

Council Meeting October 11, 2022

**Comments Received Regarding Item 11.2**

Heritage Oakville Advisory Committee Minutes - September 27, 2022

**Comments Received Regarding Item 4.4**

Heritage permit application HP043/22-42.20N 68-70 Navy Street –  
revisions to rear addition

**From:** Anita Mackey

**Sent:** September 26, 2022 3:30 PM

**To:** Town Clerks <[TownClerk@oakville.ca](mailto:TownClerk@oakville.ca)>

**Subject:** Heritage Committee Meeting on September 27, 2022 ; re 68 & 70 Navy Street

Office of the Town Clerk: Please forward this email to the members of the Heritage Advisory Committee prior to the meeting on Tuesday, September 27 and please post it on the agenda with the public comments.

RE: Heritage Permit HP043/22-42.2ON, 68-70 Navy St.

Dear Heritage Advisory Committee Members;

My husband and I live at [REDACTED] in the one and half storey heritage house immediately beside and to the south of the property subject to the application. We just became aware of this application on Friday September 23, 2022. We understand the application was submitted on Sept 2, 2022 to the Town. I find it quite unacceptable that there would have been no notice of this application to all the owners adjacent to this property especially given the interest and the sensitivity due to the demolition of the existing historic cottages that used to be on this property. Even if a notice from the Town or the applicant is not required by regulation ( which cries out for a change) at least by courtesy it should have been given. This has left us very little time to respond and will not allow us to delegate tomorrow at the meeting.

We understand the Town is recommending approval of this application. Given the historic nature of the original property and its location in the Old Oakville Heritage Conservation District we are surprised by this. One of the Guidelines , which are to apply “ to ensure compatibility of alterations to or relocation of existing structures as well as new structures with the existing built environment”, states:

- (a) Scale in height and mass be compatible with surrounding buildings to ensure visual connectedness and existing sense of scale.

According to the staff report they say that while they reviewed the Guidelines they feel that “ the majority of these Guidelines are not applicable to the subject application as it does not alter any historical architectural features, does not increase the footprint of the addition and does not change the construction material from the previous approval” . We strongly disagree and feel the above guideline does apply.

Comparing the addition and the new height to the proposed new development on the corner of Navy and Robinson (as the applicant did) is irrelevant and misleading. That property is not within the Heritage District and has not even been approved. Comparing it to the Murray house is also the wrong comparison as it are not adjacent to the Murray House, and the Murray House was a commercial building not residential cottages. Our historic cottage is not even referenced by staff

The comparison should be to what the original cottages where in height and the house at 64 Navy Street and the house at 115 William Street (which shares a property line a the back and itself is a heritage house within the district). The original application was “sold” to the neighbours as being small in scale, compatible in height, thought it extended deep into the property and overlooked both 64 Navy and 115 William. The pictures speak volumes and you can easily see how much more massive in scale this appears in comparison. We were told it was only altering a small corner of the existing cottages, and now we have entirely lost them through neglect and bad planning. We did not realize only the front wall was to be saved and, of course , that too proved impossible. My neighbour at 115 William has no computer and has not been able to address her concerns.

Contrary to the position staff is taking, this large height increase at the back will be visible from Navy Street and detract from the adjacent heritage homes. It will be visible from Water Street, as well, looking up the hill. It is a bad precedent to set in this Block and in the Heritage District generally. I am not so much worried about my home being dwarfed and overlooked but the precedent set. We are planning an addition too and have been meticulous in making sure it doesn't exceed the exiting height of the rooflines.

We ask that this application be turned down and the plans already approved be adhered to.

Anita Mackey

Michael Shaen

Navy Street

---



To: Town Clerk

Councillors David Gittings , Cathy Duddeck , Janet Haslett-Theall,

Heritage Advisory Committee Chair, Drew Bucknall & Committee Members

From: Catherine Hurley, Oakville Lakeside Residents Association (OLRA)

Date: September 27, 2022

**(Discussion item #4.4--Heritage Permit Application HP043/22-42.20N 68-70 Navy Street—Revisions to the Rear Addition)**

**Good Morning Heritage Oakville Advisory Committee Members:**

I am delegating this morning on behalf of the Oakville Lakeside Residents Association (OLRA) as a Board Member and Chair of the Association's Heritage Committee as well as, a long time resident of the Old Oakville Heritage District residing at 24 Thomas Street.

The Association only became aware of this application late on Friday, September 23, 2022 and therefore we feel that the community at large has not been given sufficient notice to review the proposed changes outlined in today's revised heritage permit application for 68-70 Navy Street, a courtesy particularly denied to those residents in the immediate area and adjacent to the property.

Despite these procedural challenges, the community's acute interest and sensitivity towards this development, most likely attributed to the sudden demolition of the former historic cottages that used to be on this property, ( to be precise, the 1859 Jeremiah Hagaman House, a one and half-storey vernacular residence formerly designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act as part of the Old Oakville Heritage Conservation District ) may account for many of these 11<sup>th</sup>-hour written delegations that appear before you this morning.

Of the many thoughtful comments provided by Lakeside residents, there are three community observations in particular that resonated with our Association and I would like to share these with you this morning:

**Community Comment # 1 – 68-70 Navy Street's Prominence to the Entrance to the Old Oakville Heritage Conservation District:**

"This property is within the boundaries of the Heritage Conservation District and as such subject to the "guidelines for change" outlined in the Old Oakville Heritage District Plan. It sits at the gateway to the Old Oakville District AND historic Navy Street. This well travelled street is one of the icons that signals to everyone – residents and visitors alike that they are entering a very special area. And as such, it is important to ensure that change is managed with care and sensitivity to not disrupt the jewel which is Old Oakville".

**Community Comment # 2 – Adherence to Old Oakville Heritage District Plan Guideline:**

- a) *“That Scale in height and mass be compatible with surrounding buildings to ensure visual connectedness and existing sense of scale”*. Height and mass are critical elements that impact the look and feel of a built structure and significantly contribute to the “character” of a heritage district.

The Association supports the community’s perspective that the Heritage Permit Application before you today, should but hasn’t demonstrated whether and how the proposed changes are compatible with the existing “built environment” and therefore, the “character” of the Old Oakville Heritage District.

“The new build on this property was originally approved on the basis that it should mirror the original 1850s structure that was demolished and fit in with the neighbouring historic cottages. What is being proposed is a significant change that will be visible from multiple angles including Navy Street and Water Street – both historic roads that are within the boundaries of the Old Oakville Heritage District and the Block Analysis”.

“This new proposed change in both the height of the rear addition of this duplex by 1.6m to the maximum zoning by-law of 9.0 m and materials has the impact of losing reference to the original 1850s structure that the originally approved new build was supposed to mirror”. “Any addition to a heritage structure should be lower in height and scale to the original portion”.

The OLRA supports the community’s view that what is being proposed today does not reflect the spirit and intention of the original heritage permit. “If what is before this Committee now had been presented originally, we feel it would have faced significant community opposition as not being compatible with or sympathetic to the character of the District and what the District Plan envisions for new builds”.

### **Community Comment # 3 - The Choice of Comparable Properties**

“Comparing the proposed height with the property to the immediate north on Robinson Street and the Murray House at the southeast corner of Navy and Robinson is not appropriate and misleading”.

Both of the cited “comparable” properties in today’s Heritage Permit Application, lie outside the boundaries of the Old Oakville Heritage District. The Murray House, is a designated Part IV building and has always been and remains a commercial property and as such should not be the comparable chosen for a residential property development at 68-70 Navy Street. Further, the planned development on the vacant land on Robinson Street is also not an appropriate basis for height as it sits outside of the boundaries of the District. The properties on the south side of Robinson Street have always been intended as the buffer for the Heritage District – NOT properties within the District itself”.

The Association supports that there are more appropriate and comparable “residential” heritage properties located in the immediate neighbourhood and vicinity of 68-70 Navy Street such as: 53, 64, and 65, Navy Street, and 115 William Street all of these lie within the Old Oakville Heritage District boundary area and request that they be given due consideration in this heritage permit application process. And further contends that Heritage Permit approval today will set a negative precedent for the District in years to come.

### **In Summary:**

In support of these community comments, the OLRA respectfully does NOT agree with the staff recommendation for approval of the Heritage Permit Application now before the Committee (HP043/22-42.20N) and asks that this Application be denied and that the conditions and spirit of the prior Heritage Permit be reinstated and adhered to.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Hurley, Director, OLRA Board

Cc: Anya Dunning, OLRA President, & OLRA Board

---

**From:** Rick Mateljan <[rick.mateljan@smda.ca](mailto:rick.mateljan@smda.ca)>

**Sent:** September 27, 2022 5:33 AM

**To:** Town Clerks <[TownClerk@oakville.ca](mailto:TownClerk@oakville.ca)>

**Cc:** Susan Schappert <[susan.schappert@oakville.ca](mailto:susan.schappert@oakville.ca)>; Ani Bogovic; Janice Johnston <

**Subject:** RE: Heritage Permit HP043/22-42.2ON, 68-70 Navy St.

SECURITY CAUTION: This email originated from outside of The Town of Oakville. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Good morning. Thank you for passing along to us letters of concern that have been recently received from the local community regarding our application at 68/70 Navy St. We would like the opportunity to discuss these concerns with the interested parties and so would ask that Heritage Oakville defer consideration of this matter to their meeting of October 18, 2022.

Please pass this request along to the Committee members. I remain available to attend this morning's meeting if necessary.

Regards,

Rick

Rick Mateljan Lic. Tech. OAA

**SMDA Design Ltd**

Design Architecture

cell: 416 . 315 4567

tel: 905 . 842 2848

[smda.ca](http://smda.ca)

To: Town Clerk  
David Gittings  
Cathy Duddeck  
Janet Haslett-Theall  
Drew Bucknall

From: Jane Hawkrigg & Jamie Macrae

Date: September 26, 2022

RE: Heritage Permit HP043/22-42.2ON, 68-70 Navy St.

Dear Heritage Advisory Committee Members

My husband and I live at [REDACTED] cross the street from the property subject to this application.

We just became aware of this application late on Friday September 23, 2022. I am away in Western Canada on a two week business trip and have just now been able to turn my attention to this matter. The lack of notice to neighbours on a property with this interest and sensitivity is extremely disappointing and we will not be able to delegate tomorrow.

With due respect, we formally request that this submission be received and given due consideration at the Committee meeting tomorrow.

**We do not agree with the staff recommendation for approval of this application and ask that this application be turned down and the plans already approved be adhered to.**

Our points for this position are as follows:

1. This property is within the boundaries of the Heritage Conservation District and as such subject to the guidelines for change in the District Plan. In addition, along with our property on the east side – it sits at the gateway to the Old Oakville District AND historic Navy Street. This well travelled street is one of the icons that signals to everyone – residents and visitors alike that they are entering a very special area. And as such, it is important to ensure that change is managed with care and sensitivity to not disrupt the jewel which is Old Oakville.
2. We do not agree with the staff report that because the majority of the guidelines are not applicable to this application that it be approved. From our perspective this is not about “how many guidelines does the application fit”. This review is actually about whether a proposed change is compatible with the existing “built environment” and character of the Heritage District.

One important guideline (that one finds in all best practice of Heritage Districts) in our Old Oakville District Plan that we feel is the appropriate lens by which to view this application for change is:

- a. *Scale in height and mass be compatible with surrounding buildings to ensure visual connectedness and existing sense of scale.*

Height and mass are critical elements that impact the look and feel of a built structure and significantly contribute to “character”.

The new build on this property was originally approved on the basis that it should mirror the original 1850s structure that was demolished and fit in with the neighbouring historic cottages at 64 Navy Street, 115 William Street and our home across the street [REDACTED] and 53 Navy Street.

What is being proposed is a significant change that will be visible from multiple angles including Navy Street and Water Street – both historic roads that are within the boundaries of the Old Oakville Heritage District and the Block Analysis.

This new proposed change in both height and in material has the impact of losing reference to the original 1850s structure that the originally approved new build was supposed to mirror.

In our view this is not appropriate. If what is before this Committee now had been presented originally, we feel it would have faced significant community opposition as not being compatible with or sympathetic to the character of the District and what the District Plan envisions for new builds.

We have included a picture of the original structure from the 1972 Canadian Heritage Inventory.



*Source: 1972 Canadian Heritage Inventory Photo Archives*

Surrounding Buildings IN HERITAGE DISTRICT – in our view, proposal should use these as context

**65 Navy Street** – directly across from 68-70 Navy Street



**64 Navy Street** – right beside 68-70 Navy Street



**115 William Street** – around corner from 68-70 Navy Street and side yard on boundary with same



**53 Navy Street** – diagonally south across the street from 68-70 Navy Street



3. Comparing the proposed height with the property to the immediate north on Robinson Street and the Murray House at the southeast corner of Navy and Robinson is not appropriate and misleading.

Both of these properties are outside the boundaries of the District. The Murray House, which is a designated Part IV building has always been a commercial property and as such in addition to being outside of the District (and not an appropriate comparison), not comparable to a residential property. The planned development on the vacant land on Robinson Street is also not appropriate basis for height as it sits outside of the boundaries of the District. The properties on the south side of Robinson Street have always been intended as the buffer for the Heritage District – NOT properties within the District itself.

**We ask that this application be turned down and the plans already approved be adhered to.**

Respectfully submitted

Jane Hawkrigg  
Jamie Macrae

