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1. Executive Summary

AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by Metrolinx to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) for the property at 1139 King Street East, in the City of Hamilton, Ontario (Figure 1). This work is being completed as part of the Hamilton Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project.

The Hamilton LRT Project B-Line alignment extends from McMaster University at Cootes Drive to the Main Street/Highway 403 Bridge. A proposed LRT only bridge will allow the alignment to then extend along King Street West until King East Street intersects with Main Street East, where the alignment will continue along Main Street East to the Queenston Road traffic circle. As a part of the project, it is anticipated that building impacts may take place on the property at 1139 King Street East.

The project impacts will be assessed following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), as prescribed in Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 231/08, Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings under the Environmental Assessment Act. As part of the TPAP Amendment, an Environmental Project Report (EPR) Amendment will be prepared for public review.

The CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Interim Cultural Heritage Management Process and utilizes the criteria in Ontario Regulation 9/06 and Ontario Regulation 10/06, as required by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport’s (MTCS) Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (2010). In addition, the CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Draft Terms of Reference for Consultants: Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations. As such the recommendations as they relate to this CHER and the potential cultural heritage value or interest of 1139 King Street East are contained in a separate Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations (CHERR) document.

As part of the reporting requirements for the Hamilton LRT Project, Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) undertook a Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) for the alignment. The CHSR identified the requirement to conduct a CHER for the property located at 1139 King Street East to assess the potential cultural heritage value or interest of the property. Where applicable, relevant background information has been utilized from the CHSR for project consistency.

A field review of the property 1139 King Street East was undertaken on January 12th, 2017 and January 17th, 2017 by Michael Greguol and Emily Game of AECOM (Figure 2).
2. Introduction

2.1 Historical Summary

2.1.1 Context

The subject property is located within the municipal boundaries of the City of Hamilton, Ontario. Prior to the incorporation of the current municipality, the property was located within the boundaries of Barton Township, in Wentworth County.

2.1.2 Wentworth County

As part of the establishment of Upper Canada, the province was divided into administrative Districts in 1792. As such, Wentworth County was one of several counties that made up the Home District. It was named in honour of Sir John Wentworth, Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia from 1792-1808. In 1816, the Home District was divided and reorganized and Wentworth County was included in the Gore District. By 1849, the original district system was abolished and replaced by a county council system and Wentworth County became an independent political entity. Townships that were included in Wentworth County at one time or another included Ancaster, Barton, Beverly, Binbrook, Caistor, Flamborough East and West, Glanford, Onondaga, Saltfleet, and Seneca. Between 1850 and 1854, Wentworth and Halton Counties were joined for government purposes into the United Counties of Wentworth and Halton. In 1973, Wentworth County was renamed the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth and, in 2001, was amalgamated with six constituent municipalities into the City of Hamilton. The City of Hamilton has remained as the administrative seat or county town since the original creation of the Gore District nearly two centuries ago.

2.1.3 Barton Township

Barton Township is described in detail in the Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth of 1875. The Township of Barton was surveyed in 1791 by Augustus Jones using the Single-Front survey system used by the colonial government between 1783 and 1818. The survey was made up of concessions separated by road allowances. The concession was divided into lots of 200 acres and sideroad allowances were surveyed after every fifth lot. The first settlers arrived in Barton Township in 1791, many of whom were United Empire Loyalists or disbanded troops. The settlement of Barton Township began slowly, with only 102 families living in the township by 1815; most of the settlement was concentrated at the foot of the Niagara Escarpment. The township continued to grow and by 1823 it contained one sawmill and three gristmills. By 1841, the population grew to 1,434.

---


2.2 Description of Property

The property located at 1139 King Street East consists of a narrow multi-use property located in a built-up area of the City of Hamilton, the east half of a duplex building combining commercial use on the ground floor and residential use above. Although located within an older area of the city, the property is outside of the immediate downtown core (Figure 1).

Both sides of the building have had their storefronts altered and no longer express a single structure. The ground floor of the subject premises consists of storefront with plate glass windows extending almost the entirety of the façade with the exception of a recessed entry porch with access to the store and the upper floor (Photograph 2). A canvas canopy and store signage extends across the structure above the ground floor windows.

The second story of the façade has not been altered and remains consistent with the west half of the building. Both sides of the façade include a pair of windows with rusticated concrete lintels over each window opening, and concrete sills. The exterior is clad in a mix of modern angel stone and the original brick exterior of the building. The flat roofline of the entire structure – which extends across this property and the adjacent 1137½ King Street East – is characterized by the parapet wall in the centre of the building. Rectangular brick detailing is located below the raised parapet with a diamond-shaped concrete block, inscribed with the date “1925”.

2.3 Current Context

The property is situated on the north side of King Street East between Connaught Avenue North and Gage Avenue North. The property is one of a series of six commercial and residential properties that extend across the majority of this block. All six properties consist of two storey buildings, five of which are used for commercial space on the ground floor and residential units above. The adjacent properties on the north and south side of King Street East are made up of a variety of residential and commercial uses, while the streets north of the subject property, including Connaught Avenue North and Gage Avenue North consist of predominantly single-detached homes that appear to have been developed in the early and mid-20th century.
3. Methodology and Sources

3.1 Study Approach

This CHER was prepared in accordance with Metrolinx’s *Interim Cultural Heritage Management Process* (Fall 2013) and the *MTCS Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties* (2010). The CHER was also undertaken according to the guidelines presented in the Metrolinx document, *Draft Terms of Reference for Consultants: Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations* (April 2016) and outlined in the following tasks:

- Research and Documentation Gathering – gathered from various sources including existing heritage studies, Metrolinx records, public archives, and published materials;
- Writing – an illustrated report based on gathered background history and site investigation materials, and the application of O.Reg. 9/06 and 10/06;
- Evaluation, Recommendations, and Statement of Cultural Heritage Value – a summary of the applicable evaluation, and recommendations regarding whether the property meets the criteria for being a provincial heritage property, a provincial heritage property of provincial significance, or neither.

As outlined in the Draft Terms of Reference, the heritage evaluation is separated into two stand-alone components: a CHER and a CHERR. The Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report includes research conducted for the CHER and is intended to address the criteria set out in O.Regs 9/06 and 10/06. The CHERR includes the results of the applied evaluation, and the recommended outcome of the evaluation.

Michael Greguol, Cultural Heritage Specialist and Emily Game, Heritage Researcher for AECOM conducted a site investigation to visually inspect and document the property on January 12th and January 17th, 2017.

3.2 Secondary Sources

A series of secondary sources were reviewed for the purposes of data collection and analysis as part of the CHER. The relevant guidelines and reference documents cited above served as a framework for undertaking the study. The *Hamilton Light Rail Transit Cultural Heritage Screening Report, City of Hamilton, Ontario* prepared by ASI in December 2016 provided a preliminary review of the rail corridor and the potential heritage properties identified along the corridor. Background information and applicable research was gathered from the report for the purposes of the CHER. In addition, a series of published materials including published histories pertaining to the history of Hamilton were consulted. A complete list of the sources reviewed for the report is contained in Section 15 (Bibliography).

3.3 Primary Sources

Where available, primary source material was consulted to provide a historical context for the evaluation of the potential heritage value of the property. A review of the following primary sources aided in the evaluation of the structure at 1139 King Street East:

- *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth*, 1875;
- Fire Insurance Plans, 1898-1964; and

3.4 Consultations

As part of the identification of recognized and potential cultural heritage resources for the CHSR, ASI undertook consultation with the City of Hamilton, the Ontario Heritage Trust (OHT) and the MTCS. Consultation during the CHSR process took place between August and October, 2016.

As part of this CHER, AECOM undertook property-specific consultation with the same municipal and provincial staff and agencies in order to identify or confirm any existing heritage recognitions or interest in this subject property.

The following individuals and organizations were consulted:

- Thomas Wicks, Heritage Planner, OHT;
- Chelsey Tyers, Cultural Heritage Planner, City of Hamilton; and
- Laura Hatcher, Team Lead, Heritage Land Use Planning, MTCS.

The results of the consultation efforts have been summarized in Section 7 (Community Input).
4. Heritage Recognitions

4.1 Municipal

As a review of applicable municipal heritage recognitions for the property or adjacent properties, AECOM reviewed the City of Hamilton’s heritage inventories. The following inventories and registers were reviewed:

- Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 1: List of Designated Properties and Heritage Conservation Easements under the *Ontario Heritage Act*; and
- Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 2: Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.

Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 1 consists of a listing of properties that have been designated by municipal by-law. The volume includes properties that have been designated under Parts IV or V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. In addition, the volume also identifies properties for which the City of Hamilton holds a Heritage Easement for the property. Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 2 is a compilation of the inventories of heritage structures and places of the six former municipalities that now make up the City of Hamilton. This volume contains approximately 7,000 properties that are of potential heritage interest, or value, but that are not formally protected under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The Inventory is publicly available, however, it is one that evolves over time and properties are added on a case-by-case basis, determined by staff at the City.

Consultation efforts were undertaken to confirm levels of municipal heritage recognition, if any. The property was identified in the December 2016 CHSR as not being subject to any heritage recognitions. However, consultation with the City of Hamilton in January and February 2017 confirmed that the property is now listed on the City’s *Inventory of Building of Architectural and/or Historical Interest*.

4.2 Provincial

As a review of applicable provincial heritage recognitions for the property or adjacent properties AECOM reviewed the OHT Provincial Plaque Guide, and list of OHT easements. 1139 King Street East is neither a subject of a provincial plaque nor a provincial easement. In addition, OHT staff was contacted to review the *Ontario Heritage Act Register* to confirm that the property is not included on the register and that an OHT easement does not exist for the property.

Thomas Wicks, Heritage Planner for the OHT, confirmed that the OHT does not have any conservation easements nor any heritage interest related to 1139 King Street East.

4.3 Federal

As a review of applicable federal heritage recognitions for the property or adjacent properties, AECOM reviewed the online searchable database for the Canadian Register of Historic Places as well as the Directory of Federal Heritage Designations. 1139 King Street East and the adjacent properties are not subject to any existing federal heritage recognitions.
5. **Adjacent Lands**

The properties adjacent to 1139 King Street East consist mainly of a mix of commercial and residential purposes. Immediately adjacent to the east is a two storey commercial and residential property which is similar in mass and scale with modern stucco exterior finishes. Immediately to the west is 1137½ King Street East. Residential properties make up the neighbouring area to the north of the subject property.

Properties adjacent to 1139 King Street East are not subject to heritage recognitions at the municipal, provincial, or federal levels, or designations under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, municipal heritage listings, heritage easements and/or commemorations.
6. **Archaeology**

ASI completed a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (AA) as part of the Rapid Transit Initiative and found that the property at 1139 King Street East did not retain archaeological potential and confirmed that no archaeological assessments have been completed within 50 metres (m) of 1139 King Street East. At the time of production of the ASI report, no archaeological sites had been identified within or adjacent to the property. The ASI Stage 1 AA indicates that archaeological potential is present within 50 m of 1137½ King Street East.

The Stage 1 AA included recommendations that Stage 2 AA must be conducted on land that will be impacted by the proposed development if it is shown as retaining potential for archaeological resources. Based on this assessment, ASI made the following recommendations for 1137½ King Street East:

- The King Street ROW does not retain archaeological site potential due to previous disturbances. An additional AA is not required within the ROW’s, and those portions of the study corridor can be cleared of further archaeological concern; and,

- A Stage 2 AA should be conducted on lands determined to have archaeological potential, if the proposed project is to impact these lands. This work will be done in accordance with the MCL’s draft Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MCL 2006), in order to identify any archaeological remains that may be present.

It should be noted that ASI’s recommendations for Stage 2 archaeological work references the MCL’s 2006 draft *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (MCL 2006); however, further Stage 2 archaeological work must now be conducted in accordance with current archaeological standards and guidelines (*Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*, Ontario Government 2011). For complete details regarding the results of the Stage 1 AA, reference should be made to the *Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment, Rapid Transit Initiative, City of Hamilton, Ontario* (February 2009).
7. Community Input

As part of the consultation process for this report, AECOM undertook consultation with the City of Hamilton, the MTCS, and the OHT. The results of the consultation efforts are identified below in Table 7-1.

Table 7-1: Community Input and Consultation Undertaken for 1139 King Street East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chelsey Tyers</td>
<td>905-546-2424</td>
<td>January 13 and 17, 2017</td>
<td>Response pending.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Planner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chelsey.tyers@hamilton.ca">chelsey.tyers@hamilton.ca</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Wicks</td>
<td>416-314-5972</td>
<td>January 17, 2017</td>
<td>The OHT confirmed that the property is not subject to an OHT conservation easement nor is it on their register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Planner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:thomas.wicks@heritagetrust.on.ca">thomas.wicks@heritagetrust.on.ca</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Heritage Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Hatcher</td>
<td>416-314-3108</td>
<td>January 17, 2017</td>
<td>Rosi Zirger, Heritage Advisor for MTCS, confirmed on January 18, 2017 that the property is not listed or designated and is not of heritage interest to MTCS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Lead</td>
<td><a href="mailto:laura.e.hatcher@ontario.ca">laura.e.hatcher@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Land Use Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Discussion of Historical or Associative Value

8.1 Historic Theme/Cultural Pattern

8.1.1 Transportation

The earliest roads in Ontario were typically military roads or colonization roads. These roads often followed aboriginal hunting trails or were dictated by the topography of the land which they crossed. The Dundas Road which was opened to connect Toronto with the Thames River, in what is now London, Ontario and the Kingston Road, was designed to provide a military link between Toronto and Kingston and was one of the earliest and still functioning roads in southern Ontario.

Following the Crown surveys in Ontario, concession and side roads were opened on a grid that was dictated by the survey type that was used. The roads were cleared and made passable by the early land owners who built their dwellings adjacent to the concession roads. Despite being cleared, road conditions were often poor until the late-19th and early-20th centuries. The crown surveys, and later surveys of town and city plots were laid out on a grid, which has left a visible imprint on rural and urban street grids today. Much of the pattern of these surveys can be seen in the grids of cities and townships in Ontario. Within Hamilton, this is visible in the parallel city streets and grid layout of the downtown core and outlying areas. As a pre-existing road, King Street has a visible curve in its orientation, swinging north just east of Wellington Street before swinging south again around Barnesdale Avenue. This curvature in the road is visible on historic maps of the township and can be attributed to its history as an indigenous trail that pre-dates European settlement in the Hamilton area. The historic trail has left a visible footprint on the European grid of the City.

Railway transportation, both passenger and freight, greatly improved the transportation network in Ontario beginning in the mid-1800s. The opening of the Grand Trunk Railway (GTR) between Montreal and Toronto in 1856 provided a link between the two cities and provinces that was more easily travelled in comparison to mid-19th century roads. The construction of the route from Montreal to Toronto, and then on to Sarnia by the end of the 1860s resulted in the construction of significant structures such as the Victoria Bridge over the St. Lawrence River, and the St. Clair Tunnel in Sarnia. The GTR was designed to enhance the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes shipping routes in response to the railroads and shipping networks in the United States. As a result it also strengthened the connection and link between the townships, and municipal and provincial economies in Ontario.

Various railway companies were formed in Ontario to create a vast network of rail lines that spread throughout the province by the early-20th century. Nonetheless, most of the companies were eventually merged with or purchased by the Canadian National Railway (CN) or the Canadian Pacific Railway (CP).

8.2 Railways

In 1853, the Hamilton and Port Dover Railway (H&PDR) was incorporated with the intention of extending the railway between the two communities. However, sufficient funding was not available for the construction of the railway and as a result the railway laid dormant for fourteen years. In 1869 the
company went up for statutory renewal and a new venture was formed to acquire assets of the H&PDR. As a result the Hamilton and Lake Erie Railway (H&LER) was formed.

Construction began on the H&LER in 1873 and was completed for 31 kilometres to Jarvis, Ontario by 1875. As the result of a severe economic downturn, work on the railway stopped at Jarvis. The owner of the H&LER accepted a merger proposal from the Hamilton & Northwestern Railway (H&NR); this created the potential for a direct railway line from Port Dover north to Barrie and on to Collingwood. The H&NR completed the final nine kilometres to connect Jarvis and Port Dover.

The route eventually was designated the Hagersville Subdivision under CN. In 1969 CN constructed a line south from Garnet to Nanticoke, a component that now forms the southern leg of the Hagersville Subdivision. The section of railway from Jarvis to Port Dover was abandoned in 1935 and from Garnet to Jarvis in the 1970s. The segment of railway from south of Hamilton to Caledonia was abandoned in 1997.

8.3 Local History

1139 King Street East is located within the City of Hamilton, Ontario. Historically the structure was located within Barton Township in Wentworth County. The subsections below include historic information related to the settlement and growth of these municipalities.

8.3.1 Settlement History

Wentworth County was originally part of the Gore District, a district that covered over half a million acres in western Ontario. When the district was divided in 1850, Halton and Wentworth Counties were united; they were subsequently separated in 1854. Wentworth County was composed of seven townships until 1974 when the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth was formed.

Barton Township is described in detail in the Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth of 1875. The Township of Barton was surveyed in 1791 by Augustus Jones using the Single-Front survey system used by the colonial government between 1783 and 1818. The survey was made up of concessions separated by road allowances. The concession was divided into lots of 200 acres and sideroad allowances were surveyed after every fifth lot. The first settlers arrived in Barton Township in 1791, many of whom were United Empire Loyalists or disbanded troops. The Settlement of Barton Township began slowly, with only 102 families living in the township by 1815; most of the settlement was concentrated at the foot of the Niagara Escarpment. The township continued to grow and by 1823 it contained one sawmill and three gristmills. By 1841, the population grew to 1,434.

Governor Simcoe had previously organized Upper Canada into nineteen counties, one of which was named Wentworth County. By 1851 it had dramatically reduced in size as Wentworth, Halton, Ontario and Peel Counties had been separated from the County. Barton County was later annexed by the City of Hamilton in 1960. In 1973-74, Wentworth County was dissolved and succeeded by the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth. The City of Hamilton has remained as the administrative seat or county town since the original creation of the Gore District nearly two centuries ago.

8.3.2 Site History

In 1875 Lot 7, Concession II appears to have been used primarily for agricultural use, at this time it was occupied by George Gage and one structure and an orchard was listed on the property. The H&LER and the Great Western Railway are also illustrated on the 1875 map (Figure 3). By 1905, the area around
1139 King Street East had become considerably more populated with brick and wooden houses constructed along King Street East and the surrounding side streets (Figure 4). Two brick and two wooden structures are shown on the 1905 NTS map, at the southwest corner of King Street East and Gage Street North, these structures are no longer extant. By 1938, topographic mapping indicates that the lands north of the Niagara Escarpment were fully developed (Figure 5).

The structure at 1139 King Street East was constructed in 1925 as a mixed-use building. The main floor was intended for commercial use and the second floor for residential. The City Directory from 1926 recorded both the main and second floor as being vacant. In 1928, the part of the building was occupied by L.G. Woodrow, but it is unclear if Woodrow occupied the main or second floor. By 1936, the second floor was occupied by I.L. Grierson. Grierson ran a contracting company, Grierson and Godwin Contractors, from the main floor. In 1945 the City Directory lists John Koziol as occupying 1139 and the Noraline Beauty Salon at 1139½, in this instance it is presumed that the Noraline Beauty Salon was on the first floor of the building. By 1955, the main floor became Allen Confectionary and by 1966 the name of the store changed to Allen Variety Store, the second floor tenants were Nicholas Herman and Bruce Hall respectively. The City Directory from 1978 records show Robert’s Quality Upholstering as occupying the main floor, this business currently occupies the main floor.

8.4 Person/Event/Organization

In 1875 the block on which 1139 King Street East was located was owned by George Gage. The Gage family were a prominent family in Hamilton in the mid-19th century, however, there is no connection between the Gage family and the existing structure.
9. Discussion of Design or Physical Value

9.1 Style/Type/Tradition

The building located at 1139 King Street East consists of the east half of a two-storey commercial and residential structure that forms part of a commercial block on the north side of King Street East between Connaught Avenue North and Gage Avenue North (Photograph 1).

The ground floor of the building consists of storefront with plate glass windows that extend the entirety of the storefront with the exception of the recessed entry porch giving access to the retail premises and the upper floor. A canvas canopy and store signage extends across the structure above the ground floor windows (Photograph 2). Despite the change in cladding and the removal of details, the storefront retains the characteristic recessed entrance beside the large display windows typical of the late-19th and early-20th centuries.

The second story of the façade is consistent with the west half of the building and can be more easily read as one continuous building that spans the property line. The second storey of the building includes a pair of windows with rusticated concrete lintels over each window opening, and concrete sills.

Although the property forms a component of the much larger continuous block of buildings on this portion of the north side of King Street East, it does not represent a specific style, type, or tradition of architectural style or design. Rather, the building is a typical example of a vernacular commercial/residential architectural form that was utilized throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. The materials, detailing and finishes that survive were in common use during the 1920s and 1930s. This form of urban design can be found throughout small towns as well as large cities across Ontario.

9.2 Function

The building on the property was designed and built as combined commercial and residential spaces in 1925, and it continues to be used for those purposes.

9.3 Fabric

According to mid-20th century Fire Insurance Maps, the building at 1139 King Street East was originally constructed of concrete blocks with brick veneer, much of which is visible on the second floor of the building today, despite extensive modifications to the exterior of the ground floor.

The ground floor is much altered and does not consist of many of the original building fabric materials. The exterior on the ground floor of the building is clad in a modern tan and pink synthetic masonry material (angel stone) as a veneer. Most of the commercial façade consists of the plate glass that forms the display windows and the front door to the commercial space. A canvas canopy and a commercial backlit sign extends across the top of the building.

The original brick masonry has survived on the second storey of the building, a type of textured brick that was widely used during the 1920s and 1930s. Likewise, the concrete sills and lintels are contemporary with the construction of the building. The flat roofline of the entire structure – which extends across this
property and the adjacent 1137½ King Street East – is characterized by the parapet wall in the centre of the building. Rectangular contrasting brick detailing is located below the raised parapet with a diamond-shaped concrete block, inscribed with the date “1925” (Photograph 4).
10. Discussion of Contextual Value

10.1 Social Meaning

The structure located at 1139 King Street East is one of many commercial storefront structures that also include residential spaces on the second floor found in town and cities across Ontario. Built in the early-20th century the property is one of many of these structures that was built fronting onto King Street East in Hamilton as it expanded eastwards.

10.2 Environment

The property is situated on the north side of King Street East between Connaught Avenue North and Gage Avenue North. The property is one of a series of six combined commercial and residential properties that occupy most of this block. The adjacent properties on the north and south side of King Street East are made up of a variety of residential and commercial uses, while the streets north of the subject property – including Connaught Avenue North and Gage Avenue North consist of predominantly single-detached homes that appear to have been developed in the early and mid-20th century. The property has been a part of the expanding urban environment of Hamilton since the early-20th century.

10.3 Formal Recognition

The property was identified in the December 2016 CHSR as not being subject to any heritage recognitions. However, consultation with the City of Hamilton in January and February 2017 confirmed that the property is now listed on the City’s Inventory of Building of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.
### 11. Data Sheet

Table 11-1: Data Sheet for 1139 King Street East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>PROPERTY DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Address</td>
<td>1139 King Street East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Area (square metres)</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Corridor</td>
<td>Hamilton LRT B-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN</td>
<td>172120064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aerial photo showing location and boundaries**

**Exterior, street-view photo**
| **Date of construction of built resources (known or estimated and source)** | 1925 (Hamilton City Directories, inscription on building) |
| **Date of significant alterations to built resources (known or estimated and source)** | Unknown |
| **Architect/designer/builder (source)** | Unknown |
| **Previous owners or occupants** | Various commercial and residential tenants throughout 20th century (See Section 8) |
| **Current function** | Commercial and Residential |
| **Previous function(s)** | Commercial and Residential |
| **Heritage Recognition/Protection (municipal, provincial, federal)** | Listed on City’s *Inventory of Building of Architectural and/or Historical Interest* |
| **Local Heritage Interest** | Listed on City’s *Inventory of Building of Architectural and/or Historical Interest* |
| **Adjacent Lands** | No protected heritage properties |
| **Latitude or UTM Northing** | 43.248369° |
| **Longitude or UTM Easting** | -79.828929° |
12. Photographs
Photograph 1: View looking north showing subject property in relation to continuous block on King Street East (AECOM, 2017)

Photograph 2: View looking north across King Street East showing 1137½(left) and 1139 (right) (AECOM, 2017)
Photograph 3: View looking north across King Street East showing subject property in relation to adjacent building. Intersection at right is Gage Avenue North (AECOM, 2017)

Photograph 4: View showing decorative brick detailing and "1925" concrete date inscription between 1137½ and 1139 King Street East (AECOM, 2017)
13. Figures

All figures pertaining to this CHER can be found on the following pages:
Figure 1: Location of 1139 King Street East
Figure 2: Aerial photographs showing the area surrounding 1139 King Street East
Figure 3: Location of 1139 King Street East on the 1875 Historic Atlas Map (Page & Smith, 1875)
Figure 4: Location of 1139 King Street East on the 1905 NTS Map
Figure 5: Location of 1139 King Street East on the 1938 NTS Map
14. **Chronology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1791</td>
<td>Barton Township was surveyed by Augustus Jones; the first settlers arrived in the township.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Gore District was divided and Halton and Wentworth Counties were created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>The Hamilton &amp; Lake Erie Railway was formed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>Construction on the Hamilton &amp; Lake Erie Railway began.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>George Gage is shown as occupying Lot 7, Concession II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>The NTS map shows two brick and two wooden structures at the current location of 1139 King Street East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1137½ and 1139 King Street East was constructed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Main and second floor units of 1139 King Street East are vacant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>L.G. Woodrow occupied unit in 1139 King Street East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>I.L. Grierson occupied the second floor unit and ran Grierson &amp; Godwin Contracting from the main floor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>The City Directory lists John Koziol as occupying 1139 and the Noraline Beauty Salon at 1139½, it is presumed that the Noraline Beauty Salon was on the first floor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Allen Confectionary occupied the main floor while Nicholas Herman was the second floor tenant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Allen Variety Store occupied the main floor while Bruce Hall was the second floor tenant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>The Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth was formed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Robert’s Quality Upholstering occupied the main floor; this business currently occupies the main floor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. **Executive Summary**

AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by Metrolinx to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) for the property at 1139 King Street East, in the City of Hamilton, Ontario (see Figure 1 of the CHER). This work is being completed as part of the Hamilton Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project.

The Hamilton LRT Project B-Line alignment extends from McMaster University at Cootes Drive to the Main Street/Highway 403 Bridge. A proposed LRT-only bridge will allow the alignment to then extend along King Street West until King East Street intersects with Main Street East, where the alignment will continue along Main Street East to the Queenston Road traffic circle. As a part of the project, it is anticipated that building impacts may take place on the property at 1139 King Street East.

The project impacts will be assessed following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), as prescribed in Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 231/08, Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings under the *Environmental Assessment Act*. As part of the TPAP Amendment, an Environmental Project Report (EPR) Amendment will be prepared for public review.

The CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Interim Cultural Heritage Management Process and utilizes the criteria in Ontario Regulation 9/06 and Ontario Regulation 10/06, as required by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport’s (MTCS) *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties* (2010). In addition, the CHER was prepared according to the *Metrolinx Draft Terms of Reference for Consultants: Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations*. As such the recommendations as they relate to this CHER and the potential cultural heritage value or interest of 1139 King Street East are contained in a separate Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations (CHERR) document.

As part of the reporting requirements for the Hamilton LRT Project, Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) undertook a Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) for the alignment. The CHSR identified the requirement to conduct a CHER for the property located at 1139 King Street East to assess the potential cultural heritage value or interest of the property. Where applicable, relevant background information has been utilized from the CHSR for project consistency.

A field review of the property at 1139 King Street East, Hamilton, Ontario was undertaken on January 12th, 2017 and January 17th, 2017 by Michael Greguol and Emily Game of AECOM (see Figure 2 of the CHER).
2. **Ontario Regulation 9/06 Evaluation**

*Ontario Regulation 9/06, Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest* (O. Reg. 9/06) provides criteria to apply to a potential heritage property to evaluate its heritage value. If a privately-owned property meets one or more of the following criteria it may be designated by a municipality under Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. For the purposes of this CHERR, O. Reg. 9/06 considers the evaluation of the property as part of the community context. The *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties* state that a property may be considered a Provincial Heritage Property (PHP) if it meets one or more of the criteria under O. Reg. 9/06. The application of the criteria for 1139 King Street East is included in Table 2-1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2-1: O.Reg. 9/06 Evaluation for 1139 King Street East</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1) The property has design or physical value because it:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Is a rare, unique, representative, or early example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2) The property has historic or associative value because it:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Yields, or has the potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) 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>

3) The property has **contextual value** because it:

| i) Is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area; | No                | The property at 1139 King Street East forms a component of the larger commercial/residential block on the north side of King Street East. However, it is not important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area. |
| ii) Is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings; or | No                | The property at 1139 King Street East forms a component of the larger commercial/residential block on the north side of King Street East. However, it is not physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings. |
| iii) Is a landmark.                                                          | No                | The property at 1139 King Street East is not considered a landmark.                                                                      |
### 3. Ontario Regulation 10/06 Evaluation

Ontario Regulation 10/06, *Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest of Provincial Significance* (O. Reg. 10/06), provides criteria against which to assess a property to determine if the property holds provincial heritage significance. The *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties* state that Ministries and prescribed public bodies shall apply the criteria in O. Reg. 10/06 to determine whether a property is of provincial significance. Therefore, for the purpose of this CHERR, O. Reg 10/06 considers the evaluation of the property as a part of the provincial context. If the property meets the criteria, it may be considered a Provincial Heritage Property of Provincial Significance (PHPPS). The application of the criteria for 1139 King Street East is in Table 3-1, below.

**Table 3-1: O.Reg. 10/06 Evaluation for 1139 King Street East**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Response (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The property represents or demonstrates a theme or pattern in Ontario’s history.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1139 King Street East does not represent a theme or pattern in Ontario’s history. Commercial and residential structures similar to this are found throughout towns and cities in Ontario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The property yields, or had the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of Ontario’s history.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1139 King Street East does not yield, and is not anticipated to yield information that contributes to an understanding of Ontario’s history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The property demonstrates an uncommon, rare, or unique aspect of Ontario’s cultural heritage.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1139 King Street East does not demonstrate an uncommon, rare, or unique aspect of Ontario’s cultural heritage. The form and massing of the structures are commonly found in Ontario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The property is of aesthetic, visual, or contextual importance to the province.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1139 King Street East property is not of aesthetic, visual, or contextual importance to the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The property demonstrates a high degree of excellence or creative, technical, or scientific achievement at a provincial level in a given period.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1139 King Street East does not demonstrate a high degree of excellence or creative, technical, or scientific achievement at a provincial level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The property has a strong or special association with the entire province or with a community that is found in more than one part of the province.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1139 King Street East does not have a strong or special association with the entire province or with a community that is found in more than one part of the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1139 King Street East does not have strong or special associations with the life or work of a person, group, or organization of importance to the province or with an event of importance to the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The property has a strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organization of importance to the province or with an event of importance to the province.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1139 King Street East does not have strong or special associations with the life or work of a person, group, or organization of importance to the province or with an event of importance to the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The property is located in an unorganized territory and the Minister determines that there is a provincial interest in the protection of the property.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1139 King Street East is not located in an unorganized territory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Recommended Outcome of Evaluation**

The application of O.Reg 9/06 and O.Reg. 10/06 concluded that 1139 King Street East does not meet O.Reg. 9/06 or O.Reg. 10/06, as it did not satisfy any of the nine criteria. Therefore, this CHERR recommends that the property at 1139 King Street East is not considered a Provincial Heritage Property (PHP). As a result, a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and Heritage Attributes have not been prepared.
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1. Executive Summary

AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by Metrolinx to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) for the properties at 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East and 1149-51 King Street East, in the City of Hamilton, Ontario (Figure 1). This work is being completed as part of the Hamilton Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project.

The Hamilton LRT Project B-Line alignment extends from McMaster University at Cootes Drive to the Main Street/Highway 403 Bridge. A proposed LRT-only bridge will allow the alignment to then extend along King Street West until King East Street intersects with Main Street East, where the alignment will continue along Main Street East to the Queenston Road traffic circle. As a part of the project, it is anticipated that building impacts may take place on the properties at 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East and 1149-51 King Street East.

The project impacts will be assessed following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), as prescribed in Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 231/08, Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings under the Environmental Assessment Act. As part of the TPAP Amendment, an Environmental Project Report (EPR) Amendment will be prepared for public review.

The CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Interim Cultural Heritage Management Process and utilizes the criteria in Ontario Regulation 9/06 and Ontario Regulation 10/06, as required by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport’s (MTCS) Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (2010). In addition, the CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Draft Terms of Reference for Consultants: Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations. As such, the recommendations as they relate to this CHER and the potential cultural heritage value or interest of 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East and 1149-51 King Street East are contained in separate Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations (CHERR) documents.

As part of the reporting requirements for the Hamilton LRT Project, Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) undertook a Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) for the alignment. The CHSR identified the requirement to conduct a CHER for the properties located at 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East and 1149-51 King Street East to assess the potential cultural heritage value or interest of the properties. Where applicable, relevant background information has been utilized from the CHSR for project consistency.

The properties located at 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East and 1149-51 King Street East consist of narrow multi-use buildings located in a built-up area of the City of Hamilton. All of the buildings combine commercial use on the ground floor and residential use above. Although located within an older area of the city, the properties are outside of the immediate downtown core.

In 1875, King Street East between Gage Avenue North and Connaught Avenue appears to have been used primarily for agricultural use; at this time, it was occupied by George Gage and one structure and an orchard was listed on the property. By 1905, the area around 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East and 1149-51 King Street East had become considerably more populated with brick and wooden houses constructed along King Street East and the surrounding side streets. By 1926, the structures at 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East and 1149-1151 King Street East were...
constructed. Since their construction the main floors of the buildings have been occupied by various businesses while the second floor functioned as residential space.

A field review of the privately owned properties at 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East and 1149-1151 King Street East was undertaken on January 12, 2017 and January 17, 2017 by Michael Greguol and Emily Game of AECOM (Figure 2). An assessment was not completed on the interior of the structures due to timing constraints of the TPAP Amendment.

The buildings are typical examples of a vernacular commercial/residential architectural form that was utilized throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. The façade of 1141-1143 King Street East is much altered and none of the original building fabric materials are visibly extant. The ground floor of 1145 King Street East is much altered and does not consist of many of the original building fabric materials. The original brick masonry has survived on the second storey of the building, a type of textured brick that was widely used during the 1920s and 1930s. The storefront section of the ground floor of 1149-1151 King Street East is somewhat altered by the application of post-modern detailing in stucco over the brick and replacement of the display windows. Although painted, the original brick masonry has survived on the second storey of the building, a type of textured brick that was widely used during the 1920s and 1930s.
2. **Introduction**

2.1 **Historical Summary**

2.1.1 **Context**

The subject properties are located within the municipal boundaries of the City of Hamilton, Ontario. Prior to the incorporation of the current municipality, the property was located within the boundaries of Barton Township, in Wentworth County.

2.1.2 **Wentworth County**

As part of the establishment of Upper Canada, the province was divided into administrative Districts in 1792. As such, Wentworth County was one of several counties that made up the Home District. It was named in honour of Sir John Wentworth, Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia from 1792-1808. In 1816, the Home District was divided and reorganized and Wentworth County was included in the Gore District. By 1849, the original district system was abolished and replaced by a county council system and Wentworth County became an independent political entity. Townships that were included in Wentworth County at one time or another included Ancaster, Barton, Beverly, Binbrook, Caistor, Flamborough East and West, Glanford, Onondaga, Saltfleet, and Seneca. Between 1850 and 1854, Wentworth and Halton Counties were joined for government purposes into the United Counties of Wentworth and Halton. In 1973, Wentworth County was renamed the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth and, in 2001, was amalgamated with six constituent municipalities into the City of Hamilton. The City of Hamilton has remained the administrative seat or county town since the original creation of the Gore District nearly two centuries ago.

2.1.3 **Barton Township**

Barton Township is described in detail in the *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth of 1875*. The Township of Barton was surveyed in 1791 by Augustus Jones using the Single-Front survey system used by the colonial government between 1783 and 1818. The survey was made up of concessions separated by road allowances. The concession was divided into lots of 200 acres and sideroad allowances were surveyed after every fifth lot. The first settlers arrived in Barton Township in 1791, many of whom were United Empire Loyalists or disbanded troops. The settlement of Barton Township began slowly, with only 102 families living in the township by 1815; most of the settlement was concentrated at the foot of the Niagara Escarpment. The township continued to grow and by 1823 it contained one sawmill and three gristmills. By 1841, the population grew to 1,434.

---


was later amalgamated into the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth, with today is known as the City of Hamilton.

2.2 Description of Property

The properties located at 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East and 1149-51 King Street East consist of narrow multi-use buildings located in a built-up area of the City of Hamilton. All of the buildings combine commercial use on the ground floor and residential use above. Although located within an older area of the city, the properties are outside of the immediate downtown core (Figure 1).

2.2.1 1141-1143 King Street East

1141-1143 King Street East consists of a two story duplex. The main floor units have been combined to create one large storefront. The ground floor of the subject premises consists of storefront with plate glass windows extending almost the entirety of the façade with the exception of a recessed entry porch with access to the store and the upper floor (Photograph 2). The original brick veneer has been covered in modern stucco, eliminating any architectural details that may have been present on the original façade.

The second story of the façade is divided into six bays; the original window sills appear to have been replaced or covered with metal sills. The structure has a flat roof in keeping with the adjacent 1139 King Street East and 1145 King Street East; it is characterized by the low parapet wall in the centre of the building.

2.2.2 1145 King Street East

1145 King Street East is a single storefront building constructed of brick veneer on concrete. The exterior on the ground floor of the building is clad in modern white corrugated metal as well as black and white structural glass panels. Most of the commercial façade consists of the plate glass window that forms the display windows and the front door to the commercial space. The entrance to the residential space appears unchanged and consists of an arched doorway constructed of brick (Photograph 3).

The original brick masonry has survived on the second storey of the building. The single window opening on the second floor is topped with a brick voussoir and the concrete window sill is contemporary with the construction of the building. A bracketed cornice extends across the roofline, above which is a decorative fielded panel. The roof is flat, as are the adjacent structures, and is characterized by the parapet wall in the centre of the building.

1145 and 1149-1151 King Street East were designed and built together, which is evident in the consistency of design and materials above the ground floor of both buildings.

2.2.3 1149-1151 King Street East

1149-1151 King Street East is a single storefront building on the corner of King Street East and Gage Avenue North. The entrance to the commercial space is located at the south-east corner of the building (Photograph 4) which has been angled for the purpose. This was a common practice for corner commercial buildings during the 19th and early 20th centuries, and sometimes took the form of a curve. The plate glass windows face onto King Street East and Gage Avenue North. The entrance to the residential space is on King Street East. The building has a slightly flatiron footprint (as does the whole row) due to the angle of King Street relative to Gage Avenue.
Although painted, the original brick masonry has survived on the second storey of the building. The single window opening on the second floor is a shallower segmental brick arch, and the concrete window sill is contemporary with the construction of the building. A bracketed wooden cornice extends across the rooftop, above which is a decorative fielded panel. The flat roof is characterized by the parapet wall in the centre of the building.

1145 and 1149-1151 King Street East were designed and built together, which is evident in the consistency of design and materials above the ground floor of both buildings.

2.3 Current Context

The properties are situated on the north side of King Street East between Connaught Avenue North and Gage Avenue North. The properties are three of a series of six commercial and residential properties that extend across the majority of this block. All six properties consist of two storey buildings, five of which are used for commercial space on the ground floor and residential units above. The adjacent properties on the north and south side of King Street East are made up of a variety of residential and commercial uses, while the streets north of the subject property, including Connaught Avenue North and Gage Avenue North, consist of predominantly single-detached homes that appear to have been developed in the early and mid-20th century.
3. Methodology and Sources

3.1 Study Approach

This CHER was prepared in accordance with Metrolinx’s Interim Cultural Heritage Management Process (Fall 2013) and the MTCS Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (2010). The CHER was also undertaken according to the guidelines presented in the Metrolinx document, Draft Terms of Reference for Consultants: Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations (April 2016) and outlined in the following tasks:

- Research and Documentation Gathering – gathered from various sources including existing heritage studies, Metrolinx records, public archives, and published materials;
- Writing – an illustrated report based on gathered background history and site investigation materials, and the application of O.Reg. 9/06 and 10/06; Evaluation, Recommendations, and Statement of Cultural Heritage Value – a summary of the applicable evaluation, and recommendations regarding whether the property meets the criteria for being a provincial heritage property, a provincial heritage property of provincial significance, or neither.

As outlined in the Draft Terms of Reference, the heritage evaluation is separated into two stand-alone components: a CHER and a CHERR. The Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report includes research conducted for the CHER and is intended to address the criteria set out in O.Regs 9/06 and 10/06. The CHERR includes the results of the applied evaluation, and the recommended outcome of the evaluation.

Michael Greguol, Cultural Heritage Specialist and Emily Game, Heritage Researcher for AECOM conducted a site investigation to visually inspect and document the property on January 12 and January 17, 2017.

3.2 Secondary Sources

A series of secondary sources were reviewed for the purposes of data collection and analysis as part of the CHER. The relevant guidelines and reference documents cited above served as a framework for undertaking the study. The Hamilton Light Rail Transit Cultural Heritage Screening Report, City of Hamilton, Ontario (CHSR) prepared by ASI in December 2016, provided a preliminary review of the rail corridor and the potential heritage properties identified along the corridor. Background information and applicable research was gathered from the report for the purposes of the CHER. In addition, a series of published materials including published histories pertaining to the history of Hamilton were consulted. A complete list of the sources reviewed for the report is contained in Section 15 (Bibliography).

3.3 Primary Sources

Where available, primary source material was consulted to provide a historical context for the evaluation of the potential heritage value of the property. Primary source research was undertaken at the Local History and Archives Department of the Hamilton Public Library, the Mills Memorial Library at McMaster University, and at the Map and Data Centre at the University of Western Ontario. A review of the
following primary sources aided in the evaluation of the structures at 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East and 1149-51 King Street East:

- Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth, 1875;
- Fire Insurance Plans, 1898-1964; and

### 3.4 Consultations

As part of the identification of recognized and potential cultural heritage resources for the CHSR, ASI undertook consultation with the City of Hamilton, the Ontario Heritage Trust (OHT) and the MTCS. Consultation during the CHSR process took place between August and October, 2016.

As part of this CHER, AECOM undertook property-specific consultation with the same municipal and provincial staff and agencies in order to identify or confirm any existing heritage recognitions or interest in this subject property.

The following individuals and organizations were consulted:

- Thomas Wicks, Heritage Planner, OHT;
- Chelsey Tyers, Cultural Heritage Planner, City of Hamilton; and
- Laura Hatcher, Team Lead, Heritage Land Use Planning, MTCS.

The results of the consultation efforts have been summarized in Section 7 (Community Input).
4. Heritage Recognitions

4.1 Municipal

As a review of applicable municipal heritage recognitions for the property or adjacent properties, AECOM reviewed the City of Hamilton’s heritage inventories. The following inventories and registers were reviewed:

- Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 1: List of Designated Properties and Heritage Conservation Easements under the *Ontario Heritage Act*; and
- Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 2: Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.

Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 1 consists of a listing of properties that have been designated by municipal by-law. The volume includes properties that have been designated under Parts IV or V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. In addition, the volume also identifies properties for which the City of Hamilton holds a Heritage Easement for the property. Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 2 is a compilation of the inventories of heritage structures and places of the six former municipalities that now make up the City of Hamilton. This volume contains approximately 7,000 properties that are of potential heritage interest, or value, but that are not formally protected under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The Inventory is publicly available; however, it is one that evolves over time and properties are added on a case-by-case basis, determined by staff at the City.

Consultation efforts were undertaken to confirm levels of municipal heritage recognition, if any. The property was identified in the December 2016 CHSR as not being subject to any heritage recognitions. However, consultation with the City of Hamilton in January and February 2017 confirmed that the property is now listed on the City’s *Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest*.

4.2 Provincial

As a review of applicable provincial heritage recognitions for the property or adjacent properties AECOM reviewed the OHT’s Provincial Plaque Guide, and list of OHT easements. 1411-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East and 1149-51 King Street East are neither a subject of a provincial plaque nor a provincial easement. In addition, OHT staff was contacted to review the *Ontario Heritage Act* Register to confirm that the property is not included on the register and that an OHT easement does not exist for the property.

Thomas Wicks, Heritage Planner for the OHT confirmed that the OHT does not have any conservation easements nor any heritage interest related to at 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East and 1149-51 King Street East.
4.3 Federal

As a review of applicable federal heritage recognitions for the property or adjacent properties, AECOM reviewed the online searchable database for the Canadian Register of Historic Places as well as the Directory of Federal Heritage Designations. 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East and 1149-51 King Street East and the adjacent properties are not subject to any existing federal heritage recognitions.
5. **Adjacent Lands**

The properties adjacent to 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East and 1149-51 King Street East consist mainly of a mix of commercial and residential purposes. Residential properties make up the neighbouring area to the north of the subject property.

Properties adjacent to 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East and 1149-51 King Street East are not subject to heritage recognitions at the municipal, provincial, or federal levels, or designations under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, municipal heritage listings, heritage easements and/or commemorations.
6. Archaeology

ASI completed a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (AA) as part of the Rapid Transit Initiative and found that the properties at 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East, and 1149-1151 King Street East did not retain archaeological potential and confirmed that no archaeological assessments have been completed within 50 metres these properties. At the time of production of the ASI report, no archaeological sites had been identified within or adjacent to the property. The ASI Stage 1 AA indicates that archaeological potential is present within 50 metres of 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East, or 1149-1151 King Street East.

The Stage 1 AA included recommendations that Stage 2 AA must be conducted on land that will be impacted by the proposed development if it is shown as retaining potential for archaeological resources. Based on this assessment, ASI made the following recommendations for 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East, and 1149-1151 King Street East:

- The King Street ROW does not retain archaeological site potential due to previous disturbances. An additional AA is not required within the ROW’s, and those portions of the study corridor can be cleared of further archaeological concern; and,

- A Stage 2 AA should be conducted on lands determined to have archaeological potential, if the proposed project is to impact these lands. This work will be done in accordance with the MTCS’S Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTCS 2011), in order to identify any archaeological remains that may be present.

It should be noted that ASI’s recommendations for Stage 2 archaeological work references the MCL’s 2006 draft Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MCL 2006); however, further Stage 2 archaeological work must now be conducted in accordance with current archaeological standards and guidelines (Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists, Ontario Government 2011) . For complete details regarding the results of the Stage 1 AA, reference should be made to the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment, Rapid Transit Initiative, City of Hamilton, Ontario (February 2009).
7. Community Input

As part of the consultation process for this report, AECOM undertook consultation with the City of Hamilton, the MTCS, and the OHT. The results of the consultation efforts are identified below in Table 7-1.

Table 7-1: Community Input and Consultation Undertaken for 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East and 1149-51 King Street East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asiya Patel</td>
<td>905-546-2424 ext. 7163</td>
<td>January 26, 2017</td>
<td>1141-1143 and 1145 King Street East are included in the City’s Inventory of Architectural and/or Historical Interest indicating that they have heritage features work consideration; however, Ms. Patel noted that she was unaware of any heritage interest on behalf of the City or the heritage committee. 1149-1151 King Street East is not included in the City’s registry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Cultural Heritage Planner City of Hamilton</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chelsey.tyers@hamilton.ca">chelsey.tyers@hamilton.ca</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Wicks</td>
<td>416-314-5972 <a href="mailto:thomas.wicks@heritagetrust.on.ca">thomas.wicks@heritagetrust.on.ca</a></td>
<td>February 1, 2017</td>
<td>The OHT confirmed that the properties are not subject to an OHT conservation easement nor is it on their register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Planner OHT</td>
<td></td>
<td>February 9, 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Hatcher</td>
<td>416-314-3108 <a href="mailto:laura.e.hatcher@ontario.ca">laura.e.hatcher@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td>January 17, 2017</td>
<td>No Response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Lead Heritage Land Use Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Discussion of Historical or Associative Value

8.1 Historic Theme/Cultural Pattern

8.1.1 Transportation

The earliest roads in Ontario were typically military roads or colonization roads. These roads often followed aboriginal hunting trails or were dictated by the topography of the land which they crossed. The Dundas Road which was opened to connect Toronto with the Thames River, in what is now London, Ontario and the Kingston Road, was designed to provide a military link between Toronto and Kingston and was one of the earliest and still functioning roads in southern Ontario.

Following the Crown surveys in Ontario, concession and side roads were opened on a grid that was dictated by the survey type that was used. The roads were cleared and made passable by the early land owners who built their dwellings adjacent to the concession roads. Despite being cleared, road conditions were often poor until the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The crown surveys, and later surveys of town and city plots were laid out on a grid, which has left a visible imprint on rural and urban street grids today. Much of the pattern of these surveys can be seen in the grids of cities and townships in Ontario. Within Hamilton, this is visible in the parallel city streets and grid layout of the downtown core and outlying areas. As a pre-existing road, King Street has a visible curve in its orientation, swinging north just east of Wellington Street before swinging south again around Barnesdale Avenue. This curvature in the road is visible on historic maps of the township and can be attributed to its history as an indigenous trail that pre-dates European settlement in the Hamilton area. The historic trail has left a visible footprint on the European grid of the City.

Railway transportation, both passenger and freight, greatly improved the transportation network in Ontario beginning in the mid-1800s. The opening of the Grand Trunk Railway (GTR) between Montreal and Toronto in 1856 provided a link between the two cities and provinces that was more easily travelled in comparison to mid-19th century roads. The construction of the route from Montreal to Toronto, and then on to Sarnia by the end of the 1860s resulted in the construction of significant structures such as the Victoria Bridge over the St. Lawrence River, and the St. Clair Tunnel in Sarnia. The GTR was designed to enhance the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes shipping routes in response to the railroads and shipping networks in the United States. As a result it also strengthened the connection and link between the townships, and municipal and provincial economies in Ontario.

Various railway companies were formed in Ontario to create a vast network of rail lines that spread throughout the province by the early 20th century. Nonetheless, most of the companies were eventually merged with or purchased by the Canadian National Railway (CN) or the Canadian Pacific Railway (CP).
8.2 Railways

In 1853, the Hamilton and Port Dover Railway (H&PDR) was incorporated with the intention of extending the railway between the two communities. However, sufficient funding was not available for the construction of the railway and as a result the railway lay dormant for fourteen years. In 1869, the company went up for statutory renewal and a new venture was formed to acquire assets of the H&PDR. As a result, the Hamilton and Lake Erie Railway (H&LER) was formed.

Construction began on the H&LER in 1873 and was completed for 31 kilometres (km) to Jarvis, Ontario by 1875. Work on the railway stopped at Jarvis due to a severe economic downturn. The owner of the H&LER accepted a merger proposal from the Hamilton and Northwestern Railway (H&NR); this created the potential for a direct railway line from Port Dover north to Barrie and on to Collingwood. The H&NR completed the final 9 km to connect Jarvis and Port Dover.

The route eventually was designated the Hagersville Subdivision under CN. In 1969, CN constructed a line south from Garnet to Nanticoke, a component that now forms the southern leg of the Hagersville Subdivision. The section of railway from Jarvis to Port Dover was abandoned in 1935 and from Garnet to Jarvis in the 1970s. The segment of railway from south of Hamilton to Caledonia was abandoned in 1997.

8.3 Local History

1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East and 1149-51 King Street East are located within the City of Hamilton, Ontario. Historically the structure was located within Barton Township in Wentworth County. The subsections below include historic information related to the settlement and growth of these municipalities.

8.3.1 Settlement History

Wentworth County was originally part of the Gore District, a district that covered over half a million acres in western Ontario. When the district was divided in 1850, Halton and Wentworth Counties were united; and were subsequently separated in 1854. Wentworth County was composed of seven townships until 1974 when the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth was formed.

Barton Township is described in detail in the Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth of 1875. The Township of Barton was surveyed in 1791 by Augustus Jones using the Single-Front survey system used by the colonial government between 1783 and 1818. The survey was made up of concessions separated by road allowances. The concession was divided into lots of 200 acres and sideroad allowances were surveyed after every fifth lot. The first settlers arrived in Barton Township in 1791, many of whom were United Empire Loyalists or disbanded troops. The Settlement of Barton Township began slowly, with only 102 families living in the township by 1815; most of the settlement was concentrated at the foot of the Niagara Escarpment. The township continued to grow and by 1823 it contained one sawmill and three gristmills. By 1841, the population grew to 1,434.

Governor Simcoe had previously organized Upper Canada into nineteen counties, one of which was named Wentworth County. By 1851 it had dramatically reduced in size as Wentworth, Halton, Ontario and Peel Counties had been separated from the County. Barton County was later annexed by the City of Hamilton in 1960. In 1973-74, Wentworth County was dissolved and succeeded by the Regional
Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth. The City of Hamilton has remained as the administrative seat or county town since the original creation of the Gore District nearly two centuries ago.

### 8.3.2 Site History

In 1875, Lot 7, Concession II appears to have been used primarily for agricultural use; at this time, it was occupied by George Gage and one structure and an orchard was listed on the property. The H&LER and the Great Western Railway are also illustrated on the 1875 map (Figure 3). By 1905, the area around 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East and 1149-1151 King Street East had become considerably more populated with brick and wooden houses constructed along King Street East and the surrounding side streets (Figure 4). Two brick and two wooden structures are shown on the 1905 NTS map, at the southwest corner of King Street East and Gage Street North, these structures are no longer extant. By 1938, topographic mapping indicates that the lands north of the Niagara Escarpment were fully developed (Figure 5). The structure at 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East, and 1149-1151 King Street East was constructed prior to 1926 as a mixed-use building, although the exact date is unknown. The main floor was intended for commercial use and the second floor for residential.

#### 8.3.2.1 1141 King Street East

The City Directory from the years 1926, 1928 and 1936 list David Duignan, a butcher as occupying the main floor of 1141 King Street East. In 1926, H.W. Linke and H.C Rudge occupied the second floor apartments (1141 ½ King Street East). By 1928, J. Palmer and Mrs. G. Start are listed as the tenants of 1141 ½ King Street East. By 1936, C.L. Richarz and J.A. Fountain are listed as the tenants. The 1945 and 1955 directory list the main floor as being occupied by Gage Butchers with Frank McCallum and Leslie Galloway renting the second floor apartments. By 1966, the main floor is occupied by the Super-Vale Red and White Food Market, there is no tenant information for 1141 ½ King Street East. The 1978 City Directory lists the Crestline Studio as the main floor tenant; W. Wood is listed as occupying the second floor apartment.

#### 8.3.2.2 1143 King Street East

The 1926, 1928, 1936, 1945 Hamilton City Directory lists William Carroll Grocers as the tenant on the main floor of the building, there is no information available in the 1955, 1966 and 1978 City Directory for the main floor. The 1926 directory lists R.G. Rudge as occupying the second floor apartment at 1143 ½ King Street East; this is the only year a tenant is listed for the second floor apartment. The commercial spaces of 1141 and 1143 King Street East have been combined into one large space, currently occupied by a bar.

#### 8.3.2.3 1145 King Street East

In 1926, 1928, 1936 and 1945, 1149 King Street East was occupied by dry cleaners, Henry Longley, Gage Cleaners, N.A Clifford Cleaners and Reliable Cleaners respectively. No tenant is listed in the 1955 City Directory for the main floor. The 1926 directory lists R.G. Rudge as occupying the second floor apartment at 1143 ½ King Street East; this is the only year a tenant is listed for the second floor apartment. The commercial spaces of 1141 and 1143 King Street East have been combined into one large space, currently occupied by a bar.

A restaurant currently occupies the commercial space at 1145 King Street East.
8.3.2.4 1149 King Street East and 1151 King Street East

Unlike the other structures on this block, the main floor and second floor of the building have two separate addresses; 1151 King Street East is the main floor used for commercial purposes, while 1149 King Street East is the second floor residential spaces. The 1926 and 1928 City Directories list G.C. Bidwell Drugs as occupying the 1151 King Street East. E.J. Allen, a tobacconist is listed as the tenant of 1151 King Street East for the years of 1936 and 1945. By 1955, 1151 King Street East is occupied by Gage Pharmacy. In 1966, the main floor was occupied by Kent Cleaners and in 1978 by the Steakout Co. Ltd. 1151 King Street East is currently occupied by a law office. In 1926, Jason Fraser is shown as the tenant in 1149 King Street East, in 1928 it is occupied by W.G Emerson, Jason Hinchecliffe in 1936, George M. Knowles in 1945, Rocco Giammichele and Garnet Le Blanch in 1955 and Joseph Zagorski in 1966. The Apartments are listed as vacant in 1978.

8.4 Person/Event/Organization

In 1875, the block of King Street East on which the subject properties sit was owned by George Gage. The Gage family was a prominent family in Hamilton in the mid-19th century, however, there is no connection between the Gage family and the existing structure.
9. Discussion of Design or Physical Value

9.1 Style/Type/Tradition

The buildings located at 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East and 1149-1151 King Street East consist of a continuous row of two-storey commercial and residential structures that form part of a commercial block on the north side of King Street East between Connaught Avenue North and Gage Avenue North (Photograph 1).

The ground floor of 1141-1143 King Street East and 1145 King Street East consist of storefront with plate glass windows. They extend the entirety of the storefront with the exception of the recessed entry porch giving access to the retail premises and the upper floor (Photograph 2). The commercial entrance to 1149-1151 King Street East is on the corner of King Street East and Gage Avenue North with commercial storefronts on either side of the entrance.

Despite the change in cladding and the removal of details, the three storefronts retain their characteristic recessed entrance beside the large display windows typical of the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

Although the properties form a component of the much larger continuous block of buildings on this portion of the north side of King Street East, they do not represent a specific style, type, or tradition of architectural style or design. Rather, the buildings are typical examples of a vernacular commercial/residential architectural form that was utilized throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. The materials, detailing and finishes that survive were in common use during the 1920s and 1930s. This form of urban design can be found throughout small towns as well as large cities across Ontario.

9.2 Function

The buildings at 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East and 1149-1151 King Street East were designed and built as combined commercial and residential spaces; they continue to be used for those purposes. According to mid-20th century Fire Insurance Maps, all three buildings were originally constructed of concrete blocks with brick veneer.

9.3 Fabric

9.3.1 1141-1143 King Street East

The façade of 1141-1143 King Street East is much altered and none of the original building fabric materials are visibly extant. The brick veneer has been covered in modern stucco, eliminating any architectural details that may have been present on the original façade. Most of the commercial façade consists of the plate glass that forms the display windows and the front door to the commercial space.

The flat roofline extends across this structure and the adjacent structures - is characterized by the parapet wall in the centre of the building (Photograph 2).
9.3.2 1145 King Street East

The ground floor of 1145 King Street East is much altered and does not consist of many of the original building fabric materials. The exterior on the ground floor of the building is clad in modern white corrugated metal as well as black and white structural glass panels in the entranceway. These are undoubtedly fragments of an earlier campaign to modernize the façade, and more of it may survive behind the current tenant’s sign. The material was popular during the Art Deco period and is not often found still in place. Most of the commercial façade consists of the plate glass window that forms the display windows and the front door to the commercial space. The entrance to the residential space appears unchanged and consists of an arched doorway constructed of brick.

The original brick masonry has survived on the second storey of the building, a type of textured brick that was widely used during the 1920s and 1930s. The single window opening on the second floor is a low segmented brick arch and the rusticated concrete window sill is contemporary with the construction of the building. A bracketed cornice extends across the roofline, above which is a decorative fielded panel. The flat roofline extends across this structure and the adjacent structures - is characterized by the parapet wall in the centre of the building (Photograph 3).

9.3.3 1149-1151 King Street East

The storefront section of the ground floor of 1149-1151 King Street East is somewhat altered by the application of post-modern detailing in stucco over the brick and replacement of the display windows. The brick on the first and second storey has been painted and the lower section of the building has been covered with gray tiles, visually stimulating a basement storey. The commercial entrance, located on the corner of the building is flanked by plate glass windows that face King Street East and Gage Avenue North. The entrance to the residential space appears unchanged and consists of an arched doorway constructed of brick that faces on to King Street East.

Although painted, the original brick masonry has survived on the second storey of the building, a type of textured brick that was widely used during the 1920s and 1930s. The single window opening on the second floor a low segmental brick arch and the rusticated concrete window sill is contemporary with the construction of the building. There is a single window, also a segmental arch, on the second floor in the corner bay above the commercial entrance A bracketed wooden cornice extends across the roofline, above which is a decorative fielded panel. The flat roofline extends across this structure and the adjacent structures and is characterized by the parapet wall in the centre of the building (Photograph 5).
10. Discussion of Contextual Value

10.1 Social Meaning

The structures located at 1141-1143, 1145 and 1149-1151 King Street East are some of many commercial storefront structures that also include residential spaces on the second floor found in towns and cities across Ontario. Built in the early-20th century, the properties represent these types of commercial storefront structures that were built fronting onto King Street East in Hamilton as it expanded eastwards.

10.2 Environment

The properties are situated on the north side of King Street East between Connaught Avenue North and Gage Avenue North. They are part of a series of six combined commercial and residential properties that occupy most of this block. The adjacent properties on the north and south side of King Street East are made up of a variety of residential and commercial uses, while the streets north of the subject property – including Connaught Avenue North and Gage Avenue North consist of predominantly single-detached homes that appear to have been developed in the early and mid-20th century. The property has been a part of the expanding urban environment of Hamilton since the early 20th century.

10.3 Formal Recognition

The property was identified in the December 2016 CHSR as not being subject to any heritage recognitions. However, consultation with the City of Hamilton in January and February 2017 confirmed that the property is now listed on the City’s Inventory of Building of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.
# 11. Data Sheet

## Table 11-1: Data Sheet for 1141-1143 King Street East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>PROPERTY DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Address</td>
<td>1141-1143 King Street East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Area (square metres)</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Corridor</td>
<td>Hamilton LRT B-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN</td>
<td>172120065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerial photo showing location and boundaries</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Aerial Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior, street-view photo</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Exterior Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of construction of built resources (known or estimated and source)</td>
<td>Pre 1926 (Hamilton City Directories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of significant alterations to built resources (known or estimated and source)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIELD</td>
<td>PROPERTY DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect/designer/builder (source)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous owners or occupants</td>
<td>Various commercial and residential tenants throughout 20th century (See Section 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current function</td>
<td>Commercial and Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous function(s)</td>
<td>Commercial and Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Recognition/Protection (municipal, provincial, federal)</td>
<td>Listed on City’s <em>Inventory of Building of Architectural and/or Historical Interest</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Heritage Interest</td>
<td>Listed on City’s <em>Inventory of Building of Architectural and/or Historical Interest</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Lands</td>
<td>No protected heritage properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude or UTM Northing</td>
<td>43.24830°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitude or UTM Easting</td>
<td>-79.82885°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11-2: Data Sheet for 1145 King Street East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>PROPERTY DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Address</td>
<td>1145 King Street East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Area (square metres)</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Corridor</td>
<td>Hamilton LRT B-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN</td>
<td>172120066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerial photo showing location and boundaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior, street-view photo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of construction of built resources</td>
<td>Pre 1926 (Hamilton City Directories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of significant alterations to built resources</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect/designer/builder (source)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous owners or occupants</td>
<td>Various commercial and residential tenants throughout 20th century (See Section 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current function</td>
<td>Commercial and Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIELD</td>
<td>PROPERTY DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous function(s)</td>
<td>Commercial and Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Recognition/Protection (municipal, provincial, federal)</td>
<td>Listed on City's Inventory of Building of Architectural and/or Historical Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Heritage Interest</td>
<td>Listed on City's Inventory of Building of Architectural and/or Historical Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Lands</td>
<td>No protected heritage properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude or UTM Northing</td>
<td>43.24823°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitude or UTM Easting</td>
<td>-79.82874°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 11-3: Data Sheet for 1149-1151 King Street East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>PROPERTY DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Address</td>
<td>1149-1151 King Street East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Area (square metres)</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Corridor</td>
<td>Hamilton LRT B-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN</td>
<td>172120067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aerial photo showing location and boundaries**

**Exterior, street-view photo**

**Date of construction of built resources (known or estimated and source)** Pre 1926 (Hamilton City Directories)

**Date of significant alterations to built resources (known or estimated and source)** Unknown

**Architect/designer/builder (source)** Unknown

**Previous owners or occupants** Various commercial and residential tenants throughout 20th century (See Section 8)

**Current function** Commercial and Residential

**Previous function(s)** Commercial and Residential
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>PROPERTY DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Recognition/Protection (municipal, provincial, federal)</td>
<td>Listed on City's <em>Inventory of Building of Architectural and/or Historical Interest</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Heritage Interest</td>
<td>Listed on City’s <em>Inventory of Building of Architectural and/or Historical Interest</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Lands</td>
<td>No protected heritage properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude or UTM Northing</td>
<td>43.24822°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitude or UTM Easting</td>
<td>-79.82871°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Photographs

Photograph 1: View looking north showing subject property, third from left in relation to continuous block on King Street East (AECOM, 2017)

Photograph 2: View looking north across King Street East showing 1141-1143 King Street East (AECOM, 2017)
Photograph 3: View looking north along King Street East showing 1145 (left) and 1149-1151 King Street East (right) (AECOM, 2017)

Photograph 4: View looking north across King Street East showing subject property in relation to adjacent building. Intersection at right is Gage Avenue North (AECOM, 2017)
Photograph 5: View looking north across King Street East showing 1149-1151 King Street East  
(AECOM, 2017)
13. Figures

All figures pertaining to this CHER can be found on the following pages:
Figure 1: Location of 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East and 1149-1151 King Street East
Figure 2: Aerial photograph showing the area surrounding 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East and 1149-1151 King Street East
Figure 3: Location of 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East and 1149-1151 King Street East on the 1875 Historic Atlas Map (Page & Smith, 1875)
Figure 4: Location of 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East and 1149-1151 King Street East on the 1905 and 1909 NTS Map
Figure 5: Location of 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East and 1149-1151 King Street East on the 1938 NTS Map
14. Chronology

1791 Barton Township was surveyed by Augustus Jones; the first settler arrived in the township.

1850 Gore District was divided and Halton and Wentworth Counties were created.

1869 The Hamilton & Lake Erie Railway was formed.

1873 Construction on the Hamilton & Lake Erie Railway began.

1875 George Gage is shown as occupying Lot 7, Concession II.

1905 The NTS map shows two brick and two wooden structures at the current location of 1141-1143 King Street East, 1145 King Street East and 1149-1151 King Street East.

1926 David Duignan, a butcher occupied the main floor of 1141 King Street East. H.W. Linke and H.C Rudge occupied the second floor apartments (1141½ King Street East).

The Hamilton City Directory lists William Carroll Grocers as the tenant on the main floor of 1143 King Street East.

1145 King Street East was occupied by Henry Longley, a dry cleaner.

1149 King Street East was occupied by Jason Fraser.

1151 King Street East was occupied by G.C. Bidwell Drugs.

1928 David Duignan, a butcher occupied the main floor of 1141 King Street East. J. Palmer and Mrs. G. Start occupied the second floor apartments.

The Hamilton City Directory lists William Carroll Grocers as the tenant on the main floor of 1143 King Street East.

1145 King Street East was occupied by Gage Cleaners.

1149 King Street East was occupied by W.G Emerson.

1151 King Street East was occupied by G.C. Bidwell Drugs.

1936 David Duignan, a butcher occupied the main floor of 1141 King Street East. C.L. Richarz and J.A. Fountain occupied the second floor apartments.

The Hamilton City Directory lists William Carroll Grocers as the tenant on the main floor of 1143 King Street East.

1145 King Street East is occupied by N.A Clifford Cleaners.

1149 King Street East is occupied by Jason Hinchecliffe.
1151 King Street East is occupied by E.J. Allen, a tobacconist.

1945 Gage Butchers occupied the main floor of 1141 King Street East. Frank McCallum and Leslie Galloway occupied the second floor apartments.

The Hamilton City Directory lists William Carroll Grocers as the tenant on the main floor of 1143 King Street East.

1145 King Street East was occupied by Reliable Cleaners.

1149 King Street East was occupied by George M. Knowles.

1151 King Street East was occupied by E.J. Allen, a tobacconist.

1955 Gage Butchers occupied the main floor of 1141 King Street East. Frank McCallum and Leslie Galloway occupied the second floor apartments.

1151 King Street East is occupied by Gage Pharmacy.

1966 Super-Vale Red and White Food Market occupied the main floor of 1141 King Street East.

Adam’s Forms and Office Equipment is listed as the tenant of the main floor of 1143 King Street East.

1974 The Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth was formed.

1978 Crestline Studios occupied the main floor of 1141 King Street East.

Adam’s Forms and Office Equipment is listed as the tenant of the main floor of 1143 King Street East.

1151 King Street East was occupied by the Steakout Co. Ltd.
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1. Executive Summary

AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by Metrolinx to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) for the property at 1141-1143 King Street East, in the City of Hamilton, Ontario (see Figure 1 of the CHER). This work is being completed as part of the Hamilton Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project.

The Hamilton LRT Project B-Line alignment extends from McMaster University at Cootes Drive to the Main Street/Highway 403 Bridge. A proposed LRT-only bridge will allow the alignment to then extend along King Street West until King East Street intersects with Main Street East, where the alignment will continue along Main Street East to the Queenston Road traffic circle. As a part of the project, it is anticipated that building impacts may take place on the property at 1141-1143 King Street East.

The project impacts will be assessed following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), as prescribed in Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 231/08, Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings under the Environmental Assessment Act. As part of the TPAP Amendment, an Environmental Project Report (EPR) Amendment will be prepared for public review.

The CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Interim Cultural Heritage Management Process and utilizes the criteria in Ontario Regulation 9/06 and Ontario Regulation 10/06, as required by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport's (MTCS) Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (2010). In addition, the CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Draft Terms of Reference for Consultants: Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations. As such the recommendations as they relate to the CHER and the potential cultural heritage value or interest of 1141-1143 King Street East are contained in a separate Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations (CHERR) document.

As part of the reporting requirements for the Hamilton LRT Project, Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) undertook a Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) for the alignment. The CHSR identified the requirement to conduct a CHER for the property located at 1141-1143 King Street East to assess the potential cultural heritage value or interest of the property. Where applicable, relevant background information has been utilized from the CHSR for project consistency.

The property located at 1141-1143 King Street East consists of narrow multi-use buildings located in a built-up area of the City of Hamilton. The building combines commercial use on the ground floor and residential use above. Although located within an older area of the city, the property is outside of the immediate downtown core.

In 1875, King Street East between Gage Avenue North and Connaught Avenue appears to have been used primarily for agricultural use; at this time, it was occupied by George Gage and one structure and an orchard was listed on the property. By 1905, the area around 1141-1143 King Street East had become considerably more populated with brick and wooden houses constructed along King Street East and the surrounding side streets. By 1926, the structure at 1141-1143 King Street East was constructed. Since its construction the main floor of the building has been occupied by various businesses while the second floor functioned as residential space.

A field review of the privately owned property at 1141-1143 King Street East was undertaken on January 12, 2017 and January 17, 2017 by Michael Greguol and Emily Game of AECOM (Figure 2). An
assessment was not completed on the interior of the structure due to timing constraints of the TPAP Amendment.

The building is a typical example of a vernacular commercial/residential architectural form that was utilized throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. The façade of 1141-1143 King Street East is much altered and none of the original building fabric materials are visibly extant.

The application of O.Reg 9/06 and O.Reg. 10/06 concluded that 1141-1143 King Street East does not meet O.Reg. 9/06 or O.Reg. 10/06, as it did not satisfy any of the nine criteria. Therefore, this CHERR recommends that the property at 1141-1143 King Street East is not considered a Provincial Heritage Property (PHP).
2. **Ontario Regulation 9/06 Evaluation**

*Ontario Regulation 9/06, Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest* (O. Reg. 9/06) provides criteria to apply to a potential heritage property to evaluate its heritage value. If a privately-owned property meets one or more of the following criteria it may be designated by a municipality under Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. For the purposes of this CHER, O. Reg. 9/06 considers the evaluation of the property as part of the community context. The *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties* state that a property may be considered a Provincial Heritage Property (PHP) if it meets one or more of the criteria under O. Reg. 9/06. The application of the criteria for 1141-1143 King Street East is included in Table 2-1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2-1: O.Reg. 9/06 Evaluation for 1141-1143 King Street East</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criterion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) The property has <em>design or physical value</em> because it:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Is a rare, unique, representative, or early example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The property has <em>historic or associative value</em> because it:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Response (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii) Yields, or has the potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture; or</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property does not have potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a community.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>A specific architect or builder for the property could not be determined. It is likely that a contractor built the duplex block on the north side of King Street East between Connaught Avenue North and Gage Avenue North.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) The property has *contextual value* because it:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Response (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) Is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property 1141-1143 King Street East forms a component of the larger commercial/residential block on the north side of King Street East. However, it is not important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings; or</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property at 1141-1143 King Street East forms a component of the larger commercial/residential block on the north side of King Street East. However, it is not physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Is a landmark.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property at 1141-1143 King Street East is not considered a landmark.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Ontario Regulation 10/06 Evaluation

Ontario Regulation 10/06, Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest of Provincial Significance (O. Reg. 10/06), provides criteria against which to assess a property to determine if the property holds provincial heritage significance. The Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties state that Ministries and prescribed public bodies shall apply the criteria in O. Reg. 10/06 to determine whether a property is of provincial significance. Therefore, for the purpose of this CHER O. Reg 10/06 considers the evaluation of the property as a part of the provincial context. If the property meets the criteria, it may be considered a Provincial Heritage Property of Provincial Significance (PHPPS). The application of the criteria for 1141-1143 King Street East is in Table 3-1, below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Response (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The property represents or demonstrates a theme or pattern in Ontario’s history.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1141-1143 King Street East does not represent a theme or pattern in Ontario’s history. Commercial and residential structures similar to this are found throughout towns and cities in Ontario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The property yields, or had the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of Ontario’s history.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1141-1143 King Street East does not yield, and is not anticipated to yield information that contributes to an understanding of Ontario’s history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The property demonstrates an uncommon, rare, or unique aspect of Ontario’s cultural heritage.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1141-1143 King Street East does not demonstrate an uncommon, rare, or unique aspect of Ontario’s cultural heritage. The form and massing of the structures are commonly found in Ontario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The property is of aesthetic, visual, or contextual importance to the province.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The 1141-1143 King Street East property is not of aesthetic, visual, or contextual importance to the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The property demonstrates a high degree of excellence or creative, technical, or scientific achievement at a provincial level in a given period.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1141-1143 King Street East does not demonstrate a high degree of excellence or creative, technical, or scientific achievement at a provincial level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Response (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The property has a strong or special association with the entire province or with a community that is found in more than one part of the province.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1141-1143 King Street East does not have a strong or special association with the entire province or with a community that is found in more than one part of the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The property has a strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organization of importance to the province or with an event of importance to the province.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1141-1143 King Street East does not have strong or special associations with the life or work of a person, group, or organization of importance to the province or with an event of importance to the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The property is located in an unorganized territory and the Minister determines that there is a provincial interest in the protection of the property.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1141-1143 King Street East is not located in an unorganized territory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Recommended Outcome of Evaluation**

The application of O.Reg 9/06 and O.Reg. 10/06 concluded that 1141-1143 King Street East does not meet O.Reg. 9/06 or O.Reg. 10/06, as it did not satisfy any of the nine criteria. Therefore, this CHERR recommends that the property at 1141-1143 King Street East is not considered a Provincial Heritage Property (PHP). As a result, a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and Heritage Attributes have not been prepared.
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1. Executive Summary

AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by Metrolinx to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) for the property at 1145 King Street East, in the City of Hamilton, Ontario (see Figure 1 of the CHER). This work is being completed as part of the Hamilton Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project.

The Hamilton LRT Project B-Line alignment extends from McMaster University at Cootes Drive to the Main Street/Highway 403 Bridge. A proposed LRT-only bridge will allow the alignment to then extend along King Street West until King East Street intersects with Main Street East, where the alignment will continue along Main Street East to the Queenston Road traffic circle. As a part of the project, it is anticipated that building impacts may take place on the property at 1145 King Street East.

The project impacts will be assessed following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), as prescribed in Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 231/08, Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings under the Environmental Assessment Act. As part of the TPAP Amendment, an Environmental Project Report (EPR) Amendment will be prepared for public review.

The CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Interim Cultural Heritage Management Process and utilizes the criteria in Ontario Regulation 9/06 and Ontario Regulation 10/06, as required by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport’s (MTCS) Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (2010). In addition, the CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Draft Terms of Reference for Consultants: Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations. As such the recommendations as they relate to the CHER and the potential cultural heritage value or interest of 1145 King Street East are contained in a separate Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations (CHERR) document.

As part of the reporting requirements for the Hamilton LRT Project, Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) undertook a Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) for the alignment. The CHSR identified the requirement to conduct a CHER for the property located at 1145 King Street East to assess the potential cultural heritage value or interest of the property. Where applicable, relevant background information has been utilized from the CHSR for project consistency.

The 1145 King Street East property consists of narrow multi-use buildings located in a built-up area of the City of Hamilton. The building combines commercial use on the ground floor and residential use above. Although located within an older area of the city, the property is outside of the immediate downtown core.

In 1875, King Street East between Gage Avenue North and Connaught Avenue appears to have been used primarily for agricultural use; at this time, it was occupied by George Gage and one structure and an orchard was listed on the property. By 1905, the area around 1145 King Street East had become considerably more populated with brick and wooden houses constructed along King Street East and the surrounding side streets. By 1926, the structure at 1145 King Street East was constructed. Since its construction, the main floor of the building has been occupied by various businesses while the second floor functioned as residential space.

A field review of the privately owned property at 1145 King Street East was undertaken on January 12, 2017 and January 17, 2017 by Michael Greguol and Emily Game of AECOM (Figure 2). An assessment was not completed on the interior of the structure due to timing constraints of the TPAP Amendment.
The building is a typical example of a vernacular commercial/residential architectural form that was utilized throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. The ground floor of 1145 King Street East is much altered and does not consist of many of the original building fabric materials. The original brick masonry has survived on the second storey of the building, a type of textured brick that was widely used during the 1920s and 1930s.

The application of O.Reg 9/06 and O.Reg. 10/06 concluded that 1145 King Street East does not meet O.Reg. 9/06 or O.Reg. 10/06, as it did not satisfy any of the nine criteria. Therefore, this CHERR recommends that the property at 1145 King Street East is not considered a Provincial Heritage Property (PHP).
2. **Ontario Regulation 9/06 Evaluation**

*Ontario Regulation 9/06, Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest* (O. Reg. 9/06) provides criteria to apply to a potential heritage property to evaluate its heritage value. If a privately-owned property meets one or more of the following criteria it may be designated by a municipality under Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. For the purposes of this CHER, O. Reg. 9/06 considers the evaluation of the property as part of the community context. The *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties* state that a property may be considered a Provincial Heritage Property (PHP) if it meets one or more of the criteria under O. Reg. 9/06. The application of the criteria for 1145 King Street East is included in Table 2-1 below.

Table 2-1: O.Reg. 9/06 Evaluation for 1145 King Street East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Response (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1) The property has <em>design or physical value</em> because it:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Is a rare, unique, representative, or early example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The structure located on the property at 1145 King Street East is a common example of an early/mid-20th century two-storey commercial building with a residential space above. This form is commonly found throughout Hamilton. In addition, recent alterations to the building on the property have significantly compromised the historic building fabric and the overall appearance of the structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit; or</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property is of common design and does not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property is a common commercial/residential structure and does not display a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2) The property has <em>historic or associative value</em> because it:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Although the much larger agricultural lot on which 1145 King Street East was built once belonged to a member of the prominent Gage family, no significant connection between the property and the Gage’s could be drawn. As a result, the property is not directly associated with a theme, event, belief, person, activity,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Response (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Yields, or has the potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture; or</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property does not have potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a community.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>A specific architect or builder for the property could not be determined. It is likely that a contractor built the duplex block on the north side of King Street East between Connaught Avenue North and Gage Avenue North.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The property has <em>contextual value</em> because it:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property 1145 King Street East forms a component of the larger commercial/residential block on the north side of King Street East. However, it is not important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings; or</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property at 1145 King Street East forms a component of the larger commercial/residential block on the north side of King Street East. However, it is not physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Is a landmark.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property at 1145 King Street East is not considered a landmark.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Ontario Regulation 10/06 Evaluation**

*Ontario Regulation 10/06, Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest of Provincial Significance* (O. Reg. 10/06), provides criteria against which to assess a property to determine if the property holds provincial heritage significance. The *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties* state that Ministries and prescribed public bodies shall apply the criteria in O. Reg. 10/06 to determine whether a property is of provincial significance. Therefore, for the purpose of this CHER O. Reg 10/06 considers the evaluation of the property as a part of the provincial context. If the property meets the criteria, it may be considered a Provincial Heritage Property of Provincial Significance (PHPPS). The application of the criteria for 1145 King Street East is in Table 3-1, below.

**Table 3-1: O.Reg. 10/06 Evaluation for 1145 King Street East**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Response (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The property represents or demonstrates a theme or pattern in Ontario’s history.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1145 King Street East does not represent a theme or pattern in Ontario’s history. Commercial and residential structures similar to this are found throughout towns and cities in Ontario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The property yields, or had the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of Ontario’s history.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1145 King Street East does not yield, and is not anticipated to yield information that contributes to an understanding of Ontario’s history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The property demonstrates an uncommon, rare, or unique aspect of Ontario’s cultural heritage.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1145 King Street East does not demonstrate an uncommon, rare, or unique aspect of Ontario’s cultural heritage. The form and massing of the structures are commonly found in Ontario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The property is of aesthetic, visual, or contextual importance to the province.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The 1145 King Street East property is not of aesthetic, visual, or contextual importance to the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The property demonstrates a high degree of excellence or creative, technical, or scientific achievement at a provincial level in a given period.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1145 King Street East does not demonstrate a high degree of excellence or creative, technical, or scientific achievement at a provincial level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Response (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The property has a strong or special association with the entire province or with a community that is found in more than one part of the province.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1145 King Street East does not have a strong or special association with the entire province or with a community that is found in more than one part of the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The property has a strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organization of importance to the province or with an event of importance to the province.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1145 King Street East does not have strong or special associations with the life or work of a person, group, or organization of importance to the province or with an event of importance to the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The property is located in an unorganized territory and the Minister determines that there is a provincial interest in the protection of the property.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1145 King Street East is not located in an unorganized territory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Recommended Outcome of Evaluation**

The application of O.Reg 9/06 and O.Reg. 10/06 concluded that 1145 King Street East does not meet O.Reg. 9/06 or O.Reg. 10/06, as it did not satisfy any of the nine criteria. Therefore, this CHERR recommends that the property at 1145 King Street East is not considered a Provincial Heritage Property (PHP). As a result, a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and Heritage Attributes have not been prepared.
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1. Executive Summary

AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by Metrolinx to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) for the property at 1149-1151 King Street East, in the City of Hamilton, Ontario (see Figure 1 of the CHER). This work is being completed as part of the Hamilton Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project.

The Hamilton LRT Project B-Line alignment extends from McMaster University at Cootes Drive to the Main Street/Highway 403 Bridge. A proposed LRT-only bridge will allow the alignment to then extend along King Street West until King East Street intersects with Main Street East, where the alignment will continue along Main Street East to the Queenston Road traffic circle. As a part of the project, it is anticipated that building impacts may take place on the property at 1149-1151 King Street East.

The project impacts will be assessed following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), as prescribed in Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 231/08, Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings under the Environmental Assessment Act. As part of the TPAP Amendment, an Environmental Project Report (EPR) Amendment will be prepared for public review.

The CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Interim Cultural Heritage Management Process and utilizes the criteria in Ontario Regulation 9/06 and Ontario Regulation 10/06, as required by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport's (MTCS) Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (2010). In addition, the CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Draft Terms of Reference for Consultants: Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations. As such the recommendations as they relate to the CHER and the potential cultural heritage value or interest of 1149-1151 King Street East are contained in a separate Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations (CHERR) document.

As part of the reporting requirements for the Hamilton LRT Project, Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) undertook a Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) for the alignment. The CHSR identified the requirement to conduct a CHER for the property located at 1149-1151 King Street East to assess the potential cultural heritage value or interest of 1149-1151 King Street East are contained in a separate Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations (CHERR) document.

The property located at 1149-51 King Street East consists of narrow multi-use buildings located in a built-up area of the City of Hamilton. The building combines commercial use on the ground floor and residential use above. Although located within an older area of the city, the property is outside of the immediate downtown core.

In 1875, King Street East between Gage Avenue North and Connaught Avenue appears to have been used primarily for agricultural use; at this time, it was occupied by George Gage and one structure and an orchard was listed on the property. By 1905, the area around 1149-1151 King Street East had become considerably more populated with brick and wooden houses constructed along King Street East and the surrounding side streets. By 1926, the structure at 1149-1151 King Street East was constructed. Since its construction the main floor of the building has been occupied by various businesses while the second floor functioned as residential space.

A field review of the privately owned property at 1149-1151 King Street East was undertaken on January 12, 2017 and January 17, 2017 by Michael Greguol and Emily Game of AECOM (Figure 2 of the CHER).
An assessment was not completed on the interior of the structure due to timing constraints of the TPAP Amendment.

The building is a typical example of a vernacular commercial/residential architectural form that was utilized throughout the 19th and 20th centuries. The storefront section of the ground floor of 1149-1151 King Street East is somewhat altered by the application of post-modern detailing in stucco over the brick and replacement of the display windows. Although painted, the original brick masonry has survived on the second storey of the building, a type of textured brick that was widely used during the 1920s and 1930s.

The application of O.Reg 9/06 and O.Reg. 10/06 concluded that 1149-1151 King Street East does not meet O.Reg. 9/06 or O.Reg. 10/06, as it did not satisfy any of the nine criteria. Therefore, this CHERR recommends that the property at 1149-1151 King Street East is not considered a Provincial Heritage Property (PHP).
2. Ontario Regulation 9/06 Evaluation

*Ontario Regulation 9/06, Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest* (O. Reg. 9/06) provides criteria to apply to a potential heritage property to evaluate its heritage value. If a privately-owned property meets one or more of the following criteria it may be designated by a municipality under Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. For the purposes of this CHER, O. Reg. 9/06 considers the evaluation of the property as part of the community context. The *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties* state that a property may be considered a Provincial Heritage Property (PHP) if it meets one or more of the criteria under O. Reg. 9/06. The application of the criteria for 1149-1151 King Street East is included in Table 2-1 below.

**Table 2-1: O.Reg. 9/06 Evaluation for 1149-1151 King Street East**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Response (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) The property has <em>design or physical value</em> because it:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Is a rare, unique, representative, or early example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The structure located on the property at 1149-1151 King Street East is a common example of an early/mid-20th century two-storey commercial building with a residential space above. This form is commonly found throughout Hamilton. In addition, recent alterations to the building on the property have significantly compromised the historic building fabric and the overall appearance of the structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit; or</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property is of common design and does not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property is a common commercial/residential structure and does not display a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The property has <em>historic or associative value</em> because it:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Although the much larger agricultural lot on which 1149-1151 King Street East was built once belonged to a member of the prominent Gage family, no significant connection between the property and the Gage’s could be drawn. As a result, the property is not directly associated with a theme, event, belief, person, activity,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Criterion | Response (Yes/No) | Rationale
--- | --- | ---
| ii) Yields, or has the potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture; or | No | The property does not have potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture. |
| iii) Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a community. | No | A specific architect or builder for the property could not be determined. It is likely that a contractor built the duplex block on the north side of King Street East between Connaught Avenue North and Gage Avenue North. |

### 3) The property has contextual value because it:

| i) Is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area; | No | The property 1149-1151 King Street East forms a component of the larger commercial/residential block on the north side of King Street East. However, it is not important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area. |
| ii) Is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings; or | No | The property at 1149-1151 King Street East forms a component of the larger commercial/residential block on the north side of King Street East. However, it is not physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings. |
| iii) Is a landmark. | No | The property at 1149-1151 King Street East is not considered a landmark. |
3. Ontario Regulation 10/06 Evaluation

Ontario Regulation 10/06, *Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest of Provincial Significance* (O. Reg. 10/06), provides criteria against which to assess a property to determine if the property holds provincial heritage significance. The *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties* state that Ministries and prescribed public bodies shall apply the criteria in O. Reg. 10/06 to determine whether a property is of provincial significance. Therefore, for the purpose of this CHER O. Reg 10/06 considers the evaluation of the property as a part of the provincial context. If the property meets the criteria, it may be considered a Provincial Heritage Property of Provincial Significance (PHPPS). The application of the criteria for 1149-1151 King Street East is in Table 3-1, below.

Table 3-1: O.Reg. 10/06 Evaluation for 1149-1151 King Street East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Response (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The property represents or demonstrates a theme or pattern in Ontario's history.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1149-1151 King Street East does not represent a theme or pattern in Ontario’s history. Commercial and residential structures similar to this are found throughout towns and cities in Ontario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The property yields, or had the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of Ontario’s history.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1149-1151 King Street East does not yield, and is not anticipated to yield information that contributes to an understanding of Ontario’s history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The property demonstrates an uncommon, rare, or unique aspect of Ontario’s cultural heritage.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1149-1151 King Street East does not demonstrate an uncommon, rare, or unique aspect of Ontario’s cultural heritage. The form and massing of the structures are commonly found in Ontario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The property is of aesthetic, visual, or contextual importance to the province.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The 1149-1151 King Street East property is not of aesthetic, visual, or contextual importance to the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The property demonstrates a high degree of excellence or creative, technical, or scientific achievement at a provincial level in a given period.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1149-1151 King Street East does not demonstrate a high degree of excellence or creative, technical, or scientific achievement at a provincial level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Response (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The property has a strong or special association with the entire province or with a community that is found in more than one part of the province.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1149-1151 King Street East does not have a strong or special association with the entire province or with a community that is found in more than one part of the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The property has a strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organization of importance to the province or with an event of importance to the province.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1149-1151 King Street East does not have strong or special associations with the life or work of a person, group, or organization of importance to the province or with an event of importance to the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The property is located in an unorganized territory and the Minister determines that there is a provincial interest in the protection of the property.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1149-1151 King Street East is not located in an unorganized territory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Recommended Outcome of Evaluation

The application of O.Reg 9/06 and O.Reg. 10/06 concluded that 1149-1151 King Street East does not meet O.Reg. 9/06 or O.Reg. 10/06, as it did not satisfy any of the nine criteria. Therefore, this CHER recommends that the property at 1149-1151 King Street East is not considered a Provincial Heritage Property (PHP). As a result, a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and Heritage Attributes have not been prepared.
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1. Executive Summary

AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by Metrolinx to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) for the property at 1175 King Street East, in the City of Hamilton, Ontario. This work is being completed as part of the Hamilton Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project.

The Hamilton LRT Project B-Line alignment extends from McMaster University at Cootes Drive to the Main Street/Highway 403 Bridge. A proposed LRT-only bridge will allow the alignment to then extend along King Street West until King East Street intersects with Main Street East, where the alignment will continue along Main Street East to the Queenston Road traffic circle. As a part of the project, it is anticipated that building impacts may take place on the properties at 1175 King Street East (Figure 1).

The project impacts will be assessed following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), as prescribed in Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 231/08, Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings under the Environmental Assessment Act. As part of the TPAP Amendment, an Environmental Project Report (EPR) Amendment will be prepared for public review.

The CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Interim Cultural Heritage Management Process and utilizes the criteria in Ontario Regulation 9/06 and Ontario Regulation 10/06, as required by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport’s (MTCS) Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (2010). In addition, the CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Draft Terms of Reference for Consultants: Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations. Consequently the recommendations as they relate to this CHER and the potential cultural heritage value or interest of the property at 1175 King Street East are contained in a separate Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations (CHERR) document.

As part of the reporting requirements for the Hamilton LRT Project, Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) undertook a Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) for the alignment. The CHSR identified the requirement to conduct a CHER for the property located at 1175 King Street East to assess the potential cultural heritage value or interest of the properties. Where applicable, relevant background information has been utilized from the CHSR for project consistency.

1175 King Street East was historically located on the west side of Lot 6, Concession II in Barton Township, when the crown survey for the township was undertaken. By 1875, the lot had been subdivided and the subject property was located within a part of the lot belonging to an R.R. Gage. No structures are shown on the lot at this time. The surrounding properties east and west of the lot were also owned by members of the Gage family, with isolated structures shown amongst various orchards (Figure 3).

By the beginning of the 20th century, historical topographic mapping indicates that urban development was underway and the area surrounding the 1175 King Street East property had become populated with brick and wooden structures along King Street East and the surrounding side streets (Figure 4). By the 1930s, Lot 6, Concession II was completely subdivided into parcels separated by small side streets and numerous buildings (Figure 5).

Historical Fire Insurance Plans and Hamilton City Directories indicate that by 1915, a 2 1/2-storey brick dwelling was located on the property. The property’s first resident in 1915 was Ernest Myers.
property continued to be used for residential purposes throughout the 20th century with a number of different residents living in the dwelling between 1915 and 1970. The longest resident was a Mrs. A. Pleprzak who occupied the house from the 1940s into the 1970s.

Field review confirmed that the building remains in use as a private residence with no notable changes to the original appearance from c. 1915.

A field review of the privately owned property at 1175 King Street East was undertaken on January 12, 2017 and February 3, 2017 by Michael Greguol and Emily Game of AECOM. An assessment was not completed on the interior of the structure due to the timing constraints for the TPAP Amendment.
2. Introduction

2.1 Historical Summary

2.1.1 Context

The subject property is located within the municipal boundaries of the City of Hamilton, Ontario. Prior to the incorporation of the current municipality, the property was located within the boundaries of Barton Township, in Wentworth County.

2.1.2 Wentworth County

As part of the establishment of Upper Canada, the province was divided into administrative Districts in 1792. Wentworth County was one of several counties that made up the Home District. It was named in honour of Sir John Wentworth, Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia from 1792-1808. In 1816, the Home District was divided and reorganized and Wentworth County was included in the Gore District. By 1849, the original district system was abolished and replaced by a county council system and Wentworth County became an independent political entity. Townships that were included in Wentworth County at one time or another included Ancaster, Barton, Beverly, Binbrook, Caistor, Flamborough East and West, Glanford, Onondaga, Saltfleet, and Seneca. Between 1850 and 1854, Wentworth and Halton Counties were joined for government purposes into the United Counties of Wentworth and Halton. In 1973, Wentworth County was renamed the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth and, in 2001, was amalgamated with six constituent municipalities into the City of Hamilton. The City of Hamilton has remained as the administrative seat or county town since the original creation of the Gore District nearly two centuries ago.

2.1.3 Barton Township

Barton Township is described in detail in the *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth of 1875*. The Township of Barton was surveyed in 1791 by Augustus Jones using the Single-Front survey system used by the colonial government between 1783 and 1818. The survey was made up of concessions separated by road allowances. The concession was divided into lots of 200 acres and sideroad allowances were surveyed after every fifth lot. The first settlers arrived in Barton Township in 1791, many of whom were United Empire Loyalists or disbanded troops. The settlement of Barton Township began slowly, with only 102 families living in the township by 1815; most of the settlement was concentrated at the foot of the Niagara Escarpment. The township continued to grow and by 1823 it contained one sawmill and three gristmills. By 1841, the population grew to 1,434. Barton Township was later amalgamated into the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth, which today is known as the City of Hamilton.

2.2 Description of Property

The property at 1175 King Street East consists of a quadrangular lot on the north side of King Street East between Fairview Avenue and East Bend Avenue (Photograph 1). The structure consists of a 2½-storey structural brick house that rests on a parged foundation of an unknown material. The vernacular Edwardian house has a 2-bay façade with a medium pitched end-gable roof that is hipped at the rear of the house (Photograph 2). It has a full verandah over a bay window and the front entrance.

2.3 Current Context

The property is situated on the north side of King Street East between Fairview Avenue and East Bend Avenue. The vernacular Edwardian residential structure is one of a series of six early 20th century houses that extend across this block. The adjacent properties consist of 2 storey and 2½ story houses, all of varying designs and primarily of brick construction. The row of houses on the south side of King Street on this block are similar, made up of predominantly single-detached homes that appear to have been developed in the early and mid-20th century.
3. Methodology and Sources

3.1 Study Approach

This CHER was prepared in accordance with Metrolinx’s *Interim Cultural Heritage Management Process* (Fall 2013) and the *MTCS Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties* (2010). The CHER was also undertaken according to the guidelines presented in the Metrolinx document, *Draft Terms of Reference for Consultants: Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations* (April 2016) and outlined in the following tasks:

- Research and Documentation Gathering – gathered from various sources including existing heritage studies, Metrolinx records, public archives, and published materials;
- Writing – an illustrated report based on gathered background history and site investigation materials, and the application of O.Reg. 9/06 and 10/06; Evaluation, Recommendations, and Statement of Cultural Heritage Value – a summary of the applicable evaluation, and recommendations regarding whether the property meets the criteria for being a provincial heritage property, a provincial heritage property of provincial significance, or neither.

As outlined in the Draft Terms of Reference, the heritage evaluation is separated into two stand-alone components: a CHER and a CHERR. The Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report includes research conducted for the CHER and is intended to address the criteria set out in O.Regs 9/06 and 10/06. The CHERR includes the results of the applied evaluation, and the recommended outcome of the evaluation.

Michael Greguol, Cultural Heritage Specialist, and Emily Game, Heritage Researcher for AECOM, conducted a site investigation to visually inspect and document the property on January 12 and February 3, 2017. An assessment was not completed on the interior of the structure due to the timing constraints for the TPAP Amendment.

3.2 Secondary Sources

A series of secondary sources were reviewed for the purposes of data collection and analysis as part of the CHER. The relevant guidelines and reference documents cited above served as a framework for undertaking the study. The *Hamilton Light Rail Transit Cultural Heritage Screening Report, City of Hamilton, Ontario* (CHSR) prepared by ASI in December 2016, provided a preliminary review of the rail corridor and the potential heritage properties identified along the corridor. Background information and applicable research was gathered from the report for the purposes of the CHER. In addition, a series of published materials including published histories pertaining to the history of Hamilton were consulted. A complete list of the sources reviewed for the report is contained in Section 15 (Bibliography).

3.3 Primary Sources

Where available, primary source material was consulted to provide a historical context for the evaluation of the potential heritage value of the property. Primary source research was undertaken at the Local
History and Archives Department of the Hamilton Public Library, the Mills Memorial Library at McMaster University, and at the Map and Data Centre at the University of Western Ontario. A review of the following primary sources aided in the evaluation of the structures at 1175 King Street East:

- Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth, 1875;
- Hamilton City Directories, issues 1925-1970;
- Fire Insurance Plans, 1927 (rev. 1933) -1960; and,

### 3.4 Consultations

As part of the identification of recognized and potential cultural heritage resources for the CHSR, ASI undertook consultation with the City of Hamilton, the Ontario Heritage Trust (OHT) and the MTCS. Consultation during the CHSR process took place between August and October, 2016.

As part of this CHER, AECOM undertook property-specific consultation with the same municipal and provincial staff and agencies in order to identify or confirm any existing heritage recognitions or interest in the subject properties.

The following individuals and organizations were consulted:

- Thomas Wicks, Heritage Planner, OHT;
- Chelsey Tyers, Cultural Heritage Planner, City of Hamilton;
- Asyia Patel, Assistant Cultural Heritage Planner, City of Hamilton; and,
- Rosi Zirger, Heritage Planner, MTCS.

The results of the consultation efforts have been summarized in Section 7 (Community Input).
4. Heritage Recognitions

4.1 Municipal

As a review of applicable municipal heritage recognitions of 1175 King Street East adjacent properties, AECOM reviewed the City of Hamilton’s heritage inventories. The following inventories and registers were reviewed:

- Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 1: List of Designated Properties and Heritage Conservation Easements under the Ontario Heritage Act; and,
- Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 2: Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.

Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 1 consists of a listing of properties that have been designated by municipal by-law. The volume includes properties that have been designated under Parts IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act. In addition, the volume identifies properties for which the City of Hamilton holds a Heritage Easement.

Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 2 is a compilation of the inventories of heritage structures and places of the six former municipalities that now make up the City of Hamilton. This volume contains approximately 7,000 properties that are of potential heritage interest, or value, but that are not formally protected under the Ontario Heritage Act. The Inventory is publically available; however, it is one that evolves over time and properties are added on a case-by-case basis, determined by staff at the City.

Consultation efforts were undertaken to confirm levels of municipal heritage recognition, if any. The property was identified in the December 2016 CHSR as not being subject to any heritage recognitions. However, consultation with the City of Hamilton in January and February 2017 confirmed that the property is now listed on the City’s Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.

4.2 Provincial

As a review of applicable provincial heritage recognitions for the property or adjacent properties AECOM reviewed the OHT’s Provincial Plaque Guide, and list of OHT easements. The property at 1175 King Street East is neither the subject of a provincial plaque nor a provincial easement. In addition, OHT staff was contacted to review the Ontario Heritage Act Register to confirm that the property is not included on the register and that an OHT easement does not exist for the property.

A response from Thomas Wicks, Heritage Planner for the OHT confirmed that the Trust does not hold a conservation easement for 1175 King Street East.

Rosi Zirger, Heritage Planner for the MTCS also confirmed on March 10, 2017 that the property is not included on the MTCS list of provincial heritage properties and the MTCS is not aware of any previous evaluations related to the property.
4.3 Federal

As a review of applicable federal heritage recognitions for the property or adjacent properties, AECOM reviewed the online searchable database for the Canadian Register of Historic Places as well as the Directory of Federal Heritage Designations. 1175 King Street East and the adjacent properties are not subject to any existing federal heritage recognitions.
5. Adjacent Lands

The properties adjacent to 1175 King Street East consist primarily of residential properties on the block of King Street East between Fairview Avenue and East Bend Avenue North. The area was built up during and immediately after the First World War as small frame wartime housing units. In many cases the lots were redeveloped with larger homes, or the wartime houses were renovated extensively. As a result, the neighbourhood has a wide range of types and materials.

Consultation with the City of Hamilton indicated that 1173 King Street East and 1177 King Street East are listed on the City’s Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.
6. Archaeology

ASI completed a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (AA) as part of the Rapid Transit Initiative and found that the property at 1175 King Street East did not retain archaeological potential and confirmed that no known archaeological assessments have previously been completed within 50 metres (m) of the property. Consequently, at the time of production of the ASI report, no archaeological sites had been identified within or adjacent to the property. Additionally, the ASI Stage1 AA indicates that there is no land that retains archaeological potential within 50 m of 1175 King Street East.

The results of the Stage 1 AA determined that a Stage 2 AA must be conducted for all land identified as retaining archaeological potential that will be impacted by the proposed Rapid Transit Initiative. Based on this assessment, ASI made the following recommendations:

- The King Street right-of-way (ROW) does not retain archaeological potential due to previous land disturbance. An additional AA is not required within the ROW and those portions of the study corridor can be cleared of further archaeological concern; and,

- A Stage 2 AA should be conducted on lands determined to have archaeological potential if the proposed project is to impact these lands. This work must be done in accordance with the MTCS’ Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Ontario Government 2011) in order to identify any archaeological remains that may be present.

It should be noted that ASI’s recommendations for Stage 2 archaeological work references the MCL’s 2006 draft Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MCL 2006); however, further Stage 2 archaeological work must now be conducted in accordance with current archaeological standards and guidelines (Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists, Ontario Government 2011). For complete details regarding the results of the Stage 1 AA, reference should be made to the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment, Rapid Transit Initiative, City of Hamilton, Ontario (February 2009).
7. Community Input

As part of the consultation process for this report, AECOM undertook consultation with the City of Hamilton, the MTCS, and the OHT. The results of the consultation efforts are identified below in Table 7-1.

Table 7-1: Community Input and Consultation Undertaken for 1175 King Street East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chelsey Tyers, Heritage Planner City of Hamilton</td>
<td>905-546-2424 ext. 1202 <a href="mailto:chelsey.tyers@hamilton.ca">chelsey.tyers@hamilton.ca</a></td>
<td>February 1, 2017</td>
<td>The City of Hamilton confirmed that 1175 King Street East is listed on the City’s Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asiya Patel Assistant Cultural Heritage Planner City of Hamilton</td>
<td>905-546-2424 ext. 7163 <a href="mailto:asiya.patel@hamilton.ca">asiya.patel@hamilton.ca</a></td>
<td>February 6, 2017 (Response)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Wicks Heritage Planner Ontario Heritage Trust</td>
<td>416-314-5972 <a href="mailto:thomas.wicks@heritagetrust.on.ca">thomas.wicks@heritagetrust.on.ca</a></td>
<td>February 1, 2017</td>
<td>The OHT confirmed that the properties are not subject to an OHT conservation easement nor is it on their register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>February 9, 2017 (Response)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosi Zirger Heritage Planner Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport</td>
<td>416-314-7159 <a href="mailto:rosi.zirger@ontario.ca">rosi.zirger@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td>February 1, 2017</td>
<td>The MTCS confirmed that the property is not included on the MTCS list of provincial heritage properties and the MTCS is not aware of any previous evaluations related to the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>March 10, 2017 (Response)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Discussion of Historical or Associative Value

8.1 Historic Theme/Cultural Pattern

8.1.1 Transportation

The earliest roads in Ontario were typically military roads or colonization roads. These roads often followed aboriginal hunting trails or were dictated by the topography of the land which they crossed. The Dundas Road was opened to connect Toronto with the Thames River, in what is now London, Ontario, and the Kingston Road was designed to provide a military link between Toronto and Kingston. The Kingston Road was one of the earliest and still functioning roads in southern Ontario.

Following the Crown surveys in Ontario, concession and side roads were opened on a grid that was dictated by the survey type that was used. The roads were cleared and made passable by the early land owners who built their dwellings adjacent to the concession roads. Despite being cleared, road conditions were often poor until the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The crown surveys, and later surveys of town and city plots were laid out in grid-like manners, which has left a visible imprint on rural and urban street grids today. Much of the pattern of these surveys can be seen in the grids of cities and townships in Ontario. Within Hamilton, this is visible in the parallel city streets and grid layout of the downtown core and outlying areas. Nonetheless, King Street has a visible curve in its orientation, swinging north just east of Wellington Street before swinging south again around Barnesdale Avenue. This curvature in the road is visible on historic maps of the township and can be attributed to its history as an indigenous trail that pre-dates European settlement in the Hamilton area. The historic trail has left a visible footprint on the early 19th century grid of the City.

Railway transportation, both passenger and freight, greatly improved the transportation network in Ontario beginning in the mid-1800s. The opening of the Grand Trunk Railway (GTR) between Montreal and Toronto in 1856 provided a link between the two cities and provinces that was more easily travelled in comparison to mid-19th century roads. The construction of the route from Montreal to Toronto, and then on to Sarnia by the end of the 1860s resulted in the construction of significant structures such as the Victoria Bridge over the St. Lawrence River, and the St. Clair Tunnel in Sarnia. The GTR was designed to enhance the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes shipping routes in response to the railroads and shipping networks in the United States. As a result, it also strengthened the connection and link between the townships, and municipal and provincial economies in Ontario.

Various railway companies were formed in Ontario to create a vast network of rail lines that spread throughout the province by the early 20th century. Nonetheless, most of the companies were eventually merged with or purchased by the Canadian National Railway (CN) or the Canadian Pacific Railway (CP).

8.1.2 Railways

The former Toronto, Hamilton, and Buffalo Railway (TH&B) passes under King Street West approximately 60 metres east of the subject properties. The TH&B was first conceived in March 1884 as
a rail line to connect Toronto to Fort Erie and Buffalo, New York through the City of Hamilton. However, as with many of the early railways in North America, funding became an issue from the beginning. In 1891, the management of the TH&B secured an amalgamation with the already constructed Brantford, Waterloo & Lake Erie Railway (BW&LER) which operated a line between Brantford and Fort Erie. By 1892, the companies were combined and became official known as the TH&B.

A year later the railway was purchased by a series of major railway companies, most of which was based on American interest, and by 1895 a link between Hamilton and Brantford was opened. The first few decades of the 20th century resulted in a series of spurs and belt lines being constructed by the railway, as well as amalgamations with smaller railway companies, characteristic of 19th and 20th century railway business.

Within the City of Hamilton, the TH&B and City Council wrestled with the issues of grade separation, which ultimately resulted in an agreement in 1930 for the two parties to construction a grade separation to prevent long trains from block city streets. The project was completed in 1933, including the construction of a new station and corporate offices. Between the 1930s and 1970s, the TH&B came under the control of the Michigan Central Railway, the New York Central Railway, the Penn Central Railway, and eventually Conrail. However, as of 1977, Conrail’s interest in the TH&B was sold to the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR), and by 1987 the TH&B was fully integrated into the CPR system.

8.1.3 Hamilton Street Railway

In 1873, the City of Hamilton incorporated the Hamilton Street Railway; the horse-drawn streetcar service began in May 1874 with six operating cars. The line extended along three miles of track from the GTR’s passenger station east along Stuart Street South to James Street. The line travelled south to Gore Park and then east along King Street to Wellington Street. Due to popularity of the service, additional cars were added and the track was extended. New track was laid west along King Street to Locke Street and east to Wentworth Street.

The electrification process of the Hamilton Street Railway began in March 1892. A total of 12 miles of track were electrified and 15 horsecars were converted to electric street cars. Operation of the newly-electrified cars began on June 29, 1892.

At the end of the Second World War, Hamilton Street Railway sold the lines to Canada Coach for $1.4 million. Immediately following the sale, Canada Coach announced plans to replace the street car service with busses. By 1951, the last street car was removed from service and replaced by electric trolley busses.3

The proposed B-Line follows the old streetcar route from King Street near McMaster University to Sherman Avenue. The original line turned south along Sherman Avenue and then continued east on Main Street to Kenilworth Avenue North. The B-Line will carry on King Street East east of Sherman Avenue until it reconnects with Main Street East at the Delta and proceeds to the Queenston Road traffic circle.

The present-day Hamilton transit company operates under the name of Hamilton Street Railway Company.

8.2 Local History

1175 King Street East is located within the City of Hamilton, Ontario. Historically the structure was located within Lot 6, Concession II, Barton Township in Wentworth County. The subsections below include historic information related to the settlement and growth of these areas.

8.2.1 Settlement History

As part of the establishment of Upper Canada, the province was divided into administrative Districts in 1792. As such, Wentworth County was one of several counties that made up the Home District. It was named in honour of Sir John Wentworth, Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia from 1792-1808. In 1816, the Home District was divided and reorganized and Wentworth County was included in the Gore District. By 1849, the original district system was abolished and replaced by a county council system and Wentworth County became an independent political entity. Townships that were included in Wentworth County at one time or another included Ancaster, Barton, Beverly, Binbrook, Caistor, Flamborough East and West, Glanford, Onondaga, Saltfleet, and Seneca. Between 1850 and 1854, Wentworth and Halton Counties were joined for government purposes into the United Counties of Wentworth and Halton; however, this change was short-lived. In 1973, Wentworth County was renamed the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth and, in 2001, was amalgamated with six constituent municipalities into the City of Hamilton. The City of Hamilton has remained as the administrative seat or county town since the original creation of the Gore District nearly two centuries ago.

Barton Township is described in detail in the Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth of 1875. The Township of Barton was surveyed in 1791 by Augustus Jones using the Single-Front survey system used by the colonial government between 1783 and 1818. The survey was made up of concessions separated by road allowances. The concession was divided into lots of 200 acres and sideroad allowances were surveyed after every fifth lot. The first settlers arrived in Barton Township in 1791, many of whom were United Empire Loyalists or disbanded troops. The Settlement of Barton Township began slowly, with only 102 families living in the township by 1815. Most of the settlement was concentrated at the foot of the Niagara Escarpment. The township continued to grow and by 1823 it contained one sawmill and three gristmills. By 1841, the population had grown to 1,434.

8.2.2 Site History

1175 King Street East was historically located on the west side of Lot 6, Concession II in Barton Township, when the crown survey for the township was undertaken. By 1875, the lot had been subdivided, with the subject property located within a part of a lot belonging to an R.R. Gage. No structures were shown on the lot at this time. The surrounding properties east and west of the lot were also owned by members of the Gage family, with isolated structures shown amongst various orchards (Figure 3).

By the beginning of the 20th century, historical topographic mapping indicates that urban development was underway. The area surrounding the 1175 property had become more populated with brick and wooden structures along King Street East and the surrounding side streets (Figure 4). By the 1930s, Lot 6, Concession II was completely subdivided into parcels separated by small side streets and numerous buildings (Figure 5).

Historic Fire Insurance Plans Hamilton City Directories indicate that by 1915, a 2½-storey brick dwelling was located on the property. The property’s first resident in 1915 was Ernest Myers. The property continued to be used for residential purposes throughout the 20th century with a number of different
residents living in the dwelling between 1915 and 1970. The longest resident was a Mrs. A. Pleprzak who occupied the house from the 1940s into the 1970s.

Field review confirmed that the house remains in use as a private residence with no notable changes to the original appearance from ca. 1915.

8.3 Person/Event/Organization

The historic research undertaken for this CHER did not identify any significant people, events, or organizations that are directly related to or associated with the property, and could contribute to the potential cultural heritage interest or value of the property.
9. Discussion of Design or Physical Value

9.1 Style/Type/Tradition

The house located at 1175 King Street East consists of a 2½-storey residential building designed in a vernacular Edwardian style (Photograph 1). The structural brick house sits on a parged foundation of an unknown material. The main floor of the structure has a two bay façade which is covered by a deep verandah. The verandah is supported by two short columns supported by brick piers. The second floor façade has a single, large window opening which is accentuated by a rusticated concrete sill and a segmental arch. The gable-end roof spans the entire façade and is hipped at the rear of the building, the gable end facing King Street East is finished with vinyl siding. This is a very common form of housing during the last quarter of the 19th century and into the 20th century until the First World War.

9.2 Function

The structure at 1175 King Street East has functioned as a private residence continuously since its construction c. 1925. Prior to the construction of the structure, this section of Lot 6, Concession II appears to have been vacant.

9.3 Fabric

According to the 1927 (rev. 1933) Fire Insurance Maps, 1175 King Street East was constructed of structural brick which is exposed on all sides of the building. The window sashes on the main and upper storeys have been replaced with aluminum sash; the rusticated concrete sills however, are contemporary with the construction of the house. The gable-end roof spans the entire façade and is hipped at the rear of the building. The gable end facing King Street East is finished with vinyl siding. The house stands on a parged foundation of an unknown material (Photograph 2).
10. Discussion of Contextual Value

10.1 Social Meaning

The house located at 1175 King Street East is one many vernacular Edwardian houses that were constructed in cities across Ontario. Built in the early 20th century, the property represents a common type of residential house within the City of Hamilton.

10.2 Environment

The property at 1175 King Street East consists of a quadrangular lot on the north side of King Street East between Fairview Avenue and East Bend Avenue. The residential structure consists of a 2½-storey vernacular Edwardian house with a two-bay façade. The adjacent properties on the north and south side of King Street East are made up of a variety of residential and commercial uses, and include many other examples of this housing type. The streets north of the subject property, including Fairview Avenue and East Bend Avenue, consist of predominantly single-detached homes that were built as wartime housing.

10.3 Formal Recognition

The property was identified in the December 2016 CHSR as not being subject to any heritage recognitions. However, consultation with the City of Hamilton in January and February 2017 confirmed that the property is now listed on the City’s Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.
### 11. Data Sheet

**Table 11-1: Data Sheet for 1175 King Street East**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>PROPERTY DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Address</td>
<td>1175 King Street East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Area (square metres)</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Corridor</td>
<td>Hamilton LRT B-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN</td>
<td>172260119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerial photo showing location and boundaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exterior, street-view photo**

**Date of construction of built resources**

c. 1915
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>PROPERTY DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(known or estimated and source)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of significant alterations to built</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resources (known or estimated and source)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect/designer/builder</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous owners or occupants</td>
<td>Various residential tenants throughout 20th century (See Section 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current function</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous function(s)</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Recognition/Protection</td>
<td>Listed on City’s Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(municipal, provincial, federal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Heritage Interest</td>
<td>Listed on City’s Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Lands</td>
<td>1173 King Street East and 1177 King Street East are listed on the City’s Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude or UTM Northing</td>
<td>43.24746°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitude or UTM Easting</td>
<td>-79.82753°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Photographs
Photograph 1: View north along King Street East of the subject property, second from left (AECOM, 2017)

Photograph 2: façade of 1175 King Street East (AECOM, 2017)
13. Figures

All figures pertaining to this CHER can be found on the following pages.
Figure 1: Location of 1175 King Street East
Figure 2: Aerial Photograph showing the area surrounding 1175 King Street East
Figure 3: Location of 1175 King Street East on the 1875 Historical Atlas Map (Page & Smith, 1875)
Figure 4: Location of 1175 King Street East on the 1905 NTS Map
Figure 5: Location of 1175 King Street East on the 1938 NTS Map
14. **Chronology**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1791</td>
<td>Barton Township was surveyed by Augustus Jones; the first settler arrived in the township.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792</td>
<td>Province of Upper Canada divided into administrative districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td>Home District was divided and reorganized. As part of the reorganization, Wentworth was reorganized and included within the Gore District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Gore District was divided and Halton and Wentworth Counties were created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>The Hamilton Street Railway was incorporated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Lot 6, Concession II on which 1175 King Street East sits has undergone significant urban development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>The TH&amp;B was first conceived as a rail line to connect Toronto to Fort Erie and Buffalo, New York through the City of Hamilton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>The management of the TH&amp;B secured an amalgamation with the already constructed Brantford, Waterloo &amp; Lake Erie Railway (BW&amp;LER) which operated a line between Brantford and Fort Erie. A year later the companies were combined and officially known as the TH&amp;B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Twelve miles of the Hamilton Street Railway was electrified and cars were updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>The TH&amp;B opened a link between Hamilton and Brantford.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>The first tenant listed at 1175 King Street East was Ernest Myers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>The TH&amp;B completed a grade separation project, including the construction of a new station and corporate offices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1970</td>
<td>TH&amp;B eventually came under the control of the Michigan Central Railway, the New York Central Railway, the Penn Central Railway, and eventually Conrail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1970</td>
<td>The Hamilton City Directory lists Mrs. A. Pleprzak as the tenant of 1175 King Street East.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1945</td>
<td>The Hamilton Street Railway was sold to Canada Coach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>Streetcars were removed from service and replaced with electric bus trolleys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>Conrail’s interest in the TH&amp;B was sold to the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>TH&amp;B was fully integrated into the CPR system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Executive Summary

AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by Metrolinx to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) for the property at 1175 King Street East, in the City of Hamilton, Ontario. This work is being completed as part of the Hamilton Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project.

The Hamilton LRT Project B-Line alignment extends from McMaster University at Cootes Drive to the Main Street/Highway 403 Bridge. A proposed LRT-only bridge will allow the alignment to then extend along King Street West until King East Street intersects with Main Street East, where the alignment will continue along Main Street East to the Queenston Road traffic circle. As a part of the project, it is anticipated that building impacts may take place on the property at 1175 King Street East.

The project impacts will be assessed following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), as prescribed in Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 231/08, Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings under the Environmental Assessment Act. As part of the TPAP Amendment, an Environmental Project Report (EPR) Amendment will be prepared for public review.

The CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Interim Cultural Heritage Management Process and utilizes the criteria in Ontario Regulation 9/06 and Ontario Regulation 10/06, as required by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport’s (MTCS) Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (2010). In addition, the CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Draft Terms of Reference for Consultants: Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations. Consequently the recommendations as they relate to this CHER and the potential cultural heritage value or interest of the property at 1175 King Street East are contained in a separate Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations (CHERR) document.

As part of the reporting requirements for the Hamilton LRT Project, Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) undertook a Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) for the alignment. The CHSR identified the requirement to conduct a CHER for the property located at 1175 King Street East to assess the potential cultural heritage value or interest of the properties. Where applicable, relevant background information has been utilized from the CHSR for project consistency.

1175 King Street East was historically located on the west side of Lot 6, Concession II in Barton Township, when the crown survey for the township was undertaken. By 1875, the lot had been subdivided, and the subject property was located within a part of the lot belonging to an R.R. Gage. No structures are shown on the lot at this time. The surrounding properties east and west of the lot were also owned by members of the Gage family, with isolated structures shown amongst various orchards.

By the beginning of the 20th century, historical topographic mapping indicates that urban development was underway and the area surrounding the 1175 King Street East property had become populated with brick and wooden structures along King Street East and the surrounding side streets. By the 1930s, Lot 6, Concession II was completely subdivided into parcels separated by small side streets and numerous buildings.

Historical Fire Insurance Plans and Hamilton City Directories indicate that by 1915, a 2 ½-storey brick dwelling was located on the property. The property’s first resident in 1915 was Ernest Myers. The property continued to be used for residential purposes throughout the 20th century with a number of
different residents living in the dwelling between 1915 and 1970. The longest resident was a Mrs. A. Pleprzak who occupied the house from the 1940s into the 1970s.

Field review confirmed that the house remains under use as a private residence with no notable changes to the original appearance from ca. 1915.

The field review of the privately owned property at 1175 King Street East was undertaken on January 12, 2017 and February 3, 2017 by Michael Greguol and Emily Game of AECOM. An assessment was not completed on the interior of the structure due to the timing constraints for the TPAP Amendment.

The application of O.Reg 9/06 and O.Reg. 10/06 concluded that 1175 King Street East does not meet O.Reg. 9/06 or O.Reg. 10/06, as it did not satisfy any of the nine criteria. Therefore, this CHERR recommends that the property at 1175 King Street East is not considered a Provincial Heritage Property (PHP).
2. Ontario Regulation 9/06 Evaluation

Ontario Regulation 9/06, Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (O. Reg. 9/06) provides criteria to apply to a potential heritage property to evaluate its heritage value. If a privately-owned property meets one or more of the following criteria it may be designated by a municipality under Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act. For the purposes of this CHER, O. Reg. 9/06 considers the evaluation of the property as part of the community context. The Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties state that a property may be considered a Provincial Heritage Property (PHP) if it meets one or more of the criteria under O. Reg. 9/06. The application of the criteria for 1175 King Street East is included in Table 2-1 below.

Table 2-1: O.Reg. 9/06 Evaluation for 1175 King Street East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Response (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) The property has design or physical value because it:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Is a rare, unique, representative, or early example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The structure located on the property at 1175 King Street East is a common example of an early/mid-20th century 2½-storey vernacular Edwardian house. This form is commonly found throughout Hamilton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit; or</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property is of common design and does not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property is a common residential structure and does not display a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The property has historic or associative value because it:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The historic research undertaken for this CHER did not identify any significant people, events, or organizations that are directly related to or associated with the property, and could contribute to the potential cultural heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Response (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Yields, or has the potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture; or</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property does not have potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a community.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>A specific architect or builder for the property could not be determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The property has <em>contextual value</em> because it:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property at 1175 King Street East forms a component of the larger residential block on the north side of King Street East. However, it is not important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings; or</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The building is one of a series of early 20th century buildings located along this portion of King Street East. Although it has been a part of the streetscape since 1915, it does not appear to be physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Is a landmark.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property at 1175 King Street East is not considered a landmark.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. Ontario Regulation 10/06 Evaluation

*Ontario Regulation 10/06, Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest of Provincial Significance* (O. Reg. 10/06), provides criteria against which to assess a property to determine if the property holds provincial heritage significance. The *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties* state that Ministries and prescribed public bodies shall apply the criteria in O. Reg. 10/06 to determine whether a property is of provincial significance. Therefore, for the purpose of this CHER O. Reg 10/06 considers the evaluation of the property as a part of the provincial context. If the property meets the criteria, it may be considered a Provincial Heritage Property of Provincial Significance (PHPPS). The application of the criteria for 1175 King Street East is in Table 3-1, below.

**Table 3-1: O.Reg. 10/06 Evaluation for 1175 King Street East**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Response (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The property represents or demonstrates a theme or pattern in Ontario’s history.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1175 King Street East does not represent a theme or pattern in Ontario’s history. Residential structures similar to this are found throughout towns and cities in Ontario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The property yields, or had the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of Ontario’s history.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1175 King Street East does not yield, and is not anticipated to yield information that contributes to an understanding of Ontario’s history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The property demonstrates an uncommon, rare, or unique aspect of Ontario’s cultural heritage.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1175 King Street East does not demonstrate an uncommon, rare, or unique aspect of Ontario’s cultural heritage. The form and massing of the structures are commonly found in Ontario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The property is of aesthetic, visual, or contextual importance to the province.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1175 King Street East property is not of aesthetic, visual, or contextual importance to the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The property demonstrates a high degree of excellence or creative, technical, or scientific achievement at a provincial level in a given period.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1175 King Street East does not demonstrate a high degree of excellence or creative, technical, or scientific achievement at a provincial level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Response (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The property has a strong or special association with the entire province or with a community that is found in more than one part of the province.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1175 King Street East does not have a strong or special association with the entire province or with a community that is found in more than one part of the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The property has a strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organization of importance to the province or with an event of importance to the province.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1175 King Street East does not have strong or special associations with the life or work of a person, group, or organization of importance to the province or with an event of importance to the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The property is located in an unorganized territory and the Minister determines that there is a provincial interest in the protection of the property.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1175 King Street East is not located in an unorganized territory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Recommended Outcome of Evaluation**

The application of O.Reg 9/06 and O.Reg. 10/06 concluded that 1175 King Street East does not meet O.Reg. 9/06 or O.Reg. 10/06, as it did not satisfy any of the nine criteria. Therefore, this CHERR recommends that the property at 1175 King Street East is not considered a Provincial Heritage Property (PHP).

As a result, a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and Heritage Attributes have not been prepared for this property.
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1. Executive Summary

AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by Metrolinx to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) for the property at 1185 King Street East, in the City of Hamilton, Ontario. This work is being completed as part of the Hamilton Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project.

The Hamilton LRT Project B-Line alignment extends from McMaster University at Cootes Drive to the Main Street/Highway 403 Bridge. A proposed LRT-only bridge will allow the alignment to then extend along King Street West until King East Street intersects with Main Street East, where the alignment will continue along Main Street East to the Queenston Road traffic circle. As a part of the project, it is anticipated that building impacts may take place on the property at 1185 King Street East (Figure 1).

The project impacts will be assessed following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), as prescribed in Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 231/08, Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings under the Environmental Assessment Act. As part of the TPAP Amendment, an Environmental Project Report (EPR) Amendment will be prepared for public review.

The CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Interim Cultural Heritage Management Process and utilizes the criteria in Ontario Regulation 9/06 and Ontario Regulation 10/06, as required by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport’s (MTCS) Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (2010). In addition, the CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Draft Terms of Reference for Consultants: Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations. Consequently the recommendations as they relate to this CHER and the potential cultural heritage value or interest of the properties at 1185 King Street East are contained in a separate Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations (CHERR) document.

As part of the reporting requirements for the Hamilton LRT Project, Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) undertook a Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) for the alignment. The CHSR identified the requirement to conduct a CHER for the property located at 1185 King Street East to assess the potential cultural heritage value or interest of the properties. Where applicable, relevant background information has been utilized from the CHSR for project consistency.

1185 King Street East was historically located on the west side of Lot 6, Concession II in Barton Township, when the crown survey for the township was undertaken. By 1875, the lot had been subdivided, and the subject property was located within a part of the lot belonging to an R.R. Gage. No structures are shown on the lot in 1875. The surrounding properties east and west of the lot were also owned by members of the Gage family, with isolated structures shown amongst various orchards (Figure 3).

The property at 1185 King Street East consists of a quadrangular lot on the northeast corner of King Street East and East Bend Avenue. The structure, which has been much altered, consists of a 1½-storey rough-cast frame dwelling with a two bay façade. The term rough-cast is used to describe a very coarse form of stucco incorporating cement and small pebbles, used to protect less durable building materials. The wood frame structure was originally rough-cast on the first floor, but is now clad in aluminum and vinyl siding. The structure stands on a textured concrete block foundation. It has a side gable roof with a large shed dormer on the street façade.
By the beginning of the 20th century, historic topographical mapping indicates that urban development was underway and the area surrounding the 1185 King Street East property had become populated with brick and wooden structures along King Street East and the surrounding side streets (Figure 4). By the 1930s, Lot 6, Concession II was completely subdivided into parcels separated by small side streets and numerous buildings (Figure 5).

Historic Fire Insurance Plans and Hamilton City Directories indicate that by 1920, a 1½-storey rough-cast frame dwelling was located on the property. The property’s first resident was R.J. Stirling. The property continued to be used for residential purposes throughout the 20th century with a number of different residents living in the dwelling between 1920 and 1970. The 1930 Hamilton City Directory indicated that two residents occupied the building, and in 1950, two residents occupied 1185 King Street East again. After, this time, only single occupants were listed in the building.

Field review confirmed that the property remains under use as a private residence.

The field review of the privately owned property at 1185 King Street East was undertaken on January 12, 2017 and February 3, 2017 by Michael Greguol and Emily Game of AECOM. An assessment was not completed on the interior of the structure due to the timing constraints for the TPAP Amendment.
2. Introduction

2.1 Historical Summary

2.1.1 Context

The subject property is located within the municipal boundaries of the City of Hamilton, Ontario. Prior to the incorporation of the current municipality, the property was located within the boundaries of Barton Township, in Wentworth County.

2.1.2 Wentworth County

As part of the establishment of Upper Canada, the province was divided into administrative Districts in 1792. Wentworth County was one of several counties that made up the Home District. It was named in honour of Sir John Wentworth, Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia from 1792-1808. In 1816, the Home District was divided and reorganized and Wentworth County was included in the Gore District. By 1849, the original district system was abolished and replaced by a county council system and Wentworth County became an independent political entity. Townships that were included in Wentworth County at one time or another included Ancaster, Barton, Beverly, Binbrook, Caistor, Flamborough East and West, Glanford, Onondaga, Saltfleet, and Seneca. Between 1850 and 1854, Wentworth and Halton Counties were joined for government purposes into the United Counties of Wentworth and Halton. In 1973, Wentworth County was renamed the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth and, in 2001, was amalgamated with six constituent municipalities into the City of Hamilton. The City of Hamilton has remained as the administrative seat or county town since the original creation of the Gore District nearly two centuries ago.

2.1.3 Barton Township

Barton Township is described in detail in the Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth of 1875. The Township of Barton was surveyed in 1791 by Augustus Jones using the Single-Front survey system used by the colonial government between 1783 and 1818. The survey was made up of concessions separated by road allowances. The concession was divided into lots of 200 acres and sideroad allowances were surveyed after every fifth lot. The first settlers arrived in Barton Township in 1791, many of whom were United Empire Loyalists or disbanded troops. The settlement of Barton Township began slowly, with only 102 families living in the township by 1815; most of the settlement was concentrated at the foot of the Niagara Escarpment. The township continued to grow and by 1823 it contained one sawmill and three gristmills. By 1841, the population grew to 1,434. Barton Township was later amalgamated into the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth, which today is known as the City of Hamilton.

---

2 D'Arcy Boulton. Sketch of His Majesty's Province of Upper Canada. (London: C. Rickaby. 1805), pp. 48-49.
2.2 Description of Property

The property at 1185 King Street East consists of a quadrangular lot on the northeast corner of King Street East and East Bend Avenue (Photograph 1). The structure has been much altered and consists of a 1½-storey rough-cast frame dwelling with a two bay façade. The wood frame structure was originally rough-cast on the first floor, but is now clad in aluminum and vinyl siding (Photograph 2). The term rough-cast is used to describe a very coarse form of stucco incorporating cement and small pebbles, used to protect less durable building materials. The structure stands on a textured concrete block foundation (Photograph 3). It has a side gable roof with a large shed dormer on the street façade.

2.3 Current Context

The property is situated on the northeast corner of King Street East and East Bend Avenue. The structure is one of a series of six early 20th century houses that extend across this block. The properties to the west consist of 1, 2 and 2½-storey houses, all of varying designs and primarily of brick construction. The row of houses on the south side of King Street on this block are similar and consist of predominantly single-detached homes that appear to have been developed in the early and mid-20th century. The Canadian Pacific Railway corridor is located approximately 30 metres (m) east of the subject property.
3. Methodology and Sources

3.1 Study Approach

This CHER was prepared in accordance with Metrolinx’s *Interim Cultural Heritage Management Process* (Fall 2013) and the MTCS *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties* (2010). The CHER was also undertaken according to the guidelines presented in the Metrolinx document, *Draft Terms of Reference for Consultants: Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations* (April 2016) and outlined in the following tasks:

- Research and Documentation Gathering – gathered from various sources including existing heritage studies, Metrolinx records, public archives, and published materials;
- Writing – an illustrated report based on gathered background history and site investigation materials, and the application of O.Reg. 9/06 and 10/06; Evaluation, Recommendations, and Statement of Cultural Heritage Value – a summary of the applicable evaluation, and recommendations regarding whether the property meets the criteria for being a provincial heritage property, a provincial heritage property of provincial significance, or neither.

As outlined in the Draft Terms of Reference, the heritage evaluation is separated into two stand-alone components: a CHER and a CHERR. The Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report includes research conducted for the CHER and is intended to address the criteria set out in O.Regs 9/06 and 10/06. The CHERR includes the results of the applied evaluation, and the recommended outcome of the evaluation.

Michael Greguol, Cultural Heritage Specialist, and Emily Game, Heritage Researcher for AECOM, conducted a site investigation to visually inspect and document the property on January 12 and February 3, 2017. An assessment was not completed on the interior of the structure due to the timing constraints for the TPAP Amendment.

3.2 Secondary Sources

A series of secondary sources were reviewed for the purposes of data collection and analysis as part of the CHER. The relevant guidelines and reference documents cited above served as a framework for undertaking the study. The *Hamilton Light Rail Transit Cultural Heritage Screening Report, City of Hamilton, Ontario* (CHSR) prepared by ASI in December 2016, provided a preliminary review of the rail corridor and the potential heritage properties identified along the corridor. Background information and applicable research was gathered from the report for the purposes of the CHER. In addition, a series of published materials including published histories pertaining to the history of Hamilton were consulted. A complete list of the sources reviewed for the report is contained in Section 15 (Bibliography).

3.3 Primary Sources

Where available, primary source material was consulted to provide a historical context for the evaluation of the potential heritage value of the property. Primary source research was undertaken at the Local...
History and Archives Department of the Hamilton Public Library, the Mills Memorial Library at McMaster University, and at the Map and Data Centre at the University of Western Ontario. A review of the following primary sources aided in the evaluation of the structure at 1185 King Street East:

- Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth, 1875;
- Hamilton City Directories, issues 1920-1970;
- Fire Insurance Plans, 1927 (rev. 1933) -1960; and,
- National Topographic Series, 1905-1938.

### 3.4 Consultations

As part of the identification of recognized and potential cultural heritage resources for the CHSR, ASI undertook consultation with the City of Hamilton, the Ontario Heritage Trust (OHT) and the MTCS. Consultation during the CHSR process took place between August and October, 2016.

As part of this CHER, AECOM undertook property-specific consultation with the same municipal and provincial staff and agencies in order to identify or confirm any existing heritage recognitions or interest in the subject property.

The following individuals and organizations were consulted:

- Thomas Wicks, Heritage Planner, OHT;
- Chelsey Tyers, Cultural Heritage Planner, City of Hamilton;
- Asyia Patel, Assistant Cultural Heritage Planner, City of Hamilton; and,
- Rosi Zirger, Heritage Planner, MTCS.

The results of the consultation efforts have been summarized in Section 7 (Community Input).
4. Heritage Recognitions

4.1 Municipal

As a review of applicable municipal heritage recognitions for the property or adjacent properties, AECOM reviewed the City of Hamilton’s heritage inventories. The following inventories and registers were reviewed:

- Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 1: List of Designated Properties and Heritage Conservation Easements under the Ontario Heritage Act; and,
- Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 2: Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.

Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 1 consists of a listing of properties that have been designated by municipal by-law. The volume includes properties that have been designated under Parts IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act. In addition, the volume also identifies properties for which the City of Hamilton holds a Heritage Easement.

Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 2 is a compilation of the inventories of heritage structures and places of the six former municipalities that now make up the City of Hamilton. This volume contains approximately 7,000 properties that are of potential heritage interest, or value, but that are not formally protected under the Ontario Heritage Act. The Inventory is publically available; however, it is one that evolves over time and properties are added on a case-by-case basis, determined by staff at the City.

Consultation efforts were undertaken to confirm levels of municipal heritage recognition, if any. The property was identified in the December 2016 CHSR as not being subject to any heritage recognitions. However, consultation with the City of Hamilton in January and February 2017 confirmed that the property is now listed on the City’s Inventory of Building of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.

4.2 Provincial

As a review of applicable provincial heritage recognitions for the property or adjacent properties AECOM reviewed the OHT’s Provincial Plaque Guide, and list of OHT easements. The property at 1185 King Street East is neither the subject of a provincial plaque nor a provincial easement. In addition, OHT staff was contacted to review the Ontario Heritage Act Register to confirm that the property is not included on the register and that an OHT easement does not exist for the property.

A response from Thomas Wicks, Heritage Planner for the OHT confirmed that the Trust does not hold a conservation easement for 1185 King Street East.

Rosi Zirger, Heritage Planner for the MTCS also confirmed on March 10, 2017 that the property is not included on the MTCS list of provincial heritage properties and the MTCS is not aware of any previous evaluations related to the property.
4.3 Federal

As a review of applicable federal heritage recognitions for the property or adjacent properties, AECOM reviewed the online searchable database for the Canadian Register of Historic Places as well as the Directory of Federal Heritage Designations. 1185 King Street East and the adjacent properties are not subject to any existing federal heritage recognitions.
5. Adjacent Lands

The properties adjacent to 1185 King Street East consist of predominantly single-detached homes that appear to have been developed in the early and mid-20th century.

Consultation with the City of Hamilton indicated that the adjacent property at 1183 King Street East is listed on the City’s Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.
6. Archaeology

ASI completed a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (AA) as part of the Rapid Transit Initiative and found that the property at 1185 King Street East did not retain archaeological potential and confirmed that no known archaeological assessments have previously been completed within 50 m of the property. Consequently, at the time of production of the ASI report, no archaeological sites had been identified within or adjacent to the property. Additionally, the ASI Stage 1 AA indicates that there is no land that retains archaeological potential within 50 m of 1185 King Street East.

The results of the Stage 1 AA determined that a Stage 2 AA must be conducted for all land identified as retaining archaeological potential that will be impacted by the proposed Rapid Transit Initiative. Based on this assessment, ASI made the following recommendations:

- The King Street right-of-way (ROW) does not retain archaeological potential due to previous land disturbance. An additional AA is not required within the ROW and those portions of the study corridor can be cleared of further archaeological concern; and,

- A Stage 2 AA should be conducted on lands determined to have archaeological potential if the proposed project is to impact these lands. This work must be done in accordance with the MTCS’ Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Ontario Government 2011) in order to identify any archaeological remains that may be present.

It should be noted that ASI’s recommendations for Stage 2 archaeological work references the MCL’s 2006 draft Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MCL 2006); however, further Stage 2 archaeological work must now be conducted in accordance with current archaeological standards and guidelines (Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists, Ontario Government 2011). For complete details regarding the results of the Stage 1 AA, reference should be made to the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment, Rapid Transit Initiative, City of Hamilton, Ontario (February 2009).
7. Community Input

As part of the consultation process for this report, AECOM undertook consultation with the City of Hamilton, the MTCS, and the OHT. The results of the consultation efforts are identified below in Table 7-1.

Table 7-1: Community Input and Consultation Undertaken for 1185 King Street East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chelsey Tyers, Heritage Planner</td>
<td>905-546-2424 ext. 1202 <a href="mailto:chelsey.tyers@hamilton.ca">chelsey.tyers@hamilton.ca</a></td>
<td>February 1, 2017</td>
<td>The City of Hamilton confirmed that 1185 King Street East is listed on the City’s Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asiya Patel, Assistant Cultural</td>
<td>905-546-2424 ext. 7163 <a href="mailto:asiya.patel@hamilton.ca">asiya.patel@hamilton.ca</a></td>
<td>February 23, 2017</td>
<td>(Response)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Planner City of Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Wicks, Heritage Planner</td>
<td>416-314-5972 <a href="mailto:thomas.wicks@heritagetrust.on.ca">thomas.wicks@heritagetrust.on.ca</a></td>
<td>February 1, 2017</td>
<td>The OHT confirmed that the properties are not subject to an OHT conservation easement nor is it on their register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Heritage Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td>February 9, 2017</td>
<td>(Response)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosi Zirger, Heritage Planner</td>
<td>416-314-7159 <a href="mailto:rosi.zirger@ontario.ca">rosi.zirger@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td>February 1, 2017</td>
<td>The MTCS confirmed that the property is not included on the MTCS list of provincial heritage properties and the MTCS is not aware of any previous evaluations related to the property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and</td>
<td></td>
<td>March 10, 2017</td>
<td>(Response)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Discussion of Historical or Associative Value

8.1 Historic Theme/Cultural Pattern

8.1.1 Transportation

The earliest roads in Ontario were typically military roads or colonization roads. These roads often followed aboriginal hunting trails or were dictated by the topography of the land which they crossed. The Dundas Road was opened to connect Toronto with the Thames River, in what is now London, Ontario, and the Kingston Road was designed to provide a military link between Toronto and Kingston. The Kingston Road was one of the earliest and still functioning roads in southern Ontario.

Following the Crown surveys in Ontario, concession and side roads were opened on a grid that was dictated by the survey type that was used. The roads were cleared and made passable by the early land owners who built their dwellings adjacent to the concession roads. Despite being cleared, road conditions were often poor until the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The crown surveys, and later surveys of town and city plots were laid out in grid-like manners, which has left a visible imprint on rural and urban street grids today. Much of the pattern of these surveys can be seen in the grids of cities and townships in Ontario. Within Hamilton, this is visible in the parallel city streets and grid layout of the downtown core and outlying areas. Nonetheless, King Street has a visible curve in its orientation, swinging north just east of Wellington Street before swinging south again around Barnesdale Avenue. This curvature in the road is visible on historic maps of the township and can be attributed to its history as an indigenous trail that pre-dates European settlement in the Hamilton area. The historic trail has left a visible footprint on the early 19th century grid of the City.

Railway transportation, both passenger and freight, greatly improved the transportation network in Ontario beginning in the mid-1800s. The opening of the Grand Trunk Railway (GTR) between Montreal and Toronto in 1856 provided a link between the two cities and provinces that was more easily travelled in comparison to mid-19th century roads. The construction of the route from Montreal to Toronto, and then on to Sarnia by the end of the 1860s resulted in the construction of significant structures such as the Victoria Bridge over the St. Lawrence River, and the St. Clair Tunnel in Sarnia. The GTR was designed to enhance the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes shipping routes in response to the railroads and shipping networks in the United States. As a result it also strengthened the connection and link between the townships, and municipal and provincial economies in Ontario.

Various railway companies were formed in Ontario to create a vast network of rail lines that spread throughout the province by the early 20th century. Nonetheless, most of the companies were eventually merged with or purchased by the Canadian National Railway (CN) or the Canadian Pacific Railway (CP).

8.1.2 Railways

The former Toronto, Hamilton, and Buffalo Railway (TH&B) passes under King Street West approximately 20 metres east of the subject property. The TH&B was first conceived in March 1884 as a
rail line to connect Toronto to Fort Erie and Buffalo, New York through the City of Hamilton. However, as with many of the early railways in North America, funding became an issue from the beginning. In 1891, the management of the TH&B secured an amalgamation with the already constructed Brantford, Waterloo & Lake Erie Railway (BW&LER) which operated a line between Brantford and Fort Erie. By 1892, the companies were combined and became officially known as the TH&B.

A year later the railway was purchased by a series of major railway companies, most of which was based on American interest, and by 1895 a link between Hamilton and Brantford was opened. The first few decades of the 20th century resulted in a series of spurs and belt lines being constructed by the railway, as well as amalginations with smaller railway companies, characteristic of 19th and 20th century railway business.

Within the City of Hamilton, the TH&B and City Council wrestled with the issues of grade separation, which ultimately resulted in an agreement in 1930 for the two parties to construction a grade separation in order to prevent long trains from blocking city streets. The project was completed in 1933, including the construction of a new station and corporate offices. Between the 1930s and 1970s, the TH&B came under the control of the Michigan Central Railway, the New York Central Railway, the Penn Central Railway, and eventually Conrail. However, as of 1977, Conrail’s interest in the TH&B was sold to the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR), and by 1987 the TH&B was fully integrated into the CPR system.

### 8.1.3 Hamilton Street Railway

In 1873, the City of Hamilton incorporated the Hamilton Street Railway; the horse-drawn streetcar service began in May 1874 with six operating cars. The line extended along three miles of track from the GTR’s passenger station east along Stuart Street South to James Street. The line travelled south to Gore Park and then east along King Street to Wellington Street. Due to popularity of the service, additional cars were added and the track was extended. New track was laid west along King Street to Locke Street and east to Wentworth Street.

The electrification process of the Hamilton Street Railway began in March 1892. A total of 12 miles of track were electrified and 15 horsecars were converted to electric street cars. Operation of the newly-electrified cars began on June 29, 1892.

At the end of the Second World War, Hamilton Street Railway sold the lines to Canada Coach for $1.4 million. Immediately following the sale, Canada Coach announced plans to replace the street car service with busses. By 1951, the last street car was removed from service and replaced by electric trolley busses.3

The proposed B-Line follows the old streetcar route from King Street near McMaster University to Sherman Avenue. The original line turned south along Sherman Avenue and then continued east on Main Street to Kenilworth Avenue North. The B-Line will carry on King Street east of Sherman Avenue until it reconnects with Main Street East at the Delta and proceeds to the Queenston Road traffic circle.

The present-day Hamilton transit company operates under the name of Hamilton Street Railway Company.

8.2 Local History

1185 King Street East is located within the City of Hamilton, Ontario. Historically the structure was located within Lot 6, Concession II, Barton Township in Wentworth County. The subsections below include historic information related to the settlement and growth of these areas.

8.2.1 Settlement History

As part of the establishment of Upper Canada, the province was divided into administrative Districts in 1792. As such, Wentworth County was one of several counties that made up the Home District. It was named in honour of Sir John Wentworth, Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia from 1792-1808. In 1816, the Home District was divided and reorganized and Wentworth County was included in the Gore District. By 1849, the original district system was abolished and replaced by a county council system and Wentworth County became an independent political entity. Townships that were included in Wentworth County at one time or another included Ancaster, Barton, Beverly, Binbrook, Caistor, Flamborough East and West, Glanford, Onondaga, Saltfleet, and Seneca. Between 1850 and 1854, Wentworth and Halton Counties were joined for government purposes into the United Counties of Wentworth and Halton; however, this change was short-lived. In 1973, Wentworth County was renamed the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth and, in 2001, was amalgamated with six constituent municipalities into the City of Hamilton. The City of Hamilton has remained as the administrative seat or county town since the original creation of the Gore District nearly two centuries ago.

Barton Township is described in detail in the Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth of 1875. The Township of Barton was surveyed in 1791 by Augustus Jones using the Single-Front survey system used by the colonial government between 1783 and 1818. The survey was made up of concessions separated by road allowances. The concession was divided into lots of 200 acres and sideroad allowances were surveyed after every fifth lot. The first settlers arrived in Barton Township in 1791, many of whom were United Empire Loyalists or disbanded troops. The Settlement of Barton Township began slowly, with only 102 families living in the township by 1815. Most of the settlement was concentrated at the foot of the Niagara Escarpment. The township continued to grow and by 1823 it contained one sawmill and three gristmills. By 1841, the population had grown to 1,434.

8.2.2 Site History

1185 King Street East was historically located on the west side of Lot 6, Concession II in Barton Township, when the crown survey for the township was undertaken. By 1875, the lot had been subdivided, with the current location of the property located within a part belonging to a R.R. Gage. No structures are shown on the lot at this time, and the surrounding properties east and west of the lot were also owned by members of the Gage family, with isolated structures shown amongst various orchards (Figure 3).

By the beginning of the 20th century, historic topographical mapping indicates that urban development was underway and the area surrounding the 1185 property had become more populated with brick and wooden structures along King Street East and the surrounding side streets (Figure 4). By the 1930s, Lot 6, Concession II was completely subdivided into parcels separated by small side streets and numerous buildings (Figure 5).

Historic Fire Insurance Plans Hamilton City Directories indicate that by 1920, a 1½-storey rough-cast frame dwelling was located on the property. The property’s first resident was R.J. Stirling. The property continued to be used for residential purposes throughout the 20th century with a number of different
residents living in the dwelling between 1920 and 1970. The 1930 Hamilton City Directory indicated that two residents occupied the building at this time, and two residents appeared at 1185 King Street East again in 1950. After, this time, only single occupants were listed in the building.

Most recently, it appears that the residential building remains under use as a private residence.

8.3 Person/Event/Organization

The historic research undertaken for this CHER did not identify any significant people, events, or organizations that are directly related to or associated with the property, and could contribute to the potential cultural heritage interest or value of the property.
9. Discussion of Design or Physical Value

9.1 Style/Type/Tradition

The house located at 1185 King Street East is one of many small houses that were constructed in cities and towns across Ontario, initially to house workers engaged in the war effort and then in the aftermath of the First World War to house returning veterans. They were simple and very basic, intended to get the men back on their feet while they found work and started families (Photograph 4). In Hamilton, thousands of these houses were built in the north east end (Figure 6). In fact, many survive disguised by nearly a century of renovations. A large neighbourhood of these houses still exists roughly between Tim Hortons Field and The Centre Mall.

The structure is a simple vernacular rough-cast frame house with no pretense of style and no defining architectural features, but the type is immediately recognizable.

9.2 Function

The house at 1185 King Street East has always functioned as a private residence since its construction c. 1920. Prior to the construction of the duplex, this section of Lot 6, Concession II appears to have been vacant.

9.3 Fabric

According to the 1927 (rev. 1933) Fire Insurance Maps, 1185 King Street East was constructed of rough-cast frame dwelling. Presently, the entire structure is clad in aluminum and vinyl siding with shingles of modern manufacture; a large shed-roof dormer has been added to the main façade (Photograph 2), and to the rear. The windows sashes consist of aluminum sash and are shaded by modern metal awnings. The house stands on a textured concrete block foundation (Photograph 3).
10. Discussion of Contextual Value

10.1 Social Meaning

The structure located at 1185 Street East is one many houses that were constructed in cities across Ontario. Built during and immediately after the First World War, the property represents a common type of residential house within the City of Hamilton as wartime housing. As an industrial centre, the city participated significantly in the war effort, and required great numbers of workers who needed housing. When the veterans returned, they needed work and a leg up back into society. These small houses played a central role in this process (Photograph 4). Alterations overtime to the exterior of 1185 King Street East have compromised the historic building fabric and the overall appearance of the structure.

10.2 Environment

The property at 1185 King Street East consists of quadrangular lot on the north east corner of King Street East and East Bend Avenue. The structure consists of a one-and-a-half storey rough-cast frame dwelling with a two bay façade. The wood frame structure is clad in vinyl siding and stands on a textured concrete block foundation. It has a side gable roof with a large shed dormer on the street façade, and the rear. The adjacent properties on the north and south side of King Street East are made up of a variety of residential and commercial uses. The streets north of the subject property, including Fairview Avenue and East Bend Avenue, consist of predominantly single-detached homes that were built as wartime housing (Figure 6), unlike the subject property that has become isolated from that context. The subject property is adjacent to properties and structures that are more reminiscent of a variety of architectural styles and eras, while the streets to the north are much more reflective of cohesive wartime housing neighbourhoods.

10.3 Formal Recognition

The property was identified in the December 2016 CHSR as not being subject to any heritage recognitions. However, consultation with the City of Hamilton in January and February 2017 confirmed that the property is now listed on the City’s Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.
## 11. Data Sheet

**Table 11-1: Data Sheet for 1185 King Street East**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>PROPERTY DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Address</td>
<td>1185 King Street East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Area (square metres)</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Corridor</td>
<td>Hamilton LRT B-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN</td>
<td>172260124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerial photo showing location and boundaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior, street-view photo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of construction of built resources (known or estimated and source)</td>
<td>ca. 1920 (Hamilton City Directories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIELD</td>
<td>PROPERTY DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of significant alterations to built resources (known or estimated and source)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect/designer/builder</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous owners or occupants</td>
<td>Various residential occupants from 1920-1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current function</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous function(s)</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Recognition/Protection (municipal, provincial, federal)</td>
<td>Listed on City’s <em>Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Heritage Interest</td>
<td>Listed on City’s <em>Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Lands</td>
<td>No protected heritage properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude or UTM Northing</td>
<td>43.247071.°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitude or UTM Easting</td>
<td>-79.827240°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Photographs
Photograph 1: View to north east along King Street East of subject property, second from the left (AECOM, 2017)

Photograph 2: Façade of 1185 King Street East (AECOM, 2017)
Photograph 3: View showing the east façade on East Bend Avenue (AECOM, 2017)

Photograph 4: Veteran’s house on Campbell Avenue, Hamilton, early 1925 (built 1918; private coll.)
13. Figures

All figures pertaining to this CHER can be found on the following pages.
Figure 1: Location of 1185 King Street East
Figure 2: Aerial Photograph showing the area surrounding 1185 King Street East
Figure 3: Location of 1185 King Street East on the 1875 *Historical Atlas Map* (Page & Smith, 1875)
Figure 4: Location of 1185 King Street East on the 1905 NTS Map
Figure 5: Location of 1185 King Street East on the 1938 NTS Map
Figure 6: 1185 King Street East, 1927 Fire Insurance Plan (rev. 1933), Chas. E. Goad
14. **Chronology**

1791 | Barton Township was surveyed by Augustus Jones; the first settler arrived in the township.
1792 | Province of Upper Canada divided into administrative districts.
1816 | Home District was divided and reorganized. As part of the reorganization, Wentworth was reorganized and included within the Gore District.
1850 | Gore District was divided and Halton and Wentworth Counties were created.
1873 | The Hamilton Street Railway was incorporated.
1875 | Lot 6, Concession II on which 1185 King Street East sits has undergone significant urban development.
1884 | The TH&B was first conceived as a rail line to connect Toronto to Fort Erie and Buffalo, New York through the City of Hamilton.
1891 | The management of the TH&B secured an amalgamation with the already constructed Brantford, Waterloo & Lake Erie Railway (BW&LER) which operated a line between Brantford and Fort Erie. A year later the companies were combined and officially known as the TH&B.
1892 | Twelve miles of the Hamilton Street Railway was electrified and cars were updated.
1895 | The TH&B opened a link between Hamilton and Brantford.
1920 | 1185 King Street East was constructed; the property continued to be used for residential purposes throughout the 20th century with a number of different residents living in the dwelling between 1920 and 1970.
1933 | The TH&B completed a grade separation project, including the construction of a new station and corporate offices.
1930-1970 | TH&B eventually came under the control of the Michigan Central Railway, the New York Central Railway, the Penn Central Railway, and eventually Conrail.
c. 1945 | The Hamilton Street Railway was sold to Canada Coach.
1951 | Streetcars were removed from service and replaced with electric bus trolleys.
1977 | Conrail’s interest in the TH&B was sold to the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR).
1987 | TH&B was fully integrated into the CPR system.
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Statement of Qualifications and Limitations

The attached Report (the "Report") has been prepared by AECOM Canada Ltd. ("AECOM") for the benefit of the Client ("Client") in accordance with the agreement between AECOM and Client, including the scope of work detailed therein (the "Agreement").

The information, data, recommendations and conclusions contained in the Report (collectively, the "Information"):

- is subject to the scope, schedule, and other constraints and limitations in the Agreement and the qualifications contained in the Report (the "Limitations");
- represents AECOM's professional judgement in light of the Limitations and industry standards for the preparation of similar reports;
- may be based on information provided to AECOM which has not been independently verified;
- has not been updated since the date of issuance of the Report and its accuracy is limited to the time period and circumstances in which it was collected, processed, made or issued;
- must be read as a whole and sections thereof should not be read out of such context;
- was prepared for the specific purposes described in the Report and the Agreement; and
- in the case of subsurface, environmental or geotechnical conditions, may be based on limited testing and on the assumption that such conditions are uniform and not variable either geographically or over time.

AECOM shall be entitled to rely upon the accuracy and completeness of information that was provided to it and has no obligation to update such information. AECOM accepts no responsibility for any events or circumstances that may have occurred since the date on which the Report was prepared and, in the case of subsurface, environmental or geotechnical conditions, is not responsible for any variability in such conditions, geographically or over time.

AECOM agrees that the Report represents its professional judgement as described above and that the Information has been prepared for the specific purpose and use described in the Report and the Agreement, but AECOM makes no other representations, or any guarantees or warranties whatsoever, whether express or implied, with respect to the Report, the Information or any part thereof.

Without in any way limiting the generality of the foregoing, any estimates or opinions regarding probable construction costs or construction schedule provided by AECOM represent AECOM's professional judgement in light of its experience and the knowledge and information available to it at the time of preparation. Since AECOM has no control over market or economic conditions, prices for construction labour, equipment or materials or bidding procedures, AECOM, its directors, officers and employees are not able to, nor do they, make any representations, warranties or guarantees whatsoever, whether express or implied, with respect to such estimates or opinions, or their variance from actual construction costs or schedules, and accept no responsibility for any loss or damage arising therefrom or in any way related thereto. Persons relying on such estimates or opinions do so at their own risk.

Except (1) as agreed to in writing by AECOM and Client; (2) as required by-law; or (3) to the extent used by governmental reviewing agencies for the purpose of obtaining permits or approvals, the Report and the Information may be used and relied upon only by Client.

AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to parties other than Client who may obtain access to the Report or the Information for any injury, loss or damage suffered by such parties arising from their use of, reliance upon, or decisions or actions based on the Report or any of the Information ("improper use of the Report"), except to the extent those parties have obtained the prior written consent of AECOM to use and rely upon the Report and the Information. Any injury, loss or damages arising from improper use of the Report shall be borne by the party making such use.

This Statement of Qualifications and Limitations is attached to and forms part of the Report and any use of the Report is subject to the terms hereof.
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AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by Metrolinx to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) for the property at 1185 King Street East, in the City of Hamilton, Ontario. This work is being completed as part of the Hamilton Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project.

The Hamilton LRT Project B-Line alignment extends from McMaster University at Cootes Drive to the Main Street/Highway 403 Bridge. A proposed LRT-only bridge will allow the alignment to then extend along King Street West until King East Street intersects with Main Street East, where the alignment will continue along Main Street East to the Queenston Road traffic circle. As a part of the project, it is anticipated that building impacts may take place on the properties at 1185 King Street East.

The project impacts will be assessed following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), as prescribed in Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 231/08, Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings under the Environmental Assessment Act. As part of the TPAP Amendment, an Environmental Project Report (EPR) Amendment will be prepared for public review.

The CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Interim Cultural Heritage Management Process and utilizes the criteria in Ontario Regulation 9/06 and Ontario Regulation 10/06, as required by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport’s (MTCS) Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (2010). In addition, the CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Draft Terms of Reference for Consultants: Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations. Consequently, the recommendations as they relate to this CHER and the potential cultural heritage value or interest of the properties at 1185 King Street East are contained in a separate Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations (CHERR) document.

As part of the reporting requirements for the Hamilton LRT Project, Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) undertook a Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) for the alignment. The CHSR identified the requirement to conduct a CHER for the property located at 1185 King Street East to assess the potential cultural heritage value or interest of the properties. Where applicable, relevant background information has been utilized from the CHSR for project consistency.

1185 King Street East was historically located on the west side of Lot 6, Concession II in Barton Township, when the crown survey for the township was undertaken. By 1875, the lot had been subdivided, and the subject property was located within a part of the lot belonging to an R.R. Gage. No structures are shown on the lot in 1875. The surrounding properties east and west of the lot were also owned by members of the Gage family, with isolated structures shown amongst various orchards.

The property at 1185 King Street East consists of a quadrangular lot on the northeast corner of King Street East and East Bend Avenue. The structure, which has been much altered, consists of a 1½-storey frame dwelling with a 2-bay façade, standing on a textured concrete block foundation. The term rough-cast is used to describe a very coarse form of stucco incorporating cement and small pebbles, used to protect less durable building materials. The wood frame structure was originally rough-cast on the first floor, but is now clad in vinyl siding. It has a steep side-gable roof with a large shed dormers on the front and rear façades.
By the beginning of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century, historic topographical mapping indicates that urban development was underway and the area surrounding the 1185 King Street East property had become populated with brick and wooden structures along King Street East and the surrounding side streets. By the 1930s, Lot 6, Concession II was completely subdivided into parcels separated by small side streets and numerous buildings.

Historic Fire Insurance Plans and Hamilton City Directories indicate that by 1920, a 1½- storey rough-cast frame dwelling was located on the property. The property’s first resident was R.J. Stirling. The property continued to be used for residential purposes throughout the 20\textsuperscript{th} century with a number of different residents living in the dwelling between 1920 and 1970. The 1930 Hamilton City Directory indicated that two residents occupied the building and in 1950 two residents appeared at 1185 King Street East again. After, this time, only single occupants were listed in the building.

Field review confirmed that the property remains under use as a private residence.

The field review of the privately owned property at 1185 King Street East was undertaken on January 12, 2017 and February 3, 2017 by Michael Greguol and Emily Game of AECOM. An assessment was not completed on the interior of the structure due to the timing constraints for the TPAP Amendment.

The application of O.Reg 9/06 and O.Reg. 10/06 concluded that 1185 King Street East does not meet O.Reg. 9/06 or O.Reg. 10/06, as it did not satisfy any of the nine criteria. Therefore, this CHERR recommends that the property at 1185 King Street East is not considered a Provincial Heritage Property (PHP).
2. Ontario Regulation 9/06 Evaluation

Ontario Regulation 9/06, Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (O. Reg. 9/06) provides criteria to apply to a potential heritage property to evaluate its heritage value. If a privately-owned property meets one or more of the following criteria it may be designated by a municipality under Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act. For the purposes of this CHER, O. Reg. 9/06 considers the evaluation of the property as part of the community context. The Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties state that a property may be considered a Provincial Heritage Property (PHP) if it meets one or more of the criteria under O. Reg. 9/06. The application of the criteria for 1185 King Street East is included in Table 2-1 below.

Table 2-1: O.Reg. 9/06 Evaluation for 1185 King Street East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Response (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) The property has design or physical value because it:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Is a rare, unique, representative, or early example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The structure located at 1185 King Street East is one of many small houses that were constructed in cities and towns across Ontario, initially to house workers engaged in the war effort and then to house veterans after the First World War. The structure is much altered and no longer expresses the character of its type.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit; or</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property is of common design and does not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property is a common residential structure and does not display a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) The property has historic or associative value because it:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The historic research undertaken for this CHER did not identify any significant people, events, or organizations that are directly related to or associated with the property, and could contribute to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Response (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Yields, or has the potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture; or</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property does not have potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a community.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>A specific architect or builder for the property could not be determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) The property has <em>contextual value</em> because it:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property at 1185 King Street East forms a component of the larger residential block on the north side of King Street East. However, it is not of the same character or type, and is a non-contributing feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings; or</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The building is one of a series of early 20th century buildings located along this portion of King Street East. Although it has been a part of the streetscape since 1920, it does not appear to be physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Is a landmark.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property at 1185 King Street East is not considered a landmark.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. **Ontario Regulation 10/06 Evaluation**

*Ontario Regulation 10/06, Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest of Provincial Significance* (O. Reg. 10/06), provides criteria against which to assess a property to determine if the property holds provincial heritage significance. The *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties* state that Ministries and prescribed public bodies shall apply the criteria in O. Reg. 10/06 to determine whether a property is of provincial significance. Therefore, for the purpose of this CHER O. Reg 10/06 considers the evaluation of the property as a part of the provincial context. If the property meets the criteria, it may be considered a Provincial Heritage Property of Provincial Significance (PHPPS). The application of the criteria for 1185 King Street East is in Table 3-1, below.

### Table 3-1: O.Reg. 10/06 Evaluation for 1185 King Street East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Response (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The property represents or demonstrates a theme or pattern in Ontario’s history.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1185 King Street East does not represent a theme or pattern in Ontario’s history. Residential structures similar to this are found throughout towns and cities in Ontario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The property yields, or had the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of Ontario’s history.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1185 King Street East does not yield, and is not anticipated to yield information that contributes to an understanding of Ontario’s history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The property demonstrates an uncommon, rare, or unique aspect of Ontario’s cultural heritage.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1185 King Street East does not demonstrate an uncommon, rare, or unique aspect of Ontario’s cultural heritage. The form and massing of the structures are commonly found in Ontario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The property is of aesthetic, visual, or contextual importance to the province.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1185 King Street East is not of aesthetic, visual, or contextual importance to the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The property demonstrates a high degree of excellence or creative, technical, or scientific achievement at a provincial level in a given period.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1185 King Street East West does not demonstrate a high degree of excellence or creative, technical, or scientific achievement at a provincial level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The property has a strong or special association with the entire</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1185 King Street East does not have a strong or special</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Response (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>province or with a community that is found in more than one part of the province.</td>
<td></td>
<td>association with the entire province or with a community that is found in more than one part of the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The property has a strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organization of importance to the province or with an event of importance to the province.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1185 King Street East does not have strong or special associations with the life or work of a person, group, or organization of importance to the province or with an event of importance to the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The property is located in an unorganized territory and the Minister determines that there is a provincial interest in the protection of the property.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1185 King Street East is not located in an unorganized territory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Recommended Outcome of Evaluation

The application of O.Reg 9/06 and O.Reg. 10/06 concluded that 1185 King Street East does not meet O.Reg. 9/06 or O.Reg. 10/06, as it did not satisfy any of the nine criteria. Therefore, this CHERR recommends that the property at 1185 King Street East is not considered a Provincial Heritage Property (PHP).

As a result, a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and Heritage Attributes have not been prepared for this property.
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1. Executive Summary

AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by Metrolinx to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) for the property at 668 King Street East (Figure 1), in the City of Hamilton, Ontario. This work is being completed as part of the Hamilton Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project.

The Hamilton LRT Project B-Line alignment extends from McMaster University at Cootes Drive to the Main Street/Highway 403 Bridge. A proposed LRT-only bridge will allow the alignment to then extend along King Street West until King East Street intersects with Main Street East, where the alignment will continue along Main Street East to the Queenston Road traffic circle. As a part of the project, it is anticipated that building impacts may take place on the property at 668 (666) King Street East.

The project impacts will be assessed following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), as prescribed in Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 231/08, Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings under the Environmental Assessment Act. As part of the TPAP Amendment, an Environmental Project Report (EPR) Amendment will be prepared for public review.

The CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Interim Cultural Heritage Management Process and utilizes the criteria in Ontario Regulation 9/06 and Ontario Regulation 10/06, as required by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport’s (MTCS) Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (2010). In addition, the CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Draft Terms of Reference for Consultants: Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations. As such the recommendations as they relate to this CHER and the potential cultural heritage value or interest of the property at 668 (666) King Street East are contained in a separate Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations (CHERR) document.

As part of the reporting requirements for the Hamilton LRT Project, Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) undertook a Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) for the alignment. The CHSR identified the requirement to conduct a CHER for the property located at 668 (666) King Street East to assess the potential cultural heritage value or interest of the properties. Where applicable, relevant background information has been utilized from the CHSR for project consistency.

The property located at 668 (666) King Street East consists of an irregularly shaped lot on the southwest corner of the intersection of King Street and Wentworth Street South, in Hamilton, Ontario. The structure on the property is a former bank building that was purpose-built for the Dominion Bank in the 1920s.

Hamilton City Directories indicate that the existing bank building was constructed in 1922 and occupied both of the previous properties (666 and 668 King Street East). The design drawings by architect Ralph K. Shepard are dated 1921. By 1923, the Dominion Bank was listed as occupying the building. The bank occupied the southwest corner of King Street East and Wentworth Street South for the majority of the 20th century, becoming the Toronto Dominion Bank in 1955.

A field review of the privately owned property at 668 (666) King Street East was undertaken on January 12, 2017 and February 3, 2017 by Michael Greguol and Emily Game of AECOM. An assessment was not completed on the interior of the structures due to the timing constraints for the TPAP Amendment.

The bank building located at 668 (666) King Street East consists of a tall single storey bank building, a modest design in the Classical tradition, which was popularly used for commercial and institutional buildings (Photographs 1 – 3). This specific design derives architectural details from other classicist trends including Art Deco and Beaux Arts which are partially hidden by the stucco finish on the exterior of the building.
2. Introduction

2.1 Historical Summary

2.1.1 Context

The subject property is located within the municipal boundaries of the City of Hamilton, Ontario. Prior to the incorporation of the current municipality, the property was located within the boundaries of Barton Township, in Wentworth County.

2.1.2 Wentworth County

As part of the establishment of Upper Canada, the province was divided into administrative Districts in 1792. As such, Wentworth County was one of several counties that made up the Home District. It was named in honour of Sir John Wentworth, Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia from 1792-1808. In 1816, the Home District was divided and reorganized and Wentworth County was included in the Gore District. By 1849, the original district system was abolished and replaced by a county council system and Wentworth County became an independent political entity. Townships that were included in Wentworth County at one time or another included Ancaster, Barton, Beverly, Binbrook, Caistor, Flamborough East and West, Glanford, Onondaga, Saltfleet, and Seneca. Between 1850 and 1854, Wentworth and Halton Counties were joined for government purposes into the United Counties of Wentworth and Halton; however, this change was short-lived. In 1973, Wentworth County was renamed the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth and, in 2001, was amalgamated with six constituent municipalities into the City of Hamilton. The City of Hamilton has remained as the administrative seat or county town since the original creation of the Gore District nearly two centuries ago.

2.1.3 Barton Township

Barton Township is described in detail in the Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth of 1875. The Township of Barton was surveyed in 1791 by Augustus Jones using the Single-Front survey system used by the colonial government between 1783 and 1818.\(^2\) The survey was made up of concessions separated by road allowances. The concession was divided into lots of 200 acres and sideroad allowances were surveyed after every fifth lot. The first settlers arrived in Barton Township in 1791, many of whom were United Empire Loyalists or disbanded troops. The settlement of Barton Township began slowly, with only 102 families living in the township by 1815; most of the settlement was concentrated at the foot of the Niagara Escarpment. The township continued to grow and by 1823 it contained one sawmill and three gristmills. By 1841, the population grew to 1,434.\(^3\) Barton Township was later amalgamated into the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth, which amalgamated with the “old” city as the City of Hamilton in 2001.

2.2 Description of Property

The property located at 668 (666) King Street East consists of an irregularly shaped lot on the southwest corner of the intersection of King Street and Wentworth Street South, in Hamilton, Ontario. The structure on the property is a former bank building that was purpose-built for the Dominion Bank in the 1920s. The bank building continued to function as a bank throughout the 20th century, becoming the Toronto Dominion Bank in 1955, and then occupied by a printing service in the early-21st century (Figure 2).

The scale and massing of the bank building on the property has remained relatively unaltered from its original construction. The building has occupied the corner lot with frontage that extends on both King Street East and Wentworth Street South. The exterior of the building has undergone some alterations in that its facades along both streets have been stuccoed and painted. It is likely that the brick that is visible on the parapet walls of the building was covered in the late 20th or early 21st century by the existing stucco finish on the structure. Until recently, the upper level of the building above the white section of wall was also covered with an exterior panelling that created a metallic waffle-like pattern on the structure (Photograph 5). Online street imagery indicates that it was removed in 2016 to expose the brick components of the exterior as well as the concrete cornice that wraps around the building.

2.3 Current Context

The property is situated on the south side of King Street East, on the eastern outskirts of downtown Hamilton. The bank building is one of a series of structures located on the south side of King Street that appear to have been built in the early 20th century. Although the properties appear to have all been developed in the same period, the bank building at 668 (666) King Street East is the only property that has not historically included residential premises as well as commercial purposes. The adjacent properties, both on the north side of King Street as well as the properties to the west, contain structures that have been used for commercial uses on the ground floor and residential space above. Much like the property located on the northwest corner of King Street East and Wentworth Street, the structure located at 668 (666) King Street East makes up a significant component of the streetscape at this intersection. Wentworth Street forms a boundary between the largely late 19th early 20th century character in the block to the west from an open, parking-lot dominated streetscape to the east.
3. Methodology and Sources

3.1 Study Approach

This CHER was prepared in accordance with Metrolinx’s *Interim Cultural Heritage Management Process* (Fall 2013) and the MTCS *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties* (2010). The CHER was also undertaken according to the guidelines presented in the Metrolinx document, *Draft Terms of Reference for Consultants: Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations* (April 2016) and outlined in the following tasks:

- Research and Documentation Gathering – gathered from various sources including existing heritage studies, Metrolinx records, public archives, and published materials;
- Writing – an illustrated report based on gathered background history and site investigation materials, and the application of O.Reg. 9/06 and 10/06; Evaluation, Recommendations, and Statement of Cultural Heritage Value – a summary of the applicable evaluation, and recommendations regarding whether the property meets the criteria for being a provincial heritage property, a provincial heritage property of provincial significance, or neither.

As outlined in the Draft Terms of Reference, the heritage evaluation is separated into two stand-alone components: a CHER and a CHERR. The Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report includes research conducted for the CHER and is intended to address the criteria set out in O.Regs 9/06 and 10/06. The CHERR includes the results of the applied evaluation, and the recommended outcome of the evaluation.

Michael Greguol, Cultural Heritage Specialist, and Emily Game, Heritage Researcher for AECOM, conducted a site investigation to visually inspect and document the property on January 12, 2017 and February 3, 2017.

3.2 Secondary Sources

A series of secondary sources were reviewed for the purposes of data collection and analysis as part of the CHER. The relevant guidelines and reference documents cited above served as a framework for undertaking the study. The *Hamilton Light Rail Transit Cultural Heritage Screening Report, City of Hamilton, Ontario* (CHSR) prepared by ASI in December 2016, provided a preliminary review of the rail corridor and the potential heritage properties identified along the corridor. Background information and applicable research was gathered from the report for the purposes of the CHER. In addition, a series of published materials including published histories pertaining to the history of Hamilton were consulted. A complete list of the sources reviewed for the report is contained in Section 15 (Bibliography).

3.3 Primary Sources

Where available, primary source material was consulted to provide a historical context for the evaluation of the potential heritage value of the property. Primary source research was undertaken at the Local History and Archives Department of the Hamilton Public Library, the Mills Memorial Library at McMaster
University, and at the Map and Data Centre at the University of Western Ontario. A review of the following primary sources aided in the evaluation of the structures at 668 (666) King Street East:

- Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth, 1875;
- Hamilton City Directories, issues 1920-1970;
- Fire Insurance Plans, 1911, 1927 revised 1933, and 1964; and,

3.4 Consultations

As part of the identification of recognized and potential cultural heritage resources for the CHSR, ASI undertook consultation with the City of Hamilton, the Ontario Heritage Trust (OHT) and the MTCS. Consultation during the CHSR process took place between August and October, 2016.

As part of this CHER, AECOM undertook property-specific consultation with the same municipal and provincial staff and agencies in order to identify or confirm any existing heritage recognitions or interest in this subject property.

The following individuals and organizations were consulted:

- Thomas Wicks, Heritage Planner, OHT;
- Chelsey Tyers, Cultural Heritage Planner, City of Hamilton;
- Asyia Patel, Assistant Cultural Heritage Planner, City of Hamilton; and,
- Rosi Zirger, Heritage Planner, MTCS.

The results of the consultation efforts have been summarized in Section 7 (Community Input).
4. Heritage Recognitions

4.1 Municipal

As a review of applicable municipal heritage recognitions for the property or adjacent properties, AECOM reviewed the City of Hamilton’s heritage inventories. The following inventories and registers were reviewed:

- Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 1: List of Designated Properties and Heritage Conservation Easements under the Ontario Heritage Act; and,

- Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 2: Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.

Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 1 consists of a listing of properties that have been designated by municipal by-law. The volume includes properties that have been designated under Parts IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act. In addition, the volume also identifies properties for which the City of Hamilton holds a Heritage Easement. Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 2 is a compilation of the inventories of heritage structures and places of the six former municipalities that now make up the City of Hamilton. This volume contains approximately 7,000 properties that are of potential heritage interest, or value, but that are not formally protected under the Ontario Heritage Act. The Inventory is publically available; however, it is one that evolves over time and properties are added on a case-by-case basis, determined by staff at the City.

Consultation efforts were undertaken to confirm levels of municipal heritage recognition, if any. The property was identified in the December 2016 CHSR as not being subject to any heritage recognitions. However, consultation with the City of Hamilton in January and February 2017 confirmed that the property is now listed on the City’s Inventory of Building of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.

4.2 Provincial

As a review of applicable provincial heritage recognitions for the property or adjacent properties AECOM reviewed the OHT’s Provincial Plaque Guide, and list of OHT easements. The property at 668 (666) King Street East is neither the subject of a provincial plaque nor a provincial easement. In addition, OHT staff was contacted to review the Ontario Heritage Act Register to confirm that the property is not included on the register and that an OHT easement does not exist for the property.

A response from Thomas Wicks, Heritage Planner for the OHT confirmed that the Trust does not hold a conservation easement for 668 (666) King Street East.

4.3 Federal

As a review of applicable federal heritage recognitions for the property or adjacent properties, AECOM reviewed the online searchable database for the Canadian Register of Historic Places as well as the
Directory of Federal Heritage Designations. 668 (666) King Street East and the adjacent properties are not subject to any existing federal heritage recognitions.
5. Adjacent Lands

The properties adjacent to 668 (666) King Street East consist primarily of the three-storey multi-use apartment building located at 662-664 King Street East. Much like the bank building, the commercial and residential building built in 1910 at 662-664 King Street East has been a part of the streetscape of this block since the early 20th century. To the south, the parking lot section of 668 (666) King Street East separates the bank building from 16 Wentworth Street South, a residential property that contains a pre-1911 2-storey Queen Anne, Bay-and-Gable structure. A row of similar residential buildings extends south on Wentworth Street, briefly interrupted by a muffler shop, almost to Main Street East.

On the north side of the King Street East, the three-storey, brick commercial and residential building at 665-667 King Street East also forms a substantial component of the streetscape character at this intersection. A single-storey fast food restaurant with no potential cultural heritage value is located on the east side of Wentworth Street South.

Consultation with the City of Hamilton indicated that the adjacent property, 662-664 King Street East, is listed on the City’s Inventory of Building of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.
6. Archaeology

ASI completed a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (AA) as part of the Rapid Transit Initiative and found that the property at 668 (666) King Street East did not retain archaeological potential and confirmed that no known archaeological assessments have previously been completed within 50 metres (m) of the property. Consequently, at the time of production of the ASI report, no archaeological sites had been identified within or adjacent to the property; however, the ASI Stage 1 AA indicates that there is a small area of land that retains archaeological potential within 50 m of 668 (666) King Street East at the northeast corner of the intersection of King Street East and Wentworth Avenue.

The results of the Stage 1 AA determined that a Stage 2 AA must be conducted for all land identified as retaining archaeological potential that will be impacted by the proposed Rapid Transit Initiative. Based on this assessment, ASI made the following recommendations:

- The King Street East right-of-way (ROW) does not retain archaeological potential due to previous land disturbance. An additional AA is not required within the ROW and those portions of the study corridor can be cleared of further archaeological concern; and,

- A Stage 2 AA should be conducted on lands determined to have archaeological potential if the proposed project is to impact these lands. This work must be done in accordance with the MTCS' Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Ontario Government 2011) in order to identify any archaeological remains that may be present.

It should be noted that ASI’s recommendations for Stage 2 archaeological work references the MCL’s 2006 draft Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MCL 2006); however, further Stage 2 archaeological work must now be conducted in accordance with current archaeological standards and guidelines (Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists, Ontario Government 2011). For complete details regarding the results of the Stage 1 AA, reference should be made to the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment, Rapid Transit Initiative, City of Hamilton, Ontario (February 2009).
7. Community Input

As part of the consultation process for this report, AECOM undertook consultation with the City of Hamilton, the MTCS, and the OHT. The results of the consultation efforts are identified below in Table 7-1.

Table 7-1: Community Input and Consultation Undertaken for 668 (666) King Street East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chelsey Tyers, Heritage Planner City of Hamilton</td>
<td>905-546-2424 ext. 1202 <a href="mailto:chelsey.tyers@hamilton.ca">chelsey.tyers@hamilton.ca</a></td>
<td>February 1, 2017</td>
<td>The City of Hamilton confirmed that 668 (666) King Street East is listed on the City’s City’s Inventory of Building of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asiya Patel Assistant Cultural Heritage Planner City of Hamilton</td>
<td>905-546-2424 ext. 7163 <a href="mailto:asiya.patel@hamilton.ca">asiya.patel@hamilton.ca</a></td>
<td>February 6, 2017 (Response)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Wicks Heritage Planner Ontario Heritage Trust</td>
<td>416-314-5972 <a href="mailto:thomas.wicks@heritagetrust.on.ca">thomas.wicks@heritagetrust.on.ca</a></td>
<td>February 1, 2017</td>
<td>The OHT confirmed that the properties are not subject to an OHT conservation easement nor is it on their register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosi Zirger Heritage Planner Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport</td>
<td>416-314-7159 <a href="mailto:rosi.zirger@ontario.ca">rosi.zirger@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td>February 1, 2017</td>
<td>No response.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Discussion of Historical or Associative Value

8.1 Historic Theme/Cultural Pattern

8.1.1 Transportation

The earliest roads in Ontario were typically military roads or colonization roads. These roads often followed aboriginal hunting trails or were dictated by the topography of the land which they crossed. The Dundas Road was opened to connect Toronto with the Thames River, in what is now London, Ontario, and the Kingston Road was designed to provide a military link between Toronto and Kingston. The Kingston Road was one of the earliest and still functioning roads in southern Ontario.

Following the Crown surveys in Ontario, concession and side roads were opened on a grid that was dictated by the survey type that was used. The roads were cleared and made passable by the early land owners who built their dwellings adjacent to the concession roads. Despite being cleared, road conditions were often poor until the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The crown surveys, and later surveys of town and city plots were laid out on a grid, which has left a visible imprint on rural and urban street grids today. Much of the pattern of these surveys can be seen in the grids of cities and townships in Ontario. Within Hamilton, this is visible in the parallel city streets and grid layout of the downtown core and outlying areas. As a pre-existing road, King Street has a visible curve in its orientation, swinging north just east of Wellington Street before swinging south again around Barnesdale Avenue. This curvature in the road is visible on historic maps of the township and can be attributed to its history as an indigenous trail that pre-dates European settlement in the Hamilton area. The historic trail has left a visible footprint on the 19th century grid of the City.

Railway transportation, both passenger and freight, greatly improved the transportation network in Ontario beginning in the mid-1800s. The opening of the Grand Trunk Railway (GTR) between Montreal and Toronto in 1856 provided a link between the two cities and provinces that was more easily travelled in comparison to mid-19th century roads. The construction of the route from Montreal to Toronto, and then on to Sarnia by the end of the 1860s resulted in the construction of significant structures such as the Victoria Bridge over the St. Lawrence River, and the St. Clair Tunnel in Sarnia. The GTR was designed to enhance the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes shipping routes in response to the railroads and shipping networks in the United States. As a result it also strengthened the connection and link between the townships, and municipal and provincial economies in Ontario.

Various railway companies were formed in Ontario to create a vast network of rail lines that spread throughout the province by the early 20th century. Nonetheless, most of the companies were eventually merged with or purchased by the Canadian National Railway (CN) or the Canadian Pacific Railway (CP).

In 1873, the City of Hamilton incorporated the Hamilton Street Railway (HSR); the horse-drawn streetcar service began in May 1874 with six operating cars. The line extended along three miles of track from the GTR’s passenger station east along Stuart Street South to James Street. The line travelled south to Gore Park and then east along King Street to Wellington Street. Due to popularity of the service, additional
cars were added and the track was extended. New track was laid west along King Street to Locke Street and east to Wentworth Street.

The electrification process of the HSR began in March 1892. A total of 12 miles of track were electrified and 15 horsecars were converted to electric street cars. Operation of the newly-electrified cars began on June 29, 1892.

At the end of the Second World War the HSR sold the lines to Canada Coach for $1.4 million. Immediately following the sale, Canada Coach announced plans to replace the street car service with buses. By 1951, the last street car was removed from service and replaced by electric trolley buses.

The proposed LRT B-Line follows the old streetcar route from King Street near McMaster University to Sherman Avenue; it turned south onto Sherman Avenue and then continued east on Main Street to Kenilworth Avenue North.

The present-day Hamilton transit company operates under the name of Hamilton Street Railway Company.

8.2 Local History

668 (666) King Street East is located within the City of Hamilton, Ontario. Historically the structure was located on what was Lot 11, Concession II, Barton Township in Wentworth County. The subsections below include historic information related to the settlement and growth of these areas.

8.2.1 Settlement History

As part of the establishment of Upper Canada, the province was divided into administrative Districts in 1792. As such, Wentworth County was one of several counties that made up the Home District. It was named in honour of Sir John Wentworth, Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia from 1792-1808. In 1816, the Home District was divided and reorganized and Wentworth County was included in the Gore District. By 1849, the original district system was abolished and replaced by a county council system and Wentworth County became an independent political entity. Townships that were included in Wentworth County at one time or another included Ancaster, Barton, Beverly, Binbrook, Caistor, Flamborough East and West, Glanford, Onondaga, Saltfleet, and Seneca. Between 1850 and 1854, Wentworth and Halton Counties were joined for government purposes into the United Counties of Wentworth and Halton; however, this change was short-lived. In 1973, Wentworth County was renamed the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth and, in 2001, was amalgamated with six constituent municipalities into the City of Hamilton. The City of Hamilton has remained as the administrative seat or county town since the original creation of the Gore District nearly two centuries ago.

Barton Township is described in detail in the *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth of 1875*. The Township of Barton was surveyed in 1791 by Augustus Jones using the Single-Front survey system used by the colonial government between 1783 and 1818. The survey was made up of concessions separated by road allowances. The concession was divided into lots of 200 acres and sideroad allowances were surveyed after every fifth lot. The first settlers arrived in Barton Township in 1791, many of whom were United Empire Loyalists or disbanded troops. The settlement of Barton Township began slowly, with only 102 families living in the township by 1815. Most of the settlement was concentrated at the foot of the Niagara Escarpment. The township continued to grow and by 1823 it contained one sawmill and three gristmills. By 1841, the population had grown to 1,434.
8.2.2 Site History

668 (666) King Street East was historically located in the southeast part of Lot 11, Concession II in Barton Township when the crown survey for the township was undertaken. By 1875, the lot was already subdivided as part of the urbanization of Hamilton. Individual structures were not shown on the mapping material at the time; however it is likely that urban development was beginning to take place within the area. At the time, the lot on which the subject property is located extended from King Street East to Main Street, and west from Wentworth Street for 185 m (Figure 3), an area of 3.35 ha.

At the start of the 20th century, historic topographic mapping and Fire Insurance Plans indicate that the block on which the existing property is located was already heavily developed. Prior to 1911, two separate buildings were located at this location, likely built in the late-19th or early 20th century. In 1911, the properties are depicted on Fire Insurance Plans as separate two-storey brick buildings, at the time occupied by a fruit grocer, and a pharmaceutical business. The businesses at these locations appeared to change regularly, much like elsewhere in the City. By 1920, the two properties were the location of a fish grocer and a stationery store. Aside from the footprints of the building, historic photographs or drawings of the former buildings on this property could not be located (Figure 4 and Figure 5).

The original drawings in the archives of the Toronto Dominion Bank are dated 1921. Hamilton City Directories indicate that the existing bank building was constructed in 1922 and occupied both of the previous properties (666 and 668 King Street East). By 1923, the Dominion Bank was listed as occupying the building. Unlike the previous businesses at this address, the bank occupied the southwest corner of King Street East and Wentworth Street South for the majority of the 20th century. Historic photographs related to the bank building could not be located. The Dominion Bank merged with the Toronto Bank in 1954, and launched as the Toronto-Dominion Bank in 1955.

In the late 20th century, the bank became one of a series of banks that were targeted for robberies in Hamilton. In September 1992, The Spectator covered a story that identified five bank robberies within a two week period, one of which was at the subject property. A few months later in January, 1993 the bank was targeted again for another robbery. Again in June and August of 1996, the bank was robbed on two separate occasions. Perhaps the most publically covered case was the August 1996 robbery in which a suspect, identified at the “Lunchtime Bandit” was arrested in connection with six separate robberies in Hamilton, all taking place in the middle of the day throughout the month of August. Two of the six robberies were at the 668 (666) King Street bank.

Most recently, the property at 668 (666) King Street East was occupied by Inneract Printing Ltd., a printing company that occupied the building for the majority of the early-21st century. Online imagery indicates that by April 2014 the business no longer occupied the building and the building has remained vacant since then.

---


8.3 Person/Event/Organization

8.3.1 Ralph K. Shepard

Ralph K. Shepard was identified as the architect of the Dominion Bank building. Little biographical information is available related to Shepard; however, it is known that he was active as an architect in Ontario between 1912 and 1933 (his death), where he was part of the firm of Shepard and Calvin. The vast majority of his work took place in Toronto, where he designed buildings for the University of Toronto, the Bank of British North America (2234 Queen St. E., Toronto), the Toronto Conservancy of Music, the Bank of Montreal (2448 Lakeshore Blvd., Mimico), as well as a number of residences and houses. In partnership with Calvin, Sheppard succeeded in obtaining commissions for important buildings in Toronto as well as on the campus of Queen’s University. Outside of Toronto, he designed Carnegie libraries, banks, college buildings, and churches in other Ontario municipalities including Simcoe, Watford, Oakville, Niagara Falls, Kingston, North Bay, and Hamilton. The Dominion Bank at 668 (666) King Street East was his only project within the City of Hamilton. In addition, it appears to be his only commission for the Dominion Bank.6

Although he was not a widely known architect, his work provided solid, well-designed examples of their architectural types, and their role in contributing to the street character of the early 20th urban environment.

---

9. Discussion of Design or Physical Value

9.1 Style/Type/Tradition

The bank building located at 668 (666) King Street East consists of a tall single storey bank building, designed in a modest Classical style. The form and style was popularly used for commercial and institutional buildings, however, this specific design borrows architectural details from other styles including Art Deco and Beaux Arts styles, which are partially hidden from the parging/stucco finish on the exterior of the building.

The exterior of the building fronts onto both King Street East and Wentworth Street South, as well as a short angled façade that faces the intersection of the two streets. The fenestration on the building is one of the dominant details as the main exterior walls are punctuated with six large arched plate glass windows that extend from ground level to just below the entablature. The original glazing of the structure has been changed; however, it is likely that windows were historically steel frame windows.

Remnants and hints of architectural details on the structure are most evident along the entablature, and the parapet of the building on all of the publically-visible facades. Along both the King Street East façade, and the Wentworth Street South façade, several rows of brick are evident in the parapet walls extending above the entablature. The brick in the parapet is interrupted at corners and periodically along the Wentworth Street South portion of the building with concrete panels that correspond with small decorative panels in the frieze and gaps in the lead flashing. This indicates a classical façade design using pilasters to articulate a formal composition. On the east façade, the three central openings are two large, round-headed windows flanking a doorway of the same shape and size. At either end is a slightly smaller window that would have been framed by pilasters, probably standing on a base course that would have extended around the building. The gaps in the flashing located above the stucco hints at the possibility that when the recent exterior finish was applied, the details of the pilasters were covered or removed. The east façade would thus be symmetrical with a central bay containing the entrance flanked by large windows, and a bay defined by pilasters projecting slightly from the centre bay, at each end of the wall.

The north façade on King Street East was a variation on the end bays, comprising a single, much larger window framed by pilasters. Details of the corner entrance are impossible to discern in the current state of the building.

The most visible remaining architectural details are located within the entablature that extends along each façade. Just below each concrete panel in the parapet is a small rectangular panel that includes a classical motif, a key design component in both the Beaux Arts and Art Deco styles. In addition, the lettering of “THE TORONTO-DOMINION BANK” on the King Street East and Wentworth Street South is a visual reminder of its previous function and prominence on this corner. Lettering of this nature is typically found on large commercial and institutional buildings from the early 20th century. It is also likely that the lettering was later added to the building, or was updated as the Dominion Bank merged with the Bank of Toronto in 1955 to become the Toronto-Dominion Bank.
9.2 Function

The building located at 668 (666) King Street East was designed primarily for commercial purposes. It functioned as a bank from 1922 until the branch closed in either the late 20th or the early-21st century. Since then, it was home to a printing company in the early 21st century, and has remained vacant since 2014.

9.3 Fabric

The structure at 668 (666) King Street East is constructed of a combination of brick and concrete materials. Although barely visible today as a result of exterior modifications, the majority of the exterior was originally constructed of red brick with concrete details including window sills, pilasters, and entablature. The large plate glass windows are replacements of the steel frame windows that would have likely been the originals installed on the structure.
10. Discussion of Contextual Value

10.1 Social Meaning

The property located at 668 (666) King Street East is an example of early 20th century commercial architecture that has borrowed design elements from the Beaux Arts and Art Deco styles of architecture. Although some architectural details are visible at the top of the building, the vast majority of the details have been covered by the extensive application of stucco on the exterior facades of the building. Nonetheless, the form and the details that are visible indicate that the structure is representative of early 20th century commercial and institutional bank buildings.

10.2 Environment

The property located at 668 (666) King Street East is one of a series of older buildings located along this portion of King Street in Hamilton. Specifically, the property forms a corner property and the building plays a role in defining the corner of this block. To the west, a series of buildings ranging in dates from 1910 to the 1930s are present. In addition, the north side of the street is populated with a variety of buildings of differing ages and architectural styles and forms.

10.3 Formal Recognition

The property was identified in the December 2016 CHSR as not being subject to any heritage recognitions. However, consultation with the City of Hamilton in January and February 2017 confirmed that the property is now listed on the City’s Inventory of Building of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.
### 11. Data Sheet

#### Table 11-1: Data Sheet for 668 (666) King Street East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>PROPERTY DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Address</td>
<td>668 (666) King Street East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Area (square metres)</td>
<td>728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Corridor</td>
<td>Hamilton LRT B-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN</td>
<td>171800228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerial photo showing location and boundaries</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Aerial photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exterior, street-view photo</td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Exterior photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of construction of built resources (known or estimated and source)</td>
<td>1922 (Hamilton City Directories)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIELD</td>
<td>PROPERTY DATA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of significant alterations to built resources (known or estimated and source)</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous owners or occupants</td>
<td>Toronto-Dominion Bank, Inneract Printing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current function</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous function(s)</td>
<td>Dominion Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Recognition/Protection (municipal, provincial, federal)</td>
<td>Listed on the City’s <em>Inventory of Building of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Heritage Interest</td>
<td>Listed on the City’s <em>Inventory of Building of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Lands</td>
<td>Immediately to the west, 662 King Street East is listed on the City’s <em>Inventory of Building of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude or UTM Northing</td>
<td>43.251930°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitude or UTM Easting</td>
<td>-79.849229°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Photographs

Photograph 1: View looking south showing King Street East facade and angled facade at the intersection (AECOM, 2017)

Photograph 2: View showing King Street East facade, arched plate glass windows and lettering within the entablature (AECOM, 2017)
Photograph 3: View showing the east façade on Wentworth Street South including series of arched plate glass windows (AECOM, 2017)

Photograph 4: View showing motifs located below the concrete panels in the parapet wall. It is likely that below these motifs, pilasters divided the façade into bays to articulate a formal composition (AECOM, 2017)
Photograph 5: Online street imagery capture showing previous exterior cladding installed on the exterior of the building. It appears to have been installed as early as 2007 and was only removed in 2016 (Google Street Imagery, 2016)
13. Figures

All figures pertaining to this CHER can be found on the following pages.
Figure 1: Location of 668 (666) King Street East
Figure 2: Aerial Photograph showing the area surrounding 668 (666) King Street East
Figure 3: Location of 668 (666) King Street East on the 1875 Historic Atlas Map (Page & Smith, 1875)
Figure 4: Location of 668 (666) King Street East on the 1905 NTS Map
Figure 5: Location of 668 (666) King Street East on the 1938 NTS Map
## 14. Chronology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1791</td>
<td>Barton Township was surveyed by Augustus Jones; the first settler arrived in the township.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1792</td>
<td>Province of Upper Canada divided into administrative districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1816</td>
<td>Home District divided and reorganized. As part of the reorganization, Wentworth was reorganized and included within the Gore District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>Gore District was divided and Halton and Wentworth Counties were created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Lot 11, Concession II is depicted as already subdivided for suburban development. Subject property is shown as on a large block that has since been further subdivided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Lots at 666 and 668 King Street East are shown as two separate buildings occupied by a fruit grocer and a pharmaceutical business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>Hamilton City Directory indicates the presence of a new building at 668 (666) King Street East. A year later is identified in the directories as the Dominion Bank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>Dominion Bank and Bank of Toronto amalgamate to form the Toronto-Dominion Bank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>Toronto-Dominion Bank branch at King Street and Wentworth Street is targeted several times as part of a series of bank robberies in Hamilton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>Former bank building is home to Inneract Printing Ltd. for the first part of the 21st century. As of 2014 it appears that the building has been vacant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Executive Summary

AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by Metrolinx to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) for the property at 668 (666) King Street East, in the City of Hamilton, Ontario. This work is being completed as part of the Hamilton Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project.

The Hamilton LRT Project B-Line alignment extends from McMaster University at Cootes Drive to the Main Street/Highway 403 Bridge. A proposed LRT-only bridge will allow the alignment to then extend along King Street West until King East Street intersects with Main Street East, where the alignment will continue along Main Street East to the Queenston Road traffic circle. As a part of the project, it is anticipated that building impacts may take place on the property at 668 (666) King Street East.

The project impacts will be assessed following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), as prescribed in Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 231/08, Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings under the Environmental Assessment Act. As part of the TPAP Amendment, an Environmental Project Report (EPR) Amendment will be prepared for public review.

The CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Interim Cultural Heritage Management Process and utilizes the criteria in Ontario Regulation 9/06 and Ontario Regulation 10/06, as required by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport’s (MTCS) Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (2010). In addition, the CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Draft Terms of Reference for Consultants: Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations. As such the recommendations as they relate to this CHER and the potential cultural heritage value or interest of the property at 668 (666) King Street East are contained in a separate Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations (CHERR) document.

As part of the reporting requirements for the Hamilton LRT Project, Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) undertook a Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) for the alignment. The CHSR identified the requirement to conduct a CHER for the property located at 668 (666) King Street East to assess the potential cultural heritage value or interest of the property. Where applicable, relevant background information has been utilized from the CHSR for project consistency.

The property located at 668 (666) King Street East consists of an irregularly shaped lot on the southwest corner of the intersection of King Street East and Wentworth Street South, in Hamilton, Ontario. The structure on the property is a former bank building that was built specifically for the Dominion Bank in the 1920s.

Hamilton City Directories indicate that the existing bank building was constructed in 1922 and occupied both of the previous properties (666 and 668 King Street East). By 1923, the Dominion Bank was listed as occupying the building. The bank occupied the southwest corner of King Street East and Wentworth Street South for the majority of the 20th century.

A field review of the privately owned property at 668 (666) King Street East was undertaken on January 12, 2017 and February 3, 2017 by Michael Greguol and Emily Game of AECOM. An assessment was not completed on the interior of the structures due to the timing constraints for the TPAP Amendment.
The bank building located at 668 (666) King Street East consists of a tall single-storey bank building, designed in a modest Classical style. The form and style was popularly used for commercial and institutional buildings; however, this specific design borrows architectural details from other styles including Art Deco and Beaux Arts styles, which are partially hidden from the stucco finish on the exterior of the building.

The application of O.Reg 9/06 and O.Reg. 10/06 concluded that 668 (666) King Street East met three of the nine O.Reg. 9/06 criteria. However, it did not meet the criteria outlined in O.Reg. 10/06. Therefore, this CHERR recommends that the property at 668 (666) King Street East be considered a Provincial Heritage Property (PHP).
2. Ontario Regulation 9/06 Evaluation

Ontario Regulation 9/06, *Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest* (O. Reg. 9/06) provides criteria to apply to a potential heritage property to evaluate its heritage value. If a privately-owned property meets one or more of the following criteria it may be designated by a municipality under Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. For the purposes of this CHER, O. Reg. 9/06 considers the evaluation of the property as part of the community context. The *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties* state that a property may be considered a Provincial Heritage Property (PHP) if it meets one or more of the criteria under O. Reg. 9/06. The application of the criteria for 668 (666) King Street East is included in Table 2-1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Response (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) The property has design or physical value because it:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Is a rare, unique, representative, or early example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The property at 668 (666) King Street East, includes a representative example of classical architecture typically used on commercial and institutional buildings in the early 20th century with modest design elements from the Beaux Arts and Art Deco styles. Although a great deal of the exterior has been covered by more recent stucco, elements including the entablature, the motifs in the frieze as well as remnants of additional covered details such as pilasters on each façade contribute to its design value. Although the application of the exterior stucco has compromised its original design, the building still retains its design and physical value as a result of the remaining heritage attributes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit; or</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Although the design details are representative of a particular style they do not represent particular artistic merit or a high degree of craftsmanship due to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Response (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Although the design details are representative of a particular style they do not represent a particularly high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2) The property has *historic or associative value* because it:

| i) Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community; | No | The bank building on the property represents the economic growth within the City of Hamilton in the early 20th century; however, it does not have specific historic value that appears to be significant to a community. |
| ii) Yields, or has the potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture; or | No | The property does not have potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture. |
| iii) Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a community. | Yes | The building was designed by Ralph K. Shepard, an architect with Calvin and Shepard. The firm was active primarily in Toronto between 1912 and 1933. Shepard designed a series of buildings in Toronto, Simcoe, Watford, Oakville, Niagara Falls, Kingston, North Bay, and Hamilton. In partnership with Calvin, Sheppard succeeded in obtaining commissions for important buildings in Toronto as well as on the campus of Queen’s University. |

### 3) The property has *contextual value* because it:

<p>| i) Is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area; | Yes | The bank property has occupied the southwest corner of the intersection of King Street East and Wentworth Street South since 1921. As a result of its frontages |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Response (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>on both streets and its distinctive architectural form, it has played a role in defining the streetscape of this section of King Street East in Hamilton.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings; or</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The building is one of a series of commercial buildings located along this portion of King Street East. Although it has been a part of the streetscape since 1921, it does not appear to be physically, functionally, visually, or historical linked to its surroundings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Is a landmark.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property is not a landmark.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Ontario Regulation 10/06 Evaluation

Ontario Regulation 10/06, Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest of Provincial Significance (O. Reg. 10/06), provides criteria against which to assess a property to determine if the property holds provincial heritage significance. The Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties state that Ministries and prescribed public bodies shall apply the criteria in O. Reg. 10/06 to determine whether a property is of provincial significance. Therefore, for the purpose of this CHER O. Reg 10/06 considers the evaluation of the property as a part of the provincial context. If the property meets the criteria, it may be considered a Provincial Heritage Property of Provincial Significance (PHPPS). The application of the criteria for 668 (666) King Street East is in Table 3-1, below.

Table 3-1: O.Reg. 10/06 Evaluation for 668 (666) King Street East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Response (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The property represents or demonstrates a theme or pattern in Ontario’s history.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property does not represent a theme or pattern in Ontario’s history. Commercial and structures similar to this are found throughout towns and cities in Ontario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The property yields, or had the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of Ontario’s history.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property does not yield, and is not anticipated to yield information that contributes to an understanding of Ontario’s history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The property demonstrates an uncommon, rare, or unique aspect of Ontario’s cultural heritage.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property does not demonstrate an uncommon, rare, or unique aspect of Ontario’s cultural heritage. The form and massing of the structure represent design elements which are found on banks elsewhere in Ontario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The property is of aesthetic, visual, or contextual importance to the province.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property is not of aesthetic, visual, or contextual importance to the province. Although it contributes to the streetscape character of this portion of Hamilton, it is not of visual, aesthetic, or contextual importance to the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The property demonstrates a high degree of excellence or</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Although the design details are representative of a particular style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Response (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>creative, technical, or scientific achievement at a provincial level in</td>
<td></td>
<td>they do not represent a particularly high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a given period.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The property has a strong or special association with the entire</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property does not have a strong or special association with the entire province or with a community that is found in more than one part of the province. Rather, the building has more association with its streetscape and immediate surroundings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>province or with a community that is found in more than one part of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>province.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The property has a strong or special association with the life or</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The building was designed by Ralph K. Shepard, an architect with Calvin and Shepard. The firm was active primarily in Toronto between 1912 and 1933. Shepard designed a series of buildings in Toronto, Simcoe, Watford, Oakville, Niagara Falls, Kingston, North Bay, and Hamilton. Little biographical detail could be located related to Shepard, so there is insufficient evidence with which to assess his standing in the profession or the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work of a person, group or organization of importance to the province or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with an event of importance to the province.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The property is located in an unorganized territory and the Minister</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property is not located in an unorganized territory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>determines that there is a provincial interest in the protection of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>property.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Recommended Outcome of Evaluation**

The application of O.Reg 9/06 and O.Reg. 10/06 concluded that 668 (666) King Street East met three of the nine O.Reg. 9/06 criteria. However, it did not meet the criteria outlined in O.Reg. 10/06. Therefore, this CHERR recommends that the property at 668 (666) King Street East be considered a Provincial Heritage Property (PHP).
5. **Draft Statement of Cultural Heritage Value**

5.1 **Description of the Property**

The property located at 668 (666) King Street East consists of an irregularly shaped lot on the southwest corner of the intersection of King Street East and Wentworth Street South, in Hamilton, Ontario. The structure on the property is a former bank building that was built specifically for the Toronto Dominion Bank in the 1920s. The bank building functioned primarily as a bank throughout the 20th century, and appears to have last been used for a printing service in the early 21st century.

The scale and massing of the bank building on the property has appeared to remain relatively unaltered from its original construction. The building has occupied the corner lot with frontage that extends on both King Street East and Wentworth Street South. The exterior of the building has undergone some alterations in that its facades along both streets have been stuccoed and painted. Until recently, the upper level of the building was also covered in with an exterior panelling that created a waffle-like pattern on the structure. Online street imagery indicates that it was removed in 2016 to expose the brick components of the exterior as well as the concrete cornice that wraps around the building.

5.2 **Statement of Cultural Heritage Value**

The property located at 668 (666) King Street East consists of an irregularly shaped lot on the southwest corner of the intersection of King Street and Wentworth Street South, in Hamilton, Ontario. The structure on the property is a former bank building that was built specifically for the Dominion Bank in the 1920s. The bank building functioned primarily as a bank throughout the 20th century, and appears to have last been used for a printing service in the early 21st century.

Designed by Ralph K. Shepard of the firm Calvin and Sheppard, the bank building at 668 (666) King Street East was built in 1922 and opened in 1923 as a branch of the Dominion Bank at the corner of King Street East and Wentworth Street South. The bank building was one of many of the important commissions obtained by Calvin and Sheppard, who also designed important buildings in Toronto, Kingston, and various municipalities across Ontario. The bank occupied the southwest corner of King Street East and Wentworth Street South for the majority of the 20th century. The bank remained the sole occupant of the property until the early 21st century when it was occupied by a printing service.

Architecturally, the property is an example of early 20th century commercial architecture that has borrowed design elements from the Beaux Arts and Art Deco styles of architecture. Although some architectural details are visible at the top of the building, the vast majority of the details have been covered by the extensive application of stucco on the exterior facades of the building. Nonetheless, the form and the details that are visible indicate that the structure is representative of early 20th century commercial and institutional bank buildings.

The exterior of the building fronts onto both King Street East and Wentworth Street South, as well as a short angled façade that faces the intersection of the two streets. The fenestration on the building is one of the dominant details as the main exterior walls are punctuated with six large arched plate glass...
windows that extend from ground level to just below the entablature. The original glazing of the structure has been changed and it is likely that the windows were historically steel frame windows.

Remnants and hints of architectural details on the structure are most evident along the entablature, and the parapet of the building on all of the publically-visible facades. Along both the King Street East façade, and the Wentworth Street South façade, several rows of brick are evident in the parapet walls extending above the entablature. The brick in the parapet is interrupted at corners and periodically along the Wentworth Street South portion of the building with concrete panels that correspond with small decorative panels in the frieze and gaps in the lead flashing. This indicates a classical façade design using pilasters to articulate a formal composition. On the east façade, the three central openings are two large, round-headed windows flanking a doorway of the same shape and size. At either end is a slightly smaller window that would have been framed by pilasters, probably standing on a base course that would have extended around the building. The gaps in the flashing located above the stucco hints at the possibility that when the recent exterior finish was applied, the details of the pilasters were covered or removed. The east façade would thus be symmetrical with a central bay containing the entrance flanked by large windows, and a bay defined by pilasters projecting slightly from the centre bay, at each end of the wall.

The north façade on King Street East was a variation on the end bays, comprising a single, much larger window framed by pilasters. Details of the corner entrance are impossible to discern in the current state of the building. The most visible remaining architectural details are located within the entablature that extends along each façade. Just below each concrete panel in the parapet is a small rectangular panel that includes a classical motif, a key design component in both the Beaux Arts and Art Deco styles. In addition, the lettering of “THE TORONTO-DOMINION BANK” on the King Street East and Wentworth Street South is a visual reminder of its previous function and prominence on this corner. Lettering of this nature is typically found on large commercial and institutional buildings from the early 20th century. It is also likely that the lettering was later added to the building, or was updated as the Dominion Bank merged with the Bank of Toronto in 1955 to become the Toronto-Dominion Bank.

5.3 Heritage Attributes

Heritage Attributes as described in the Standards and Guidelines are the physical features or elements that contribute to a property’s cultural heritage value or interest, and may include the property’s built or manufactured elements, as well as natural landforms, vegetation, water features, and its visual setting. The Heritage Attributes for the property at 668 (666) King Street East relate to its design/physical and contextual value. This is demonstrated by the following Heritage Attributes:

- Scale, form, and massing of the former bank building;
- Main frontage along corner of King Street East and Wentworth Street South;
- Fenestration, including tall, arched, windows;
- Remaining brick parapet walls;
- Concrete panels in parapet walls with decorative motifs; and
- Remnants of architectural details including potential pilasters located under modern exterior finishes.
**Metrolinx Interim Heritage Committee – Statement of Cultural Heritage Value**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Name: 668 (666) King Street East, Hamilton (Hamilton LRT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Description of property:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The property located at 668 (666) King Street East consists of an irregularly shaped lot on the southwest corner of the intersection of King Street East and Wentworth Street South, in Hamilton, Ontario. The structure on the property is a former bank building that was built specifically for the Toronto Dominion Bank in the 1920s. The bank building functioned primarily as a bank throughout the 20th century, and appears to have last been used for a printing service in the early-21st century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scale and massing of the bank building on the property has appeared to remain relatively unaltered from its original construction. The building has occupied the corner lot with frontage that extends on both King Street East and Wentworth Street South. The exterior of the building has undergone some alterations in that its facades along both streets have been stuccoed and painted. Until recently, the upper level of the building was also covered in with an exterior panelling that created a waffle-like pattern on the structure. Online street imagery indicates that it was removed in 2016 to expose the brick components of the exterior as well as the concrete cornice that wraps around the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is recommended that Metrolinx/GO Transit proceed with identifying 668 (666) King Street East as a Conditional Metrolinx Heritage Property.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cultural Heritage Value:**

The property located at 668 (666) King Street East consists of an irregularly shaped lot on the southwest corner of the intersection of King Street and Wentworth Street South, in Hamilton, Ontario. The structure on the property is a former bank building that was built specifically for the Dominion Bank in the 1920s. The bank building functioned primarily as a bank throughout the 20th century, and appears to have last been used for a printing service in the early-21st century.

Designed by Ralph K. Shepard of the firm Calvin and Shepard, the bank building at 668 King Street East was built in 1922 and opened in 1923 as a branch of the Dominion Bank at the corner of King Street East and Wentworth Street South. The bank occupied the southwest corner of King Street East and Wentworth Street South for the majority of the 20th century. The bank remained the sole occupant of the property until the early-21st century when it was occupied by a printing service.

Architecturally, the property is an example of early-20th century commercial architecture that has borrowed design elements from the Beaux Arts and Art Deco styles of architecture. Although some architectural details are visible at the top of the building, the vast majority of the details have been covered by the extensive application of stucco on the exterior facades of the building. Nonetheless, the form and the details that are visible indicate that the structure is representative of early-20th century commercial and institutional bank buildings.

The exterior of the building fronts onto both King Street East and Wentworth Street South, as well as a short angled façade that faces the intersection of the two streets. The fenestration on the building is one
of the dominant details as the main exterior walls are punctuated with six large arched plate glass windows that extend from ground level to just below the entablature. The original glazing of the structure has been changed and it is likely that the windows were historically steel frame windows.

Remnants and hints of architectural details on the structure are most evident along the entablature, and the parapet of the building on all of the publically-visible facades. Along both the King Street East façade, and the Wentworth Street South façade, several rows of brick are evident in the parapet walls extending above the entablature. The brick in the parapet is interrupted at corners and periodically along the Wentworth Street South portion of the building with concrete panels that correspond with small decorative panels in the frieze and gaps in the lead flashing. This indicates a classical façade design using pilasters to articulate a formal composition. On the east façade, the three central openings are two large, round-headed windows flanking a doorway of the same shape and size. At either end is a slightly smaller window that would have been framed by pilasters, probably standing on a base course that would have extended around the building. The gaps in the flashing located above the stucco hints at the possibility that when the recent exterior finish was applied, the details of the pilasters were covered or removed. The east façade would thus be symmetrical with a central bay containing the entrance flanked by large windows, and a bay defined by pilasters projecting slightly from the centre bay, at each end of the wall.

The north façade on King Street East was a variation on the end bays, comprising a single, much larger window framed by pilasters. Details of the corner entrance are impossible to discern in the current state of the building. The most visible remaining architectural details are located within the entablature that extends along each façade. Just below each concrete panel in the parapet is a small rectangular panel that includes a classical motif, a key design component in both the Beaux Arts and Art Deco styles. In addition, the lettering of “THE TORONTO-DOMINION BANK” on the King Street East and Wentworth Street South is a visual reminder of its previous function and prominence on this corner. Lettering of this nature is typically found on large commercial and institutional buildings from the early-20th century. It is also likely that the lettering was later added to the building, or was updated as the Dominion Bank merged with the Bank of Toronto in 1955 to become the Toronto-Dominion Bank.

**Heritage Attributes:**

Key elements that define the subject property’s heritage character include:

1. Scale, form, and massing of the former bank building;
2. Main frontage along corner of King Street East and Wentworth Street South;
3. Fenestration, including tall, arched, windows;
4. Remaining brick parapet walls;
5. Concrete panels in parapet walls with decorative motifs; and
6. Remnants of architectural details including potential pilasters located under modern exterior finishes.
Metrolinx Heritage Property Location:

Figure showing the location of 668 (666) King Street East (green).
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AECOM accepts no responsibility, and denies any liability whatsoever, to parties other than Client who may obtain access to the Report or the Information for any injury, loss or damage suffered by such parties arising from their use of, reliance upon, or decisions or actions based on the Report or any of the Information (“improper use of the Report”), except to the extent those parties have obtained the prior written consent of AECOM to use and rely upon the Report and the Information. Any injury, loss or damages arising from improper use of the Report shall be borne by the party making such use.
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1. Executive Summary

AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by Metrolinx to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) for the property at 832 King Street East, in the City of Hamilton, Ontario. This work is being completed as part of the Hamilton Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project.

The Hamilton LRT Project B-Line alignment extends from McMaster University at Cootes Drive to the Main Street/Highway 403 Bridge. A proposed LRT-only bridge will allow the alignment to then extend along King Street West until King East Street intersects with Main Street East, where the alignment will continue along Main Street East to the Queenston Road traffic circle. As a part of the project, it is anticipated that building impacts may take place on the property at 832 King Street East.

The project impacts will be assessed following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), as prescribed in Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 231/08, Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings under the Environmental Assessment Act. As part of the TPAP Amendment, an Environmental Project Report (EPR) Amendment will be prepared for public review.

The CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Interim Cultural Heritage Management Process and utilizes the criteria in Ontario Regulation 9/06 and Ontario Regulation 10/06, as required by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport’s (MTCS) Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (2010). In addition, the CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Draft Terms of Reference for Consultants: Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations. As such the recommendations as they relate to this CHER and the potential cultural heritage value or interest of the property at 832 King Street East are contained in a separate Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations (CHERR) document.

As part of the reporting requirements for the Hamilton LRT Project, Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) undertook a Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) for the alignment. The CHSR identified the requirement to conduct a CHER for the property located at 832 King Street East to assess the potential cultural heritage value or interest of the property. Where applicable, relevant background information has been utilized from the CHSR for project consistency.

The property is located at 832 King Street East on a rectangular corner lot at the southwest corner of King Street East and Holton Avenue South. The structure on the property consists of a three-storey apartment building that extends approximately 40 metres (m) south on Holton Avenue. The massing, design, and exterior configuration of the apartment appears to remain relatively unchanged from its original construction in the 1930s.

Hamilton City Directories indicate that the building at 832 King Street East was constructed by 1931 and was used for residential purposes, identified as the “Dunena Apartments”. The building footprint appears as part of a 1933 revision that was made to the 1927 Fire Insurance Plan and is illustrated as “Apartments”.

A field review of the privately owned property at 832 King Street East was undertaken on January 12th, 2017 and February 3rd, 2017 by Michael Greguol and Emily Game of AECOM. An assessment was not completed on the interior of the structures due to the timing constraints for the TPAP Amendment.
The property at 832 King Street East is an example of mid-20th century urban apartment construction. The apartment building includes particular design elements such as the wooden brackets above the door on the King Street East façade, the decorative brick quoins on the corners of the building, and the raised parapet walls along the rooflines, but does not represent a particular style or characteristic. Rather, it is a typical example of apartment construction found in Hamilton.
2. Introduction

2.1 Historical Summary

2.1.1 Context

The subject property is located within the municipal boundaries of the City of Hamilton, Ontario. Prior to the incorporation of the current municipality, the property was located within the boundaries of Barton Township, in Wentworth County.

2.1.2 Wentworth County

As part of the establishment of Upper Canada, the province was divided into administrative Districts in 1792. As such, Wentworth County was one of several counties that made up the Home District. It was named in honour of Sir John Wentworth, Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia from 1792-1808. In 1816, the Home District was divided and reorganized and Wentworth County was included in the Gore District. By 1849, the original district system was abolished and replaced by a county council system and Wentworth County became an independent political entity. Townships that were included in Wentworth County at one time or another included Ancaster, Barton, Beverly, Binbrook, Caistor, Flamborough East and West, Glanford, Onondaga, Saltfleet, and Seneca. Between 1850 and 1854, Wentworth and Halton Counties were joined for government purposes into the United Counties of Wentworth and Halton; however, this change was short-lived. In 1973, Wentworth County was renamed the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth and, in 2001, was amalgamated with six constituent municipalities into the City of Hamilton. The City of Hamilton has remained as the administrative seat or county town since the original creation of the Gore District nearly two centuries ago.

2.1.3 Barton Township

Barton Township is described in detail in the *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth* of 1875. The Township of Barton was surveyed in 1791 by Augustus Jones using the Single-Front survey system used by the colonial government between 1783 and 1818. The survey was made up of concessions separated by road allowances. The concession was divided into lots of 200 acres and sideroad allowances were surveyed after every fifth lot. The first settlers arrived in Barton Township in 1791, many of whom were United Empire Loyalists or disbanded troops. The settlement of Barton Township began slowly, with only 102 families living in the township by 1815; most of the settlement was concentrated at the foot of the Niagara Escarpment. The township continued to grow and by 1823 it contained one sawmill and three gristmills. By 1841, the population grew to 1,434. Barton Township was later amalgamated into the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth, which today is known as the City of Hamilton.

---

2.2 Description of Property

The property is located at 832 King Street East on a rectangular corner lot at the southwest corner of King Street East and Holton Avenue South. The structure on the property consists of a three-storey apartment building that extends approximately 40 m south on Holton Avenue. The massing, design, and exterior configuration of the apartment appears to remain relatively unchanged from its original construction in the 1930s. With the exception of replacement windows, the exterior masonry and window details including the sills and lintels appear to remain unchanged. As a result of its large form and configuration the building retains large portions of frontage along King Street East and along Holton Avenue South with interior access to the building from both rights of way.

2.3 Current Context

The property is situated on the south side of King Street East, on the eastern outskirts of downtown Hamilton. The property forms a large portion of the intersection of King Street East and Holton Avenue South as a result of its orientation on the corner of these roads, but also as a result of the vacant parking lot located immediately west of the apartment building. While the apartment building shares similarities with regards to its form and massing with the buildings on the north side of King Street East; ultimately, it is relatively isolated on the south side of King Street East as a result of the parking lot to the west, the small convenience store property on the east side of Holton Avenue and the single detached residential structures located to the south of the property.
3. **Methodology and Sources**

3.1 **Study Approach**

This CHER was prepared in accordance with Metrolinx’s Interim Cultural Heritage Management Process (Fall 2013) and the MTCS *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties* (2010). The CHER was also undertaken according to the guidelines presented in the Metrolinx document, *Draft Terms of Reference for Consultants: Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations* (April 2016) and outlined in the following tasks:

- Research and Documentation Gathering – gathered from various sources including existing heritage studies, Metrolinx records, public archives, and published materials;
- Writing – an illustrated report based on gathered background history and site investigation materials, and the application of O.Reg. 9/06 and 10/06; Evaluation, Recommendations, and Statement of Cultural Heritage Value – a summary of the applicable evaluation, and recommendations regarding whether the property meets the criteria for being a provincial heritage property, a provincial heritage property of provincial significance, or neither.

As outlined in the Draft Terms of Reference, the heritage evaluation is separated into two stand-alone components: a CHER and a CHERR. The Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report includes research conducted for the CHER and is intended to address the criteria set out in O.Regs 9/06 and 10/06. The CHERR includes the results of the applied evaluation, and the recommended outcome of the evaluation.

Michael Greguol, Cultural Heritage Specialist, and Emily Game, Heritage Researcher for AECOM, conducted a site investigation to visually inspect and document the property on January 12th and February 3rd, 2017. An assessment was not completed on the interior of the structures due to the timing constraints for the TPAP Amendment.

3.2 **Secondary Sources**

A series of secondary sources were reviewed for the purposes of data collection and analysis as part of the CHER. The relevant guidelines and reference documents cited above served as a framework for undertaking the study. The *Hamilton Light Rail Transit Cultural Heritage Screening Report, City of Hamilton, Ontario* (CHSR) prepared by ASI in December 2016, provided a preliminary review of the rail corridor and the potential heritage properties identified along the corridor. Background information and applicable research was gathered from the report for the purposes of the CHER. In addition, a series of published materials including published histories pertaining to the history of Hamilton were consulted. A complete list of the sources reviewed for the report is contained in Section 15 (Bibliography).

3.3 **Primary Sources**

Where available, primary source material was consulted to provide a historical context for the evaluation of the potential heritage value of the property. Primary source research was undertaken at the Local History and Archives Department of the Hamilton Public Library, the Mills Memorial Library at McMaster
University, and at the Map and Data Centre at the University of Western Ontario. A review of the following primary sources aided in the evaluation of the structures at 832 King Street East:

- *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth*, 1875;
- Hamilton City Directories, issues 1931-1970;
- Fire Insurance Plans, 1927 (rev. 1933), 1960-1964; and,

### 3.4 Consultations

As part of the identification of recognized and potential cultural heritage resources for the CHSR, ASI undertook consultation with the City of Hamilton, the Ontario Heritage Trust (OHT) and the MTCS. Consultation during the CHSR process took place between August and October, 2016.

As part of this CHER, AECOM undertook property-specific consultation with the same municipal and provincial staff and agencies in order to identify or confirm any existing heritage recognitions or interest in this subject property.

The following individuals and organizations were consulted:

- Thomas Wicks, Heritage Planner, OHT;
- Chelsey Tyers, Cultural Heritage Planner, City of Hamilton;
- Asyia Patel, Assistant Cultural Heritage Planner, City of Hamilton; and,
- Rosi Zirger, Heritage Planner, MTCS.

The results of the consultation efforts have been summarized in Section 7 (Community Input).
4. Heritage Recognitions

4.1 Municipal

As a review of applicable municipal heritage recognitions for the property or adjacent properties, AECOM reviewed the City of Hamilton’s heritage inventories. The following inventories and registers were reviewed:

- Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 1: List of Designated Properties and Heritage Conservation Easements under the Ontario Heritage Act; and,
- Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 2: Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.

Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 1 consists of a listing of properties that have been designated by municipal by-law. The volume includes properties that have been designated under Parts IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act. In addition, the volume also identifies properties for which the City of Hamilton holds a Heritage Easement for the property. Hamilton’s Heritage Volume 2 is a compilation of the inventories of heritage structures and places of the six former municipalities that now make up the City of Hamilton. This volume contains approximately 7,000 properties that are of potential heritage interest, or value, but that are not formally protected under the Ontario Heritage Act. The Inventory is publically available, however, it is one that evolves over time and properties are added on a case-by-case basis, determined by staff at the City.

Consultation efforts were undertaken to confirm levels of municipal heritage recognition, if any. The property was identified in the December 2016 CHSR as not being subject to any heritage recognitions. However, consultation with the City of Hamilton in January and February 2017 confirmed that the property is now listed on the City’s Inventory of Building of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.

4.2 Provincial

As a review of applicable provincial heritage recognitions for the property or adjacent properties, AECOM reviewed the OHT’s Provincial Plaque Guide, and list of OHT easements. The property at 832 King Street East is neither the subject of a provincial plaque nor a provincial easement. In addition, OHT staff was contacted to review the Ontario Heritage Act Register to confirm that the property is not included on the register and that an OHT easement does not exist for the property.

Thomas Wicks, Heritage Planner for the OHT confirmed on February 9th, 2017 that the property is not subject to an OHT conservation easement or on their register.

4.3 Federal

As a review of applicable federal heritage recognitions for the property or adjacent properties, AECOM reviewed the online searchable database for the Canadian Register of Historic Places as well as the Directory of Federal Heritage Designations. 832 King Street East and the adjacent properties are not subject to any existing federal heritage recognitions.
5. Adjacent Lands

The properties adjacent to 832 King Street East consist of commercial and residential properties, all of which are either newer buildings or buildings not built in the same period and style as 832 King Street East. A single-storey commercial office space with a large parking lot is located immediately to the west, while immediately to the east, a small single-storey convenience store is located on Holton Avenue. A residential structure with design details from the Arts and Crafts style of architecture is located immediately south of the subject property on Holton Avenue. The residential properties on Holt Avenue South were constructed in the early-20th century.

Consultation with the City of Hamilton indicated that the adjacent properties, 818 King Street East, 838 King Street East, and 14 Holton Avenue South are not protected heritage properties.
6. Archaeology

ASI completed a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (AA) as part of the Rapid Transit Initiative and found that the property at 832 King Street East did not retain archaeological potential and confirmed that no known archaeological assessments have previously been completed within 50 m of the property. Consequently, at the time of production of the ASI report, no archaeological sites had been identified within or adjacent to the property; however, the ASI Stage 1 AA indicates that there is a small area of land that retains archaeological potential immediately adjacent to 832 King Street East to the west between Holton and Fairleigh Avenue.

The results of the Stage 1 AA determined that a Stage 2 AA must be conducted for all land identified as retaining archaeological potential that will be impacted by the proposed Rapid Transit Initiative. Based on this assessment, ASI made the following recommendations:

- The King Street right-of-way (ROW) does not retain archaeological potential due to previous land disturbance. An additional AA is not required within the ROW and those portions of the study corridor can be cleared of further archaeological concern; and,

- A Stage 2 AA should be conducted on lands determined to have archaeological potential if the proposed project is to impact these lands. This work must be done in accordance with the MTCS’ Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (Ontario Government 2011) in order to identify any archaeological remains that may be present.

It should be noted that ASI’s recommendations for Stage 2 archaeological work references the MCL’s 2006 draft Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MCL 2006); however, further Stage 2 archaeological work must now be conducted in accordance with current archaeological standards and guidelines (Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists, Ontario Government 2011). For complete details regarding the results of the Stage 1 AA, reference should be made to the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment, Rapid Transit Initiative, City of Hamilton, Ontario (February 2009).
7. Community Input

As part of the consultation process for this report, AECOM undertook consultation with the City of Hamilton, the MTCS, and the OHT. The results of the consultation efforts are identified below in Table 7-1.

Table 7-1: Community Input and Consultation Undertaken for 832 King Street East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chelsey Tyers, Heritage Planner</td>
<td>905-546-2424 ext. 1202</td>
<td>February 1, 2017</td>
<td>The City of Hamilton confirmed that 832 King Street East is listed on the City’s Inventory of Building of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hamilton</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chelsey.tyers@hamilton.ca">chelsey.tyers@hamilton.ca</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asiya Patel, Assistant Cultural</td>
<td>905-546-2424 ext. 7163</td>
<td>February 6, 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Planner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:asiya.patel@hamilton.ca">asiya.patel@hamilton.ca</a></td>
<td>(Response)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Wicks, Heritage Planner</td>
<td>416-314-5972</td>
<td>February 1, 2017</td>
<td>The OHT confirmed that the properties are not subject to an OHT conservation easement nor is it on their register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Heritage Trust</td>
<td><a href="mailto:thomas.wicks@heritagetrust.on.ca">thomas.wicks@heritagetrust.on.ca</a></td>
<td>February 9, 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Response)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rosi.zirger@ontario.ca">rosi.zirger@ontario.ca</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Discussion of Historical or Associative Value

8.1 Historic Theme/Cultural Pattern

8.1.1 Transportation

The earliest roads in Ontario were typically military roads or colonization roads. These roads often followed aboriginal hunting trails or were dictated by the topography of the land which they crossed. The Dundas Road was opened to connect Toronto with the Thames River, in what is now London, Ontario, and the Kingston Road was designed to provide a military link between Toronto and Kingston. The Kingston Road was one of the earliest and still functioning roads in southern Ontario.

Following the Crown surveys in Ontario, concession and side roads were opened on a grid that was dictated by the survey type that was used. The roads were cleared and made passable by the early land owners who built their dwellings adjacent to the concession roads. Despite being cleared, road conditions were often poor until the late-19th and early-20th centuries. The crown surveys, and later surveys of town and city plots were laid out on a grid, which has left a visible imprint on rural and urban street grids today. Much of the pattern of these surveys can be seen in the grids of cities and townships in Ontario. Within Hamilton, this is visible in the parallel city streets and grid layout of the downtown core and outlying areas. As a pre-existing road, King Street has a visible curve in its orientation, swinging north just east of Wellington Street before swinging south again around Barnesdale Avenue. This curvature in the road is visible on historic maps of the township and can be attributed to its history as an indigenous trail that pre-dates European settlement in the Hamilton area. The historic trail has left a visible footprint on the 19th century grid of the City.

Railway transportation, both passenger and freight, greatly improved the transportation network in Ontario beginning in the mid-1800s. The opening of the Grand Trunk Railway (GTR) between Montreal and Toronto in 1856 provided a link between the two cities and provinces that was more easily travelled in comparison to mid-19th century roads. The construction of the route from Montreal to Toronto, and then on to Sarnia by the end of the 1860s resulted in the construction of significant structures such as the Victoria Bridge over the St. Lawrence River, and the St. Clair Tunnel in Sarnia. The GTR was designed to enhance the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes shipping routes in response to the railroads and shipping networks in the United States. As a result it also strengthened the connection and link between the townships, and municipal and provincial economies in Ontario.

Various railway companies were formed in Ontario to create a vast network of rail lines that spread throughout the province by the early-20th century. Nonetheless, most of the companies were eventually merged with or purchased by the Canadian National Railway (CN) or the Canadian Pacific Railway (CP) in 1997.
8.1.2 Hamilton Street Railway

In 1873, the City of Hamilton incorporated the Hamilton Street Railway; the horse-drawn streetcar service began in May 1874 with six operating cars. The line extended along three miles of track from the GTR’s passenger station east along Stuart Street South to James Street. The line travelled south to Gore Park and then east along King Street to Wellington Street. Due to popularity of the service, additional cars were added and the track was extended. New track was laid west along King Street to Locke Street and east to Wentworth Street.

The electrification process of the Hamilton Street Railway began in March 1892. A total of 12 miles of track were electrified and 15 horsecars were converted to electric street cars. Operation of the newly-electrified cars began on June 29, 1892.

At the end of the Second World War, Hamilton Street Railway sold the lines to Canada Coach for $1.4 million. Immediately following the sale, Canada Coach announced plans to replace the street car service with busses. By 1951, the last street car was removed from service and replaced by electric trolley busses.

The proposed B-Line follows the old streetcar route from King Street near McMaster University to Sherman Avenue; the old streetcar route then turned south along Sherman Avenue and then continued east on Main Street to Kenilworth Avenue North.

The present-day Hamilton transit company operates under the name of Hamilton Street Railway Company.

8.2 Local History

832 King Street East is located within the City of Hamilton, Ontario. Historically the structures were located within Lot 9, Concession II, Barton Township in Wentworth County. The subsections below include historic information related to the settlement and growth of these areas.

8.2.1 Settlement History

As part of the establishment of Upper Canada, the province was divided into administrative Districts in 1792. As such, Wentworth County was one of several counties that made up the Home District. It was named in honour of Sir John Wentworth, Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia from 1792-1808. In 1816, the Home District was divided and reorganized and Wentworth County was included in the Gore District. By 1849, the original district system was abolished and replaced by a county council system and Wentworth County became an independent political entity. Townships that were included in Wentworth County at one time or another included Ancaster, Barton, Beverly, Binbrook, Caistor, Flamborough East and West, Glanford, Onondaga, Saltfleet, and Seneca. Between 1850 and 1854, Wentworth and Halton Counties were joined for government purposes into the United Counties of Wentworth and Halton; however, this change was short-lived. In 1973, Wentworth County was renamed the Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth and, in 2001, was amalgamated with six constituent municipalities into the City of Hamilton. The City of Hamilton has remained as the administrative seat or county town since the original creation of the Gore District nearly two centuries ago.

---

Barton Township is described in detail in the *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth of 1875*. The Township of Barton was surveyed in 1791 by Augustus Jones using the Single-Front survey system used by the colonial government between 1783 and 1818. The survey was made up of concessions separated by road allowances. The concession was divided into lots of 200 acres and sideroad allowances were surveyed after every fifth lot. The first settlers arrived in Barton Township in 1791, many of whom were United Empire Loyalists or disbanded troops. The Settlement of Barton Township began slowly, with only 102 families living in the township by 1815. Most of the settlement was concentrated at the foot of the Niagara Escarpment. The township continued to grow and by 1823 it contained one sawmill and three gristmills. By 1841, the population had grown to 1,434.

### 8.2.2 Site History

832 King Street East was historically located in the southern part of Lot 9, Concession II in Barton Township when the crown survey for the township was undertaken. By 1875, the lot was subdivided amongst a number of landowners with 832 King Street East falling on the portion of the lot owned by W. Holton. At this time, urban development along this section of King Street East to the east of Wentworth Street South was not as extensive as the land to the west. A structure is illustrated on the southern portion of W. Holton’s property fronting along what would become Main Street East. The remainder of the property was not yet developed. Early urban roads around the subject property that were constructed around 1875 include King Street East, Main Street East, Sherman Avenue South, Wentworth Street South, and Sanford Avenue South (Figure 3).

By the beginning of the 20th century, historic topographic mapping indicates that urban development was well underway surrounding the subject property and that urban expansion was spreading east of Wentworth Avenue South (Figure 4). Hamilton City Directories indicate that the building at 832 King Street East was constructed by 1931 and was used for residential purposes, identified as the “Dunena Apartments”. The building footprint appears as part of a 1933 revision that was made to the 1927 Fire Insurance Plan and is illustrated as “Apartments”.

It should be noted that this building fronts onto Holton Avenue and, as such, the address of the southern portion of the Dunena Apartments at the time are listed as 2-10 Holton Avenue South. Apartments 1 through 6 are listed at 832 King Street East with apartments 7 through 21 at 2, 6, and 10 Holton Avenue South. All six apartments at 832 King Street were occupied and continued to be occupied by private residents through to the 1970s. Today, the property at 832 King Street East is still occupied by tenants and is currently in use for residential purposes. The existing footprint and an exterior evaluation of the property show no major alterations to the property.

### 8.3 Person/Event/Organization

The historic research undertaken for this CHER did not identify any significant people, events, or organizations that are directly related to or associated with the properties, and could contribute to the potential cultural heritage interest or value of the properties.
9. Discussion of Design or Physical Value

9.1 Style/Type/Tradition

The building located on the property at 832 King Street East consists of a three-storey brick apartment building that was built in the 1930s. The building is substantial in size and spans the majority of the large property at the corner of King Street East and Holton Avenue South. The building is utilitarian in design, typical of mid-20th century urban apartment construction with minimal design characteristics.

Architecturally, the building consists of two main façades, one fronting onto each street. The King Street East façade consists of three bays which includes a symmetrical arrangement of windows and doors. A ground floor door is located in the centre bay, covered by a small hipped roof supported on wooden decorative brackets, one of the few design elements incorporated into the apartment building. Two large windows are located above the centre door. The two flanking bays consist of groupings of three stories of matching windows. A symmetrical pair of basement windows is also located on this façade; however, the west window has been filled.

Along the east side of the property, the façade that fronts onto Holton Avenue South consists of a long series of bays and entrances along this side of the property. Conceptually, this façade can be understood in three sections which all include a central door, flanked by bays of apartment windows, and balconies. Each of the central doors include a built out brick porch with decorative concrete quoins. Two of the three entranceways also include a decorative gable that rises above the doorway. Immediately on each side of the doorway are two sets of two brick pillars that form the structural components of the walkouts and balconies from the apartments. This pattern is repeated at each entrance along the Holton Avenue façade.

The west side of the apartment building functions primarily as the rear portion of the building. This façade is much more modest in architectural detail and consists mostly of apartment windows and rear balconies with wooden non-decorative balustrades. This façade is most visible from the parking lot associated with the property at 818 King Street East.

Additional design details on the building are located on each corner of the structure and along the rooflines. At each corner, the exterior brick has been configured in a manner representative of quoins, or structural stone units that were historically laid in the corners of buildings. The use of brick quoin details on this structure is purely decorative. In addition, a projecting cornice constructed of modern soffit and roofing materials wraps around both the King Street East and Holton Avenue South facades, located immediately above the third-storey windows. Lastly, a short parapet walls extends above the roofline on the apartment building and includes a central raised parapet with a decorative concrete panel on each façade.

9.2 Function

The building located at 832 King Street East was designed for residential apartment use. Since its construction in 1931 it has functioned as an apartment building with various tenants.
9.3 Fabric

The structure at 832 King Street East is constructed of brick with concrete detailing. The majority of the exterior consists of brick facades along King Street and Holton Avenue. Brick has been used as a structural component of the structure but has also been used for decorative details including the brick quoins on the corners of the building. Lastly, rusticated concrete has been used for the decorative panels in the peaks of the raised parapet walls, as well as parts of the sills and lintels above and below each window. There is little wood incorporated into the design of the apartment with the exception of the minor wood details around the doors.
10. Discussion of Contextual Value

10.1 Social Meaning

The property at 832 King Street East is an example of mid-20th century urban apartment construction. The apartment building includes particular design elements such as the wooden brackets above the door on the King Street East façade, the decorative brick quoin on the corners of the building, and the raised parapet walls along the rooflines, but does not represent a particular style or characteristic. Rather, it is a typical example of apartment construction found in Hamilton. The proliferation of this type of low-rise, multi-unit dwelling reflects the increasing density of the population as the city grew.

10.2 Environment

The property located at 832 King Street is rather isolated in terms of its characteristic on this block of King Street East. While the apartment building shares similarities with regards to its form and massing with the buildings on the north side of King Street East, ultimately it is relatively isolated on the south side of King Street East as a result of the parking lot to its west and the small convenience store property on the east side of Holton Avenue.

10.3 Formal Recognition

The property was identified in the December 2016 CHSR as not being subject to any heritage recognitions. However, consultation with the City of Hamilton in January and February 2017 confirmed that the property is now listed on the City’s Inventory of Building of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.
## 11. Data Sheet

**Table 11-1: Data Sheet for 832 King Street East**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIELD</th>
<th>PROPERTY DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Address</td>
<td>832 King Street East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximate Area (square metres)</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail Corridor</td>
<td>Hamilton LRT B-Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIN</td>
<td>172020105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership</td>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Aerial photo showing location and boundaries

![Aerial Photo](image_url)

### Exterior, street-view photo

![Exterior Photo](image_url)

### Date of construction of built resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(known or estimated and source)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ca. 1931 (Hamilton City Directories)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Date of significant alterations to built resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(known or estimated and source)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIELD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect/designer/builder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous owners or occupants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous function(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Recognition/Protection (municipal, provincial, federal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Heritage Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latitude or UTM Northing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longitude or UTM Easting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Photographs

Photograph 1: View looking south showing frontage onto King Street East (AECOM, 2017)

Photograph 2: View looking east, showing the west façade adjacent to the parking lot associated with 181 King Street East (AECOM, 2017)
Photograph 3: View looking south showing northwest corner of the property and balconies on the west façade (AECOM, 2017)

Photograph 4: View looking west, showing one of the conceptual portions on the east façade which includes a central doorway, brick pillars as part of the balconies, and the apartment windows (AECOM, 2017)
Photograph 5: View looking west, showing one of the conceptual portions on the east façade which includes a central doorway, brick pillars as part of the balconies, and the apartment windows (AECOM, 2017)

Photograph 6: Detail showing door in King Street East façade with decorative wood brackets supporting a small porch roof.
13. Figures

All figures pertaining to this CHER can be found on the following pages:
Figure 1: Location of 832 King Street East
Figure 2: Aerial Photograph showing the area surrounding 832 King Street East
Figure 3: Location of 832 King Street East on the 1875 Historic Atlas Map (Page & Smith, 1875)
Figure 4: Location of 832 King Street East on the 1905-1909 NTS Map
**Figure 5: Location of 832 King Street East on the 1938 NTS Map**
14. **Chronology**

1791  Barton Township was surveyed by Augustus Jones; the first settler arrived in the township.

1792  Province of Upper Canada divided into administrative districts.

1816  Home District divided and reorganized. As part of the reorganization, Wentworth was reorganized and included within the Gore District.

1850  Gore District was divided and Halton and Wentworth Counties were created.

1873  Incorporation of the Hamilton Street Railway.

1875  A single structure is illustrated on the southern portion of the undeveloped property fronted on Main Street East. The property is owned by W. Holton.

1931  The property at 832 King Street East has been constructed and is in use as a residential apartment building under “Dunena Apartments” with six residents listed in the City Directory.

1970  The property remains under use as “Dunena Apartments”.
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1. Executive Summary

AECOM Canada Ltd. (AECOM) was retained by Metrolinx to complete a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) for the property at 832 King Street East, in the City of Hamilton, Ontario. This work is being completed as part of the Hamilton Light Rail Transit (LRT) Project.

The Hamilton LRT Project B-Line alignment extends from McMaster University at Cootes Drive to the Main Street/Highway 403 Bridge. A proposed LRT-only bridge will allow the alignment to then extend along King Street West until King East Street intersects with Main Street East, where the alignment will continue along Main Street East to the Queenston Road traffic circle. As a part of the project, it is anticipated that building impacts may take place on the property at 832 King Street East.

The project impacts will be assessed following the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), as prescribed in Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 231/08, Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings under the Environmental Assessment Act. As part of the TPAP Amendment, an Environmental Project Report (EPR) Amendment will be prepared for public review.

The CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Interim Cultural Heritage Management Process and utilizes the criteria in Ontario Regulation 9/06 and Ontario Regulation 10/06, as required by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport’s (MTCS) Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (2010). In addition, the CHER was prepared according to the Metrolinx Draft Terms of Reference for Consultants: Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations. As such the recommendations as they relate to this CHER and the potential cultural heritage value or interest of the property at 832 King Street East are contained in a separate Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report Recommendations (CHERR) document.

As part of the reporting requirements for the Hamilton LRT Project, Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) undertook a Cultural Heritage Screening Report (CHSR) for the alignment. The CHSR identified the requirement to conduct a CHER for the property located at 832 King Street East to assess the potential cultural heritage value or interest of the property. Where applicable, relevant background information has been utilized from the CHSR for project consistency.

The property located at 832 King Street East on a rectangular corner lot at the southwest corner of King Street East and Holton Avenue South. The structure on the property consists of a three-storey apartment building that extends approximately 40 metres (m) south on Holton Avenue. The massing, design, and exterior configuration of the apartment appears to remain relatively unchanged from its original construction in the 1930s.

Hamilton City Directories indicate that the building at 832 King Street East was constructed by 1931 and was used for residential purposes, identified as the “Dunena Apartments”. The building footprint appears as part of a 1933 revision that was made to the 1927 Fire Insurance Plan and is illustrated as “Apartments”.

A field review of the privately owned property at 832 King Street East was undertaken on January 12th, 2017 and February 3rd, 2017 by Michael Greguol and Emily Game of AECOM. An assessment was not completed on the interior of the structures due to the timing constraints for the TPAP Amendment.
The property at 832 King Street East is an example of mid-20th century urban apartment construction. The apartment building includes particular design elements such as the wooden brackets above the door on the King Street East façade, the decorative brick quoins on the corners of the building, and the raised parapet walls along the rooflines, but does not represent a particular style or character. Rather, it is a typical example of apartment construction found in Hamilton.

The application of O.Reg 9/06 and O.Reg. 10/06 concluded that 832 King Street East does not meet O.Reg. 9/06 or O.Reg. 10/06, as it did not satisfy any of the criteria. Therefore, this CHERR recommends that the property at 832 King Street East, Hamilton is not considered a Provincial Heritage Property (PHP).
2. **Ontario Regulation 9/06 Evaluation**

*Ontario Regulation 9/06, Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest* (O. Reg. 9/06) provides criteria to apply to a potential heritage property to evaluate its heritage value. If a privately-owned property meets one or more of the following criteria it may be designated by a municipality under Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. For the purposes of this CHER, O. Reg. 9/06 considers the evaluation of the property as part of the community context. The *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties* state that a property may be considered a Provincial Heritage Property (PHP) if it meets one or more of the criteria under O. Reg. 9/06. The application of the criteria for 832 King Street East is included in Table 2-1 below.

**Table 2-1: O.Reg. 9/06 Evaluation for 832 King Street East**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Response (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1) The property has design or physical value because it:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Is a rare, unique, representative, or early example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property includes a building that is a typical example of mid-20th century apartment construction in Hamilton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit; or</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property is of common design and does not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property is a common residential apartment structure and does not display a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2) The property has historic or associative value because it:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community was found to be directly associated with this building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Yields, or has the potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture; or</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property does not have potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Criterion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>A specific architect, designer, or builder could not be determined for this property.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3) The property has **contextual value** because it:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i) Is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area;</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>The property forms a large portion of the south side of King Street East between Holton Avenue and Farleigh Avenue; however, it is of relatively common design and does not appear to be an important property in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of the area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ii) Is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings; or</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property has remained relatively unchanged from its original construction on the south side of King Street East since 1931; however, its surrounding environment has changed over time. While connected to its historic location just outside of downtown Hamilton, the property does not appear to be physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Is a landmark.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property at 832 King Street East is not considered a landmark.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Ontario Regulation 10/06 Evaluation

Ontario Regulation 10/06, Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest of Provincial Significance (O. Reg. 10/06), provides criteria against which to assess a property to determine if the property holds provincial heritage significance. The Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties state that Ministries and prescribed public bodies shall apply the criteria in O. Reg. 10/06 to determine whether a property is of provincial significance. Therefore, for the purpose of this CHER O. Reg 10/06 considers the evaluation of the property as a part of the provincial context. If the property meets the criteria, it may be considered a Provincial Heritage Property of Provincial Significance (PHPPS). The application of the criteria for 832 King Street East is in Table 3-1, below.

Table 3-1: O.Reg. 10/06 Evaluation for 832 King Street East

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Response (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The property represents or demonstrates a theme or pattern in Ontario's history.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>832 King Street East does not represent a theme or pattern in Ontario's history. Residential apartment structures similar to this are found throughout towns and cities in Ontario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The property yields, or had the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of Ontario's history.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>832 King Street East does not yield, and is not anticipated to yield information that contributes to an understanding of Ontario’s history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The property demonstrates an uncommon, rare, or unique aspect of Ontario’s cultural heritage.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>832 King Street East does not demonstrate an uncommon, rare, or unique aspect of Ontario’s cultural heritage. The form and massing of the structures are commonly found in Ontario.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The property is of aesthetic, visual, or contextual importance to the province.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>832 King Street East property is not of aesthetic, visual, or contextual importance to the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The property demonstrates a high degree of excellence or creative, technical, or scientific achievement at a provincial level in a given period.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>832 King Street East is a common residential apartment structure and does not demonstrate a high degree of excellence or creative, technical, or scientific achievement at a provincial level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Response (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The property has a strong or special association with the entire province or with a community that is found in more than one part of the province.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>832 King Street East does not have a strong or special association with the entire province or with a community that is found in more than one part of the province. No provincial connections could be determined for this property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The property has a strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organization of importance to the province or with an event of importance to the province.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>832 King Street East does not have strong or special associations with the life or work of a person, group, or organization of importance to the province or with an event of importance to the province.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The property is located in an unorganized territory and the Minister determines that there is a provincial interest in the protection of the property.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>832 King Street East is not located in an unorganized territory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. **Recommended Outcome of Evaluation**

The application of O.Reg 9/06 and O.Reg. 10/06 concluded that 832 King Street East does not meet O.Reg. 9/06 or O.Reg. 10/06, as it did not satisfy any of the criteria. Therefore, this CHERR recommends that the property at 832 King Street East, Hamilton is not considered a Provincial Heritage Property (PHP). As a result, a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and Heritage Attributes have not been prepared for this property.