



Stevens Burgess Architects Ltd.

**PEER REVIEW OF
HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT
OF LISTER BLOCK**

for

**CITY of HAMILTON
SHARON VATTAY : CULTURAL HERITAGE PLANNER**

by

**STEVENS BURGESS ARCHITECTS
JANE BURGESS (OAA, CAPHC)**

April 2006

A0622

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Summary	1

PART A

1. Overview of Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA)	2
2. Tab 1 - Heritage Impact Assessment as Amended October 2005	3
3. Tab 2 - Requirement 1: Identification of Heritage Resources & Requirement 2: Site Biography	5
4. Tab 3 - Requirement 3: Evaluation of Heritage Resources	7
5. Tab 4 - Consideration of Eight Guiding Principles	7
6. Tab 5 - Photographic Drawings of the Heritage Resources in the Context of their Setting	8
7. Tab 6 - Impact on Heritage Resources	8
8. Tab 7 - Requirement 7: Identification of Conservation Options & Requirement 8: The Advantages and Disadvantages of Each Conservation Option	10
9. Tab 8 - Appendix A: WGD Architects Inc.: Proposed Development	10
10. Tab 9 - Appendix B: WGD Architects Inc.: Alternative Drawings	12
11. Tab 10 - Appendix C: Helyar's Order of Magnitude Construction Budget	12
12. Tab 11 - Appendix D: Construction Control Inc. Report	12

PART B

1. Applying the City of Hamilton's Standards for Leased Space to Heritage Buildings ...	13
2. Lease Compliance Potential	14
3. Retail Reuse	14

APPENDICES

Curriculum Vitae: Jane Burgess

INTRODUCTION

Sharon Vattay, Cultural Heritage Planner, City of Hamilton, retained Jane Burgess of Stevens Burgess Architects (SBA) (CAPHC) to be part of a three-member peer review committee. The peer review committee's scope of work was to assess the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for the Lister Block.

Andy Huct with McCormick Rankin was to evaluate the assessment of the structure. André Scheinman was to evaluate the assessment of the building envelope. The focus of SBA's assessment was to evaluate the assessment for adaptive reuse as an office building. SBA was also to review the City's "Standards for Leased Space" and determine if the proposed adaptive reuse complies.

The City of Hamilton intends to lease three floors in the completed project. This reviewer's scope of work was focused on the impact on the building from conversion to "class A" office space as defined by the City of Hamilton's "Standards for Leased Space." Conversely, the reviewer was to review any shortfalls the proposal had in achieving "class A" office space.

The terms of reference included for a day review of the existing documents, a day at the site in discussion with other peer reviewers, and two days to produce, review and submit the assessment of the assessment.

SUMMARY

As a result of the conflicts between the original HIA, the amending tabs, and the appendices, the reader is left to surmise the proponent's intent; demolition and pseudo replication. There is not clear evaluation of the heritage attributes and little assessment of the impact on the heritage attributes of other buildings of historical interest on the site, or the neighborhood. The drawings and text of the proposal by the WGD Architects in Appendix B contradict the description of the mitigating measures described by the heritage architect John Mokrycke in his HIA.

The HIA does not really address the adaptive reuse of the existing structure as an office building that could meet the City of Hamilton's "Standards for Leased Space." It determines that the top four floors of the Lister Block have a floor to underside of concrete deck height of only 9'-10", approximately two feet less than the Federal Government Building in Hamilton and therefore would not be a state of the art Class AAA building. The HIA does not address possible means of mitigating the lack of ceiling height.

This reviewer doesn't wish to imply there are not difficulties, many of which have been pointed out in the HIA, to be overcome in order to reuse of these heritage buildings as a single complex but the state of willful neglect the building is presently kept in combined with the shortcomings of the HIA make one think the document was produced for the purpose of justifying demolition rather than explore reuse options.

PART A

1. OVERVIEW OF HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT (HIA)

“Lister Block Heritage Impact Assessment”
(dated February 2006)

There is no clear indication of who takes responsibility for the overall composition and authorship of the document but I have assumed that it is John Mokrycke Architect as the words “Heritage Impact Assessment” appear above his name in the footer of many of the initial chapters, although the drawings appended are credited to a WGD Architects Inc..

The document is extensive, over two hundred pages in length, but unfortunately it does not have a detailed index. Numbered tabs relate to general titles.

The first tab is the Heritage Impact Assessment as amended February 2006, yet the title page for that tab says 2005.

The next six tabs are the February 2006 amendment to the original document and reflect eight requirements of the City of Hamilton for a HIA.

The final five tabs are appendices by others including the existing and proposed drawings by WGD Architects Inc..

The document as submitted is very difficult to work with. There are a great many inconsistencies between the tabs and appendices.

2. TAB 1 - HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT AS AMENDED OCTOBER 2005

The first tab is entitled *Heritage Impact Assessment as Amended* but is dated October 2005, four months earlier than the cover page and the title of the tab in the index.

This section covers the Lister Block only, street addresses 28-42 James Street North and 5-11 King William Street. It gives a history but because the bibliography is not footnoted and there are no credits or captioning to the graphics (many of which are obviously archival), it is hard to discern what is the author's input and what is information from primary or secondary sources. The assessment then describes the layout of the Lister Building, its structure, designated features, exterior conditions compared with other similar buildings and the interior condition. The assessment ends with Options for Renewal. The options for renewal include the incorporation of a building at 50 James St. N., the most northerly part of the William Thomas Building, and a building at 23 King William St., a lot not owned by the applicants. (Page 17, end of second paragraph.)

Reference to the survey found at Tab 12 Appendix E indicates that the applicants own the majority of this block in contiguous holdings. In addition to the Lister Block they own two other buildings facing King William St., two buildings facing James St. N., one facing Rebecca St., the central core of the block and parking lot frontage on Hughson Street. This proposal will be of such a magnitude that it will impact the heritage significance of the entire block. There is no reference to the additions to the Lister Block, the stack, any of the other buildings on the block nor any of the cultural landscape of the block or this historical district.

The options given for 'renewal' of the Lister Block as I interpret them are:

- .1 **Restoration of facades and internal arcade:** This option is deemed not viable due to the extent of repair required and because it doesn't serve long term needs of users (AAA office space) and the community at large.
- .2 **Preserve and restore the existing designated facades only:** This option is deemed impractical.
- .3 **Preserve the existing designated facades and one structural bay internally on each side:** This option is deemed impractical because of issues noted in #1 and because it is too difficult to integrate the floor levels of the Lister Block with floor to floor heights of a modern type AAA building.
- .4 **Remove terra cotta, demolish building, rebuild 'stretching' a replicated facade that matches the new floor to ceiling heights as required for Class AAA office.** Restore conserved terra cotta units mixed with new concrete units died to match. Replicate the internal arcade.

I infer the "impact" on the Lister Block to be complete demolition with the restoration of some terra cotta fragments, the replication of the ground floor arcade and shop fronts and a vertically distorted replication of the front facade. There is no reference to the other buildings of historical

interest on the block, nor of the impact on this historical block itself. I am forced to conclude that although this tab is entitled impact assessment, there is no clear description of the impact on the heritage value nor any reference to a mitigation being proposed.

It is hard to assess heritage impact in the absence of as-designed drawings. Assuming the drawings at Tab 8 Appendix A are reflective of Option 4 above, there appear to be some discrepancies / omissions with the wording of this chapter for the Lister Block:

- .1 The mechanical penthouse is not shown on the elevations.
- .2 The elevations don't indicate the height of the original building or show where the distortion in the elevation occurs to accommodate the 'stretch'. The elevations don't clearly show where the reconstructed original elements are being proposed to be used. (For example if the stretch is in the windows, then reuse of the copper panels might be appropriate.)
- .3 One suspects the pattern language on the street is being changed as once each storefront had an entrance, while the drawings show a limited number of retail entrances with much larger stores.
- .4 There is only one level of arcade, not two, and again one suspects the pattern language of use must be changed as there are not separate small stores off the arcade nor any stores along the north where the parking lot is adjacent. The heritage impact should include the viability of the arcade being populated.
- .5 The building at 50 St. James St. N. is only nominally being incorporated into this proposal, in that a parking garage is being built behind a narrow residual frontage. The office levels are not being connected with the Lister building's.
- .6 The plans indicate a parking structure roof below the third level of the Lister Block, while the elevations show a glass structure slightly higher than the Lister Block.
- .7 There is no discussion about what is happening to the north and east elevations yet the drawings show that portions of both are clearly visible from the street.

There appears to be a disconnect between the heritage consultant and the project architectural team.

Photographic Review of Existing Conditions: October 2005

What follows at the end of Tab 1 is a non-tabbed "*Photographic Review of Existing Conditions*". This is somewhat confusing as Tab 12 Appendix E is entitled "WGD Architects Inc. Existing Conditions." Appendix E is in fact a current survey and drawing C101 Project Location Context, which shows the proposal.

3. TAB 2 - REQUIREMENT 1: IDENTIFICATION OF HERITAGE RESOURCES & REQUIREMENT 2: SITE BIOGRAPHY

It is my understanding that this tab and the following 'Requirement' tabs were added after the review of the initially submitted HIA at the request of the City of Hamilton.

The content of this tab is totally bewildering. Historical city mapping and better block mapping would greatly enhance the understanding.

James Street North

For James Street North the confusion lies in that the street addresses are not included on the survey or the street elevation, unlike King William St. where the addresses are shown on the survey. The description is by address and the description defines 54 James Street North as a separate building wedged between what is noted as 'a' William Thomas building to the south (44 to 50, with 44 being described on the survey as a separate building from the remainder) and 'a' building to the north (56 to 60). It is only much later at Tab 8 Appendix A - WGD Architects Proposed Development, that I could be sure where the proponent's property line was reflected on the streetscape.

For a building designed by an architect as famous as William Thomas there is sparse documentation, no as-designed drawings and no bibliography. There is no attempt to describe the impact on this building. It is simply stated that it is being incorporated. After so much talk of inadequate floor heights in the Lister Block, we are not told if the floor heights in the William Thomas building are ideal and will therefore line up with the new proposal.

On page 4 we are told that the incorporation of 44 to 50 successfully meets the objectives of the Downtown Secondary Plan through the **retention and enhancement of the historic fabric**, yet this contrasts what was said in Tab 1 and shown on the drawings of Tab 8. Tab 1, the HIA, says the Lister Block is to be torn down with the possibility of some terra cotta fragments being reconstructed. Tab 8 plan A202 shows a single commercial entrance, which historically was probably four separate entrances. The elevations at Tab 8 show 46 to 50 still covered with industrial steel siding. Page 3 refers to the restoration of only the partial William Thomas design at 44 James Street North. This all begs more questions concerning the heritage impact assessment than it answers.

No mention is made of the fact that all the structures at 44 - 50 are being truncated past the limits of the original stone buildings and a three or four level parking garaged built. One is suspicious that the land the building sits on is being incorporated into the proposal as a parking garage but the building itself is not being incorporated in any meaningful way.

There is no mention of the heritage impact of the parking garage on the William Thomas building nor its neighbouring buildings.

King William Street

There appears to be no primary research into the buildings along this street. Of particular interest

would be the buildings the applicant owns; 15 - 21 and the building at 33 - 35. All we are told about 33 - 35 is that it is vacant. (The photos show a derelict boarded-up building.)

We are told on page 4 that 33 - 35 will be restored “to match the current uses of its neighbours.” This sentence makes no sense. The drawings at Tab 8 do not include this building in the site plan, while the elevation shows the building as it presently appears with its facade boarded up. The heritage significance of this property has not been well documented, the existing condition is unknown, and what physically will happen to the building is not shown. Thus it is impossible to even surmise what the heritage impact of this development will be.

We are told that 15 - 21 King William St. “will be dismantled and reconstructed as a four storey building.” Again this is most confusing. Even a cursory glance at the front elevation of 15 - 21 shows that there was originally a gap between the Lister Block and this building. I would suspect that the building was originally three storeys high and became four floors at the same time the gap was filled to provide vertical circulation.

The drawings at Tab 8 show the following: A101 shows the 15 - 17 roof at the same height as the Lister Block; A202/3 show a recessed glass infill where the gap was and two storey retail at grade; 204/5 show four floors above of open office that are open to and contiguous with the open office space of the newly reconstructed Lister Building.

The elevations shown on drawing A301 show the exact same distressed retail elevations that appear today. The second floor office windows have been reconstructed and will open onto a void. The building has been ‘stretched’ between the second and third levels. The coloured elevations show a very different elevation. The storefronts have been combined into one storefront with single sheets of glass from grade to top of first floor level and glazed doors centrally located.

The conflicts and discrepancies within the document make it very difficult to know what really is intended. There has been no building specific heritage impact assessment undertaken.

The City Block

The concluding paragraph on page 4 is filled with inconsistent statements and ends with a motherhood statement along the lines that the redevelopment of this site will rejuvenate not only this block but adjacent city blocks. This may well be but no heritage impact assessment has been undertaken.

There is no discussion regarding the impact of the development on the corner building 6 - 8 Rebecca St. / 56 -60 James St. North.

The Lister Block

The remainder of this tab is taken up with a photo documentation of the rear of the Lister Block and the interiors. It would seem to make more sense if all this material was included in the unindexed / non-tabbed “Photographic Review of Existing Conditions” that occurs at the end of Tab 1.

4. TAB 3 - REQUIREMENT 3: EVALUATION OF HERITAGE RESOURCES

This tab does not evaluate any heritage resources but rather points to places in Tab numbers 1 & 2 where the author feels this can be found. This reviewer does not feel that the heritage resources of the Lister Block nor the other buildings affected by the proposal have been succinctly evaluated.

The author implies under point #5 that the value of a heritage resource is the same as its as-found condition. The condition may affect the value of a heritage resource but it in itself doesn't reflect the value of that resource.

The quotes from the CCI report are very unfortunate in that they are taken from the extreme statements of the report and are very hard to justify. (See other reviewers reports.) The reference to the hazardous materials is secondary to the buildings reuse as many of the hazardous materials mentioned will have to be disposed of in the legislated manner whether the building is being demolished or reused.

5. TAB 4 - CONSIDERATION OF EIGHT GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The author shows little knowledge of the intent or application of the Ministry's Eight Guiding Principles. Perhaps this unfamiliarity is part of the reason that, in spite of the not inconsiderable amount of work done, there is no succinct heritage impact statement contained within the document.

Guiding Principle #8 is maintenance. The author indicates maintenance doesn't apply to the proposed project. This reviewer has never been involved with a heritage project where maintenance didn't apply. The lack of its application may account for the present state of the site. The rapid rate of decline from the designation photographs of ten years ago would indicate a policy of destruction through neglect. If any credence is to be given to the proponent's assertion of restoring certain elements, a maintenance program must be put forward and implemented post haste.

6. TAB 5 - PHOTOGRAPHIC DRAWINGS OF THE HERITAGE RESOURCES IN THE CONTEXT OF THEIR SETTING

What is included under the tab has nothing to do with the title. It appears to be a response to the heritage planner who was obviously struggling as am I with finding the necessary information laid out in a logical manner.

Unfortunately it appears that in responding to the heritage planner's concerns, instead of reformatting the original report to address the shortcomings, supplementary information has been added as stand alone items within the tab system making things even more difficult to understand.

There is a systemic problem with accuracy in this report. The example I note here is that #8 here notes the date of the survey used for the October HIA was from June to September 2005. Surveys as a rule have a single date and although the year on the survey in Tab 12 Appendix E is too small to read it appears to begin with a 1 not a 2.

7. TAB 6 - IMPACT ON HERITAGE RESOURCES

No heritage impact assessment follows this Table of Contents heading. The resources aren't noted. The only impact statement given is somewhat obfuscating: " Within this description it is clear that all of the existing heritage resources within the Lister Block building will be affected." I believe the author means to say the Lister Block is going to be demolished.

It would be possible to understand the assessment if the assessor referred to the different levels of intervention by their commonly referred names. I would refer him to MBS's Manual of Guidelines for heritage conservation which lists and defines all levels of intervention in order of magnitude as:

- 1 Documentation
- 2 Monitoring
- 3 Housekeeping
- 4 Maintenance
- 5 Repair
- 6 Mothballing
- 7 Stabilization
- 8 Restoration
- 9 Rehabilitation
- 10 Retrofit
- 11 Reassembly
- 12 Replication
- 13 Reconstruction
- 14 Renovation
- 15 Modernization

- 16 Moving
- 17 Salvage
- 18 Fragmentation
- 19 Demolition

Each one of the above levels of intervention have opportunities for mitigation which the assessor should be describing to satisfy the authorities that all feasible measures are being undertaken to minimize the negative impact.

As I understand this proposal, the intent as regards to the Lister Block is to demolish it, replicate the street facades in a modified manner and maybe reassemble fragments of the glazed terra cotta intermixed with replicated concrete units.

Since the terra cotta is listed in the reasons for designation and since restoration of original fragments is given as a key means of mitigating the loss of heritage resources, it is mandatory that the applicants give a detailed description of the intended methods for removal, safe storage, conservation, and restoration of the fragments to the new building facade.

The proponent states: *“The process of removal of exterior cladding, the storage location for removed heritage components and how the heritage material will be replaced within the reconstructed facade has not been pursued because the development team finds it impractical in view of the decision to implement new construction.”*

If the proponent is saying he/she is restoring original pieces, they must give some level of comfort that this is possible. The best means of doing this is to undertake a well documented trial using skilled craftsmen. This not only provides the authorities with the level of comfort they need; it also affords the owner the most accurate means of costing the work. In the case of the terra cotta, since a component of the glazed tile restoration is to match with precast concrete, the proponent should include coloured samples of same or failing that note the sources for new material to match. It is not impractical to do this for every material proposed to be restored. If the existing team doesn't have the expertise to do this, they should hire it through a qualified restoration consultant.

The reasons for designation clearly state that the two-level interior arcade is a significant feature. The absence anywhere in the document of any discussion about the impact of the removal of the second level and the change of use in the ground level replication to what amounts to an office building lobby is a serious omission.

**8. TAB 7 - REQUIREMENT 7: IDENTIFICATION OF CONSERVATION OPTIONS
& REQUIREMENT 8: THE ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF
EACH CONSERVATION OPTION**

The conservation options listed here vary from the original HIA with no associated rationale.

Preservation of the Lister Block is no longer listed as an option. The reason given for dropping this option is that it wouldn't result in a 'state of the art office building' due to deficiencies in HVAC systems and floor to ceiling heights. There is no attempt to indicate what unique attributes might be gained through the restoration that would offset certain features in a state of the art building. Heritage buildings provide the kudos associated with many of the most prized signature office space for governments, e.g. Queen's Park Circle, and corporate headquarters, e.g. the Confederation Life Building.

Other than monetary amounts, the author tells us the advantages and disadvantages aren't listed under this tab but will be found in Appendix B, Tab 9.

It is interesting to note that a code compliance analysis with alternative measures is found nowhere in the HIA.

The financial implications are that Option C, an option never previously noted, the removal of every other floor, is the least costly. It gives no actual or environmental costs for the preferred proposal of total demolition.

This tab goes on to note that in response to the City's staff's concerns, John Mokrycke Architects will undertake as-built drawings and photo documentation in order to mitigate the effects of demolition. The staff would have every right to expect a detailed scope of work and methodology for this documentation but none is given here.

**9. TAB 8 - APPENDIX A: WGD ARCHITECTS INC.:
PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT**

The conflicts between this section and the wording of the HIA in Tab 1 make it truly impossible to understand what is being proposed. Some of these conflicts, especially as they relate to buildings other than the Lister Block, have already been discussed.

There are motherhood statements about the new building being up to current industry standards, but absolutely no details. From this description it is not possible to ascertain if the City's lease standards are to be met.

What is especially disturbing as regards the lack of information about materials being proposed is that there is no way of knowing the intention for the replication of the arcades. Are the windows going to be wood or ubiquitous aluminum? There is no mention of terra cotta, new or old, in the materials description.

The words of the HIA lead us to believe the arcade is to be preserved. The drawings show that the widths of the arcade are to change as well as the interior elevation. It is impossible to tell if the height of the arcade is to change. There has been no discussion about the impact of the change of dimensions on the arcade, as there has been no discussion about the impact of the arcade becoming an elevator lobby.

The interior elevations of the arcade in A303 are very telling. For example, the north elevation shows what would appear to be retail windows replicating the original storefronts minus the doors to enter the stores. When cross-referenced to the plan, the majority of these windows look onto the parking garage so for reasons of fire separation this reviewer presumes they are 'blind' windows. The wording of the HIA would lead the reviewer to believe that the facades of the arcades are being restored and that is clearly not the case.

There will be no arcade on the second floor. In fact there will be no second floor as it will be open to below and is called a mezzanine. So the large second floor commercial type windows are either 'blind' windows with mechanical systems behind them or are extremely large clerestorey windows to the retail level below. There has been no discussion about the impact of the missing second level on the appearance of the second floor windows.

The HIA has not discussed the significant changes to the storefronts these elevation drawings show. James Street North originally had seven retail entrances. These elevations show two, one of which is presumably the restored entrance at #36 which is mentioned in the reasons for designation. If the entrance at #36 is the restored original fabric will it look slightly different than the others, following the Eight Guiding Principles? Since the original floor to ceiling height for the ground and second floors was higher than the upper floors, will the original floor to ceiling heights and therefore the proportions be maintained for the storefronts and retail windows over? None of this has been discussed in the HIA.

The mechanical floor that is shown in plan is missing on the elevations. This surely will have a considerable impact on how the building looks.

These drawings show Rebecca Street and Hughson Street elevations of 100% glazed curtain wall and brick with aluminum(?) windows but nowhere is there any discussion regarding the impact of these elevations.

One thing these elevations clearly show is that the rear portion of the William Thomas building is to be sacrificed for a parking lot while the street facade is condemned to remain encased in industrial steel siding.

10. TAB 9 - APPENDIX B: WGD ARCHITECTS INC.: ALTERNATIVE DRAWINGS

The drawings and discussion found at this tab are very superficial and concentrate on identifying the difficulties but not on exploration of how to overcome the difficulties. For Option C, removal of every other floor, all they say is that it will be complex and difficult.

The low ceiling heights are illustrated here in relation to current standards but there is no attempt to show mitigation of the low ceiling heights through addition vertical shafts, exposed ducting, and core drilling through the very robust concrete beams.

11. TAB 10 - APPENDIX C: HELYAR'S ORDER OF MAGNITUDE CONSTRUCTION BUDGET

Other reviewers will deal with the section in more detail.

There is no base building cost for the new construction given here, only premium cost for alternative options for "heritage wall retention." All this section tells us is that retaining an heritage facade while building behind has a premium. There is no indication of what the magnitude of that premium is in relation to the cost of the entire project.

There is no cost given for the demolition, nor for upgrading the existing structure for office/retail reuse.

Paying a premium cost for conservation is no justification for demolition.

12. TAB 11 - APPENDIX D: CONSTRUCTION CONTROL INC. REPORT

This report has been conducted by someone with little knowledge of the heritage materials or the conservation of these materials. The assessment of the terra cotta contradicts Clifford's who does have this knowledge, while the assessment of the rug brick as being in poor condition is contrary to the as-found condition.

PART B

1. APPLYING THE CITY OF HAMILTON'S STANDARDS FOR LEASED SPACE TO HERITAGE BUILDINGS

The City of Hamilton's "Standards for Leased Space," March 13, 2006, is not reflective of the tradeoff's inherent in using a heritage building. In particular the standard 90.1 for Energy Efficient Design of New Buildings was never intended to apply to existing buildings. For example, the requirement for low-emissivity soft coating of double glazing would result in the windows being reflective, a very undesirable feature in a heritage building.

Accessibility often requires alternative measures in older buildings.

It is in the HVAC systems that alternative measures must be carefully taken into account. If older buildings are not retrofitted with vapour barriers, the high levels of humidity desired by humans can result in the rapid destruction of the building envelope. These lease standards of 30% winter design levels are fairly modest and should be achievable.

Energy conservation standards are often only achievable at the cost of some element of the historic fabric, usually the windows. Alternate energy standards should be allowable for heritage buildings, and the conservation of primary manufacturing energy through the preservation of existing building materials should always be taken into account.

The lease standard requiring the ceiling height to be a minimum of 2750 mm would at first glance appear to be the standard that is condemning the Lister Block, which only has a finished floor to underside of slab height of 2920 mm. The Lister Block can only achieve this standard by exposing the building systems.

Generally speaking, and particularly in this case where the proponent team seems to have little experience with the reuse of heritage buildings, the City of Hamilton should encourage alternative measures.

2. LEASE COMPLIANCE POTENTIAL

A shortcoming in the HIA is the omission of the buildings with heritage attributes other than the Lister Block that form part of the proposal. There is no information given about these buildings that would allow the reviewer to comment.

The Lister Block cannot and should not comply with the lease standards as written. The proponent has not attempted to envision what the best possible office space with the least amount of intervention might be like. If the goal is to achieve 20,000 square foot floor plates, creative measures will have to be put in place to enable maximization of ceiling heights and natural light penetration. The proponent has identified these two important issues but will need the help of the City as its lead tenant to identify potential solutions.

There has been no attempt by the proponent to undertake a code compliance report, and therefore there have not been put forth any code compliance alternatives. Should there be any will to preserve these buildings, this will be an important aspect. I am confident that acceptable code compliance alternatives can be found, but it will take code consultants familiar with and sympathetic to heritage buildings to propose these measures.

3. RETAIL REUSE

This reviewer is extremely concerned that not enough thought has gone into the preservation of the arcade. Does the heritage designation include its use? An arcade by its very nature is made up of a lot of small entities. Does the designation only cover the preservation of the building fabric? In the present proposal, neither the use, nor the fabric, nor the appearance, nor even the second level are to be preserved. The proposal and its HIA are very confusing and contradictory as to what exactly is being proposed. I believe the City should open a dialogue with the proponent to try to come to some real understanding as to what the long term intent is.

APPENDICES

1. Curriculum Vitae: Jane Burgess

JANE BURGESS
Principal, Stevens Burgess Architects

EDUCATION	Bachelor of Architecture, 1974, University of Toronto
TEACHING	University of Waterloo, School of Architecture Program Co-ordinator, 5th Year Urban Design Option, 1979 University of Waterloo, School of Architecture Visiting Critic, 1978-79 Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, Studio Critic, 1980 Ryerson Polytechnical Institute, Studio Instructor, 1988, 1989
PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE	1984 to date Stevens Burgess Architects, Ltd. 1980 to 1984 Karl Stevens and Associates, Architects 1976 to 1984 Jane Burgess Architect, Toronto
PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS	Member, Royal Architectural Institute of Canada Member, Ontario Association of Architects Member, Toronto Society of Architects Member, Association of Preservation Technologists Member, Canadian Association of Professional Heritage Consultants (President 1997-99) Vice-Chair, Toronto Preservation Board (2000-2002) Director, Friends of Fort York (2004-present)

Jane Burgess, a partner of the firm, was fortunate enough to attend the University of Toronto's School of Architecture during the radical early seventies when it was the leading design school in the country. Once she had graduated Jane wanted to quickly develop hands-on construction experience so she worked for engineers, architects and contractors in some of the more remote corners in Canada where opportunities to take on construction and contract responsibility were greater. Following this she ran her own combined architectural/contracting business specializing in residential and preservation work.

Jane's interest in preservation dates back to her university days when she was fortunate enough to study under Eric Arthur, Marian MacRae and Bill Goulding, and she continues to study conservation, both here and abroad. Her sensitivity to historical precedents results in the buildings she has designed encompassing a sense of belonging to both the social and built environment surrounding them. Jane excels in working with her clients, whether they be individuals or groups, to develop building programmes that sensitively respond to the clients' needs. Based on the building programme, various scenarios are graphically developed with the client until a design concept evolves which exploits the client's building programme to its fullest.

Committed to giving back to her profession and community, Jane is a volunteer architectural consultant working through the United Way with various disenfranchised groups. She has lectured at Ryerson Polytechnic Institute's Department of Architectural Sciences and has been a guest critic at the School of Architecture, University of Waterloo, and is a long-standing, active member of the Association of Preservation Technologists.

CONSERVATION / PRESERVATION / RESTORATION / REUSE PROJECTS

- Old Stone Church, Beaverton (Nationally Significant):
Designation, fundraising, preservation, ongoing maintenance, manual
- Fort York Armoury (Nationally Significant):
Review of federal heritage assessment, conservation and repair
- Old Don Jail (Nationally Significant):
Heritage Significance Study, Intervention Guidelines, Stabilization, Phase 1 Preservation
- George Brown House, Toronto (Provincially Significant):
Conservation and repair, design of new yet compatible operable storm window system, interior access to roof top units.
- French River:
Grant from the Royal Canadian Geographical Society for Study of Architectural Vernacular of Extant Logging Camp along French River, preparatory to Designation of French River Heritage River Park
- Old Whitby Psychiatric Hospital (Provincially Significant):
Heritage Inventory, Phase 1 Significance Study, Intervention Guidelines & Stabilization, Condition Assessment Report of 48 buildings, Realty Masterplan, Emergency Stabilization
- City of Yellowknife, N.W.T.:
Urban Design Guidelines associated with the General Plan Revision dealing with built form response to severe climatic conditions and historical context.
- Whitney Block and Tower, Queen's Park (Designated):
Heritage Significance Study, Intervention Guidelines, Preservation Phase I and II
- University of Guelph, Macdonald Institute Complex:
Feasibility Study
- Old Hamilton Psychiatric Hospital, Century Manor (Designated):
Stabilization Masterplan
- Old Hamilton Psychiatric Hospital Site:
Conservation projects for Century Manor and Grove Hall
- Old Kingston Psychiatric Hospital:
Feasibility Study to combine two vacant heritage buildings into a sustainable office complex for the Ministry of Environment
- Gerrard/Ashdale Library, Toronto:
Renovation
- Wychwood Library Plaza, Toronto (Listed):
Renovation
- 20 Victoria Street, Toronto (Designated):
Alteration and adaptive reuse of 1910, 9-storey building.
- 44 Victoria Street, Toronto (Listed):
Integration of existing 1927, 22-storey building within a block development.
- Richmond Hill:
Heritage Inventory Study of 1,200 acres in Richmond Hill.