

Ministry of Culture
400 University Avenue
Toronto ON M7A 2R9

Ministère de la Culture
400, avenue University
Toronto ON M7A 2R9



Conservation Review Board
Tel 416-314-7137
Fax 416-314-7175

Commission des
Biens culturels
T91 416-314-7137
T919c 416-314-7175

CONSERVATION REVIEW BOARD

RE: THE CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF MISSISSAUGA INTENTION TO DESIGNATE THE PROPERTY KNOWN AS 84 HIGH STREET EAST (THE HAMILTON PROPERTY), MISSISSAUGA, ONTARIO

Terence J. Moynihan, Chair
Peter A.P. Zakarow, Assisting

July 6, 2006

This hearing was convened under Section 29(8) of the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O.1990, c.O.18 as amended, for the purpose of reporting to the Council of the City of Mississauga, Ontario, whether, in the opinion of this Board, on the basis of the evidence it heard, the property known at 84 High Street East in Mississauga, Ontario, should be designated by by-law under the Act.

Notice of this hearing was given by the Conservation Review Board in the manner required under the Act in the Mississauga News in its issue of June 21, 2006. An affidavit prepared by a member of the Conservation Review Board staff with respect to the publication of this notice was filed at this hearing as Exhibit 1.

Two pre-hearings on this matter were held before the Conservation Review Board on February 15, 2006 and March 31, 2006.

As is the custom of the Board, immediately prior to the hearing, the Board members who conducted this hearing had an opportunity to inspect the building, the site and the neighbourhood in the vicinity of the site. This hearing was conducted in Committee Room A on the second floor, 300 City Centre Drive, Mississauga, Ontario, between 10:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. on Thursday, July 6, 2006.

Participants:

Counsel in Order of Appearance:

- Michael E. Minkowski, Solicitor for the City of Mississauga: Legal Services, City of Mississauga
- Chris Barnett, Davis and Company, Solicitors for the Objector

Witnesses in Order of Appearance:

- Mark Warrack, Heritage Coordinator, Community Services, City of Mississauga
- Marian M. Gibson, Chair of The Mississauga Heritage Foundation Inc., a non-share charitable corporation dedicated to the identification and preservation of heritage sites in the City of Mississauga
- Mark Hall, OAA, MRAIC, MCIP, AICP, FAIA, CAPHC, MW Hall and Associates, Toronto, Ontario

In this report the structure in question is identified as 84 High Street East. It is a one and one-half storey dwelling situated at the intersection of High Street West and Anne Street in the community of Port Credit which was incorporated into the City of Mississauga in 1974. Throughout this report it will be referred to as "the Property."

The hearing commenced at 10:00 a.m.

Case for the City of Mississauga

Mr. Minkowski introduced the case for the City of Mississauga. He filed a document, shown as Exhibit 2, as proof of the title for the Property showing the legal description as PT LT 1, PL PC2 ECR N/S High St in R0768460: Mississauga, and the current owner as 1609375 Ontario Ltd.

He filed a binder prepared by the City of Mississauga that would be used to document various features of the City's reason for designation. This was introduced as Exhibit 3.

He filed an affidavit which showed that the Council of the City of Mississauga, at its meeting of July 6, 2005, gave notice of its intention to designate the Property (Exhibit 3, Tab 10, Page 29).

Witness – Mark Warrack, Heritage Coordinator, Community Services, City of Mississauga

Mr. Minkowski called Mark Warrack as an expert witness for the City of Mississauga. Mr. Warrack was affirmed. Mr. Warrack's CV was accepted (Exhibit 3, Tab 1)

Mr. Warrack stated that he is Heritage Coordinator for the City of Mississauga. He is responsible for identifying structures for designation, advising the city's Heritage Committee and providing direction on planning and policy development related to heritage matters. He coordinates the City's plan to develop a strategy and implement a full cultural plan that integrates arts and heritage.

He prepares reports on heritage properties in the City of Mississauga, and makes recommendations to the City's Heritage Advisory Committee and City Council on properties considered for designation. He prepared all the documentation and undertook the research to support this case for the designation of the Property.

He acknowledged that he is not an architect.

Mr. Barnett questioned the expertise of the witness, pointing out that Mr. Warrack was not a registered professional architect and suggesting that he was therefore not qualified to comment on the architectural features of the Property. While this lack of professional designation was noted, the Chair ruled that the witness did have considerable experience in the field of heritage and that the Board would take into account his qualifications when architectural considerations were raised.

Mr. Minkowski introduced the reasons for designation (Exhibit 4). Mr. Warrack acknowledged that he had prepared this document.

Mr. Warrack indicated that the property was acquired in 1886 by Fredrick Hamilton who sold it to his brother Charles in 1903. James Hamilton, the father of Fredrick and Charles, had built a successful general store business in Port Credit, and the two sons continued to operate the business after James' death. In 1908 Charles Hamilton sold Lot 1, the eastern half of the property, to William Thomas Gray. Mr. Gray was the owner of The St. Lawrence Starch Company, the major manufacturing enterprise in Port Credit. Mr. Gray built a home on the property (90 High Street) which still stands today and has been designated as a heritage site by the City of Mississauga. In 1912, Charles Hamilton married and proceeded to build on the remaining portion of property. There is some evidence that he assured Mr. Gray that the building would be of comparative quality to the one which he (Mr. Gray) had built.

The present owner (1609375 Ontario Ltd.) acquired the Property in 2004 and currently is renovating the interior to accommodate six separate suites for residential occupation.

In order to meet current building codes, the owner has had to make extensive modifications to the rear of the building to permit fire exits and separate alternative entrances. While agreeing that these structures were not in keeping with the original architectural style of the building, Mr. Warrack stated that it was his opinion these alterations did not compromise the case for designation of the building.

Mr. Warrack proceeded to outline the process used by the City of Mississauga to prepare an inventory of heritage sites, and the eventual designation of sites.

The adjacent property, 90 High Street, which is viewed by the City of Mississauga as an historical “companion piece” to the Property, has been designated and its owner was supportive of the designation. It has been totally renovated and is currently in use as a commercial property. The exterior has not been altered in any way from what was originally built. The City’s corporate report detailing the designation of 90 High Street (the Gray Property) is found in Tab 18 of Exhibit 3.

Mr. Warrack outlined the City’s criteria for designation as well as its policies for designation. These are detailed in Tab 3 of Exhibit 3.

He also set the context of heritage conservation within the framework of the City’s strategic plan – see Tab 4 of Exhibit 3, Strategic Plan for the New Millennium.

He also indicated that the criteria adopted by the City of Mississauga are consistent with the new Ontario Regulation 9/06 under the Ontario Heritage Act, Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest.

Mr. Warrack stated that the Property was on the City’s inventory of Heritage Sites at the time it was purchased (2004) and the owner should have known this.

Mr. Warrack then proceeded to establish the historical context of the Property in the surrounding neighbourhood. He showed aerial photographs (1933) that confirmed that the streets were unchanged. The relationship with the rail line is the same, the relationship to the St. Lawrence Starch Company properties has not changed and the pedestrian character of the surrounding streets has not changed. The Property and 90 High Street clearly stood out on the aerial photographs as significant structures relative to others in the neighbourhood.

Mr. Warrack then attempted to establish the architectural style of the Property. He made reference to *Ontario Architecture, a Guide to Styles and Building Terms, 1784 to the Present*, by John Blumenson. He stated that in his opinion the Property and 90 High Street are good examples of the Bungalow Style and manifest many of its characteristic features, namely:

- broad, gently pitched roof, covering the porch
- large front porch/veranda
- extensive use of gables
- large generous eaves
- extensive use of stone
- one large dominant chimney

He also made reference to the *Field Guide to American Housing*, “Craftsman,” exhibit 5A, and “Tudor,” exhibit 5B, in which he found reference to specific features of the architecture of the Property that are associated with these architectural styles:

- large gabled roof
- false half-timbering
- large porches
- extensive use of stone
- distinctive windows
- use of stucco
- prominent chimneys

He stated that in his opinion the Property was more like the Bungalow Style with some Tudor elements.

Mr. Warrack then pointed out that the architects for the property were Chadwick & Beckett of Toronto who were likely the architects for 90 High Street as well. Through photographs (Tab 23 of Exhibit 3), he showed that this same architect had been responsible for the design of many other well-known properties in the Toronto area of the same period. Many of these showed architectural similarities to the Property.

Mr. Warrack then turned to the arguments in support of designation based on historical significance. The original owner, Charles Hamilton and his family were leading members of the community. They had financial means. The property and its sister property at 90 High Street made major architectural and construction statements in the community at the time when they were built.

The Hamilton family owned the local general store. After the death of the father, James Hamilton, his sons, Charles and Fredrick, took over the business. Later the store became the local Post Office and Charles was appointed Postmaster, a significant position in the early 1900s.

Mr. Warrack then proceeded to review several newspaper articles and other records of the time that attested to the fact that the Hamilton family has been prominent in municipal politics, their church and the military (Tabs 33 to 47, Exhibit 3).

Cross-Examination of Mark Warrack by Chris Barnett, Solicitor for the Owner

Mr. Barnett pointed out that between the time the Notice of Intention to Designate was given, July 6, 2005, and the time of this hearing, the Ontario Heritage Act has been amended. The amended Act now makes designation more permanent (there is no longer a 180-day “cooling-off period” for demolition applications). The legislation gives municipalities power to prohibit demolition subject to the owner’s right to appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board.

Because of this, Mr. Barnett said he felt that his client should be treated in this hearing under the terms and conditions of the Act as it existed when designation was commenced by the City of Mississauga.

In response to Mr. Barnett’s questioning, Mr. Warrack acknowledged that every old house does not merit preservation simply because of its age.

Mr. Warrack admitted that he had approved the renovations to the building requested by the owner.

Mr. Barnett then questioned the contention that designation was merited because of the architecture of the building. Mr. Warrack acknowledged, for example, that the windows are supposed to be a distinct feature of the Bungalow/Tudor style, and yet every window in the building has been changed to modern casement windows.

Mr. Barnett then referenced issues dealing with architectural style, see Tab 21, Exhibit 3. He pointed out that the building is obviously more than one storey and suggested it does not look like a bungalow. While there are admittedly some similarities to the Bungalow Style, he alleged it was not a neat fit.

Mr. Warrack responded that while not all of the design features were present the building did contain elements of both the Bungalow and Tudor styles. He said that in his opinion it fit best with the Bungalow Style.

Mr. Barnett then turned to the matter of the historical significance of the Property.

In response to questioning, Mr. Warrack agreed that, while people who owned established businesses provide essential services to the community, we should not necessarily be preserving all of their homes. Mr. Barnett further contended that not all Postmasters’ homes merit designation, nor do prominent members of local

churches, lodges or other community groups. He further suggested that just because Charles Hamilton attended Upper Canada College and had lots of wealthy friends who attended with him; this in itself did not prove that he was a prominent or influential member of the community. Mr. Warrack agreed.

Mr. Warrack admitted under cross-examination that the designation of some properties on the east side of Hurontario Street that had been owned by The St. Lawrence Starch Company, Lots 15 – 43, including Mr. Gray's original home, had been repealed and the properties were replaced with new commercial buildings.

When asked if he knew which architect in the firm of Chadwick & Bennett had designed the Property, Mr. Warrack stated that he did not know. He also agreed that, with the exception of 90 High Street, there is no proof that Chadwick and Bennett were involved in the architectural design of other Port Credit homes.

Re-examination of Mr. Warrack by Mr. Minkowski

Mr. Minkowski suggested and Mr. Warrack agreed that some of the examples of the Bungalow Style, referred to in the Blumenson book (Tab 21, Exhibit 3) were in fact one and one-half to two-storey buildings. Mr. Warrack stated that in his opinion there was some overlap between the Craftsman and the Bungalow styles and that the former could be considered a sub-category of latter.

Mr. Minkowski asked why the designation of The St. Lawrence Starch Company-owned homes on Hurontario Street had been repealed. Mr. Warrack stated that he only knew that they were no longer needed by the company and that the St. Lawrence Starch Company wanted them demolished. There was a long-term lease on one property (Lot 15) so it was not demolished until the lease expired.

Other Witnesses Called by Mr. Minkowski

Marion Gibson of the Mississauga Heritage Foundation was sworn in as a witness. Ms. Gibson stated that she was a retired school teacher and a writer on heritage topics. She was the President of the Foundation, a position she had held for four years and has been a member of the Foundation since 1996. She outlined the importance of Port Credit in the history of Mississauga.

She said that there are not many tangible heritage sites left in Port Credit. She felt that 84 High Street and 90 High Street were two sites that remain to tell the community what life was like back in the early 1900s. In her opinion, the property is "a little gem" and she supported the designation.

The Case for the Owner

Mr. Barnett called Mr. Mark W. Hall as his witness. Mr. Hall was affirmed. Mr. Barnett presented Mr. Hall as an expert in preservation of architectural sites and historical buildings, designs, and materials.

Mr. Hall is a professional architect with a master's degree in city planning from Harvard University. He is a graduate of the U.S. Navy Civil Engineering Officers School and has done graduate work in planning and economics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He is a graduate of the Pratt Institute Studies in City Planning and holds a Bachelor of Architecture degree from the University of Michigan. He is a member of the Ontario Association of Architects. He has had wide experience in city development, urban design, real estate development, historic preservation, architecture practice and community and educational service. His CV is included in his report (Exhibit 8A).

Mr. Hall stated that he was retained by the current owner of the Property in April 2006 to give an independent professional opinion of the heritage merits of 84 High Street.

Mr. Hall stated that, in his professional opinion, the case for designation is weak. Mr. Hall stated that on all criteria – historical, architectural and contextual – the subject property does not merit designation. He summarized his assessment as follows:

Architectural: It is an agglomeration of many styles. It is not unique.

Historical: James Hamilton, the owner, and his family, were local businessmen. The sons inherited the position of Postmaster, they did not earn it.

Contextual: Its significance is only nominal. It contributes, but not much.

Mr. Hall outlined the process followed in his study:

- Met with the owner
- Reviewed the property and surrounding areas
- Met with legal and planning consultants
- Tried to meet with the City of Mississauga Planning Department and was denied
- Researched the history of Port Credit and the property
- Reviewed Bungalow style and Arts and Crafts tradition
- Reviewed physical condition of the property
- Completed a field survey of neighbourhood buildings
- Reviewed City of Mississauga Official Plan
- Prepared an independent determination of the merits of designation

Mr. Hall said that, when determining whether or not a building should be preserved because it represents a particular architectural style, there should be strong evidence that many of the typical features are represented. He is very familiar with the Bungalow Style and feels that the Property is not unique or representative of the style nationally or locally.

With respect to the local area near the Property, Mr. Hall's view was that the area context belongs to the St. Lawrence Starch Company properties. However, the company houses that were designated have been demolished. Now only the original office remains. No other buildings in the area are significant. In fact, the immediate area is made up of small stores, condominiums, parking garages, etc. Three other buildings have been designated, i.e., 90 High Street, 10 and 20 Hurontario Street. They are, in his opinion, of questionable historical importance and of no contextual or architectural importance.

Mr. Hall said the Property is an agglomeration of two or three architectural styles. He sees the building as having a "split personality." His investigation showed that Chadwick and Beckett, the architects, had a habit of designing buildings with mixed architectural styles.

When asked if there was a relationship between 84 High Street and 90 High Street, Mr. Hall said that 90 High Street has been well preserved. 84 High Street was not.

Mr. Hall stated that while 84 High Street was not a good example of the Craftsman or Bungalow style, in the course of his study he had discovered several other buildings in the area that were good examples of the style. In his opinion these were:

- 1300 Hurontario Street
- 1322 Hurontario Street
- 1370 Hurontario Street
- 46 Park Street
- 5 Woodlawn Avenue
- 30 Woodlawn Avenue

Mr. Hall's Cross-Examination by Mr. Minkowski

Mr. Minkowski asked Mr. Hall whether this property meets the criteria for designation under the Ontario Heritage Act (Tab 13, Exhibit 3).

Mr. Hall answered that one can never say that it does not meet any of them, but in his view the property is not a landmark property.

Mr. Minkowski asked Mr. Hall what sources he looked at and whether he had examined the photographs in Tab 22 and 23 in Exhibit 3. Mr. Hall answered that he had not, but after Mr. Minkowski drew his attention to them, he said that he had no reason to question them.

Mr. Minkowski then asked whether Mr. Hall would agree that 90 High Street and 84 High Street look somewhat alike and suggested that both have large front porches supported by large columns characteristic of Chadwick & Bennett's work. Mr. Hall agreed that they did but the roof on 84 High Street is steeper.

When asked if 84 High Street and 90 High Street were unique in the Port Credit area, Mr. Hall agreed.

The Chair asked Mr. Hall what he thought of the structural additions the owner has made to the back of the building. Mr. Hall answered that they seriously detracted from the appearance of the building and generally had a negative impact.

On the question of context, Mr. Hall said that, when looking at the history of the area around 84 High Street and 90 High Street, he had focused on what the Official Plan said about Port Credit. He stated that in his opinion the real history of the area centred on the area west of the Credit River, not the area near The St. Lawrence Starch Company. He did not feel that the Hurontario Street and Lakeshore Boulevard area was of great historical importance.

When asked about the significance of being a Postmaster in determining Mr. Hamilton's contribution to the Port Credit community, Mr. Hall said he was not an expert in that area and couldn't comment. Mr. Hall did say that because the Hamilton family ran the only general store in Port Credit, it was understandable that the Post Office was put there and that the store was also the location of the first gasoline pump and telephone. He said that the Hamilton sons merely inherited these functions upon the death of their father.

Summary for the Owner – Mr. Barnett

Mr. Barnett asked the Board to remember the architectural context. The building carries no real significance. The municipality should not designate borderline properties like this one. He said that while the Property has some significance, it is not significant enough for designation.

The Board should apply the Ontario Heritage Act as it existed before May, 2006. The permanency of the designation scares the owner

The Property is neither rare nor unique, and is not significant. It does not meet the standard.

There is no agreement on the particular style of the building.

Mr. Barnett suggested that the City's own standards for designation were not consistent. There does not appear to be an objective rating system. There is not sufficient certainty or clarity.

The Board should consider the Property as it is today when making its determination. The building has been modified and, unlike the neighbouring property at 90 High Street, it no longer represents what it did when it was built.

Summary for the City of Mississauga - Mr. Minkowski:

Mr. Minkowski suggested that the owner is only looking at the long-term economic impact of designation. While this is understandable, it is not appropriate to the question of significance.

The City of Mississauga has put forth a well-researched and well-documented case and asked the Board to find that it is appropriate and reasonable to designate.

Statements from the Public

There were no statements from the public.

The Hearing adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Findings and Recommendations of the Board

With respect to counsel for the Objector's argument that the Board should apply the Ontario Heritage Act as it existed at the time the designation was begun, i.e. before the 2005 amendments, the Board points out that the 2005 changes to the Act did not themselves change the test for cultural heritage significance. As stated in the recent regulation (Ontario Regulation 9/06) setting out the significance criteria that must now be met for any new designations, the regulation does not apply to designations commenced before January 24, 2006. Since the regulation does not apply in this case, the Board has applied the City of Mississauga's own criteria (which it was noted are very similar to the criteria in the new regulation).

The Board also notes that the 2005 changes to the Act strengthened municipalities' powers to control demolition of designated buildings, i.e. municipalities can now prohibit demolition (rather than just delay it) subject to the owner's right to appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board. While it is true that in this case the rules with respect to the effect of designation changed mid-stream, the Board finds that this change is not a relevant consideration in the discussion of the significance of the property. The question of fairness to owners of designated property has been addressed in the legislation through the provision of a right of appeal to the OMB in cases where the municipality refuses to consent to the demolition of the building.

Based on the evidence presented to it, the Board has analyzed the reasons for designation as provided by the City of Mississauga in Exhibit #4 under the three headings of historical, architectural and contextual significance.

1. Historical significance

The Board finds that the historical importance of the Hamilton family in the history of Port Credit is questionable. The city contends that Charles Hamilton, the original owner of the Property, was an important person in the history of Port Credit. His father, James, owned the general store; after James' death, Charles and his brother Frederick, inherited the business; subsequently, Charles was appointed Postmaster for the town.

As in most towns of the day, the general store was a gathering spot for the community. It is understandable that the Post Office would choose the General Store as its pick-up and delivery point and to appoint one of the owners as the head Postmaster. It is likely, too, that the position carried some special prestige in the area at that time.

In the normal progression of time the store was also selected as the location of the first telephone and the first gasoline pumps. The Board suggests that this was likely done for location and convenience as opposed to the standing of Charles Hamilton in the community.

It is clear from the evidence that the Hamilton family more than pulled its weight in the community. They were actively involved in civic politics, the Church, and local Lodges. They were well-educated and were people of means. However, to assert that Charles, who built and occupied the house, stood out as a prominent community builder and leader is debatable. Mr. Warrack, under cross-examination, agreed that we don't designate someone's home simply because they were the local Postmaster.

The Board concludes that the case for the historical significance of the Property based on its association with the Hamilton family is not compelling.

2. Architectural significance

The Board finds that the Property, built circa 1912, is a hybrid of styles and is probably best described as a traditional Bungalow style with Tudor influences. As designed it had the following features:

- A low sloping roof design adopted from the Tudor and Craftsman styles.
- Exterior finishes include course Credit Valley stone on the first floor which provides a visually solid base.
- Second floor is stucco with wooden accent battens in the Tudor style.
- Original wooden shingles have been replaced with asphalt shingles, except in the gable ends and the dormer exterior finishes.
- The sloping roof on the front is complete with multiple dormers.
- The soffit detail is very ornamental, extending to the roof overhang.
- The foundation is all original stone. There are large stone pillars that frame the front porch and taper to the roof line. There is a half-wall of the same stone, with a stone cap that extends the full length of the front porch. This stone work has the visual effect of anchoring the structure.
- A curved arch header frames the space between the front porch pillars. The same arch frames the second storey windows.
- There are extended purlins under the eaves.
- The windows are multi-paned with sandstone sills.
- There are three chimneys in the building.

The Board also finds that 84 High Street, along with the neighbouring property at 90 High Street, is unique in its design for the area. Beyond that there was no evidence that the Property set any architectural benchmarks.

In its present condition, there are some features that remain intact, such as the sloping roof, the gables, the large front porch, the extensive stone work, the stucco and the wooden battens. However, many of the original features no longer exist or have been substantially altered. The roof shingles, originally wood, have been replaced with asphalt shingles. The multi-pane windows have been replaced with single-pane casement windows, which has had a major impact on the building's appearance. Two of the three original chimneys no longer extend beyond the roof line.

The present owner is in the process of converting the Property from a single-family dwelling into a multi-family dwelling consisting of six separate suites. In order to effect the changes and comply with building codes, the owner has had to construct entrances and exits to accommodate the needs of individual tenants, and to meet privacy, fire-safety ingress and egress requirements.

To accomplish this, the owner has modified doorways and built wooden stairs and walkways on the rear of the building that seriously compromise the architectural features of the building. These are roughly finished and detract from the appearance of the Property from the rear and from Ann Street.

The Board also notes the landscaping and other external features such as steps, walks and the large front porch are in a state of serious disrepair.

The Board finds that, as it stands today, 84 High Street is only a shadow of its former self. The original structure, both on the interior and the exterior have been severely modified. Although the proposed designation deals only with the exterior, many of the changes made to the interior have affected some of the key elements of the exterior, i.e., chimneys, entrances and exits, and windows. In particular, the multi-paned windows, a prominent feature of both the Tudor and Bungalow styles, have been replaced with modern single-pane casement windows that are totally out of character with those styles.

It is the conclusion of the Board that the City has over time allowed owners of the Property to alter the exterior features of the building to the extent that the integrity of the Property has been compromised. This has seriously weakened the justification for designation on architectural grounds.

3. Contextual significance

The City maintains that the Property, located near the intersection of Lakeshore Road and Hurontario Street in the centre of Port Credit, is open and visible and is integral to the Hurontario cultural landscape. It points out that, along with 90 High Street, the Property stands out as a representative of early twentieth century residential architecture and still remains its residential character despite the fact it has been used for both residential and commercial purposes since 1951.

The Board finds that the area near the intersection of Lakeshore Road and Hurontario Street was historically associated with the St. Lawrence Starch Company plant. Products of this plant have been household names across Canada for decades. Several years ago, the plant was closed and the plant site was redeveloped into very attractive and well-planned condominiums that tie nicely into the Lake Ontario lakefront via paths, gardens and walkways. All that remains of the former plant is the main office building. It is a beautifully maintained example of office design of the time and is still in use today. It has been designated under the Ontario Heritage Act.

On the east side of Hurontario Street, north of Lakeshore Road, the St. Lawrence Starch Company had a series of company houses and other structures it needed as part of its business operations. None of these structures remain. The Board heard evidence that they were once designated but the designations were later rescinded and the structures demolished at the request of the St. Lawrence Starch Company.

Besides 90 High Street, there are two other residences of the period that remain on the west side of Hurontario Street, namely number 10 and number 20. They have been well-maintained and are currently being used as commercial properties. Number 10 Hurontario Street is the business office of the owner of 84 High Street. Both properties have been designated under the Ontario Heritage Act.

The two properties, 84 and 90 High Street are a pair of similar buildings that are the last remaining examples of grand housing design of the 1912 era. While this is true, the Board finds that this pairing is not of itself sufficient contextual grounds for designation. The state of preservation and authenticity to original design of the two buildings are not comparable. 90 High Street has retained most of its original features while 84 High Street has had its features significantly compromised.

The Board therefore finds the arguments for contextual importance weak. Little remains of The St. Lawrence Starch Plant and support buildings and 84 High Street has no historical association with the plant. The Board suggests that the City has not strengthened its case by permitting the buildings associated with the St. Lawrence Starch Company in this area to have their designations rescinded and by allowing them to be removed.

Recommendations for the City of Mississauga

The Board concludes that while the Property known as 84 High Street does have some historical, architectural and contextual merit, it is not sufficient to warrant designation. The Board therefore recommends to the Council of the City of Mississauga that the City not proceed with the designation of the property.

The Board also recommends that the City carefully consider allowing owners to make structural changes to buildings which compromise the integrity of important architectural features. In the case of 84 High Street, several of these modifications, i.e., to windows, chimneys, roofing, exits, and entrances, have taken away major elements of the original design.

The Board also suggests that the City develop a more rigorous method for the evaluation of properties proposed for designation. Some ranking based on letter or numerical rating could be useful. The reasons for designation should also include a succinct statement explaining the cultural heritage value of the property and a more detailed identification and assessment of the “heritage attributes” of the property as required by the Ontario Heritage Act.

The Board heard that the real historical context of the area around the intersection of Lakeshore Road and Hurontario Street centres around the location of the former St. Lawrence Starch Company plant. The City should look for opportunities to preserve structures that were related to this plant. In general we suggest that the City give more attention to preserving structures that support the historical and contextual nature of the community or its parts. This will require more in-depth study of the history and context of different sections of the city.

(original signed) by:

Terrence J. Moynihan, Chair

(original signed) by:

Peter A.P. Zakarow, Assisting

List of Exhibits

1. Conservation Review Board Affidavit of Notice
- 1a. Copy of the Public Notice, July 13, 2006, Mississauga News
2. Proof of Title documents
3. Exhibit Document Book City of Mississauga
4. Reasons for Designation
- 5a. Field Guide to American Houses, Virginia and Lee McAlester page 452, Craftsman Style
- 5b. Page 354 of the Guide to American Houses (same book)
6. Page 20 of Toronto Architecture “A City Guide” of the Guide to American Houses (same book) Patricia McHugh “Tudor Style”.
7. Document Book for Marion Gibson
- 8a. Mark Hall’s Report
- 8b. List of Historical Properties on which Mr. Hall has worked