

## Business Arising from the Minutes

**1411 Government** – Mr. Barber reported that he and Bill Patterson examined the brick underneath the stucco and found it was badly damaged. They are investigating repair and painting options.

**331 Michigan** – Valerie Spohn reported that she had toured the inside of this house and found the interior to be beautifully intact. She advised that the owner was very responsive to other heritage advisory committee members viewing the interior.

**1519 Amelia Street – Proposed addition to a Heritage Registry house. Building Permit Application. Application of JCR Construction on behalf of Brooks and Marshall Associates. Zoned CA-3 Central Area General Commercial. For comment to the applicant.**

---

Adrian Brooks and Darrell Marshall of Brooks & Marshall Associates were present.

Steve Barber outlined the proposal which is for the addition of a second storey. It will match existing materials of cedar shingles and wood siding. The design is similar to that of 652 Niagara Street and is consistent with the Rehabilitation Principles and Guidelines. He recommended its approval.

### Individual committee member comments:

- The houses on Amelia Street are unique to the city and are very significant as the only example of a group of Italianate working class houses.
- Concern with gradual changes which have been taking place to these houses.
- The Amelia and Mason Street façade is prominent.
- Erosion of heritage qualities – 5 years from now could be another change.
- This addition is inappropriate.
- Any changes to one house will alter the significance of other houses in the grouping.
- Mr. Brooks remarked that he recognizes the concerns and has attempted to keep the addition consistent with the building.

**1519 Amelia**

Mr. Barber commented that the proposal is for a modest addition and is considered a rehabilitation, not restoration. It is necessary for the owners to make the building more useful for their business and it would be unrealistic not to expect any changes.

The applicants left the room.

**Further individual committee comments:**

- It was suggested that the house be designated.
- With other businesses on the street is it necessary to expand in that location?
- Concern with the heritage preservation which has existed since the 1890's.
- The side of the house is as significant as the front. The addition will shadow the adjacent building and spoil the continuity.
- Economics is one thing but massing is another.
- Concern with overall zoning for the area.
- The addition is not sympathetic.
- Design of the new addition should be distinguishable from the original.

Mr. Barber advised that the City will have design control when the development permit area/heritage conservation area for this block has been implemented as part of the North Park Plan Implementation.

The applicants returned. The Chairman asked the applicants if they had considered having the property designated and they replied that they had. They agreed to meet with Mr. Barber to discuss heritage designation.

As this application was for comment to the applicant there was no motion.

**New Business**

A committee member questioned the necessity of special meetings when there are only one or two items. Mr. Barber replied that postponing items to the regular meeting results in a delay for applicants requiring their building permits. The Chairman stated that the preparation of the agenda should continue to be left at Mr. Barber's discretion.

The meeting adjourned at 1:10.