources of the era beginning with and following the arrival of Euro Canadian settlers. A background study prepared by an Archaeological team has been prepared as part of the EA process, and was consulted during the completion of this report. The Archaeological team’s report provides background on the potential historical use of the land by aboriginal groups, and comments on the potential for archaeological resources. The report concludes that archaeological potential for the study area is generally low, due to the disturbance over nearly two centuries of activity that has transformed the harbour area. A letter from Parks Canada to the City of Hamilton Planning Staff makes mention of an aboriginal burial mound possibly located at the foot of MacNab Street in the 1830s (Graham, 1992). It is likely this feature would have been removed or disturbed in constructing wharves at the waterfront. No other historical references to this feature were found.

The study area is located in the North End of the City of Hamilton, in an area of the city that was once Barton Township, in Lincoln County. Surveys of Lincoln County began in the late 1780s, and Barton Township was surveyed in 1791. James Durand acquired land in what is now Hamilton between 1805 and 1809 (including some land from Nathaniel Hughson). Durand held Lot 14, Concession 3 and Lot 14 Concession 2 in Barton Township. Durand and Hughson promoted the site as a potential location for a courthouse, should a new district be formed. In 1815, Durand sold his portion of the 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).

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

A number of early settlers to the Hamilton area were United Empire Loyalists, arriving in Upper Canada, seeking respite from the American Revolution. Early use of the waterfront was limited to mill sites and lakeshore wharves that were operated by local settlers. The original site of the Burlington Bay area north of the town site was shallow and only accessible by canoes (Freeman 30. 2001). Landowners and prospective businessmen and industrialists petitioned for harbour improvements (Weaver 17, 1982). In 1823, the legislature passed an act to allow a navigable channel to be cut through the beach strip, to connect Burlington Bay to Lake Ontario. The canal was completed in 1832, and drew a number of workers to what is now the North End of Hamilton during its construction, along with storehouses, barns and boathouses. With the completion of the canal, a large steamboat wharf was constructed at the foot of James Street (within the study area), and additional smaller wharves were located along the shoreline. Access to the lake soon brought steam ships and lake schooners from other ports, facilitating export and import and increased settlement, industry and development in the North End of Hamilton and the wider area (Freeman 30-31, 2001). Hamilton was incorporated as a town in 1833, and as a city in 1846 (Weaver and Cruikshank).

A number of the roads within the study area are part of a historical transportation pattern for the area that was laid out as early as the 1830s, including Burlington Street, Brock Street, Guise Street, James Street, Hughson Street, John Street, Catharine Street and Mary Street.

Hughson Street was named for Nathanial Hughson, a United Empire Loyalist who received a Crown grant in what is now downtown Hamilton in 1792. Hughson and his wife Rebecca Land’s property was located between the present-day Main Street, the harbour, James Street and Mary Street. In the mid 1830s, Nathanial began subdividing his large property, naming streets after his family members, including several streets in the study area: James, Catharine, and Hughson (Houghton 56, 2002). The layout of James street had previously existed, and was named Jarvis Street by George Hamilton, after his wife, Maria Lavinia Jarvis (Houghton 61, 2002).

John Street is one of the oldest streets in the City of Hamilton. It was formed from one of the aboriginal trails that led through the area, possibly pre-dating Euro-Canadian Settlement. The early settlers of the area also used the route, and in 1837 George Hamilton named the route John Street, reportedly in honour of a family of early settlers (Houghton 62, 2002).
Ferguson Avenue was named for the Ferguson family, who were early settlers in the Hamilton area. Peter and Mary Ferguson received a Crown Grant in 1802 in Barton Township, of land now bordered by Wellington Street, Main Street, Mary Street and the Harbour. The former streets of Cherry, Nelson and Henry Street were later named to honour the Fergusons (Houghton 36, 2002). In the 19th century, Ferguson Avenue terminated at Burlington Street. By the 1970s, Ferguson Avenue was extended northward, cutting through the eastern edge of Eastwood Park.

5.2 Development of the Study area

Development of the harbour and the surrounding study area increased steadily from the 1830s. Mapping shows the 1836 layout of the shoreline and the newly constructed MacNab’s Wharf, Gunn’s Wharf, and Hughson’s Wharf (Plate 2). The street grid layout had been established by this time to include James Street, Hughson Street, John Street, Catharine Street, Mary Street, Brock Street (which became East Bay Street east of Hughson Street), Burlington Street (which became Base Street east of James Street), and Guy Street (now Guise Street). Lots south of Brock Street (East Bay Street) appear to have been subdivided into smaller lots. An 1842 map of Hamilton shows the study area with numerous creeks or streams (which have since been filled in), spreading through the street grid. At this time, there are only a handful of structures located within the study area. This map does not show subdivision of the lots, or even streets such as Brock or Guise. A small number of scattered buildings are located along Burlington Street or at the Wharves.
By 1846, the majority of the blocks in the study area contained subdivided lots. At this time, McNab’s Wharf remained, but Gunn’s Wharf was now Land and Ruth’s Wharf, and Hughson’s Wharf was called W.E. Browne’s Wharf. An additional wharf, located at the foot of John and Catharine Streets, was labeled “Warren’s occupied by Browne”. Each of the wharves had a storehouse. While the streets were subdivided with smaller lots by this time, it is not known how many contained structures (Plate 3).
Plate 2: Excerpt of 1846 mapping showing layout and subdivision of study area. Source: Hamilton Public Library.
Plate 3: Excerpt of 1850 Marcus Smith Map of Hamilton, showing harbour area. Source: University of Toronto Map and Data Library (online).

An 1850 map of the harbour area contains building footprints, showing that there were several large buildings at the various wharves during this time, likely warehouses or factory buildings associated the port or early industries in the area. There is a building located near the approximate location of 659 Catharine Street, though the footprint does not match the existing building.

There is a gap in available mapping until 1875, when the Illustrated Atlas for Wentworth County was published. The atlas shows substantial changes to the shoreline, particularly west of the subject property. By this time, the shoreline west of Catharine Street has been almost entirely modified by human activity. East of Catharine Street two streams are shown. One crosses the area now known as Eastwood Park. The block of land between James Street and MacNab Street, south of Burlington Street, has not yet been subdivided.
Plate 4: Excerpt of 1875 mapping from the *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth*, showing study area.

Plate 5: Excerpt of 1876 Bird’s Eye View drawing of the study area. Source: Hamilton Public Library.
A bird’s eye view illustration in 1876 shows a number of structures built within the study area, including small cottages and row houses or boarding house type structures in the residential portion of the study area, and a number of large warehouse type buildings. The map shows Mary Street trailing off before meeting Burlington Street, and the area that now contains Eastwood Park, the HMSC Star reserves base, and Ferguson Street is vacant, open land (Plate 5).

In 1886, the City of Hamilton purchased lots owned by the Fergusons and Pattersons to construct a new wharf. The wharf was never constructed, and the North End did not have any parkland, so the City transferred the land to the Parks Board.

An 1893 bird’s eye view map shows increased development in a more regular pattern within the residential areas. Large warehouse or industrial buildings are still shown, along with a number of sail and steam boats. Descriptions at the base of the map list the Hamilton Steamboat Co. at the foot of Hughson Street and McKay’s Wharf at the foot of James Street. A streetcar line is shown along James Street turning east onto Brock Street, likely the Hamilton Street Railway, which was extended down James Street to McKay’s Wharf in 1878 (Hamilton Public Library). The land in the east of the study area is still open space (Plate 6).

Plate 6: Excerpt from 1893 Bird’s Eye View drawing of the study area (looking south). Source: Hamilton Public Library.

A 1909 bird’s eye view map shows continued development in the study area. This map shows the Steamboat Co. building at the foot of Hughson, and trolley cars along Brock and Guise Streets.
The previously open space area now shows an ornate park design, with curving pathways, trees and fountains. It is not known whether the park was actually built to this type of design, or whether this was an artistic interpretation (Plate 7). The park was opened in 1908, and named Eastwood Park in 1911, in honour of John Morrison Eastwood, who was the co-founder and vice president of the Hamilton Playgrounds Association, editor of the Hamilton Daily Times, and Alderman (Hamilton Public Library).

Plate 7: Excerpt of 1909 bird’s eye view drawing of study area. Source: Hamilton Public Library.

Beginning in the early 20th century, topographic maps show the area and some of the buildings at the harbour. The maps printed between 1909 and 1923 do not depict the building at 659 Catharine Street, though it does appear on the 1938 map. Fire Insurance Maps of the area show the structure in 1911.
Plates 8-10: Topographic maps showing the study area. From left to right: 1909, 1915, and 1938.

Maps produced by the Hamilton Harbour Canadian Hydrographic Service between the 1920s and 1970s primarily focus on the depths of the water, but also show the evolution of the harbourfront shoreline, street grid and buildings at the Piers.

In 1926, the Harbour Commissioner’s Dock is located at the foot of Catharine Street. A chimney from what was listed on previous maps at the Steamboat Co. is also labeled at the foot of Hughson Street. The Canadian Steamship lines are listed at the foot of James Street. A large structure is depicted at the foot of Catharine Street (659 Catharine Street). On this map, what are now Guise and Burlington Streets terminate at James Street, and do not connect further westward.

Plate 12: Excerpt of the 1926 Hamilton Harbour Canadian Hydrographic map. Source: Hamilton Public Library.

By 1938, the Streets had been connected westward. The chimney is still labeled on the map, but the Steamship Lines are not. The Royal Hamilton Yacht Club is now depicted at the foot of MacNab Street, in its present location. Eastwood Park is labeled, and dashed lined indicated plans.
for the extension of Ferguson Avenue (Plate 9). Minimal changes are shown in 1943. In 1943, land in the south end of Eastwood Park was purchased by the Naval Department of National Defence for the construction of the H.M.C.S. Star (Hamilton Public Library), but this is not depicted on the topographic maps or hydrographic maps.

Fire Insurance Plans for the area in 1947 show that the H.M.C.S. Star and the Sea Cadet Hall (595 Catharine Street North) have both been constructed. The Maintenance shed at 1 Guise Street also appears in the 1947 Fire Insurance Plan.


In 1952, the Marine Police Patrol is listed on the map at the foot of Hughson, and the H.H.C Marine Railway is identified at the foot of James Street. The Harbour Commission Building is under construction. The Catharine Street building is identified as belonging to the Harbour Commission (Plate 10-12). By 1959, the H.M.S.C. Star reserves are identified on the map, and lines indicated the extension or planned extension of Ferguson Avenue. The pier north of Ferguson Avenue has been extended with fill (Plate 13). In 1972, 0.40 hectares of land in Eastwood Park was purchased by the Board of Control to construct Dock Service Road (Hamilton Public Library). By the late 1960s and early 1970s, Pier 8 has been expanded with fill to resemble its current delineation, and includes the Harbour Masters Office. Between the 1960s and present day (Plates 14-16), the harbour front has continued to evolve with the construction of the new Yacht Club, the Marine Discovery Centre (now restaurant venues) and the waterfront trail and public amenities such as an outdoor skating area, parking lot, cafe and Hamilton Waterfront Trust offices. Much of the land on the expanded Pier 8 is used for boat storage and maintenance areas. Eastwood Park was redeveloped in the late 1990s, when a new sewer was installed under the park grounds (Hamilton Public Library).
Plates 15 and 16: Excerpt of the 1938 (left) and 1952 (right) Hamilton Harbour Canadian Hydrographic map. Source: Hamilton Public Library.

Plate 17: 1952 Aerial view of Piers 5-8 (looking north), from the Hamilton Spectator. Source: Hamilton Waterfront Trust.

Plates 18 and 19: Excerpts of the 1959 (left) and 1972 (right) Hamilton Harbour Canadian Hydrographic map. Source: Hamilton Public Library.

5.3 Historical themes

The study area is primarily associated with the theme of harbour development, which began in the 1830s and continues to present day. The residential neighbourhood between Guise Street and Burlington Street also developed alongside the harbour development, containing a number of structures representative of workers’ housing. Many residents of the area may have found employment through various harbour activities, or in other North End industries. The western portion of the harbour, including the subject areas, contained less heavy industry and shipping in the 20th century, and became an area with administrative, maintenance, storage and recreational marina/training uses (Hamilton Harbour Commission, 2012).
6.0 Description of Built Features

1 Guise Street

The property addressed as 1 Guise Street contains two built features: a varnish shed and maintenance shed both formerly associated with the Hamilton Port Authority/Harbour West Marina. The buildings were used in their early years to service Navy boats, harbour tub boats, and the passenger ferry service that operated from the foot of James Street (Hamilton Port Authority 21, 2012).

The maintenance shop building was constructed by 1946. The building is of riveted steel construction (as seen in the gable truss) and is clad in aluminum siding. It is of vernacular design, and is a two storey structure with gable roof. The south side of the building features a row of multi-paned wood frame windows. The north side of the building extends over the water with three large bays and dock areas for boats. An addition was put on the building in the late 20th century for Harbour West Marina offices. The east side of the building is primarily clad in corrugated metal siding, but features a large wooden door with six sliding panels. Each sliding panel features rectangular panels with diagonal wooden siding and nearly square windows. In one of the centre panels there is a single entrance door, with a small round window. An additional single entrance door is located just beside the large sliding doors. The west elevation contains multipaned wood frame windows, and a variety of windows and door types, suggesting that the addition of these features has occurred at different points in time. A red brick chimney is located at the roofline of the west elevation.

The interior of the maintenance shed features a large two storey open area with an upper deck around two sides of the building. This deck area previously provided better access to the boats when undertaking maintenance. Tools and equipment are stored beneath the deck platform, and in rooms at the west end of the building. Smaller office and storage areas are located north of the large maintenance area. The maintenance shed is no longer used for the maintenance of large boats, but general service vehicles and other items for the Marina. Some of the interior walls feature horizontal wooden cladding, while other areas contain plywood or have drywall.

Settling has occurred in the building over time and the building is sloping towards the water and support piers have sustained wear and damage over time. Markings along an interior door frame show the changes over time from where the floors have shifted several inches over five years from a benchmark on the other side of the building.

The varnish shed was constructed by 1954, alongside the Hamilton Port Authority maintenance shop. The building is of steel frame construction and is clad in corrugated aluminum siding. It is a
tall, single storey structure with gable roof. The north elevation features a row of single pane square wood frame windows. There is an exterior rack for boat masts attached to the north side of the building. The east side of the building features a large two-panel sliding door clad in plywood, and utility boxes beside the door. The south elevation of the building is similar to the north side, with a row of single pane square wood frame windows. The west elevation does not contain any doors or windows. This elevation features a metal smokestack. The interior of the building is an open area currently used for storing boats. The walls and ceiling are clad in painted plywood.

The two buildings are located beside each other near the harbour. They are surrounded by asphalt pavement and boat storage and vehicular parking areas.

17 Discovery Drive

The building addressed as 17 Discovery Drive is the former Marine Police building. The structure was constructed between 1938 and 1952, as shown on Hamilton Harbour Canadian Hydrographic maps in the previous section. The building has been used as the City of Hamilton Marine Police unit since its construction.

The building is a single storey rectangular frame structure built partly on the pier and partly on a dock on the harbour. The building has a predominantly flat roof, with a triangular projection on the south portion of the building. The building is clad in synthetic siding. The north elevation, facing the harbour, features three garage doors for boat access and storage. The east elevation features a single entrance door surrounded by wood frame rectangular windows that are bordered with synthetic flashing. Pairs of wood frame rectangular windows are located to the south of the door. To the north of the entrance is a trio of wood framed rectangular windows. Additional piers to support the building have been added to the east side and encased in synthetic siding. The south elevation features different sized grouping rectangular wood frame windows bordered by synthetic flashing on both the first and second storey. The west elevation features a single entrance door with wood frame window above, and a trio of wood frame windows surrounded by synthetic flashing.

The interior of the building features an open foyer, office space, workout room and boat garage on the first storey, and dressing room, storage area, staff area and kitchenette on the second storey.

595 Catharine Street North

The building addressed as 959 Catharine Street North is the former Navy League/Sea Cadet building. It was constructed by 1947, and likely constructed shortly after the H.M.C.S. Star in 1943. It is a two-storey building of frame construction and features a central wing with low pitched side gable roof and two flanking wings with flat roofs. The side wings of the building feature single
metal entrance doors under awnings, horizontal rectangular windows at the top of the first storey and rectangular vinyl windows on the second storey. The central section of the building features a double metal entrance with garage style door, trios of what appear to be metal frame windows with wooden or metal panels above featuring crests of the organization. The building is vernacular in design and clad with synthetic siding. A red brick chimney is located on the southern side wing. Access to the site and interior access was not available at the time of the site visit, as the building owners could not be reached.

The building is located at the northwestern corner of its lot, with an asphalt area in front of the building and asphalt driveway connecting to Catharine Street. The remainder of the lot is open lawn and bordered to the north, south and west by vegetation.

659 Catharine Street North

The property addressed as 659 Catharine Street North is a former boat maintenance building. The building was constructed by 1911 according to Fire Insurance Plans, though it is possible that it was constructed earlier than this. A 1909 bird’s eye view of the harbour area shows a gable roofed structure in the same location as the existing building, suggesting that it could have been constructed by this time. Later mapping shows that the building had a longer tail addition that extended towards the waterfront until at least the early 1970s.

659 Catharine Street is a tall, single storey metal framed building with corrugated metal cladding. The building features an asymmetrical roofline with two front-facing gables; a taller and broader one and a shorter, narrower one partially truncated by the larger gable. The south elevation of the building features three large bays. The two westernmost bays have more recent steel rollback doors, while the smallest of the three bays is a sliding door composed of multiple rectangular metal sections.

The east side of the building features multi-paned wood frame windows in the upper section of the building, and there are several painted mural panels on this elevation as well depicting harbour scenes. There are steel gooseneck lights on the east elevation of the building, towards the centre and the northern end of the elevation near the eaves. Several damaged floodlights on poles are located above the roofline.

The north elevation features a large sliding door towards the easternmost corner, and in the centre of the gable, four rectangular window openings that have been covered with plastic cladding.

The west elevation does not contain any windows, but there is a large sliding door composed of small rectangular metal panels (similar to the door on the south elevation). Parts of the west elevation are clad in wooden siding, both horizontal and vertical. The smaller western gable
extends above the roof pitch of the remainder of the structure when viewed from this angle. Harbour West Marina staff noted that this area previously contained office spaces.

The interior space is a large, open area used for boat storage. The riveted steel truss structure and support posts are prominent features of the interior. The area of the smaller gable section is clad with wood siding, and shows that there were previously rectangular window openings on the second storey and an entrance door on the first storey that have been covered by the exterior metal cladding.

The structure is located at the eastern end of Pier 8, beside the harbour and waterfront trail. The HMCS Haida National Historic Site is located east of the building, and the former Marine Freight terminal to the north.

**Stone Retaining Wall/Culvert at the Foot of James Street, Pier 7**

The stone retaining wall and culvert are visible between two marina slips on Pier 7. It is difficult to determine the exact date of construction of the wall, as unlike the buildings is less likely to be prominently depicted and labeled. However, an 1893 bird’s eye view map that looks southwards from the lake to the City shows a feature containing a small culvert at the foot of James Street that bears a resemblance to the existing culvert. It is difficult to determine the accuracy of hand drawn maps, and the feature shown on the map may have been a previous feature that served a similar function. The feature was part of an older sewage system, first installed along James Street in 1884 (Gore, et al 1923), draining into the harbour (an acceptable practice at the time). Modifications were likely made over time as the piers changed. Given the different sizes and shapes of stone and the fact that they are not joined together in an interlocking pattern, it is likely that the large stone portion was added later than the central section. Exact dates of construction for the sewer culvert could not be confirmed. The 1954 aerial photo of the site shows the feature similar to how it exists today (See Plate 18).
The retaining wall and culvert features three sections. A central section contains the culvert, a semicircular opening in the wall above a concrete and stone base. The culvert arch features shaped voussoir stones. The remainder of the wall section features smaller cut stones in a broken ashlar course. The two sections on either side of the central culvert are larger rectangular stones in an even course.

7.0 Evaluation
7.1 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. The criteria below have been developed from, and expand on, Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act. Full Evaluation Criteria are included in Appendix A. The built features are also evaluated using Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act.

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

**Architecture and Design**
4. Architectural merit: what is the architectural value of the resource?
5. Functional metric: what is the functional quality of the resource?
6. Designer: what is the significance of this structure as an illustration of the work on an important designer?

**Integrity**
7. Location integrity: is the structure in its original location?
8. Built integrity: is the structure and its components parts all there?

**Environmental Context**
9. Landmark: is it a visually conspicuous feature in the area?
10. Character: what is the influence of the structure on the present character of the area?
11. Setting: what is the integrity of the historical relationship between the structure and its immediate surroundings?

**Social Value**

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

### 7.2 Evaluation of subject properties

#### 1 Guise Street (Machine shop and varnish shed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design or Physical Value – the property...</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical or Associative Value – the property...</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community,</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual Value – the property...</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area,</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is a landmark.</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The buildings at 1 Guise Street are illustrative of the theme of mid 20th century harbour development. Constructed in the 1940 and 50s, they are two buildings that were part of the maintenance and seasonal storage of smaller harbour service boats, including navy vessels, tugboats and police crafts. In more recent years, the buildings have been used for storage of private recreational boats, office space for the Harbour West Marina, and repair/maintenance areas for various harbour activities.

The buildings are of vernacular construction, featuring common materials (steel cladding, plywood and wooden clapboard). The maintenance shed features a riveted steel frame with truss...
structure visible in the attic, and large wooden sliding doors on the east elevation that distinguish it from other buildings. Both buildings are examples of typical methods of industrial/utilitarian vernacular construction of the mid 20th century. The builder/designer of the buildings is not known.

The buildings are located in the same location as were constructed, and have a reasonable degree of integrity, though cladding and roofing have been replaced over time, and interior alterations have likely been made as the functions of the buildings changed over time. The buildings are still recognizable from photos taken shortly after their construction.

The buildings are visible features in the area that are part of the harbour character, but are not conspicuous landmark features that stand out from the surroundings. The setting and location of the buildings at the harbour demonstrates their relationship to former marine maintenance and service industries.

The buildings may have some social value, as indicated in the Hamilton West Harbour Waterfront Recreation Master Plan, that they should be considered for adaptive re-use as public buildings or pavilions. These recommendations were part of a public process that would have involved consultation and discussion on important aspects of the harbour to incorporate into future plans.

**Heritage attributes:**

**Varnish shed**
- Vernacular construction of rectangular plan, one storey massing and gable roof
- Location at the water’s edge
- Proximity to maintenance shed

**Maintenance shed**
- Vernacular construction of rectangular plan, two storey massing and gable roof
- Riveted steel construction
- Wooden sliding doors on the east elevation
- Wood frame multi-pane windows on the south and west elevations
- Boat bays on the north elevation
- Location at the water’s edge/partial construction on the water
- Proximity to varnish shed
17 Discovery Drive (Marine Police Building)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design or Physical Value – the property...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical or Associative Value – the property...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual Value – the property...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is a landmark.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The building at 17 Discovery Drive is associated with the theme of 20th century harbour development. Since its construction between 1946-1952, the building has served as a waterfront police outpost. The department was originally the Hamilton Harbour Police, established in 1922, and became part of the City of Hamilton police department in 1986 (Nolan 2012).

The building is a vernacular structure, and does not contain significant architectural or design features or notable materials. The building is of functional vernacular design, a purpose-built marine police unit, with boat storage and office space. The designer/builder is not known.

The structure stands in its original location. It appears that there have been several modifications to the windows and door feature on the east side of the building when compared to a 1954 air photograph, though the shape and massing of the structure have not changed.

The property is not a landmark in the area, not being a large or prominent structure, and does not stand out from its surroundings in a distinctive manner. The property supports the character of the area as a harbour, as it is a vernacular structure associated with marine use and maintains a relationship to the harbour.

**Heritage Attributes:**

- Vernacular design with two storey massing, rectangular plan and flat roof with gabled section
• Boat bays on north elevation
• Location at the water’s edge/partial construction on the water

595 Catharine Street North (Navy League Building)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design or Physical Value – the property...</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical or Associative Value – the property...</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual Value – the property...</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is a landmark</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The structure at 595 Catharine Street North was constructed by 1948. Since its construction, it has been the home of the Sea Cadets (a branch of the Navy League of Canada, RCSCC 31 Lion). The Navy League was established in 1895, as an organization that aimed to support naval defence by engaging in naval reserve training and youth training (Navy League 2016). The broader organization of the Navy League contributed to the war efforts by recruiting personnel, operating hostels, providing welfare services to dependants of naval personnel and rehabilitating naval veterans. Following the wars, the organization scaled back its operations and focused on providing opportunities for youth training and promoting knowledge of naval affairs (Navy League, 2016).

The building is a vernacular frame structure. It is not representative of a particular architectural style or building type, and does not feature notable architectural details. The building was functionally designed to serve as a Sea Cadet drill hall. The integrity of the building is not known, as historic photographs are not available. The footprint of the building appears to have changed slightly with the addition of the south wing, which is not shown on earlier Fire Insurance Plans.
The context of the building has changed since its construction in the 1940s. At the time of its construction, the rear of the building was near the water, but the expansion of Pier 8 has filled in the land to the northwest where the shoreline used to be. These changes alter the physical relationship between the Navy League building and the harbour.

The subject property has potential for social value, as it has played a role in the local community for many years by providing navy training and education opportunities to youth.

**Heritage Attributes:**

- Proximity to the H.M.C.S. Star, with which it shares similar historical associations of naval training.

**659 Catharine Street North (Maintenance building)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design or Physical Value – the property...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>is a rare, unique, representative</em> or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical or Associative Value – the property...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual Value – the property...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is a landmark.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The structure at 659 Catharine Street North was constructed by 1911, and may have been constructed prior to 1909. The building is noted on the 1911 Fire Insurance Plan as a freight shed for the Canadian Steamship Lines. By 1947, the building was owned by the Hamilton harbour Commission and was noted as a warehouse that contained chemical extinguishers. By this time, the tail addition on the rear of the building had been constructed. It remained a warehouse in the 1960s, but Fire Insurance Plans noted both the Hamilton Harbour Commission and the Dominion Glass Company on the site.
The building is a riveted steel truss structure with metal cladding (and some wood cladding on the west elevation). The cladding has likely been replaced over time. Former interior office space has been removed, resulting in a section of the interior that features wooden cladding. The building is a representative vernacular/industrial design, and built to serve a functional warehouse purpose, and does not feature decorative details that are attributed to any particular architectural style.

The integrity of the structure is not known, as there are few historical photographs that depict the building before the 1950s. The footprint of the building appears to have remained intact over the years, with the exception of a rear addition (since removed).

The context and surroundings of the building have changed over the course of the 20th century with the expansion of Pier 8 and changes in the industrial/recreational use of the harbour over time, but the building has maintained its connection to the harbour particularly on the east side, which remains beside the water, and the visual and historical relationships to this context remain.

The building at 659 Catharine Street North does not appear to have strong social value, as there are few references to it in historical sources, civic/tourism documents or local newspapers/community sources. The potential for social value may stem from the Harbour Waterfront Recreational Master Plan where there is a desire to maintain industrial buildings and integrate them into future development to retain a sense of the harbour area’s past.

**Heritage Attributes:**

- Vernacular construction with rectangular plan, tall one storey/two storey massing, gable roof
- Riveted steel construction
- Multi-paned wood frame window on the east elevation
- Location at the water’s edge

**Stone Retaining Wall/Culvert**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design or Physical Value – the property...</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historical or Associative Value – the property...</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The stone retaining wall and culvert appear to have been part of an early municipal sewer system, which drained into the harbour. The James Street sewer line was constructed as early as 1884, and mapping from the 1920s confirms that it was still in active use at the time. It is not known if the existing stone culvert structure was constructed in 1884 or whether it replaced an earlier structure. Historic images from the 1950s show the structure in place.

The feature contains a dressed stone retaining wall with semicircular culvert opening with stone voussoir. On either side of the culvert feature are sections of the wall with larger stones. The culvert and wall are not representative of an architectural style, but are of a functional vernacular design.

The integrity of the wall is not known, as historical photographs that do show the feature are not of high enough quality to determine whether it has been altered. The use of larger stones that are not interlocked with the smaller stones suggest that the wall has been added to at some point.

The culvert/wall maintains a historical and physical relationship to its surroundings, as the former sewage outlet of a James Street sewer line to the harbour. The line no longer drains into the harbour.

The feature does not appear to have social value, as there are no references to it in local materials that would suggest social value, such as tourism brochures, newspaper articles, etc.

### 8.0 Summary of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

Each of the structures assessed in the previous section demonstrates cultural heritage value or interest. Generally, the structures are significant for similar reasons: they are representative or vernacular buildings or features that have a historical association and contextual relationship to the harbour. Some features date to the late 19th or early 20th century period of harbour development, while others date to the more recent mid 20th century period of harbour development. The built features all contribute to supporting the character of the area as a harbour, and are representative of different facets of this history.
9.0 Description of Proposed Development

A proposed plan of subdivision has been prepared for the lands at 65 Guise Street East, containing Piers 5-8 of the Hamilton harbour. The draft plan of subdivision proposes the creation of 11 blocks of land within a street grid pattern, ranging in size from 0.44 hectares to 2.3 hectares. All blocks are proposed for residential mixed use and institutional development, except for Blocks 10 and 11, which are proposed for park/open space and connect to existing development on Pier 8.

The proposed plan of subdivision does not intend to retain existing buildings on the lands (except for the existing commercial/recreational centres on Pier 8). No specific development plans for the blocks of land are proposed at this time.

Plate 23: Draft plan of subdivision for the subject property. See Appendix B for full size version.
10.0 Impacts of Proposed Development

There are three classifications of changes that the effects of a proposed development may have on an identified cultural heritage resource: beneficial, neutral or adverse. Beneficial effect may include such actions as retaining a property of cultural heritage value, protecting it from loss or removal, maintaining restoring or repairing heritage attributes, or making sympathetic additions or alterations that allow for a continued long-term use and retain heritage building fabric. Neutral effects have neither a markedly positive or negative impact on a cultural heritage resource. Adverse effects may include the loss or removal of a cultural heritage resource, unsympathetic alterations or additions that remove or obstruct heritage attributes, the isolation of a cultural heritage resource from its setting or context, or the addition of other elements that are unsympathetic to the character or heritage attributes of a cultural heritage resource. Adverse effects may require strategies to mitigate their impact on cultural heritage resources.

The impacts of a proposed development or change to a cultural heritage resource may be direct or indirect. They may occur over a short term or long term duration, and may occur during a pre-construction phase, construction phase or post-construction phase. Impacts to a cultural heritage resource may also be site specific or widespread, and may have low, moderate or high levels of physical impact.

The draft plan of subdivision would, as planned, result in the demolition of the existing structures on site, including 1 Guise Street (maintenance shed and varnish shed), 17 Discovery Drive (marine police unit), 595 Catharine Street (navy league building) and 659 Catharine Street (shed 7 warehouse). The draft plan of subdivision does not propose changes to the stone retaining wall/culvert feature at the foot of James Street, though City of Hamilton staff have indicated that there may be opportunities in the future to modify the existing layout of the piers, which could impact this feature.

As each of the features has been identified as demonstrating cultural heritage value or impact vested in their historical and contextual values, the removal of these features would be considered adverse impacts to the cultural heritage value and heritage attributes of the properties as it would result in the loss/removal of these features as they currently exist. The impacts of the removal of each structure are as follows:

1 Guise Street, Maintenance shed:

- Loss of a vernacular steel truss building
- Loss of building with historical associations to the theme of mid 20th century harbour development and the storage and maintenance of private boats
- Loss of building that supports the area’s character as a harbour area
1 Guise Street, Varnish shed:

- Loss of a vernacular mid-20th century building
- Loss of building with historical associations to the theme of mid 20th century harbour development and the storage and maintenance of private boats
- Loss of building that supports the area's character as a harbour area

17 Discovery Drive, marine police building:

- Loss of a vernacular 20th century purpose-built marine police building
- Loss of building with historical associations to the theme of mid 20th century harbour development, specifically marine safety and law enforcement
- Loss of building that supports the area's character as a harbour area

595 Catharine Street North, Navy League building:

- Loss of building with historical associations to the theme of mid 20th century harbour development, specifically naval training and education
- Loss of building that supports the area's character as a harbour area

659 Catharine Street North, warehouse shed 7:

- Loss of a vernacular steel truss building
- Loss of building with historical associations to the theme of mid 20th century harbour development and the storage and maintenance of private boats
- Loss of building that supports the area's character as a harbour area

Stone retaining wall/culvert:

- Potential loss of a late 19th/early 20th century example of public works/engineering infrastructure
- Potential loss of a structure with historical associations to the theme of public works and infrastructure development in Hamilton
- Potential loss of feature with a historical and physical relationship to its surroundings.

11.0 Assessment of Development Alternatives

The following have been identified in this Heritage Impact Assessment as a range of development alternatives that may be considered as part of the heritage planning process. The alternatives may have greater or lesser levels of impact on heritage attributes from one another.
1. **Do nothing**

This alternative would result in no development on the lands or the removal of any structures. In this alternative, the structures would continue to serve their current purposes. Some impacts may still occur in the long term, as repairs of the maintenance shed and marine police building are required as they are becoming damaged by corrosion where structural elements meet the air and water. Use of the buildings would be beneficial for their long-term maintenance and conservation.

2. **Integrate all existing structures (considered in this HIA) into the draft plan of subdivision**

This alternative would result in the integration of the existing structures into the draft plan of subdivision for retention and adaptive re-use as part of future development plans. This alternative would not result in direct impacts to the heritage value or attributes of the structures, as they would remain in-situ. This alternative would have the beneficial impact of retaining cultural heritage resources consistent with the recommendations in the West Harbour Waterfront Recreation Master Plan and Setting Sail Secondary Plan.

In the longer term, there may be impacts as structures are converted to new uses. Repairs would need to be undertaken on buildings that are damaged so that they do not continue to deteriorate.

3. **Integrate some existing structures into the draft plan of subdivision**

This alternative would integrate some, but not all of the existing structures into the proposed plan of subdivision. This alternative would have the benefit of retaining some cultural heritage resources and consistent with some of the recommendations in the West Harbour Waterfront Recreation Master Plan and Setting Sail Secondary Plan.

The maintenance building at 1 Guise Street and the marine police building at 17 Discovery Drive are in need of repairs as their location partly on the water has resulted in settling/deterioration of some building components. Restoration and/or repair of these buildings may involve substantial work and may require continued maintenance over the long term to monitor the buildings and ensure that similar conditions do not develop. Future development plans may not be able to find feasible uses for all existing buildings on site, especially those that require major repairs. In this alternative, buildings such as the varnish shed at 1 Guise Street and the warehouse at 659 Catharine Street could be integrated and planned for adaptive re-use, as they are in more stable condition. This alternative would result in some adverse impacts with the loss and removal of the maintenance building and marine police building. However this alternative would also have
beneficial impacts of retaining the varnish shed at 1 Guise Street and warehouse at 659 Catharine Street which would continue to support the industrial/harbour character of the area.

4. Remove all structures as proposed on the draft plan of subdivision

This alternative would result in the removal of all structures in the study area in order to accommodate the draft plan of subdivision as currently proposed. This alternative would result in adverse impacts to the existing structures, as it would result in the loss of buildings/features with various physical, historical and contextual values as outlined in section 10. This alternative would not comply with the recommendations in the West Harbour Waterfront Recreation Master Plan and Setting Sail Secondary Plan.

12.0 Mitigation Measures

As identified in Section 11, four alternatives have been assessed with regards to the proposed development:

1. Do nothing
2. Integrate all structures into the draft plan of subdivision
3. Integrate some structures into the draft plan of subdivision
4. Remove all structures as proposed in the draft plan of subdivision

The following outlines the appropriate mitigation measures that would be required for each of the alternatives.

Mitigation measures for alternative 1 (do nothing) would include maintenance and/or repair of the structures to conserve them in the long term. Continued use would be beneficial to ensure that maintenance continues over the long term.

Mitigation measures for alternative 2 would include maintenance and/or repair of the structures to conserve them in the long term. Continued use would be beneficial to ensure that maintenance continues over the long term. If the structures are to be adapted to new uses for future development of the site, heritage attributes should be retained where possible, or documented and salvaged when they cannot be retained.

Mitigation measures for alternative 3 are similar to alternative 2. In this alternative, it is likely that less maintenance and repair will be required in the short term, as the structures to be retained would be those that are in better physical condition. Some maintenance may still be required, especially if the buildings are to be adapted for new uses when the site is developed. If the retained structures are to be adapted for new uses when the site is developed, heritage attributes
should be retained where possible, or documented and salvaged when they cannot be retained. Mitigative measures for the buildings to be removed should include documentation (such as photographic records, drawings or floor plans where appropriate) and salvage of heritage attributes. Some salvaged materials, such as the large wooden sliding doors, wood frame windows or steel truss components may be suitable for integration into new development, as decorative interior features in new establishments.

The structures to be removed in this alternative demonstrate historical and contextual value. As such, it is recommended that commemorative material be installed to mitigate their removal. Such material should include the installation of interpretive material that outlines the history of the structures and their relationship to the harbour and its periods of development.

If alternative 4 is selected and all structures are to be removed, mitigation measures would include the documentation of each structure (photographs, and drawings or floorplans where appropriate), salvage of historic materials or heritage attributes for use in the future development as decorative components and/or as part of commemorative/interpretive material to be included in the new development. Interpretive material should include textual and graphic materials that outline the history of the structures and their relationship to the harbour and its periods of development.

13.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) states that “significant built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved”. The subject site contains six structures/built features that demonstrate cultural heritage value or interest and meet at least one of the criteria in Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act. The structures and built features are generally considered to be significant for their historical and contextual values that are representative of and support the character of the area as a harbour. It is important to note that Cultural Heritage is one of many considerations in the PPS, and that the PPS is intended to be read in its entirety with relevant policies applied in each situation. As such, other planning rational may be considered where appropriate, and balancing policy objectives is often required.

The subject site is proposed for redevelopment by the City of Hamilton, from its current harbour and marina use to a mixed-use neighbourhood with commercial, residential and institutional uses and parkland/open space. A draft plan of subdivision for the site has been prepared, subdividing the area into 11 new blocks of land within a street grid system. At this time, the draft plan of subdivision assumes the removal of all structures from the site.
The impacts of this proposed development have been evaluated with consideration to the heritage value and heritage attributes of the existing structures. As the proposed development results in adverse impacts, other development alternatives have been explored, and appropriate mitigative measures for each alternative were identified.

Of the alternatives outlined, alternative 3 is recommended as it provides the most balanced approach to conserving cultural heritage value and allowing for future development. This alternative will retain parts of the harbour’s history and provide a visible reminder of that historical past that supports the character of the harbour area as it transforms to new use. Within alternative 3 there are variations as to which buildings could be retained. The buildings all share similar values; modest to little design value, historical value associated with various periods of harbour development, and contextual value in supporting the character of the harbour area. There are some differences in historical associations, as the marine police building and Navy League buildings are associated with slightly more specific aspects of harbour development than the other buildings associated with the general maintenance and storage of vessels. Though these themes differ slightly, none have greater significance than the other. Retention of buildings, if only some are to be incorporated into the draft plan of subdivision, may be determined partly by heritage value but also by the physical condition of the buildings and their potential for adaptive re-use. Some buildings may be more suitable to adaptive re-use than others, due to their size, location or interior configuration/layout constraints. Retaining buildings without an intended use, particularly if they are not in good physical condition can still have adverse impacts, as conditions may continue to deteriorate without the ongoing attention and maintenance that a long term use can provide. As such, the following actions are recommended for retaining/integrating buildings in the draft plan of subdivision:

- While the warehouse/shed 7 at 659 Catherine Street North is perhaps the oldest remaining structure on site and has associations to the late 19th/early 20th century period of industrial development, its poor condition and proximity to the water’s edge make it difficult to retain in situ. The shorewall adjacent to the building (in fact, along all of pier 8) is in need of replacement, which will involve removal of much of the building, as the tie backs are expected to be approximately 25m from the water’s edge. Therefore, we recommend retaining significant sections of the shed for adaptive reuse, perhaps in the approximate current location, once remediation of the shorewall has been completed.

- The varnish shed at 1 Guise Street be retained, if possible, to continue to represent the historical associations to the theme of mid 20th century harbour development and that recommendations in the West Harbour Waterfront Recreation Master Plan be explored as options for adaptive re-use.
• The maintenance shed at 1 Guise Street is not recommended for retention, given its deteriorating condition. It is recommended that heritage attributes from the maintenance shed be salvaged and incorporated into future development.

• That a structural assessment of the marine police building at 17 Discovery Drive be undertaken and alternatives for adaptive re-use and retention be explored subject to the findings of the structural assessment. If no reasonable use can be determined then mitigative measures of documentation and commemoration be undertaken.

• That the Navy League building at 595 Catharine Street North be removed, as the loss of its historical values can be mitigated by commemoration and by the retention of the H.M.C.S. Star, which will remain and retains a connection to naval history of the area.

• That if there are to be changes to the configuration of the pier (not proposed at this time as part of the draft plan of subdivision), that the stone retaining wall/culvert feature be documented and materials salvaged and incorporated on-site.
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Appendix A – City of Hamilton Evaluation Criteria
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.
Appendix B – Draft Plan of Subdivision
Appendix C – Qualifications
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Dan Currie, a Partner and Managing Director of MHBC’s Cultural Heritage Division, joined MHBC Planning in 2009, after having worked in various positions in the public sector since 1997 including the Director of Policy Planning for the City of Cambridge and Senior Policy Planner for the City of Waterloo.

Dan provides a variety of planning services for public and private sector clients including a wide range of policy and development work. Dan has experience in a number of other areas including strategic planning, heritage policy, secondary plans, watershed plans, housing studies and downtown revitalization plans.

Dan holds a Masters degree in Planning from the University of Waterloo, a Bachelors degree (Honours) in Planning from the University of Waterloo and a Bachelor of Arts degree from the University of Saskatchewan. He is a registered Professional Planner and a Member of the Canadian Institute of Planners.

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

Full Member, Canadian Institute of Planners
Full Member, Ontario Professional Planners Institute
Past Board Member, Town and Gown Association of Ontario

PROFESSIONAL HISTORY

2013 – Present Partner, Managing Director of Cultural Heritage
MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited

2010 – 2013 Associate
MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited

2009 - 2010 Senior Planner
MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited

2007 - 2009 Director, Policy Planning,
City of Cambridge

2007 – 2007 Executive Assistant to the CAO,
City of Waterloo

EDUCATION

2006 Masters of Arts (Planning)
University of Waterloo

1998 Bachelor of Environmental Studies
University of Waterloo

1998 Bachelor of Arts (Art History)
University of Saskatchewan

CONTACT

540 Bingemans Centre Drive,
Suite 200
Kitchener, ON N2B 3X9
T 519 576 3650 x 744
F 519 576 0121
dcurrie@mhbcplan.com
www.mhbcplan.com
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2007 Executive Assistant to the CAO, City of Waterloo

2000 -2007 Senior Planner, City of Waterloo

1999 - 2000 Planner, City of Waterloo

1997 - 1998 Research Planner, City of Kitchener

SELECTED PROJECT EXPERIENCE

MASTER PLANS, GROWTH MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES AND POLICY STUDIES

Burlington Heights Heritage Lands Management Plan (ongoing)
Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority, St John’s Centre Management Plan (ongoing)
Cambridge West Master Environmental Servicing Plan (ongoing)
Township of West Lincoln Settlement Area Expansion Analysis (2013)
Ministry of Infrastructure Review of Performance Indicators for the Growth Plan (2013)
Township of Tiny Residential Land Use Study (2012)
Port Severn Settlement Area Boundary Review (2012)
City of Cambridge Green Building Policy (2011)
Township of West Lincoln Intensification Study & Employment Land Strategy (2011)
Meadowlands Conservation Area Management Plan (2011)
City of Cambridge Trails Master Plan (2010)
City of Kawartha Lakes Growth Management Strategy (2010)
City of Cambridge Growth Management Strategy (2009)
Cambridge GO Train Feasibility Study (2008)
City of Waterloo Height and Density Policy (2005)
City of Waterloo Student Accommodation Study (2004)
Uptown Waterloo Residential Market Study (2002)
City of Waterloo Land Supply Study (2000)
City of Kitchener Inner City Housing Study (1998)
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HERITAGE PLANNING

City of Kingston, Barriefield Heritage Conservation District Plan Update (ongoing)
City of Markham, Victoria Square Heritage Conservation District Study (ongoing)
Township of Muskoka Lakes, Bala Heritage Conservation District (ongoing)
Municipality of Meaford Heritage Conservation District Plan (ongoing)
City of Guelph Heritage Conservation District Study (ongoing)
City of Toronto Garden District Heritage Conservation District Study (ongoing)
City of London Western Counties Cultural Heritage Plan
City of Cambridge Heritage Master Plan
City of Waterloo Mary-Allen Neighbourhood Heritage District Plan Study
City of Waterloo Rummelhardt School Heritage Designation
Other heritage consulting services including:
  • Heritage Impact Assessments
  • Requests for Designations
  • Alterations or new developments within Heritage Conservation Districts
Lashia Jones, B.A., M.A., CAHP

Lashia Jones is a Cultural Heritage Specialist and Heritage Planner with MHBC and joined the firm after graduating from Carleton University with a Masters Degree in Canadian Studies, specializing in heritage conservation. Prior to joining MHBC, Lashia gained practical experience working for a multi-disciplinary consulting firm and was responsible for evaluating and analyzing built heritage properties and providing historical research to supplement the findings of fieldwork. Lashia provides a variety of research and report writing services for public and private sector clients. She has experience in historical research, inventory work, evaluation and analysis on a variety of projects, including heritage conservation districts, heritage impact assessments and cultural heritage assessments, and cultural heritage bridge evaluations.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2012 - Present Cultural Heritage Specialist/ Heritage Planner
MacNaughton Hermsen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited

May 2011 - September 2011 Heritage Planning Assistant
City of Ottawa

2009 - 2010 Built Heritage Technician
Golder Associates Limited

April 2008 - August 2008 Research and Laboratory Assistant
Archaeologix Inc.

SELECT PROJECT EXPERIENCE

HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

Rondeau Heritage Conservation District Plan, Municipality of Chatham-Kent
Barriefield Heritage Conservation District Plan Update, City of Kingston
Victoria Square Heritage Conservation District Study, City of Markham
Bala Heritage Conservation District Study and Plan, Township of Muskoka Lakes
Garden District Heritage Conservation District Study and Plan, City of Toronto
Port Stanley Heritage Conservation District Plan and Guidelines, Port Stanley
Meaford Heritage Conservation District Study, Municipality of Meaford
Oil Springs Heritage Conservation District, Lambton County
CURRICULUM VITAE

Lashia Jones, B.A., M.A., CAHP

HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENTS/ CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENTS

- HIA for mid-19th century property, Wilson Street, City of Hamilton
- HIA for former mill and factory, Hespeler, City of Cambridge
- HIA for rear addition on building in MacGregor-Albert HCD, City of Waterloo
- HIA for development in West Woodfield Heritage Conservation District, City of London
- HIA for development adjacent to Queen Street West Heritage Conservation District, City of Toronto
- Extension of Station Street/Haig Road EA, City of Belleville
- Integrated approach to EA/OPA, extension of Robert Ferrie Drive, City of Kitchener
- Piers 5-8 West Harbour pumping station EA, City of Hamilton
- Various Residential and Commercial properties, Richmond Hill
- Glenora Fisheries Station, Glenora
- Russell Land Registry Office, Russell
- South Quarry extension, City of Hamilton
- Development adjacent to early 20th century residence, Town of Grimsby
- Development adjacent to mid-19th century stone residence, City of Kitchener
- Rockway Centre, City of Kitchener

CULTURAL HERITAGE PLANS/MANAGEMENT PLANS

- Heritage Master Plan, Town of Cobourg
- Western Counties Health and Occupational Centre, City of London
- Burlington Heights Heritage Lands Management Plan, City of Hamilton
- Whitehorn Landscape Conservation Management Plan, City of Hamilton

HERITAGE RECORDING AND DOCUMENTATION

- Barn documentation, Duntroon
- Barn foundations, Town of Caledon

HERITAGE BRIDGE EVALUATIONS

- Metcalfe Street/Badley bridge, Township of Centre Wellington
- Allisonville Bridge, Prince Edward County
- East Cross Creek Bridge, City of Kawartha Lakes
- Prune Creek Bridge, Hearst
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PROFESSIONAL/COMMUNITY ASSOCIATIONS

2014-present Member, Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals
2014-present Member, Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals Education Committee
2013-Present Pre-candidate member, Ontario Professional Planners Institute
2009-2010 Member, Stewardship committee to London Advisory Committee on Heritage (LACH)

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT COURSES / CONFERENCES

2015 Speaker, National Trust for Canada annual conference
2015 Speaker, Ontario Professional Planners Institute annual conference
2014 Heritage Building Materials Course, University of Victoria Heritage Resource Management Program
2013 Speaker, Heritage Canada Foundation National Conference