



KINGSTON MUNICIPAL HERITAGE COMMITTEE (L.A.C.A.C.)

MINUTES

MEETING No. 2010-07

**Monday 07th June 2010 at 12:00 noon*
in the Council Chambers, City Hall**

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mr. Peter Gower, Chair
Mr. R. Bruce Downey, Vice-Chair
Councillor Bill Glover
Mr. David Ariss (left at 12:35 p.m.)
Mr. John Coleman
Mr. John Duerkop
Mr. Michael Gemmell (left at 4:30 p.m.)
Ms. Christine Sypnowich (arrived at 12:20 p.m.)
Mr. Don Taylor

REGRETS

Mr. Robert Cardwell

STAFF PRESENT

Mr. Jamie Brash, Supervisor, Facilities Maintenance
Mr. Rob Crothers, Project Manager, Real Estate & Construction
Ms. Lindsay Lambert, Planner
Mr. Marcus Letourneau, Heritage Planner
Ms. Susan Powley, Committee Clerk
Ms. Marnie Venditti, Manager, Planning & Development
Mr. George Wallace, Director, Planning & Development

OTHERS PRESENT

Ms. Helen Finley
Mr. Andrew Hill

THIS IS NOT A VERBATIM REPORT

MEETING TO ORDER:

Mr. Gower, Chair, called the meeting to order.

RECOGNITION:

WELCOME and INTRODUCTIONS:

POSSIBLE PECUNIARY INTEREST:

None was declared.

CONFIRMATION OF AGENDA:

*Moved by Mr. Duerkop
Seconded by Ms. Sypnowich*

THAT the agenda and addendum be confirmed.

CARRIED

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES:

*Moved by Mr. Duerkop
Seconded by Mr. Taylor*

***THAT** the minutes of the Kingston Municipal Heritage Committee Meeting No. 2010-05 held on 10th May 2010 be confirmed with agreed to edits.*

CARRIED

DELEGATIONS:

BRIEFINGS:

UPDATES:

A. Planning & Development Department Staff

Updates were provided regarding:

a) Working Groups:

i. Historic Properties Research Working Group (David Ariss, Don Taylor)

There was no report.

ii. Communications and Education Working Group (Bob Cardwell, John Duerkop, Peter Gower)

Mr. Letourneau invited Mr. Duerkop to provide an update. Mr. Duerkop advised that all walking tour pamphlets have been distributed. He noted that the group had provided input for the pamphlets which were produced by the Communications Department.

Mr. Duerkop advised that he, Mr. Letourneau and Ms. Hebert met with the designer, and have approved the design which will be used for the Gaskin Lion plaque. The approved template will be brought to the working group for consideration for use for other plaques.

Mr. Duerkop advised that during discussions, the history book located on the Market Square was commended, and has been noted as a viable option for use in other areas.

Ms. Sypnowich referred to a request to the working group that a plaque at the Pittsburgh Library which is over 10 years old, be placed at an upcoming June event to recognize the 30th birthday of the Designation of Barriefield Village. Mr. Duerkop noted a Parks & Recreation Department extended process for locating plaques in parks which would not accommodate this request for this month. Ms. Sypnowich advised that the Barriefield Rock Garden where the plaque could be placed is not a City Park, and is looked after by volunteers. Mr. Duerkop advised that whoever maintains it, it is a city park. He referenced the Kingston Remembers Guidelines which indicates requirements for a City template to be used.

To a question regarding ownership, Mr. Duerkop advised that the Pittsburgh Historical Society owns the plaque.

iii. Exterior Coverings Working Group (Michael Gemmell, Christine Sypnowich)

Mr. Letourneau advised that there was no report.

iv. Accessibility and Heritage Working Group (Peter Gower, Bruce Downey)

Mr. Letourneau advised that there was no report.

b) Delegated Authority:

c) Technical Circulations to Staff:

i. 76 Gore Street regarding a proposed severance

Schedule Pages 1-16.

A recommendation of the Committee on 12 April 2010 was referenced which requested further information and asked that a decision be deferred until the recommendations are fulfilled.

An addendum to the Heritage Impact Statement (HIS) dated 19th May 2010 prepared by Mr. Anthony Barlow was received and considered.

Mr. Michael Preston, owner of the property, was present together with Mr. Andrew Hill to provide an overview of the new information which includes slightly amended comparators. He said that another HIS would be required if something was developed on the property.

Ms. Venditti summarized the process regarding the technical circulation, which was brought before the Committee at the last meeting for a severance. She advised that they were hoping to finalize details of the HIS and receive comments from the Committee who had requested additional information prior to going to the Committee of Adjustment (COA). She said that staff have reviewed the information which has been submitted. There will be an opportunity for the Committee to review the proposal when it is brought forward.

Mr. Downey referenced the request for additional information at the last meeting, and expressed concern regarding the Committee relying on an HIS to determine appropriateness, dealing with a request without knowing what will happen next, and later dealing with the outcome. He noted questions due to the narrowness of the lot, mature vegetation, the prominence of the house, concern that a building built adjacent to this would overpower the existing house, and perhaps mean as an example that mature trees would need to be cut. Concerns should be outlined to the person who buys the lot. He queried if an HIS is required to sever a lot, and if this could also include what would be an appropriate house design.

Mr. Downey noted suggestions within the recently submitted addendum to the Heritage Impact Statement for what would appear to be a 600 square foot plan for a house, located near the back of the lot to avoid cutting trees. As a buyer is unlikely to build a 600 square foot house, the Committee would likely be considering a request from a purchaser for a larger dwelling. This consideration is not dealt with within the HIS. Mr. Downey noted his interest in criteria for the building, and concern that a severed lot would lead to an inappropriately sized building.

Councillor Glover noted sections of the Official Plan which identify what needs to be considered for infilling in a stable area.

Mr. Preston advised that the lot was severed until it merged on title in 1971. The original intent was to build a coachhouse structure, which would be inferior to the main building. He noted that a request could be made to build something larger than what was recommended within the HIS. He noted agreement with the assessment made within the HIS, the impact on other trees if construction took place, and while a very large home is not planned, it is unknown what building would be placed here.

To a suggestion for deferral, Ms. Venditti clarified that an application has not been presented to the Committee, but rather that technical comments are being sought. Construction cannot occur prior to severance as only one principal dwelling is permitted on the lot. An option as suggested by Mr. Preston would be for parameters for the design of a new building, which could be taken into consideration by the Committee of Adjustment when drawings are reviewed.

Mr. Gower queried Mr. Prestons intent to construct a building to contain an office adjacent to the existing home. Ms. Venditti advised that this would not be allowed outside a principal dwelling.

Mr. Downey suggested that the ramifications of a Committee response to this technical circulation decision be clarified.

Councillor Glover noted that this has come forward as a technical circulation within the Committee of Adjustment process, seeking a clear response by the Committee. To an enquiry regarding process as a motion by the Committee won't defer a response by the Committee of Adjustment, Ms. Venditti responded that the applicant has been working with staff to address Heritage matters. The Committee of Adjustment application has been received but has not yet been forwarded.

Mr. Preston advised that he could provide additional information and 'bump' the application until the matter had been fully considered by the Committee.

To a question regarding timing if the applicant was to return to the next meeting with further information, Ms. Venditti confirmed that the applicant has been working with staff for a number of months to address Heritage concerns, and that the option for appeal under the Planning Act after 90 days has been available for some time.

Mr. Downey suggested deferral of a decision until documentation for the proposal offered by the owner has been received.

Mr. Gemmell recognized that this is a hypothetical proposal and queried if it would be binding to the new owner if the severance goes through. It was recognized that information provided by Mr. Preston could be provided to the Committee of Adjustment within a recommendation, and could be bound by that Committee.

Ms. Lambert referenced pages 3 and 4 of the package and that an adjacency issue is regarding character defining features and wouldn't carry forward to a newly created lot. She noted the benefit of an HIS and a design that would be compatible with character defining elements. Mr. Downey responded that rather than relying on an HIS, it is important to see what will actually be placed there.

To a question by Mr. Andrew Hill regarding an option of withdrawing the Committee of Adjustment application, Ms. Venditti responded that it wouldn't make a difference as there is no application before the Heritage Committee, and the application for Committee of Adjustment is being held at this time.

To a question by Councillor Glover regarding process, Ms. Venditti said that staff would consider the discussions of the Heritage Committee, and the report would reflect that there was no concrete decision by the Committee pending receipt of the requested information. The staff report would address all other technical requirements. Ms. Venditti noted that the applicant would be returning to the Committee with a design for the property.

*Moved by Councillor Glover
Seconded by Mr. Downey*

WHEREAS regarding a Technical Circulation for D10-572-2010 for a property located at 76 Gore Street for a Consent to sever for the purpose of single unit residential development, a recommendation was made by the Kingston Municipal Heritage Committee on 12th April 2010 that L132NW should continue to be Designated as a Cultural Heritage Landscape under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, with a request that the Heritage Impact Statement be returned to the author with requests for further information as outlined in the recommendation, and

WHEREAS a Heritage Impact Statement addendum prepared by Mr. Anthony D. Barlow, Dip.Arch. RIBA dated 19th May 2010 was received and considered by the Kingston Municipal Heritage Committee on 07 June 2010,

THEREFORE BE IT RECOMMENDED THAT in regard to Technical Circulation for D10-572-2010 for a property located at 76 Gore Street for a Consent to sever for the purpose of single unit residential development, that on the basis of the information provided to the Kingston Municipal Heritage Committee, they would possibly be inclined to not support a severance, but would

encourage the applicant to come forward with a more concrete proposal indicating how concerns would be addressed.

CARRIED

d) Designation Matters:

e) Site Visits

i. 390 King Street West regarding alterations to the building

Details regarding this site visit are noted with the pre-consultation. (see page 17)

ii. 176 Mowat Avenue regarding the configuration of windows and the glazing pattern of the front windows

Mr. Downey advised that historic photos provided by Ms. Helen Finley showed that windows on the front of the building were originally French Doors, and that this has been identified to Mr. Gervan. He is investigating options.

iii. 239 Johnson Street regarding windows

Mr. Downey advised that a site visit has been established for Thursday with the agent to discuss windows and a railing. Ms. Lambert added that Ms. Guy attended a site visit, took photos, and concluded that all windows appear to be original.

iv. 230 Johnson Street regarding windows

There was no report provided.

f) Status of Heritage Grant and Heritage Tax Applications:

g) Other:

i. Status of Affordable Housing Proposal in Barriefield Village

Mr. Wallace reported that a motion was passed by Council to proceed with a Request for Proposal (RFP) for the Barriefield Village study, so that work will be underway.

Ms. Sypnowich noted a staff timetable which has established a 07th September date for the matter to be brought before Council. She advised that her understanding was that there would be two stages, and that during the second more thorough stage, the matter would come to this Committee. To a question regarding the point at which the City would approach the federal government to buy the land, Mr. Wallace suggested that she enquire through with Mr. Jim DeHoop, Director, Community & Family Services.

*ii. Report No. 10-183 'Requirements for Application for Alteration under the Ontario Heritage Act' – 390 King Street West could be viewed at:
http://www.cityofkingston.ca/cityhall/council/council_agenda.asp*

The report was noted.

B. Chair's Report – by Mr. Peter Gower, Chair

Updates were provided regarding:

i. KMHC Mandate Working Group (Bruce Downey, John Duerkop)

Mr. Downey reported that staff are putting together a report, and that a meeting with the group will be reconvened.

Mr. Wallace added that staff have met and further consideration is being given to the matter.

ii. Ontario Medal for Good Citizenship

An opportunity was noted whereby a citizen could be nominated for the 'Ontario Medal for Good Citizenship' 'who, through exceptional, long-term efforts, have made outstanding contributions to life in their community'.

iii. Pittsburgh Historical Society – 2010 Annual Spring Excursion – National Air Force Museum of Canada, CFB Trenton and other area museums

Mr. Gower highlighted the annual spring excursion which will be taking place on 12th June.

iv. Recognition of Councillor Leonore Foster

Mr. Gower referred to an invitation to members of the Committee to celebrate the many years of service to Pittsburgh and the City of Kingston by Councillor Leonore Foster. The celebration will take place at the Barriefield Rock Garden.

iv. St. James Church Skylight

Mr. Gower advised that removal of the St. James Church skylight had been approved by Council.

BUSINESS:

A. Reports

a) Addition of Properties of Cultural Heritage Value ('Listed' Properties) to the City of Kingston Heritage Properties Register

Schedule Pages 17-24.

The Report of the Commissioner, Cynthia Beach, Sustainability and Growth (KMHC-10-004) is attached. Due to the volume of material, the Exhibits to the report will be distributed only to members and supporting staff. They could be viewed on the City website at:

<http://www.cityofkingston.ca/cityhall/committees/lacac/agendas.asp>

Mr. Letourneau thanked Mr. Cardwell for his assistance with this report.

Mr. Letourneau noted that the properties listed are from previous inventories of the older City as well as Pittsburgh Township. Mr. Letourneau pointed out a revision to be made on page 3 from Albert Street to Alfred Street. He noted concerns with a definition of demolition in the Ontario Heritage Act, and said that he worked with Legal Services regarding what would fall under 'alterations'. A specific definition of demolition has been outlined in the report.

Mr. Downey expressed concern regarding the fifth clause of the recommendation which requires a Heritage Impact Statement with any demolition. He enquired regarding the necessity of a Heritage Impact Statement under the Planning Act. He noted that if the property is Designated, it should be the prerogative of the Committee to determine the need for a Heritage Impact Statement.

Mr. Letourneau noted that this report concerns Listed Properties, that the Ontario Heritage Act doesn't consider these properties the same as Designated properties. Although Listed Property owners may attend the Committee, in accordance with a change in legislation there is no requirement for them to come before the Committee, or to adhere to a resolution of Council. He explained that there are limited mechanisms to ensure this sort of evaluation occurs, so a mechanism has been added in regard to tearing buildings down.

Mr. Downey noted that listed property owners have come to the Committee for advice in the past, and they may wish to come to the Committee at no cost rather than pay for a Heritage Impact Statement. He

noted that the Heritage Impact Statement can be a rationalization for what is proposed rather than an independent assessment of what is appropriate. To a question by Mr. Downey regarding the possibility of an applicant coming to the Committee rather than having a Heritage Impact Statement done, Mr. Letourneau advised that Council is advised concerning the potential demolition and there is only a 60 day delay.

Mr. Downey suggested that the recommendation be amended to add an option that the applicant could request the addition of their property to the KMHC agenda to discuss what they want to do rather than obtaining a Heritage Impact Statement. He expressed concern that a Heritage Impact Statement is an encumbrance on property owners who have listed buildings; an option to come before the Committee would allow them to have the same evaluation as designated properties.

To a question by Councillor Glover regarding a provincial policy requirement or the ability of the municipality to extend this option, Mr. Letourneau advised that the matter can be examined at the next meeting.

To a question by Ms. Sypnowich regarding a Heritage Impact Statement being mandated by legislation, Mr. Letourneau noted that the HIS is a requirement identified within the Official Plan.

It was suggested that staff look into this matter.

*Moved by Mr. Downey
Seconded by Councillor Glover*

THAT the following recommendation be deferred, and that staff be requested to investigate options for applications for demolition to appear before the Kingston Municipal Heritage Committee:

THAT all properties, identified within Exhibit 'A', entitled *City of Kingston Properties of Cultural Heritage Value and Interest ("Listed") For Addition to the City of Kingston's Heritage Properties Register – March 2010* be reaffirmed by Council as properties of cultural heritage value and interest;

AND THAT all properties within Exhibit 'A' be added to the City of Kingston Heritage Properties Register;

AND THAT staff be authorized to amend the Statements of Significance from time to time as required;

AND THAT the owners of the properties in Exhibit 'A' be sent a courtesy notice advising them of their property's status;

AND THAT any notice to demolish or remove a building or structure located upon real property listed on the City's Heritage Properties Register as a property of cultural heritage value or interest, or the demolition or removal of a structural element (such as a wall or roof) on a piece of real property listed on the City's Heritage Properties Register as a property of cultural heritage value or interest, be accompanied by a Heritage Impact Statement prepared in accordance with the City's requirements;

AND THAT any proposal for a permit under the *Ontario Building Code* that includes the complete removal of a building or structure located upon real property identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by the municipality under Section 27 (1.2) of the *Ontario Heritage Act* ('listed' property) is considered as demolition or removal under Section 27(3) of the *Ontario Heritage Act* and that such applications are required to adhere to the requirements of Section 27 (3), Section 27 (4), and Section 27 (5) of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (which governs the demolition and removal of a building or structure);

AND THAT any proposal for a permit under the *Ontario Building Code* that includes the removal of a structural element (such as a wall) of a building or structure located upon real property identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by the municipality under Section 27 (1.2) of the *Ontario Heritage Act* ('listed' property), and that this removal will result in the structure or building being unable to stand without support, is considered as demolition or removal under Section 27(3) of the *Ontario Heritage Act* and that such applications are required to adhere to the requirements of Section 27 (3), Section 27 (4), and Section 27 (5) of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (which governs the demolition and removal of a building or structure).

CARRIED

Councillor Glover noted the tremendous amount of work involved in producing this document and thanked all who were involved in its production.

*Moved by Councillor Glover
Seconded by Ms. Sypnowich*

THAT the Kingston Municipal Heritage Committee wish to commend the Chief Administrative Officer for the work of staff and volunteers that is represented by *The Report of the Commissioner, Cynthia Beach, Sustainability and Growth (KMHC-10-004) entitled 'Addition of Properties of Cultural Heritage Value ('Listed' Properties) to the City of Kingston Heritage Properties Register', and*

THAT the Committee wish to extend thanks and congratulations to all concerned.

CARRIED

B. Heritage Permit Applications Requesting Approval

- i. Delegation regarding Application P18-429-059-2010 for a property located at 2 Sharman's Lane, Barriefield Village requesting approval for the replacement of a gravel driveway with interlocking tumbled pavers, and creating an interlocking paver pathway along the front of the house with details described within a submission filed May 3, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department May 17, 2010.

Schedule Pages 25-40.

Mr. Patenteau was present to describe the project, noting that the same paver would be used as was used by the driveway. He provided a sample paver.

Concern was expressed regarding the proposed interlocking paver pathway along the front of the house.

Ms. Lambert advised that the Engineering Department submitted a survey which indicated that the width of the right-of-way varied.

*Moved by Mr. Taylor
Seconded by Mr. Downey*

THAT Application P18-429-059-2010 for a property located at 2 Sharman's Lane, Barriefield Village requesting approval for the replacement of a gravel driveway with interlocking tumbled pavers **BE APPROVED** in accordance with details described within a submission filed May 3, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department May 17, 2010,

- and further -

THAT the owner is aware that due to the varied width of the right-of-way, in the event that there is damage to the stones due to City maintenance operations, the repair and or replacement will be at the sole cost of the property owner,

- and further -

THAT in the event that deeply buried or previously undiscovered archaeological deposits are discovered in the course of development or site alteration, all work must immediately cease and the site must be secured. The Cultural Program Branch of the Ministry of Tourism and Culture (416-314-7123) and the City of Kingston Heritage Planner (613-546-4291 ext 1386) must be immediately contacted,

- and further -

THAT in the event that human remains are encountered, all work must immediately cease and the site must be secured. The Kingston Police (613-549-4660), the Registrar of Cemeteries Regulation Section of the Ontario Ministry of Consumer Business Services (416-326-8494), the Cultural Program Branch of the Ministry of Tourism and Culture (416-314-7123), and the City of Kingston Heritage Planner (613-546-4291 ext 1386) must be immediately contacted.

CARRIED

- ii. Delegation regarding Application P18-440-060-2010 for a property located at 415 Regent Street, Barriefield Village requesting approval for the removal of the existing, recent and non-original porch and replacement with a limestone paving stone patio with details described within a submission filed May 3, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department May 19, 2010.

Schedule Pages 41-52.

Mr. Page, owner, was present to provide clarification regarding the project. To questions, he advised that he would be removing both the porch and the floor and adding a patio. He noted that the structure was an add on. He said that the post is not to sit directly on the ground.

The roof and columns will remain on this addition which was approved by Pittsburgh Township in the 1990's. Flagstone was noted as commonly being used.

*Moved by Mr. Downey
Seconded by Councillor Glover*

*THAT Application P18-440-060-2010 for a property located at 415 Regent Street, Barriefield Village requesting approval for the removal of the existing, recent and non-original porch and replacement with a limestone paving stone patio **BE APPROVED** in accordance with details described within a submission filed May 3, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department May 19, 2010,*

- and further -

THAT it is suggested that there be a plinth of concrete or stone that rises 4" out of the ground so it appears that posts are sitting on a base that the flagstone is encircling in order that the post end remains drier.

CARRIED

- iii. Delegation regarding Application P18-226-061-2010 for a property located at 189 King Street West requesting approval for the replacement of a front door and window, repair and replication of the bargeboard at peak, repair of decking, repair & replacement of columns as necessary, replacement of windows, re-grading of landscaping, repair to fascia below bay window, removal of back lean to the addition and addition of new porch deck & stairs with a small roof portico over it, replacement of a bay window with two double hung windows, repair of railing, replacement/repair of porch ceiling and soffit, new stringers for side steps, repair of lattice work, new fence, re-roofing of garage, repainting of house with details described within a submission filed May 13, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department May 20, 2010.

Schedule Pages 53-96.

Large drawings distributed separately.

Mr. Gervan, agent for the owner, was present to describe the application.

The work being done was commended. Concern was expressed regarding window proposals, and it was requested that they be viewed to determine their condition.

Mr. Gervan agreed, noting a property standards order and timing issues.

The replacement of the upper deck and staircase was noted, and that the railing could be kept at the same height as it is now under the Building Code, but with a black metal top railing.

Ms. Venditti referenced concerns by the Engineering Department regarding fencing. A copy of the technical comments was provided to Mr. Gervan.

Concern was expressed regarding various vague aspects of the application. Details regarding the new roof over the portico, columns and windows will be provided and a site visit will be undertaken as soon as possible for clarification. It was agreed that arrangements will be made by the Clerk for three members of the Committee to attend the site.

It was noted that details to include colour chips for the asphalt shingles will be forwarded to Ms. Lambert.

*Moved by Mr. Downey
Seconded by Mr. Taylor*

THAT Application P18-226-061-2010 for a property located at 189 King Street West requesting approval for the replacement of a front door and window, repair and replication of the bargeboard at peak, repair of decking, repair & replacement of columns as necessary, replacement of windows, re-grading of landscaping, repair to fascia below bay window, removal of back lean to the addition and addition of new porch deck & stairs, replacement of a bay window with two double hung windows, repair of railing, replacement/repair of porch ceiling and soffit, new stringers for side steps, repair of lattice work, new fence, re-roofing of garage, repainting of house **BE APPROVED** in accordance with details described within a submission filed May 13, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department May 20, 2010,
- and further –

THAT it be understood that the second floor porch railing match the first floor porch railing,
- and further –

THAT a site visit be undertaken by three members of the Committee to consider the relevance of changing two windows on the main level that may be original, windows on the second level, the addition of a new window on the east wall, and that findings be taken into account,
- and further –

THAT it be understood that the details for the porch railing and new roof at the side of the house, and information details pertinent to the repair of columns, and structural elements be provided at the time of a site visit,
- and further –

THAT consideration of the covering over the side door be deferred pending receipt and review of additional details in the drawings,
- and further –

THAT in the event that deeply buried or previously undiscovered archaeological deposits are discovered in the course of development or site alteration, all work must immediately cease and the site must be secured. The Cultural Program Branch of the Ministry of Tourism and Culture (416-314-7123) and the City of Kingston Heritage Planner (613-546-4291 ext 1386) must be immediately contacted,
- and further –

THAT in the event that human remains are encountered, all work must immediately cease and the site must be secured. The Kingston Police (613-549-4660), the Registrar of Cemeteries

Regulation Section of the Ontario Ministry of Consumer Business Services (416-326-8494), the Cultural Program Branch of the Ministry of Tourism and Culture (416-314-7123), and the City of Kingston Heritage Planner (613-546-4291 ext 1386) must be immediately contacted,

- and further –

THAT in the event that the home owner is planning to construct the fencing around the entire perimeter of the property the City is requesting that a site triangle be provided at the intersection of King Street West and Albert Street to provide visibility at the intersection.

CARRIED

- iv. Delegation regarding Application P18-520-062-2010 for a property located at 411 Wellington Street, Barriefield Village requesting approval for the addition of a 24'x32 portable classroom to the existing school site with details described within a submission filed April 29, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department May 19, 2010.

Schedule Pages 97-107.

Mr. Brandao, agent for the Limestone District School Board, represented the application.

To questions, Mr. Brandao advised that this portable is the same type of building as the last one which was put in place. He noted the impending closure of the school; the portable which will be moved in will be in place a short time as the new school will be ready for September 2012. The portable and school itself are not accessible; however, students could be accommodated in the main building.

*Moved by Mr. Downey
Seconded by Mr. Duerkop*

THAT Application P18-520-062-2010 for a property located at 411 Wellington Street requesting approval for the addition of a 24'x32' portable classroom to the existing school site **BE APPROVED** in accordance with details described within a submission filed April 29, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department May 19, 2010,

- and further –

THAT in the event that deeply buried or previously undiscovered archaeological deposits are discovered in the course of development or site alteration, all work must immediately cease and the site must be secured. The Cultural Program Branch of the Ministry of Tourism and Culture (416-314-7123) and the City of Kingston Heritage Planner (613-546-4291 ext 1386) must be immediately contacted,

- and further –

THAT in the event that human remains are encountered, all work must immediately cease and the site must be secured. The Kingston Police (613-549-4660), the Registrar of Cemeteries Regulation Section of the Ontario Ministry of Consumer Business Services (416-326-8494), the Cultural Program Branch of the Ministry of Tourism and Culture (416-314-7123), and the City of Kingston Heritage Planner (613-546-4291 ext 1386) must be immediately contacted.

CARRIED

- v. Delegation regarding Application P18-366-065-2010 for a property located at 166 Brock Street also known as 123 Sydenham Street, Hotel Dieu Hospital requesting approval for the construction of a new stair and elevator tower at the east end of the Johnson wing, the installation of a new entrance door at the north side of the Johnson wing, the installation of a new entrance door at the south side of the Jeanne Mance wing, and the replacement of an air intake louvre on level 4 of the Brock wing with details described within a submission filed May 4, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department May 21, 2010.

Schedule Pages 108-123.

Accessibility comments were attached to the addendum.

Mr. Steve Denis, HDR/Mill & Ross Architects, was present for the discussion and provided a powerpoint presentation.

The thorough presentation was recognized. It was noted that this new element does not affect the recognized historical component.

To a question regarding the limestone being an Indiana limestone to match Queenstown limestone, Mr. Denis confirmed that the final decision regarding the limestone will be made once colours and mock ups are seen.

Mr. Gower read out the accessibility comments. Ms. Venditti confirmed that these concerns can be addressed if a site plan control application is required. Also, the application will be subject to all the requirements of the Building Code.

*Moved by Mr. Downey
Seconded by Mr. Gemmell*

THAT Application P18-366-065-2010 for a property located at 166 Brock Street also known as 123 Sydenham Street, Hotel Dieu Hospital requesting approval for the construction of a new stair and elevator tower at the east end of the Johnson wing, the installation of a new entrance door at the north side of the Johnson wing, the installation of a new entrance door at the south side of the Jeanne Mance wing, and the replacement of an air intake louvre on level 4 of the Brock wing **BE APPROVED** in accordance with details described within a submission filed May 4, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department May 21, 2010,

- and further –

THAT it be understood that this application may be subject to site plan control,

- and further –

THAT the proposed work on the Brock Wing (louvre replacement) should be done in accordance with the Heritage Masonry Guidelines.

- and further –

THAT should the construction activities require use of the public right of way, an application for an encroachment permit is required. The contact in the Engineering Department is Mr. Brad Morton.

CARRIED

- vi. Delegation regarding Application P18-361-066-2010 for a property located at 73 Sydenham Street requesting approval for the repair/replacement of 3 pillars and 3 columns to match the existing with details described within a submission filed May 10, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department May 21, 2010.

Schedule Pages 124-132.

There was no one present to represent the application.

It was noted that although some of the work commenced in October 2009, some of the work is outstanding. The work done to date appears to have been done well.

Ms. Finley queried the appearance of two front yard parking spaces in front of the porch. Ms. Venditti responded that Engineering staff could follow up on this matter. Councillor Glover requested a response from By-law Enforcement.

To a concern regarding a lack of details within the application for the work which has been done, Ms. Lambert advised that she has contacted the owners regarding the work, materials, and colours and is awaiting the information.

It was agreed to defer the application to request the applicants to attend, as pertinent advice could be provided.

*Moved by Mr. Duerkop
Seconded by Mr. Taylor*

THAT Application P18-361-066-2010 for a property located at 73 Sydenham Street requesting approval for the repair/replacement of 3 pillars and 3 columns to match the existing **BE DEFERRED** for consideration at the July meeting, and that staff contact the owners to request further details pertaining to the application.

CARRIED

- vii. Delegation regarding Application P18-352-067-2010 for a property located at 2 Rideau Terrace requesting approval for the removal of an existing cedar shake roof, the installation of a new roof with three options proposed – permanent metal slate (charcoal grey), permanent metal shake (charcoal grey) or architectural shingles (charcoal grey or dual black) with details described within a submission filed April 15, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department May 19, 2010.

Schedule Pages 133-141.

This application as well as 4, 6, and 8 Rideau Terrace were discussed together with some of the owners present.

Ms. Samantha King was present for the discussion.

It was noted that 'shingle' is preferred to 'shake', and 3-tab dual black non-veriegated asphalt shingles would be appropriate.

*Moved by Mr. Downey
Seconded by Mr. Gemmell*

THAT Application P18-352-067-2010 for a property located at 2 Rideau Terrace requesting approval for the removal of an existing cedar shake roof and the installation of a new roof using 3-tab flat (not architectural) charcoal grey or dual black asphalt shingles **BE APPROVED** in accordance with details described within a submission filed April 15, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department May 19, 2010.

CARRIED

- viii. Delegation regarding Application P18-668-068-2010 for a property located at 4 Rideau Terrace requesting approval for the removal of an existing cedar shake roof, the installation of a new roof with three options proposed – permanent metal slate (charcoal grey), permanent metal shake (charcoal grey) or architectural shingles (charcoal grey or dual black) with details described within a submission filed April 9, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department May 19, 2010.

Schedule Pages 142-144.

Ms. Patricia Hatt was present for the discussion.

It was noted that 'shingle' is preferred to 'shake', and 3-tab dual black non-veriegated asphalt shingles would be appropriate.

*Moved by Mr. Downey
Seconded by Mr. Gemmell*

THAT Application P18-668-068-2010 for a property located at 4 Rideau Terrace requesting approval for the removal of an existing cedar shake roof and the installation of a new roof using

*3-tab flat (not architectural) charcoal grey or dual black asphalt shingles **BE APPROVED** in accordance with details described within a submission filed April 9, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department May 19, 2010.*

CARRIED

- ix. Delegation regarding Application P18-668-069-2010 for a property located at 6 Rideau Terrace requesting approval for the removal of an existing cedar shake roof, the installation of a new roof with three options proposed – permanent metal slate (charcoal grey), permanent metal shake (charcoal grey) or architectural shingles (charcoal grey or dual black) with details described within a submission filed April 22, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department May 19, 2010.

Schedule Pages 145-147.

Ms. Brenda Liegler was present for the discussion.

It was noted that 'shingle' is preferred to 'shake', and 3-tab dual black non-veriegated asphalt shingles would be appropriate.

*Moved by Mr. Downey
Seconded by Mr. Gemmell*

***THAT** Application P18-668-069-2010 for a property located at 6 Rideau Terrace requesting approval for the removal of an existing cedar shake roof and the installation of a new roof using 3-tab flat (not architectural) charcoal grey or dual black asphalt shingles **BE APPROVED** in accordance with details described within a submission filed April 22, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department May 19, 2010.*

CARRIED

- x. Delegation regarding Application P18-670-070-2010 for a property located at 8 Rideau Terrace requesting approval for the removal of an existing cedar shake roof, new roof installed with three options proposed – permanent metal slate (charcoal grey), permanent metal shake (charcoal grey) or architectural shingles (charcoal grey or dual black) with details described within a submission filed May 6, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department May 19, 2010.

Schedule Pages 148-156.

It was noted that 'shingle' is preferred to 'shake', and 3-tab dual black non-veriegated asphalt shingles would be appropriate.

*Moved by Mr. Downey
Seconded by Mr. Gemmell*

***THAT** Application P18-352-067-2010 for a property located at 8 Rideau Terrace requesting approval for the removal of an existing cedar shake roof and the installation of a new roof using 3-tab flat (not architectural) charcoal grey or dual black asphalt shingles **BE APPROVED** in accordance with details described within a submission filed May 6, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department May 19, 2010.*

CARRIED

- xi. Delegation regarding Application P18-273-071-2010 for a property located at 216 Ontario Street requesting approval for the installation of seven chimneys on the north side of the west wing to accommodate a new high efficiency boiler system, and matching all existing flashings and the necessary replacement of soffit and fascia at the back of the building with details described within a submission filed May 17, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department May 19, 2010.

Schedule Pages 157-164.

Mr. Jamie Brash, Supervisor, Facilities Maintenance, and Mr. Andy Huctwith, Consulting Engineer, McCormick Rankin Corporation, were present and noted revisions to the submission. Revised plans were requested to be forwarded to Ms. Lambert.

Mr. Brash described the retrofit program which will be accessed for the boilers at City Hall. He also provided a sample of the chimney, and noted that the changes won't be noticeable from Market Square. Venting will be done through 4" grey pipes. Mr. Brash advised that interior details for this alternate plan still need to be finalized.

It was suggested that a symmetrical arrangement of the venting be considered on the symmetrically designed cupola. Mr. Huctwith noted that the cupola is not an original feature. It was also noted that adding venting to the roof would pose more challenges with snow.

*Moved by Mr. Downey
Seconded by Mr. Duerkop*

THAT Application P18-273-071-2010 for a property located at 216 Ontario Street requesting approval for the installation of seven vents on the cupola of the west wing to accommodate a new high efficiency boiler system, and matching all existing flashings and the necessary replacement of soffit and fascia at the back of the building **BE APPROVED** in accordance with details described within a submission filed May 17, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department May 19, 2010, and updated June 07, 2010.

CARRIED

- xii. Delegation regarding Application P18-301-072-2010 for a property located at 19 Queen Street requesting approval for the replacement of three sections of flat roof, the matching of all existing flashings and necessary replacement of soffit and fascia at the back of the building with details described within a submission filed May 17, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department May 19, 2010.

Schedule Pages 165-175.

Mr. Jamie Brash, Supervisor, Facilities Maintenance, and Mr. Andy Huctwith, Consulting Engineer, McCormick Rankin Corporation, were present to describe the submission.

*Moved by Mr. Downey
Seconded by Mr. Taylor*

THAT Application P18-301-072-2010 for a property located at 19 Queen Street requesting approval for the replacement of three sections of flat roof, the matching of all existing flashings and necessary replacement of soffit and fascia at the back of the building **BE APPROVED** in accordance with details described within a submission filed May 17, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department May 19, 2010.

CARRIED

- xiii. Delegation regarding Application P18-309-073-2010 for a property located at 157-161 Queen Street requesting approval for a handpainted wooden sign to be attached to building using an aluminum bracket and stainless steel screws with details described within a submission filed May 25, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department May 26, 2010.

Schedule Pages 176-189.

Mr. Murrill, agent for the application, was present for the discussion. He noted a change of wording for the sign. Mr. Gower requested that he submit the change of wording to staff.

To a query regarding sign by-law requirements, Ms. Venditti noted there had been no comments.

Concerns were expressed that consideration needs to be given to the obscuring of any portion of the porch. Retaining the appearance of the posts, and the method of attachment and location on the building of the sign.

Mr. Mullin said the sign would not be attached to the pickets; attachments would be to the railing and brackets placed on the posts.

Ms. Finley expressed concern regarding the size of the sign on the property which is nearly three times the size of the one that is there.

*Moved by Mr. Downey
Seconded by Mr. Taylor*

THAT Application P18-309-073-2010 for a property located at 157-161 Queen Street requesting approval for a handpainted wooden sign to be attached to building using an aluminum bracket and stainless steel screws **BE APPROVED** in accordance with details described within a submission filed May 25, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department May 26, 2010,

- and further –

THAT the applicant is required to submit the proposed paint colours to the Planning and Development Department,

- and further –

THAT it be understood that the sign will be in compliance with City sign by-laws.

CARRIED

- xiv. Delegation regarding Application P18-926-074-2010 for a property located at 67 Brock Street requesting approval for the installation of two small signs with details described within a submission filed June 4, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department June 7, 2010.

The application and comments were attached to the addendum.

Ms. Lambert clarified that the two signs are proposed to be attached to the walls.

*Moved by Mr. Downey
Seconded by Mr. Taylor*

THAT Application P18-926-074-2010 for a property located at 67 Brock Street requesting approval for the installation of two small signs **BE APPROVED** in accordance with details described within a submission filed June 4, 2010 and deemed complete by the Planning and Development Department June 7, 2010,

- and further –

THAT the Heritage Masonry Guidelines should be followed for the sign proposed in the alleyway/walkway. Heritage Planning Staff also suggest that the Heritage Masonry Guidelines be followed for the sign proposed for the building located at the rear of the subject property,

- and further –

THAT signage be fastened into the mortar.

CARRIED

C. Heritage Permit Applications for Emergency Works requiring Reaffirmation

D. Pre-Consultation Requests

- i. Delegation regarding a pre-consultation request for 390 King Street West regarding alterations to the building.

Schedule Pages 190-195.

Present for the discussion were Mr. Robert Matthews, ema Architects/Snohetta, Mr. Mike Finn, Queen's, and Mr. Rick Carpenter, Queen's.

Mr. Robert Matthews provided information boards depicting proposed revisions to the proposal which had been considered during the pre-consultation on 10th May 2010. He noted the north and east wall of the building, and portions which were highlighted in green. He noted the structure of the tower composed of cinder block from the military period, which is not staying. The stone from this area will be used for repairs. They believe there is sufficient stone to recreate a portion of the tower wall on the third level of designated lab space. He noted that the lower two levels are part of the shipping and receiving areas, and are an awkward space to reuse stone, but it can be used on the third level.

Mr. Matthews pointed to a board depicting the ground floor of the east wall. He noted that on the third level, it reappears as part of the tower. There are organized spaces on the second level, so the east wall would be visible from a corridor on both sides. A drawing depicts the third floor with a 'ghost' of the wall.

In regard to the windows, Mr. Matthews advised that they originally were planned to be replaced with contemporary windows. He clarified that now the plan is that replacement of the windows would use contemporary construction and would replicate the muntin and sash pattern of existing windows. The existing windows will be refurbished on the inside of the building, in the retained east wall, as they wouldn't need to be airtight.

Mr. Matthews advised that the chimney, from the military period, is currently freestanding. The chimney appears to be sound, but an assessment hasn't been completed as yet, and the upgrading requirements to address the impact of an earthquake are unknown at this time.

Mr. Gower invited comments from the Committee at this time.

Mr. Downey referenced a meeting attended by Councillor Glover, Mr. Duerkop and himself following discussions at the last meeting. A number of revisions have occurred as a result of those meetings. He recalled the May proposal to remove the east wall and the chimney, as well as a corridor behind the theatre to reduce floorspace and save costs. He said that this proposal surpasses their discussions in that the east wall will not be taken down and more of the tower and the interior will be visible, the corridor is being left, and a corridor is being introduced on the other side of the wall, which addresses the request that the full wall be seen rather than only portions. Mr. Matthews responded that they have determined that the shoebox shape is an important feature to retain.

Mr. Duerkop noted that Committee comments are being heard and that Queen's have accommodated a large part of what has been asked for and more. He recalled that when they went into the meeting, they had consented to the removal of the roof. They had agreed to access as necessary through the east wall, but that it would be retained as such. He noted their concerns regarding the architectural integrity of the whole complex. He congratulated Queen's and the architects on the changes which have been made.

To a question by Ms. Synowich regarding the chimney, Mr. Matthews noted that it has been identified as a character defining element but that it doesn't represent the brewery period. He said that they would like to continue the assessment of its structural integrity. Mr. Matthews pointed out a photo and explained that they would like to take it down to a certain height, and that perhaps a steel structure could go down inside the base. It is presently sitting on a concrete foundation. There are concerns as they would need to go below grade and inside the chimney, and it would be a costly process.

To questions by Councillor Glover regarding the proposal for the roof, Mr. Matthews explained that the roof goes the height of the existing tower, and there has been no change from earlier discussions. Site studies were undertaken prior to a decision being made. He said they are using the height of the existing tower as a benchmark. Mr. Matthews confirmed that a peaked roof and not a mansard roof has always been intended with a short wooden skirt indicated from the roof to the top of the stone wall.

To a question by Mr. Taylor regarding saving some of the wood interior, Mr. Matthews pointed to the information boards, and explained that the interior of the Stella Buck building has a variety of levels to meet the needs of various programs. He said that early on, the Stella Buck was used as an entrance to the facility which was originally proposed to be 40% larger than it is now. He advised that they plan to reincorporate some columns and beams in the Stella Buck Building and their interior structural detailing that can be preserved as an example of brewery construction. They also propose to recycle wood to use as finishes in the lobby, reception and cafeteria areas, but understand that it is the Committee's preference to show it in place.

To a question by Ms. Finley regarding the roof colour and material, Mr. Matthews advised that it is shown as dark grey metal on the Stella Buck Building, representing some of the industrial period. The theatre will be in white and greys. He noted the importance of views from King Street West and the residential areas and that no large scale items are located on the roof. The roof will be seen as a clean sculpted shape, and mechanical equipment will be housed in penthouses inside the building.

Mr. Duerkop highlighted the importance of retaining or replicating as much of the existing publicly visible sections of the internal structure as possible. Mr. Downey added that while this isn't listed as one of the notable elements of the building, their suggestions had been heard.

Ms. Sypnowich asked if the proposal to remove the windows involved expense. Mr. Matthews replied that they wished to avoid long term maintenance issues related to windows. He noted the challenges of storm window removal to get fresh air, and the mechanisms required. Costs would be related to the maintenance and operation of windows. Ms. Sypnowich encouraged representatives to uphold the Heritage integrity of the building as much as possible to make it a landmark. She noted the interesting chimney at the Woolen Mill building and felt this chimney could also serve as a significant identifying element.

Councillor Glover noted a resolution of Council requiring an engineers report which would also speak to the chimney. He also noted that Council had directed that a public meeting be held and queried when an application would be completed so the process for a public meeting would be started. Mr. Matthews replied that an application for site plan approval was submitted in December, and that the municipality has been considering some questions. He also noted that documents would need to be finalized for a Building Permit, so a complete structural report would be available with the package.

Mr. Finn advised of his understanding that a public meeting would be held in two weeks time. It was noted that Council had directed that a Heritage application is required prior to establishing a public meeting. Ms. Venditti explained that tentative dates had been established for a public meeting in June, but based on a discussion between the Committee and Queen's, the concept was not yet finalized. She further noted the requirements for a Heritage Impact Statement and structural engineering report. Once a complete application has been received, the public meeting will be scheduled. Mr. Matthews advised that most of the required material has been submitted.

Mr. Gower thanked the representatives for attending, and noted that contact can be made with Ms. Lambert in regard to the application process.

- ii.* Delegation regarding a pre-consultation request for 129 William Street regarding the repair/restoration of a front porch.

Schedule Pages 196-198.

There was no one present in regard to this request.

- iii.* Delegation regarding a pre-consultation request for 85 Stuart Street (Theological Hall, Queen's University) regarding the repair/replacement of windows and frames.

Schedule Pages 199-202.

Mr. Ray Zaback, Architect, Shoalts and Zaback, provided a powerpoint presentation of this building which was built in 1880. He advised that in the mid-1960's, the majority of windows had been replaced. A donation has been provided to Queen's for this project to repair the wood sashes and replace the majority

of the windows on the base level as well as some of the attic windows. He noted an excerpt from a Heritage study as well as the description of windows in the Volume of Buildings of Historical and Architectural Significance. He noted that there are original windows on all levels of the building. Mr. Zaback highlighted proposals to retain wood around the perimeters and external moldings, while replacing operable sashes with new operable sashes in a material other than wood. Most windows which are single glazed need a lot of work and need to be operable for ventilation. Energy efficiency is to be improved. They wish to be faithful to the design of the windows, have researched to obtain aluminum windows with a consistent profile and muntin bar appearance, replicating curves in the upper sashes, and returning the upper floors to their original appearance. Lower sashes would be replaced with an aluminum, non wood window system.

Mr. Paul Everett, an enclosure consultant with Queen's since 1989, has examples of work done on other buildings on the campus. He noted examples where some but not all moldings, sashes and trim had been taken off, panning had been pulled out and an inexpensive window system added. Some original molding may be found behind some of the panning. Mr. Zaback advised that most of the original window configurations are known.

The expectation for the project is to remove all the replaced aluminum windows, and put them back to their original shape. Moldings would be restored on the second floor where they are missing so the building gets back to its original Heritage quality. The wood moldings are highly restorable. The end result would be a modern window behind original moldings and replacement moldings so they have the appearance of the original windows.

Mr. Zaback noted that they wish to marry Heritage preservation and restoration with energy conservation and low maintenance while at the same time bringing back the character which is missing from the site. He showed images of Carruthers Hall, Fleming Hall and Gordon Hall.

Members thanked Mr. Zaback for his thorough presentation. It was noted that there is generally a preference to retain original windows for appearance and their historic relevance. This is because original windows have embodied within them unique characteristics and the manner in which the window was fabricated and installed; removing the window, removes that element. Windows of a similar vintage have survived well with for over 100 years with two coats of paint. There is concern that cladding could fail sooner than original windows that have stood the test of time.

Mr. Gower thanked Mr. Zaback for attending. There was agreement that a site visit would be undertaken, and comments would be offered following the visit.

E. Heritage Property Grant Applications

F. Heritage Grant Applications Requesting Release of Funding

G. Heritage Property Grant Abandoned Applications

- i.* Heritage Property Grant HG-005-2008 for a property located at 230 James Street requesting approval for window sash repair and painting.

This matter was deferred at the May meeting.

It was noted that there are no issues in regard to the previous grant, and the current grant proposal can proceed.

H. Heritage Property Tax Refund Applications

I. Property Designations

J. Technical Circulations

K. Notice of Motion

L. Other Matters

- i.* Reaffirmation of submission in regard to Code of Conduct for Council and Committee Members
A copy of the submission was distributed separately.

This matter was deferred to the June meeting.

- ii.* Request for Withdrawal of request for approval for the replacement of top and bottom rails and repainting of spindles on the porch for Application P18-640-063-2010 for a property located at 239 Johnson Street with details described within a submission filed April 01, 2010.

Consideration of details pertaining to the balcony was deferred at the 10th May 2010 meeting. A request for withdrawal of the application has been made by the applicant.

Recommendation 10th May 2010

*Moved by Mr. Downey
Seconded by Mr. Cardwell*

THAT Application P18-640-046-2010 for a property located at 239 Johnson Street requesting approval for the replacement of top and bottom rails and repainting of spindles on the porch **BE DEFERRED** in order to receive specific details regarding dimensions.

CARRIED

The request for withdrawal was recognized.

OTHER BUSINESS:

UPCOMING EVENTS:

- i.* **11-13th June** – 2010 Ontario Heritage Conference held in Chatham-Kent.
2010 Frontenac Heritage Foundation Series beginning at 7:30 p.m. (unless otherwise noted)
- ii.* **12 June** – Pittsburgh Historical Society – 2010 Annual Spring Excursion – National Air Force Museum of Canada, CFB Trenton and other area museums
- iii.* **12th June** – Tour of restored cottage at 76 Mowat Ave at 2:00 p.m.
- iv.* **17th July** – Tour of Catarauqui Cemetery grounds at 2:00 p.m.
- v.* **10th August** – Invitation to Victoria Rose Inn at 279 King Street West, Gananoque
- vi.* **14th September** – Visit to the Warden's House known as Cedarhedge, home of the Penitentiary Museum, 555 King Street West
- vii.* **12th October** – Awards Night at the Renaissance Wedding and Event Venue, 285 Queen Street
- viii.* **09th November** – Talk by Joe Calnan regarding the restoration of the Anglican Rectory on Wolfe Island at RCHA Hall, 193 Ontario Street
- ix.* **04th December** – Tour of The Vosper House at 149 Earl Street at 2:00 p.m.

CORRESPONDENCE/CIRCULATIONS:

A. Reports to/from Council

- i.* 10th May 2010 – Heritage Report No. 06-2010 submitted to Council for consideration on 18th May 2010.

Schedule Pages 203-208.

B. Correspondence Received as Information

- i.* Ministry of Citizenship and Immigration dated May 2010 regarding an invitation to nominate a citizen for the 'Ontario Medal for Good Citizenship', who through exceptional, long-term efforts, have made outstanding contributions to life in their community.

C. Correspondence Sent as Information

Copies of the following correspondence were sent out, and were available at the meeting if a member wished to review the full document:

Correspondence dated 18 May 2010 from Ms. Marnie Venditti, Manager, Development Approvals, Planning and Development Department Sustainability and Growth, to:

- i.* Ms. Ann Browne, Associate Vice Principal (Facilities), Queen's University, regarding Application to Kingston Municipal Heritage Committee Alteration to Stella Buck Building 390 King Street.

Correspondence dated 14 May 2010 from Mr. Peter Gower, Chair, Kingston Municipal Heritage Committee to:

- ii.* Mr. Robert Matthews, Ema Architects Inc., regarding Property known as the Stella Buck Building located at 390 King Street West.

Correspondence dated 5 May 2010 from Ms. Carolyn Downs, City Clerk, to:

- i.* Philip & Petra Hirst regarding Heritage application approval - 32 Simcoe Street.
- ii.* Mr. Geoff McKay regarding Heritage application approval – 192 Ontario Street.
- iii.* Frontenac Condominium Co. 17 regarding Heritage application approval – 131-133 King Street East.
- iv.* Excalibur Learning Resource Centre Canada Corp. regarding Heritage application approval – 218 King Street East.
- v.* Elizabeth and Robert Cardwell regarding Heritage application approval – 230 James Street.
- vi.* Mary Jean Sargent and Carly Sargent regarding Heritage application approval – 237 Johnson Street.
- vii.* Elizabeth and Robert Cardwell regarding Heritage Grant application approval – 230 James Street.
- viii.* Anne and Carl Croy regarding Heritage Grant application approval – 948 Highway 2 East.
- ix.* Christine Sypnowich & David Bakhurst regarding Heritage Grant application approval – 249 Main Street Barriefield Village.
- x.* Ms. Maureen Garvie regarding Heritage Grant application approval – 215 Main Street, Barriefield Village.
- xi.* Ms. Christine Perrault regarding Heritage Grant application approval – 50 Montreal Street.
- xii.* Michael & Martina Green regarding Heritage Grant application approval – 185 William Street.
- xiii.* 1517840 Ontario Inc. regarding Heritage Grant application approval – 37-43 Brock Street.
- xiv.* Gary Patterson and Warren Bennett regarding Heritage application approval – 73 Sydenham Street.
- xv.* Ms. Christine Perrault regarding Heritage Grant application approval – 85 Queen Street.

Correspondence dated 5 May 2010 from Ms. Susan Powley, Committee Clerk, to:

- i.* Ms. Christine Perrault regarding Heritage application site visit – 85 Queen Street.

Correspondence dated 18 May 2010 from Ms. Marnie Venditti, Manager, Development Approvals to:

- i.* Ms. Ann Browne, Associate Vice Principal (Facilities), Queen's University regarding alteration to Stella Buck Building – 390 King Street West.

Correspondence dated 19 May 2010 from Mr. John Bolognone, Deputy City Clerk, to:

- ii.* Ontario Heritage Trust, Sean Fraser, Team Leader, Conservation Services – City of Kingston Municipal Heritage Committee (LACAC) Approvals – approvals, May 18, 2010.

- iii.* Ms. Cynthia Beach, Commissioner, Sustainability & Growth, regarding Notice of Intent to Designate By-Law for Denyes Monument – Princess at Bayridge.
- iv.* St. Lawrence College, regarding Notice of Intent to Update Designation By-Law for 889 King Street W. (Newcourt House).

Memorandum dated 26 May 2010 from Ms. Carolyn Downs, City Clerk, to:

- i.* Hal Linscott, Director, Legal Services regarding Certified Heritage Designation By-Laws for registration on title – Newcourt House – By-Law 2010-86
- ii.* Hal Linscott, Director, Legal Services regarding Certified Heritage Designation By-Laws for registration on title – Denyes Monument – By-Law 2010-87

DOCUMENTS:

- i.* Heritage Impact Statement – for the demolition of Tercentennial Lodge dated 19 June 2009
Distributed Separately
- ii.* Heritage Impact Statement – for the Queen’s University Performing Arts Complex (QUPAC) – Additions and Renovations to the Morton Brewery/Distillery Site
Distributed Separately

HERITAGE LINKS:

- i.* Ontario Heritage Act: http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/statutes/english/elaws_statutes_90o18_e.htm
- ii.* Ontario Heritage Connection: www.ontarioheritageconnection.org
<http://www.ontarioheritageconnection.org/live/main.php>
- iii.* Provincial Policy Statement: www.mah.gov.on.ca/userfiles/HTML/nts_1_23137_1.html
- iv.* Accessibility in Museums: <http://www.culture.gov.on.ca/english/heritage/museums/munote12.htm>
- v.* General Accessibility: <http://www.mcass.gov.on.ca/NR/rdonlyres/F8C53147-3A0E-41F1-9C95-C8829DD5485C/1118/AGUIDETOANNUALACCESSIBILITYPLANNINGJan07E.pdf>
- vi.* Archaeological Master Plan: <http://www.cityofkingston.ca/residents/culture/heritage/archaeology/>

NEXT MEETING DATES:

The following meetings for 2010 are scheduled at 12:00 noon in the Council Chambers:

- 05 July
- 09 August
- 13 September
- 04 October
- 01 November
- 06 December

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

