

Planning and Development Council Meeting
August 8, 2022

Comments Received Regarding Item 9.1

Heritage Oakville Advisory Committee Minutes – July 26, 2022

Comments Received Regarding Item 4.1

Heritage Permit Application HP030/22-42.20K 262 King Street –
Side addition for elevator

Comments Received Regarding Item 4.2

4.2. Review of development application – 23 George Street

Items before Heritage Review Committee – Tuesday, July 26th

Comments from Jane Hawkrigg and Jamie Macrae, ■ Navy Street

1. 262 King Street

Side addition to east side elevation to accommodate elevator shaft for disabled access to second floor
--

- We are not opposed to the overall intention of the application and the commitment that exterior materials used will match the current building
- Our primary concern is that approval is being requested from both Committee of Adjustment (approved last week) and Heritage Oakville **without** official architectural drawings. The application form drawings are hand done by the owner of the property “drawing over” the architectural drawings from work that was done several years ago when major renovation was made to this key building in the District. There are no measurements on the drawings and no qualified opinion that what is proposed is feasible.

While the overall footprint for the addition is small (staff report suggests 6x6), the proposed renovation involves footings; the removal of windows AND a change in the roofline on the side and rear of the building. These are changes that in our mind should require architectural drawings at both Committee of Adjustment and Heritage Oakville to ensure that what is being proposed is actually feasible.

- As such, we believe that the applicant should be required to submit official architectural drawings prior to approvals. We are also very concerned about the potential precedent this could set for future applications

2. 23 George Street

Review of proposed development application - staff is looking for the Heritage Oakville Advisory Committee's comments on the proposal specifically as it relates to its impact on the cultural heritage value of the surrounding Old Oakville Heritage Conservation District, in accordance with the district plan guidelines.

- We are not opposed to the demolition of the home currently on this property.
- We agree that the wrought iron fence with stone pillars should be retained. We wonder what conditions can be put in place to ensure this happens as it is our understanding that the same requirement was made for the new build at 221 Front Street and yet the fence and stone pillars were removed
- Regarding overall proposed development:
 - o Impact on Block Character
The Worn Doorstep at 212 Front directly across the street from this property is recognized in the Block 3 analysis as the central feature in the block. In addition, there is a specific reference to the setback of houses on the north side emphasizing the presence of the lake. As such, we think what is being proposed in terms of scale and massing needs to consider any potential negative impacts on these important Block features and how they can be mitigated.



212 Front Street – The Worn Doorstep (Picture taken July 24, 2022)



North side of Front Street (Picture taken July 24, 2022)

- Proposed materials – we believe that different materials more compatible with and sympathetic to traditional materials in the District overall and more in keeping with the traditional “cottage” across the street should be considered for this development rather than the painted white brick for cladding and stone surrounds currently referenced

We have included a picture of a recent build on Crestwood Court in Burlington which has a “white wash” shake cladding and wood trim that we consider more appropriate materials to consider for this property as we think it could “soften” the impact of the proposed design.



Picture of House on Crestwood Court, Burlington (Picture taken July 24, 2022)

- Town Trees – there are two mature tree on Town property on the Front Street edge of the property and while they are noted on the Site Plan, they are not in the “rendering” (Page 42 of 148). We assume that the Town trees will be retained as per the Site Plan.
- Landscaping and property development –Given the “gully” nature of the Block, assuming that some department in the Town will give considerations regarding implications re drainage, etc. on to the narrow Front Street

Items before Heritage Review Committee – Tuesday, July 26th

Comments from Catherine Hurley – [REDACTED] Thomas Street, Oakville

1. 262 King Street

Side addition to east side elevation to accommodate elevator shaft for disabled access to second floor

- I am supportive of the spirit of any and all applications in assisting residents with the adaptive reuse of their property in order to reside in one's home and community. However, before an exterior solution to accommodate accessibility issues is put forward, wondering if all interior options have been explored? There are numerous accessibility and tax incentive assistance programs offered by all three levels of government. Have these been investigated? From a built heritage perspective, adding exterior structures to any residence in a Heritage District, that potentially affects the View scape and Streetscape of the District should in my opinion be the last option to be considered.
- Perhaps my primary concern is that approval is being requested from both the Committee of Adjustment (approved last week) and Heritage Oakville without certified architectural and engineering drawings. It would appear that the application's East Side Elevator drawings are hand drawn over what appears to be an earlier professional architectural rendering of the property. If so, has the architectural firm that produced these original drawings been retained and approved the drawings that now appear before both the Committees of Adjustment and Heritage Review? If not, might this procedurally set a dangerous precedent for all future Town of Oakville building and heritage review applications? Heritage structures have their own unique set of challenges so just to ensure that what is being proposed is actually feasible, I would strongly suggest that only professionally prepared architectural drawings accompany all present and future Committee of Adjustment and Heritage Oakville applications.
- As such, I respectfully request that the applicant should be required to submit official architectural drawings prior to approvals.

2. 23 George Street

A Review of proposed development application - staff is looking for the Heritage Oakville Advisory Committee's comments on the proposal specifically as it relates to its impact on the cultural heritage value of the surrounding Old Oakville Heritage Conservation District, in accordance with the district plan guidelines.

Impact on Block Character (Block 3 – 1981 Old Oakville Heritage Conservation District Plan)

The Worn Doorstep at 212 Front directly across the street from this property is recognized in the Block 3 analysis as the central feature in the block. In addition, there is a specific reference to the setback of

houses on the north side emphasizing the presence of the lake. As such, I would suggest that the impact of what is being proposed needs to consider any potential negative impacts on these important Block

features. And that the new design hopefully reflect or be sympathetic to the more modest architectural lines of the Worn Doorstep's "Cottage -Style" architecture vs the gabled design that is being proposed. I hope the owners will give this their further consideration.

Given the "gully" nature of the Block as referenced in the above Block Analysis, from a Natural Heritage Conservation perspective, how does this proposal to move the new build in the direction closer to the Lake fit with Conservation Halton's 2022 Shoreline/Wetlands Mapping consultations that are presently underway?

<https://camaps.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=1eb6b5701cdd4881848c98facb45dc16>



Hardscaping

- I support the staff's recommendation that the existing wrought iron fence with stone pillars be retained. What conditions might be put in place to ensure this happens as it is my understanding that the same requirement was made for the new build at 221 Front Street and yet the fence and stone pillars were removed? I understand that this stone fence dates back to the 19th Century and therefore is a contributing and unifying design elements in the Old Oakville Heritage District.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Hurley

July 25, 2022