



REPORT

Cultural Heritage Report: Existing Conditions and Preliminary Impact Assessment

Caledon Pit / Quarry

Submitted to:

CBM Aggregates, a division of St. Marys Cement Inc. (Canada)

55 Industrial Street

Toronto, Ontario

M4G 3W9


Submitted by:

Golder Associates Ltd.

6925 Century Avenue, Suite #100, Mississauga, Ontario, L5N 7K2, Canada

19129150-5700-R01-RevB

13 December 2022 (Revised 21 July 2023)



Distribution List

1 e-copy: CBM Aggregates, a division of St. Marys Cement Inc. (Canada)

1 e-copy: Golder Associates Ltd.

1 e-copy: MHBC

1 e-copy: GSAI

Personnel

Project Director	George Schneider, MSc, Principal, Senior Geoscientist
Project Manager	Heather Melcher, MSc, Principal, Senior Ecologist
Field Investigations	Alisha Mohamed, MA, Cultural Heritage Specialist Chelsea Dickinson, BA (hons), Cultural Heritage Specialist Robert Pinchin, BA (hons), Cultural Heritage Technician
Report Production	Alisha Mohamed, MA Shannon Neill-Sword, JD, Cultural Heritage Specialist Johanna Kelly, MSc, Cultural Heritage Specialist
Senior Review	Michael Teal, MA, Director, Archaeology and Heritage, Ontario Henry Cary, PhD, CAHP, Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist Heidy Schopf, MES, CAHP, Built Heritage and Cultural Landscape Team Lead
Mapping and GIS	Shannon Orellana, Senior GIS Analyst

Acknowledgements

CBM Aggregates

David Hanratty, Director of Lands, Resources & Environment

Table of Contents

1.0 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Objectives	3
1.2 Description of Proposed Development.....	4
1.3 Extraction Plan.....	4
2.0 SCOPE AND METHODS	6
2.1 Record of Engagement.....	7
2.2 Archaeology	8
3.0 POLICY FRAMEWORK.....	9
3.1 Federal and International Heritage Policies.....	9
3.2 Provincial Heritage Policies	9
3.2.1 Aggregate Resources Act.....	9
3.2.2 <i>Planning Act</i> and Provincial Policy Statement.....	9
3.2.3 <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i> and Ontario Regulation 9/06	11
3.2.4 Provincial Heritage Guidance	12
3.2.4.1 Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport.....	12
3.3 Municipal Heritage Policies.....	12
3.3.1 Regional Municipality of Peel.....	12
3.3.2 Town of Caledon	13
3.3.2.1 Official Plan.....	13
3.3.2.2 Coulterville Special Study Area.....	15
3.3.2.3 Terms of Reference: Heritage Impact Assessment	15
4.0 GEOGRAPHICAL AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT	16
4.1 Geographical Context.....	16
4.2 Historical Context.....	16
4.2.1 Indigenous Regional History	16
4.2.2 Settler History	17
4.2.2.1 Township of Caledon, County of Peel.....	17
4.2.2.2 Study Area Specific History	18
5.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS	23

5.1 Potential Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes26

6.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS46

6.1 Assessment Methodology46

6.2 Impact Assessment.....46

6.3 Traffic Impacts62

7.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS63

8.0 REFERENCES64

TABLES

Table 1: Results of Engagement7

Table 2: Known and potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes within the study area28

Table 3: Impact Assessment and Conservation Recommendations for Known and Potential BHRs and CHLs within the Study Area.....47

FIGURES

Figure 1: Location of Study Area5

Figure 2: Study area overlaid on 1859 and 1877 historical maps20

Figure 3: Study area overlaid on 1937 and 1952 topographic maps.....21

Figure 4: Study area overlaid on 1954 aerial photograph and 1973 topographic map.....22

Figure 5: Main Street north of Charleston Sideroad, exhibiting paved asphalt, two-lane roadway with partially paved and partially gravelled shoulder (latter under snow) accompanied by ditch, facing northwest.23

Figure 6: Branch of the Credit River flowing under Charleston Sideroad to the northeast of the study area, facing southwest.24

Figure 7: Brampton-Orangeville Railway corridor (former CVR/ CPR corridor) traversing under Charleston Sideroad to the northeast of the study area, facing southwest.....24

Figure 8: Rural landscape along Mississauga Road south of Charleston Sideroad, exhibiting treelines and hedgerows delineating agricultural tracts, facing southeast.....25

Figure 9: Known and potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes within the study area45

Figure 10:Cultural Heritage 50-m Construction Buffer.....61

APPENDIX A

Terms of Reference

APPENDIX B

Caledon Quarry Traffic Data

APPENDIX C

Preliminary Cultural Heritage Evaluations

APPENDIX D

Curriculum Vitae

1.0 INTRODUCTION

CBM Aggregates (CBM), a division of St. Marys Cement Inc. (Canada) is applying to the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) for a Class A Licence (Pit and Quarry Below Water) and to the Town of Caledon for an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment to permit a mineral aggregate operation. Golder Associated Ltd., a member of WSP (Golder), has been retained by CBM to complete a Cultural Heritage Report for the proposed CBM Caledon Pit / Quarry in accordance with the Terms of Reference developed in consultation with the Development Application Review Team (DART) found in APPENDIX A.

CBM owns / controls approximately 323 hectares of land located at the northwest, northeast and southwest intersection of Regional Road 24 (Charleston Sideroad) and Regional Road 136 (Main Street). Of these lands, approximately 261.2 hectares are proposed to be licenced under the Aggregate Resources Act and designated / zoned under the Planning Act to permit the proposed CBM Caledon Pit / Quarry. These lands are mapped as a Caledon High Potential Mineral Aggregate Resource Area (CHPMARA) in the Town of Caledon Official Plan and High Potential Mineral Aggregate Resource Area (HPMARA) in the Region of Peel Official Plan and are protected for their aggregate potential.

The remaining approximately 61 hectares of land owned / controlled by CBM are not subject to the application. These lands are referred to as “CBM Additional Lands” and these lands include approximately 36 hectares of land that is located adjacent to the minor urban centre of Cataract. As part of the application, CBM is proposing to create an upland forest and meadow grassland on these lands and is exploring the potential of conveying them permanently to a public authority for long term protection.

The lands proposed to be licenced under the Aggregate Resources Act are referred to as the “Subject Site” or “Site” and are legally described as Part of Lots 15-18, Concession 4 WSCR and Part of Lot 16, Concession 3 WSCR (former Geographic Township of Caledon). The Subject Site is approximately 261.2 hectares and extraction is proposed on approximately 199.5 hectares. These lands are referred to as the “Extraction Area”. The remaining approximate 61 hectares within the Subject Site and outside of the Extraction Area are referred to as the “Setback / Buffer Lands”. The Setback / Buffer Lands are used to provide setbacks to surrounding land uses and natural heritage features and the majority of these lands include a 5-metre visual / acoustic berm and visual plantings. For the purpose of this study, “Adjacent Lands” are defined as lands within 120 m of the Subject Site and the Study Area for this assessment includes lands within a 1,000 m of the Subject Site (section 6.1.2).

The proposed Extraction Area includes approximately 80 million tonnes of a high-quality bedrock resource and approximately 5 million tonnes of a high-quality sand and gravel resource. Testing has confirmed that the mineral aggregate resource found on-site is suitable for the production of a wide range of construction products, including the use for high performance concrete. The bedrock resource provides some of the strongest and most durable aggregate material in Southern Ontario. The primary market area for the proposed CBM Caledon Pit / Quarry is the Greater Toronto Area, including the Town of Caledon and the Region of Peel. This site represents a close to market source of a high-quality mineral aggregate resource.

The proposed tonnage limit for the proposed CBM Caledon Pit / Quarry is 2.5 million tonnes per year and on average CBM anticipates shipping approximately 2.0 million tonnes per year. The proposed CBM Caledon Pit / Quarry is proposed to be operated in 7 phases. Phases 1, 2A, 3, 4, 5 are located to the northwest of the intersection of Regional Road 24 and 136. This area is referred to as the “Main Area”. Phase 2B is located to the northeast of the intersection of Regional Road 24 and 136. This area is referred to as the “North Area”. Phases 6 and 7 are located to the southwest of the intersection of Regional Road 24 and 136. This area is referred to as the “South Area”.

Operations would commence in the Main Area and Phase 1 would include the permanent processing area (crushing, screening and wash plant), aggregate recycling area and the entrance / exit for the pit/quarry. Until such time as sufficient space is opened up to establish the permanent processing area, a temporary mobile crushing and processing plant is proposed to be used in Phase 1. The entrance / exit for the CBM Caledon Pit / Quarry is proposed to be located onto Regional Road 24, approximately 775 m west of Regional Road 136. The entrance / exit is proposed to be controlled by a new traffic light and the installation of taper lanes and acceleration lanes on Regional Road 24 at CBM's expense. The primary haul route for the proposed CBM Caledon Pit / Quarry is trucks will travel eastward on Regional Road 24 and then southward on Highway 10. The proposed haul route is an existing aggregate haul route and is designated as an aggregate haul route in the Town of Caledon Official Plan.

Access to the North Area for aggregate extraction is anticipated approximately 10 years after the start of the operations in the Main Area. There will be no processing in the North Area and aggregate extracted from the North Area is proposed to be transported to the Main Area through a proposed tunnel underneath Regional Road 136 or a truck crossing. Access to South Area is anticipated approximately 30 years after the start of the operations in the Main Area. In the South Area, CBM is proposing to permit a portable processing plant and the aggregate extracted and /or processed from the South Area is proposed to be moved to the Main Area through a proposed tunnel underneath Regional Road 24 or a truck crossing. Aside from the establishment of a 1-hectare stormwater settling pond on the easternmost portion of the North Area in the initial year of operation, the North and South areas will be maintained in their current state and agricultural uses until they are required for preparation for aggregate extraction.

The CBM Caledon Pit / Quarry is proposed to operate (extraction, processing and drilling) 7:00 am to 7:00 pm Monday to Saturday, excluding statutory holidays and shipping is proposed from 6:00 am to 7:00 pm Monday to Saturday consistent with other mineral aggregate operations in Caledon. CBM is also proposing to permit limited shipping in the nighttime (7:00 pm to 6:00 am) to support public authority contracts that require the delivery of aggregates during these hours to complete public infrastructure projects. These activities will be limited to only highway trucks and shipping loaders and no other operations will be permitted during nighttime hours. Site preparation and rehabilitation is proposed to be permitted 7:00 am to 7:00 pm Monday to Friday.

The proposed CBM Caledon Pit / Quarry involves stripping topsoil and overburden from the subject site to create perimeter berm and any excess soil will be temporarily stored in the northern portion of the Main Area or used for progressive rehabilitation of the site. The proposed Extraction Area includes extracting both sand and gravel below the water table and the site will be dewatered to allow operations in a dry state. The site will be extracted in sequence of the proposed phases (Phase 1 to 7) and following extraction of Phase 7 the permanent processing plant in Phase 1 will be removed and this will be the final area to be extracted and rehabilitated. The phasing of the proposed mineral aggregate operation has been designed to reach final extraction limits and depths within each phase so progressive rehabilitation of the side slopes can be completed.

The overall goal of the final rehabilitation plan is to create a landform that represents an ecological and visual enhancement and provides future opportunities for conservation, recreational, tourism and water management. Overall, the progressive and final rehabilitation plan for the Subject Site includes the creation of lakes, vegetated shorelines, islands, wetlands, upland forested areas, riparian plantings adjacent to the existing watercourse, nodal shrub and tree planting on upland areas grassland meadows and specialized habitat features for bats and turtles. The proposed rehabilitation has been designed to use of all of the on-site topsoil and overburden and does not require the importation of additional soils.

1.1 Objectives

For the purpose of this report, the following definitions are used:

Site (Figure 1) - the total land area that will be licenced under the ARA. The site is approximately 261.2 hectares (ha) and is composed of three Site areas: Main Area, North Area and the South Area.

Extraction Area – The total area within the site in which aggregate is proposed for extraction. The total combined area of the extraction area is approximately 199.5 ha.

Study Area (Figure 1) - For the purposes of this Cultural Heritage Report, the “study area” constitutes all property parcels within or crossed by the limit of extraction area as well as all adjacent properties. Thus, the study area comprises part of Lots 15 to 18, Concession 3 West of Centre Road (WCR), part of Lots 14 to 20, Concession 4 WCR, and part of Lots 14 to 17 Concession 5 WCR, in the geographic Township of Caledon, former County of Peel.

Following guidance provided by the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM), municipal documents such as the Town of Caledon’s *Official Plan* and *Terms of Reference: Heritage Impact Assessment* (2019), and recognized conservation manuals such as Canada’s Historic Places’ (CHP) 2010 *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada* (CHP *Standards and Guidelines*), this Cultural Heritage Report includes:

- an overview of heritage legislation and policies in Ontario, and an outline of the methods that were used to investigate and assess built heritage resources (BHRs) and cultural heritage landscapes (CHLs) in the study area;
- an overview of the study area’s historical development and existing conditions;
- an inventory of known and potential BHRs and CHLs in the study area;
- a description of the proposed Project options and an assessment of their predicted impacts on potential BHRs and CHLs in the study area; and
- recommendations for cultural heritage mitigation or further studies where necessary.

1.2 Description of Proposed Development

The application is for a Class A Licence (Pit and Quarry Below Water) under the ARA. The intent is to extract, process and transport a maximum of 2.5 million tonnes of aggregate annually from the site, however on average CBM anticipates to ship 2.0 million tonnes of aggregate per year.

1.3 Extraction Plan

The proposed extraction at the Site will be undertaken in seven phases and involves the initial excavation in the Main Area and subsequently the advance of workings in a counter-clockwise direction. Works will progress to the Northern Area in the initial operation phases and the Southern Area towards the latter phases. Further detail of each operational phase is provided below. As part of the overburden removal, sand and gravel will also be extracted from the site.

- **Phase 1** – Operations will commence north of Charleston Sideroad and an entrance to the Main Area satisfying sightline and access spacing requirements will be installed. This entrance will be located on a designated haul route and may be signalled for additional safety.


Topsoil and overburden will be stripped from the operational areas for access to the underlying aggregate resource.

Controlled blasting will be undertaken to extract material from Site faces. Following each blast, it may also be necessary to break down the blast rock further using an excavator with a hydraulic rock breaking attachment. Rock from blast piles will then be transported to a temporary mobile crushing and processing plant. Processed materials will be stockpiled for off site transportation.





A permanent processing facility will be installed north of Charleston Sideroad and adjacent to the entrance once workings have progressed to the final Site floor level in this area.

- **Phase 2A** – Extraction operations will continue in a counter-clockwise direction in the Main Area. Controlled blasting and hydraulic breaking of blast rock will be undertaken at each active face. Rock from blast piles will then be transported to the permanent processing facility north of Charleston Sideroad.
- **Phase 2B** – The Northern Area will be accessed with a tunnel under Main Street. Extraction activities will be the same as that carried out in the Main Area with the extracted materials being transported the permanent processing facility.
- **Phase 3, 4 and 5** – Extraction operations will continue in a counter-clockwise direction in the Main Area.
- **Phase 6** – The Southern Area will be accessed with a tunnel under Charleston Sideroad. Extraction operations will proceed southwards, and materials will be transported the permanent processing facility in the Main Area.
- **Phase 7** – Extraction operations will continue in a southward direction in the Southern Area and materials will be transported to the permanent processing facility in the Main Area.

In each phase, overburden and topsoil stripping, sand and gravel extraction activities will precede drilling, blasting and rock extraction activities.



LEGEND

-  CULTURAL HERITAGE REPORT STUDY AREA
-  LICENCE BOUNDARY
-  LIMIT OF EXTRACTION
-  ADDITIONAL LANDS OWNED / CONTROLLED BY CBM



NOTE(S)
1. ALL LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE

REFERENCE(S)

1. LIO TOPOGRAPHIC DATA CACHE, ONTARIO MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND FORESTRY. OPEN GOVERNMENT LICENCE - ONTARIO
2. LICENSE AND EXTRACTION LIMIT PROVIDED BY MHBC IN JUNE 2023.
3. PROJECTION: TRANSVERSE MERCATOR DATUM: NAD 83 COORDINATE SYSTEM: UTM ZONE 17N

CLIENT
CBM AGGREGATES, A DIVISION OF ST. MARYS CEMENT INC. (CANADA)

PROJECT
CALEDON PIT/ QUARRY

TITLE
LOCATION OF STUDY AREA

CONSULTANT



YYYY-MM-DD 7/18/2023

DESIGNED AM

PREPARED SO

REVIEWED JK

APPROVED HM

PROJECT NO.
19129150

CONTROL
0040

REV.
0.0

FIGURE
1

2.0 SCOPE AND METHODS

The scope of this Cultural Heritage Report was defined by guidance outlined in the MCM's 2016 *Criteria for Evaluating Potential for Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes: A Checklist for the Non-Specialist* (the MCM Checklist), 2006 *Ontario Heritage Tool Kit: Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process* (MCM 2006) and the Town of Caledon's 2019 *Terms of Reference: Heritage Impact Assessment* (Town of Caledon 2019). The MCM Checklist provides a screening tool to identify all known or recognized BHRs and CHLs in the study area, as well as commemorative plaques, cemeteries, Canadian Heritage River watersheds, properties with buildings or structures 40 or more years old, or potential CHLs.

The study area constitutes all property parcels within or crossed by the preliminary extraction area as well as all adjacent properties. With this scope and Study Area, Golder completed the following tasks:

- researched archival and published sources relevant to the historical and geographic context of the study area
- reviewed federal, provincial, and municipal heritage registers, inventories, and databases to identify known BHRs and CHLs in the study area. Sources relevant to this study include:
 - *Canadian Register of Historic Places* (<https://www.historicplaces.ca/en/pages/about-afropos.aspx>)
 - *Parks Canada Directory of Federal Heritage Designations* (http://www.pc.gc.ca/apps/dfhd/search-recherche_eng.aspx) and *Directory of Heritage Railway Stations* (<https://www.pc.gc.ca/en/culture/clmhc-hsmbc/pat-her/gar-sta/on>)
 - *Canadian Heritage Rivers System* list of designated heritage rivers (<https://chrs.ca/en>)
 - Ontario Heritage Trust (OHT) *Places of Worship Inventory* (<https://www.heritagetrust.on.ca/en/places-of-worship/places-of-worship-database/search>), *Plaque Database* (<http://www.heritagetrust.on.ca/en/online-plaque-guide>), web mapping application showing OHT Buildings and Easements (<https://www.heritagetrust.on.ca/en/index.php/property-types/buildings>), and *Ontario Heritage Act (OHA) Register* (<https://www.heritagetrust.on.ca/en/oha/basic-search>)
 - Town of Caledon *Heritage Register* (<https://www.caledon.ca/en/living-here/heritage-designation.aspx>) and *Cultural Heritage Landscapes Inventory* (<https://www.caledon.ca/en/living-here/cultural-heritage-landscapes.aspx>)
- engaged with heritage planning staff at the Town of Caledon and OHT
- conducted a field investigation from the public right-of-way (ROW) to inventory and document all known and potential BHRs and CHLs within the study area and to understand the wider built and landscape context
- consulted the following project studies relevant to the identification of heritage resources and assessment of impacts:
 - Caledon Quarry Traffic Data (APPENDIX B)
 - Ecological Land Classification and Survey Stations (Golder 2022b)
- completed screening-level assessments of properties with buildings or structures 40 or more years old and assessed at a preliminary level their potential cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI)
- assessed the risk of impact to properties of known and potential CHVI

- where necessary, recommended mitigation and conservation measures using MCM and other guidance

Primary and secondary sources, including historical maps, aerial imagery, photographs and genealogical histories were accessed from published and online sources such as the Ontario Council of University Libraries' *Historical Topographic Map Digitization Project*, the University of Toronto's Map and Data Library and *Ontario Historical County Maps Project*, the University of McGill's *Canadian County Atlas Project* and the Internet Archive's *Open Library*.

Cultural Heritage Specialist Alisha Mohamed conducted the field investigation on 12 February 2021, which included recording and photographing from the public ROW all properties and roadscapes in the study area. In addition, Cultural Heritage Specialists Chelsea Dickinson and Robert Pinchin conducted property specific fieldwork from 16-18 December 2022 with permission-to-enter for 18722 Main Street, 1055 Charleston Sideroad, 1420 Charleston Sideroad, 18501 Mississauga Road, and 18677 Mississauga Road.

Descriptions of architectural styles and elements used in this Cultural Heritage Report employ terms provided in Blumenson (1990), Ricketts *et al.* (2004), Hubka (2013), and the *Canadian Inventory of Historic Buildings* (Parks Canada 1980). Landscape analysis and landform and vegetation description relies on terms and concepts presented in the *Historic Scotland Historic Landuse Assessment* (1999) and *Australian Soil and Land Survey Field Handbook, Third Edition* (2017).

The approach and terms for impact assessment and mitigation measures follow the MCM 2006 and Town of Caledon 2019, supplemented with recognized federal and international guidance such as the *CHP Standards and Guidelines* and the *Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Third Edition* (Landscape Institute 2013).

2.1 Record of Engagement

Table 1 summarizes the results of engagement conducted for this Cultural Heritage Report.

Table 1: Results of Engagement

Contact	Date of Contact and Query	Response
Cassandra Jasinski, MA, CAHP Heritage Planner, Strategic Policy Planning, Planning Department, Town of Caledon	Query sent via email on 17 November 2021 to confirm that the Town's <i>Heritage Register</i> and <i>Cultural Heritage Landscapes Inventory</i> are up to date. Golder also provided a map of the study area, a list of the listed or designated properties and inventoried landscapes Golder identified within the study area, and inquired if the Town had any additional heritage concerns within the study area.	Response received 16 December 2021 which provided additional properties for consideration from the Town's <i>Built Heritage Resource Inventory (BHRI) of Pre-1946 Structures</i> as well as recommendations of contextual heritage attributes suggested for consideration when assessing the study area. Planning staff indicated that treelined laneways, hedgerows and boundary demarcations (such as stone walls) should be factored into heritage considerations.
Kevin DeMille Natural Heritage Coordinator,	Query sent via email on 19 November 2021 to confirm that the OHT's <i>Places</i>	Response received 24 November 2021 confirming the OHT

Contact	Date of Contact and Query	Response
Designated Contact for OHT Property and Easement Requests, OHT	<i>of Worship Inventory, Plaque Database, web mapping application of OHT Buildings and Easements, and OHA Register</i> were up to date. Golder also provided a map of the study area, a list of the listed or designated properties and inventoried landscapes Golder identified within the study area, and inquired if the OHT had any additional heritage concerns within the study area.	databases were up to date and that they were not aware of other heritage concerns for the project.

2.2 Archaeology

Golder conducted a Stage 1 and 2 archaeological assessment for the Project under Project Information Form (PIF) P364-0164-2020 (Golder 2022a). The Stage 1 and 2 assessment was completed in 2021 and resulted in the identification of 30 archaeological sites. The complete results of the assessment will be presented to the MCM in a separate report for entry into the *Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports*.

3.0 POLICY FRAMEWORK

Management of cultural heritage is guided by provincial and municipal legislation and planning policy regimes, as well as advice developed at the federal and international levels. These policies have varying levels of authority at the local level, though generally are all considered when making decisions about heritage assets.

3.1 Federal and International Heritage Policies

No federal heritage policies apply to the study area, although many of the provincial and municipal policies detailed below align in approach to that of the CHP *Standards and Guidelines*. This document was drafted in response to international and national agreements such as the 1964 *International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (Venice Charter)*, 1983 *Canadian Appleton Charter for the Protection and Enhancement of the Built Environment*, and Australia's International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) *Charter for Places of Cultural Significance (Burra Charter, updated 2013)*. The latter is important for pioneering “values based” evaluation and management, an approach central to Canadian federal, provincial and territorial legislation and policies for identifying and conserving cultural heritage. The CHP *Standards and Guidelines* define three conservation treatments—preservation, rehabilitation, and restoration—and outline the process and required and best practice actions relevant to each treatment.

The ICOMOS has also developed guidance on heritage impact assessments for world heritage properties, which also provide “best practice” approaches for all historic assets (ICOMOS 2011).

3.2 Provincial Heritage Policies

3.2.1 Aggregate Resources Act

The *Aggregate Resources of Ontario: Technical Reports and Information Standards (2020)* adopted by *Ontario Regulation 244/97* under the *Aggregates Resources Act* states that applications for a Class A licence, Class B licence, or an aggregate permit must include a Cultural Heritage Report consistent with provincial requirements under the *Ontario Heritage Act* and Provincial Policy Statement. The Standards indicate that a screening checklist with supporting documentation is required to evaluate the potential for BHRs and CHLs. Following the checklist, the Standards state that a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) is required for any potential BHRs and/ or CHLs identified, and that the CHER must be prepared by a professional with appropriate experience and expertise. Following the CHER, if the evaluation determines one or more BHRs or CHLs to have CHVI, a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) must be completed.

3.2.2 Planning Act and Provincial Policy Statement

The *Ontario Planning Act (1990)* and associated *Provincial Policy Statement 2020 (PPS 2020)* mandate heritage conservation in land use planning. Under the *Planning Act*, conservation of “features of significant architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological or scientific interest” are a “matter of provincial interest” and integrates this at the provincial and municipal levels through the PPS 2020. Issued under Section 3 of the *Planning Act*, PPS 2020 recognizes that cultural heritage and archaeological resources “provide important environmental, economic, and social benefits”, and that “encouraging a sense of place, by promoting well-designed built form and cultural planning, and by conserving features that help define character, including *built heritage resources* and *cultural heritage landscapes*” supports long-term economic prosperity (PPS 2020:6,22).

The importance of identifying and evaluating built heritage and cultural heritage landscapes is recognized in two policies of PPS 2020:

- Section 2.6.1 – *Significant built heritage resources* and *significant cultural heritage landscapes* shall be *conserved*
- Section 2.6.3 – Planning authorities shall not permit *development* and *site alteration* on *adjacent lands* to *protected heritage property* except where the proposed *development* and *site alteration* has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the *heritage attributes* of the *protected heritage property* will be *conserved*

Each of the italicised terms is defined in Section 6.0 of PPS 2020, with those relevant to this report provided below:

- **Adjacent lands:** for the purposes of policy 2.6.3, those lands contiguous to a *protected heritage property* or as otherwise defined in the municipal official plan.
- **Built heritage resource:** means a building, structure, monument, installation or any manufactured or constructed part or remnant that contributes to a property's CHVI as identified by a community, including an Indigenous community. *Built heritage resources* are located on property that may be designated under Parts IV or V of the OHA, or that may be included on local, provincial, federal and/ or international registers.
- **Conserved:** means the identification, protection, management and use of BHRs, CHLs, and archaeological resources in a manner that ensures their CHVI is retained. This may be achieved by the implementation of recommendations set out in a conservation plan, archaeological assessment, and/ or heritage impact assessment that has been approved, accepted, or adopted by the relevant planning authority and/or decision-maker. Mitigative measures and/ or alternative development approaches can be included in these plans and assessments.
- **Cultural heritage landscape:** means a defined geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having CHVI by a community, including an Indigenous community. The area may include features such as buildings, structures, spaces, views, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning, or association. CHLs may be properties that have been determined to have CHVI under the OHA; or have been included on federal and/ or international registers, and/ or protected through official plan, zoning by-law, or other land use planning mechanisms.
- **Development:** means the creation of a new lot, a change in land use, or the construction of buildings and structures requiring approval under the *Planning Act*.
- **Heritage attributes:** the principal features or elements that contribute to a protected heritage property's CHVI, and may include the property's built, constructed, or manufactured elements, as well as natural landforms, vegetation, water features, and its visual setting (e.g., significant views or vistas to or from a protected heritage property).
- **Protected heritage property:** property designated under Parts IV, V or VI of the OHA; property subject to a heritage conservation easement under Parts II or IV of the OHA; property identified by the Province and prescribed public bodies as a Provincial Heritage Property (PHP) under the MCM 2014 *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties* (MCM *Standards and Guidelines*); property protected under federal legislation, and UNESCO World Heritage Sites.
- **Significant:** means, in regard to cultural heritage and archaeology, resources that have been determined to have CHVI. Processes and criteria for determining CHVI are established by the Province under the authority of the OHA.

The definition for *significant* includes a caveat that “while some significant resources may already be identified and inventoried by official sources, the significance of others can only be determined after evaluation.” The criteria for significance established by the Province as well as the need for evaluation is outlined in the following section. Municipalities implement PPS 2020 through an official plan, which may outline further heritage policies (see Section 3.3).

3.2.3 Ontario Heritage Act and Ontario Regulation 9/06

The OHA enables the Province and municipalities to conserve significant individual properties and areas. For municipalities, Part IV and Part V of the OHA enables councils to “designate” individual properties (Part IV), or properties within a Heritage Conservation District (HCD) (Part V) as being of CHVI. Evaluation for CHVI under the OHA (or *significance* under PPS 2020) is guided by Ontario Regulation 9/06 (O. Reg. 9/06), which prescribes the “criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest”. O. Reg. 9/06 has three categories of absolute or non-ranked criteria, each with three sub-criteria:

- 1) The property has **design value or physical value** because it:
 - i) Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method;
 - ii) Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit; or
 - iii) Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
- 2) The property has **historic value or associative value** because it:
 - i) Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community;
 - ii) Yields, or has the potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture; or
 - iii) Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a community.
- 3) The property has **contextual value** because it:
 - i) Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area;
 - ii) Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings; or
 - iii) Is a landmark.

A property needs to meet two criteria of O. Reg. 9/06 to be considered for designation under Part IV of the OHA. If found to meet two or more criterion, the property’s CHVI is then described with a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (SCHVI) that includes a brief property description, a succinct statement of the property’s cultural heritage significance, and a list of its heritage attributes. In the OHA, heritage attributes are defined slightly differently to the PPS 2020 and directly linked to real property¹; therefore, in most cases a property’s CHVI applies to the entire land parcel, not just individual buildings or structures.

¹ Heritage attributes, as defined in the OHA, “means, in relation to real property, and to the buildings and structures on the real property, the attributes of the property, buildings and structures that contribute to their cultural heritage value or interest.”

Once a municipal council decides to designate a property, it is recognized through by-law and added to a “Register” maintained by the municipal clerk. A municipality may also “list” a property on the Register to indicate it as having potential CHVI.

3.2.4 Provincial Heritage Guidance

3.2.4.1 Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport

To advise municipalities, organizations, and individuals on heritage protection and conservation, the Province, through the MCM, has developed a series of guidance products. Used primarily for Environmental Assessments (EAs), the MCM *Checklist* provides a screening tool for a study area to identify all the known or recognized BHRs and CHLs, commemorative plaques, cemeteries, Canadian Heritage River watersheds, properties with structures 40 or more years old, or potential CHLs. If known or potential BHRs and CHLs are identified, the MCM *Checklist* then advises whether further investigation as part of a CHER or HIA is necessary.

Further guidance on identifying, evaluating and assessing impacts to BHRs and CHLs is provided in the *Ontario Heritage Tool Kit* series. Of these, *Heritage Property Evaluation* (MCM 2006a) describes in detail the O. Reg. 9/06 criteria and methods for researching and evaluating potential cultural resources, while the *Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process* (MCM 2006b) provides an outline for the contents of an HIA, which it defines as:

“a study to determine if any cultural resources (including those previously identified and those found as part of the site assessment) are impacted by a specific proposed development or site alteration. It can also demonstrate how the cultural resource will be conserved in the context of redevelopment or site alteration. Mitigative or avoidance measures or alternative development or site alteration approaches may be recommended.”

For large study areas, a Cultural Heritage Report combines CHER and HIA studies at a preliminary level to identify potential cultural resources and assess the impacts of new development. The MCM’s 2019 *Sample Tables and Language for Cultural Heritage Report: Existing Conditions and Preliminary Impact Assessment* (MCM 2019) provides guidance to identify baseline cultural heritage conditions within a study area, identify preliminary potential project-specific impacts on known and potential BHRs and CHLs identified, and propose and recommend measures to avoid or mitigate negative impacts to known or potential cultural heritage resources.

3.3 Municipal Heritage Policies

3.3.1 Regional Municipality of Peel

Consolidated in 2022, Peel Region’s *Regional Official Plan* (ROP) was developed with the objective to provide the Regional Council with “a long-term policy framework for decision making” that “sets the Regional context for more detailed planning by protecting the environment, managing resources and directing growth”. It was drafted in response to the high level of population and employment growth in the Region, which is putting pressure on the ability to provide Regional services, the natural landscape and cultural heritage. Its goals include “to create healthy and sustainable regional communities for those living and working in *Peel* which is characterized by... a recognition and preservation of the *region’s* natural and cultural heritage” (1.3.6.1) and “to support growth and *development* which takes place in a sustainable manner and which integrates the environmental, social, economic and cultural responsibilities of the *Region* and the Province” (1.3.6.4).

In the ROP’s “Chapter 2: The Natural Environment” both natural and cultural heritage are considered, recognizing “there is an important interrelationship between these resources illustrating the historic link between the area municipal *community* and its surrounding environment” (2.1.1). Reference to cultural heritage resources is made

throughout this chapter then more specifically addressed in Section 3.6 of “Chapter 3: Resources”. Here the Region “*supports* identification, preservation and interpretation of cultural heritage features, structures, archaeological resources, and *cultural heritage landscapes* in *Peel*...according to the criteria and guidelines established by the Province”. The objectives for cultural heritage are listed as subsections of Section 3.6.1:

- 3.6.1.1 - To identify, preserve and promote *cultural heritage resources*, including the material, cultural, archaeological and *built heritage* of the *region*, for present and future generations.
- 3.6.1.2 - To promote awareness and appreciation, and encourage public and private stewardship of *Peel's* heritage.
- 3.6.1.3 - To encourage cooperation among the area municipalities, when a matter having inter-municipal cultural heritage significance is involved.
- 3.6.1.4 - To *support* the heritage policies and programs of the area municipalities.

These objectives are then to be realized through eight policies that direct municipalities to include policies addressing cultural heritage in their respective official plans (see next section).

3.3.2 Town of Caledon

3.3.2.1 Official Plan

Last consolidated in 2022, the Town’s *Official Plan* provides a “statement of principles, goals, objectives and policies intended to guide future land use, physical development and change, and the effects on the social, economic and natural environment within the Town of Caledon” (Section 1.3). Its role is to “determine the strategic local policy directions and detailed policies for the municipality, in conformity with the overall strategic direction of the ROP” (Section 1.6).

In Section 2.2, which “outlines the principles, strategic direction and goals” on which the *Official Plan* is based, is the principle that the Town will “seek to preserve, protect and enhance natural physical features and biological communities, and cultural heritage resources” (2.2.1). Its strategic direction is based on an additional three principles of:

- Stewardship of Resources
- Settlement Patterns
- Managing Growth (2.2.2)

Under Stewardship of Resources, a “key strategy” is to “protect land resources including landscape features, systems and areas that perform important natural functions or which provide economic and recreational opportunities” and this includes cultural heritage resources (2.2.2a). The “historic settlement pattern” is additionally considered under Section 2.2.2b Settlement Patterns. Section 2.2.3 identifies the goals of the *Official Plan*, which include “to conserve and promote cultural heritage resources in recognition of the non-replaceable nature of cultural heritage, as well as the contribution it makes to the character, civic pride, tourism potential, economic benefits and historical appreciation of the community”. Section 3.1 “Sustainability” refers to the “wise use of available resources” and notes the Town’s historically “progressive cultural heritage conservation policies”.

Section 3.3 addresses Cultural Heritage Conservation and lists the following objectives:

- To identify and conserve the Town’s cultural heritage resources, in balance with the other objectives of this Plan, through the implementation of appropriate designations, policies and programs including public and private stewardship and partnering with other heritage organizations in the community.
- To promote the continuing public and private awareness, appreciation and enjoyment of Caledon’s cultural heritage through educational activities and by providing guidance on sound conservation practices.
- To develop partnerships between various agencies and organizations to conserve and promote cultural heritage resources.
- To use as appropriate all relevant Provincial legislation that references the conservation of cultural heritage resources, particularly the provisions of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, the *Planning Act*, the *Environmental Assessment Act*, the *Municipal Act*, the *Cemeteries Act* and the *Niagara Escarpment Planning and Development Act* in order to conserve Caledon’s cultural heritage.

Section 3.3.3.1.3 defines the purpose and components of a Cultural Heritage Impact Statement (CHIS). When determined necessary, a CHIS should contain the following:

- i) A description of the proposed development;
- ii) A description of the cultural heritage resource(s) to be affected by the development;
- iii) A description of the effects upon the cultural heritage resource(s) by the proposed development;
- iv) A description of the measures necessary to mitigate the adverse effects of the development upon the cultural heritage resource(s); and,
- v) A description of how the policies and guidance of any relevant Cultural Heritage Planning Statement have been incorporated and satisfied.

The Town may require development agreements respecting the care and conservation of any affected cultural heritage resources, while Section 3.3.3.1.14 indicates the Town will also have “regard for the interrelationship between cultural heritage landscapes and scenic natural landscapes.” In Section 3.3.3.3.3 is the statement that the Town “shall encourage the retention of significant built heritage resources in their original locations wherever possible” and outlines four options for retention that must be met before a BHR can be moved. CHLs are addressed in Section 3.3.4 and in the following subsection states that “candidate cultural heritage landscapes shall be identified by the proponent of a development or redevelopment proposals” either through surveys or a CHIS.

Section 5.11.2.4.2. sets out the requirements for approval of an application for an Official Plan Amendment to designate lands identified as Aggregate Resource Lands. Among the requirements is a Cultural Heritage Survey described in Section 5.11.2.4.12, as follows:

The Cultural Heritage Survey as described by Section 5.11.2.4.2 (f) will be carried out in accordance with Section 3.3.3.1.4 of this Plan and, in the case of the traffic studies required by Sections 5.11.2.4.2 (b) and/or 5.11.2.4.4(c), shall include an evaluation of cultural heritage resources in so far as they relate to roads not identified pursuant to section 5.11.2.5.1. The level of cultural heritage resource investigation associated with these traffic studies will be survey level appropriate to the nature of the cultural heritage resources encountered and the nature of the anticipated impacts on these resources associated with the proposed haul route.

The evaluation is required in relation to haul routes on roads other than “High Capacity Arterials as are identified on Schedule J to this Plan and on Charleston Sideroad, Old Church Road between Regional Road 7 and Regional Road 50 and King Street between Highway 10 and Regional Road 50” (Section 5.11.2.5.1).

3.3.2.2 *Coulterville Special Study Area*

The study area for this Cultural Heritage Report is located within the “Coulterville Special Study Area” referred to in the Town of Caledon’s *Official Plan*, consolidated 2022. The Coulterville Special Study Area is denoted as an area within the “Rural Lands” land use designation and contains natural environmental features, cultural heritage features, intensive tourism development and extensive areas of aggregate extraction. The Coulterville Special Study Area aims at examining appropriate after uses for the aggregate extraction areas as well as developing policies to ensure uses are complimentary to the natural environmental features and cultural heritage features while still maintaining extraction opportunities for Caledon’s “High Potential Mineral Aggregate Resource Areas”.

3.3.2.3 *Terms of Reference: Heritage Impact Assessment*

The Town of Caledon has developed its own *Terms of Reference: Heritage Impact Assessment* (Town of Caledon 2019) which identifies when an HIA is required and the format. The rationale for the requirement to provide an HIA arises from Section 2(d) of the *Planning Act*, Section 2.6.3 of the Provincial Policy Statement, as well as the OHA and Section 3.3 of the Town of Caledon’s *Official Plan*. An HIA is required for:

- Any property listed or designated in the municipal heritage register that is subject to land use planning applications or facing possible demolition; or
- Any property that is subject to a land use planning application and is adjacent to a property designated in the municipal heritage register.

An HIA may also be required for the following:

- Consent and/ or minor variance and building permit applications for any property included on the Town’s Inventory of Heritage Properties;
- Where properties adjacent to a cultural heritage resource are subject to Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment, Plans of Subdivision, Site Plan Control and/or Consent and/ or Minor Variance applications;
- Heritage Permit applications for any property designated under Part IV (individual) or Part V (HCD) of the OHA; and,
- Any property that is subject to land use planning applications and is adjacent to a property listed in the municipal heritage register, pursuant to Section 27 (1.2) of the OHA.

HIAs must include: an executive summary; background research and analysis; statement of significance; assessment of existing conditions; description of the proposed development or site alteration; impact of development or site alteration; mitigation and conservation strategies; conservation methods and proposed strategies; and recommendations.

4.0 GEOGRAPHICAL AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT

4.1 Geographical Context

The study area is located within southern Ontario and situated near the northeast end of the Guelph Drumlin Field physiographic region. This region is described by Chapman and Putnam (1984) as the following:

The drumlins of this field are not so closely grouped as those of some other areas and there is more intervening low ground, which is largely occupied by fluvial materials. The till in these drumlins is loamy and calcareous, and was derived mostly from dolostone of the Amabel Formation so strategically exposed along the Niagara Cuesta...The till throughout is rather stony, with large surface boulders being more numerous in some localities than others...The ice which moulded this drumlin field advanced from the southeast and the front of the melting receding glacier was at right angles to this, that is, down slope of the plain. The drainage of the ice front was consequently able to find progressively lower and lower outlets, so that the drumlin field is furrowed by more or less parallel valleys running almost at right angles to the trend of the drumlins themselves. There are also numerous interconnecting cross valleys which occupy deeper depressions between drumlins. Along the sides of these valleys there are broad sand and gravel terraces, while the bottoms are often swampy...Incidental to this pattern are the several gravel ridges or eskers which cross the plain in the same general direction as the drumlins.

(Chapman and Putnam 1984:137-138)

The study area is also located within the Mixed-wood Plains ecozone of Ontario (The Canadian Atlas Online 2015). Although largely altered by 19th century human activity, this ecozone once supported a wide variety of deciduous trees, such as various species of ash, birch, chestnut, hickory, oak, and walnut, as well as a variety of birds and small to large land mammals, such as raccoon, red fox, white tailed deer, and black bear. The study area is also situated within the Credit River Watershed which spans 1000 km² and drains into Lake Ontario at the Port Credit, Mississauga waterfront (Credit Valley Conservation 2022). Branches of the Credit River flow approximately 270 m north of the study area, 95 m east of the study area, as well as through the western portion of the study area.

In reference to current and former political boundaries, the study area includes lands in the Town of Caledon, Peel Region, and comprises part of Lots 15 to 18, Concession 3 WCR, part of Lots 14 to 20, Concession 4 WCR, and part of Lots 14 to 17 Concession 5 WCR, in the geographic Township of Caledon, former County of Peel. The study area contains part of Main Street, Mississauga Road, Charleston Sideroad, Cataract Road and Williams Street East, with the surrounding properties consisting of mainly large agricultural tracts in the north, south and west, and smaller estate or village lots in the east (Cataract).

4.2 Historical Context

4.2.1 Indigenous Regional History

The earliest evidence of human activity in the Great Lakes area can be traced back approximately 11,000 years. These first arrivals, known as Paleo People, moved into Ontario as the last of the glaciers retreated northward (10,950 to 9950 B.P.). The limited available evidence suggests that Paleo People were highly mobile hunters and gatherers relying on migratory caribou, small game, fish and wild plants found in the sub-arctic environment. Their sites have been located along the former shores of glacial lakes such as Lake Algonquin and along the north shore of present-day Lake Ontario. The end of the Paleo Period was heralded by numerous technological and cultural innovations that appeared throughout the subsequent Archaic Period. These innovations may be best explained in relation to the dynamic nature of the post-glacial environment and region-wide population increases.

During the succeeding Archaic Period (9950 to 2900 B.P.), the environment of southern Ontario became more temperate, yielding larger areas suitable for human habitation. Archaic groups were also hunter-gatherers, yet their tool kit was more varied, reflecting a greater reliance on local food resources instead of high mobility. In the Middle to Late Archaic Periods, extensive trade networks developed and included copper from the north shore of Lake Superior among other exotic items.

The appearance of cemeteries during the Late Archaic Period has been interpreted as a response to increased population densities and competition between local groups for access to resources. These cemeteries are often located on heights of well-drained sandy/gravel soils adjacent to major watercourses.

The Woodland Period (2900 to 350 B.P.) is distinguished by the introduction of ceramics into southern Ontario. Extensive trade networks continued through the early part of this period and Early Woodland populations in Ontario appear to have been heavily influenced by groups to the south, particularly the Adena people of the Ohio Valley. The Late Woodland Period is widely accepted as the beginning of agricultural life ways in south-central Ontario. Researchers have suggested that a warming trend during this time may have encouraged the spread of maize into southern Ontario, providing a greater number of frost-free days (Stothers and Yarnell 1977). The first agricultural villages in southern Ontario date to the 10th century C.E. and, unlike the riverine base camps of previous periods, were located upland on well-drained sandy soils.

4.2.2 Settler History

4.2.2.1 Township of Caledon, County of Peel

The study area is located within part of the Mississauga Tract which was ceded to the British by the Mississaugas on the 28th of October 1818, under Treaty 19, for £522 and 10 shillings annually. Treaty 19 was the “Second Purchase” involving the Tract of which the “First Purchase” or “Mississauga Purchase” of 1805 allowed the British Crown to acquire over 74,000 acres of land in southern Peel County. Treaty 19 transferred an additional 648,000 acres of the Tract to the British who in 1819 surveyed the area and divided it into the townships of Toronto, Chinguacousy, Caledon, Albion and Toronto Gore (PAMA 2014).

Albion, Caledon and Chinguacousy Townships began settlement in 1820 with Caledon and Chinguacousy consisting of six concessions on both the east and west sides of Centre Road. According to George Walton’s 1842 *Walton’s Home District Directory*, the population of Caledon Township that year was 1920. The 1870s saw the creation of railway lines east of the study area for the Credit Valley Railway (CVR) and Toronto Grey & Bruce Railway (both acquired by the Canadian Pacific Railway [CPR] in 1884). Caledon Township was bound on the east by Albion Township, on the south by Chinguacousy Township, on the west by Erin Township in the County of Wellington, and on the north-west by Garafraxa Township also in the County of Wellington (Lynch 1874).

Events in Europe during the mid-19th century dramatically improved the fortunes for Caledon Township and the surrounding county. A combination of failed harvests and disrupted trade routes caused by the Crimean War suddenly created a market for Canadian wheat producers, then centred in Ontario, to meet global demand. Simultaneously, the 1854 Canadian American Reciprocity Treaty prompted farmers to also take up livestock rearing for export to the United States (Scheinman 2009). Getting these products to consumers was aided by the new railway lines.

At the opening of the 20th century, economic development in Caledon Township, like that of adjacent counties and townships, relied on the prosperity of nearby Toronto and exports to the United States and Britain. Following World War II, the widespread use of motor vehicles brought changes to urban and rural development. As vehicular traffic increased, the network of roadways throughout the region improved, providing Caledon Township and its communities with better connections to the growing metropolis of Toronto.

Significant new growth and development has occurred in Peel County over the past four decades. When it became the Regional Municipality of Peel in 1974, Caledon Township along with Albion Township and the north half of Chinguacousy Township were incorporated into the new Town of Caledon. In that year, there were 334,750 people living in Peel Region and by 2014 the population numbered 1,350,000 (Neill 2015). The 2016 census recorded Peel's population at 1,381,739, of which 66,502 were residents of Caledon.

4.2.2.2 Study Area Specific History

A review of historical county maps, topographic maps and aerial photographs chart the 19th and 20th century development of the study area. The earliest cartographic resource consulted was George Tremaine's 1859 *Tremaine's Map of the County of Peel, Canada West* (Tremaine 1859) (Figure 2). This map suggests the alignments for present-day Main Street and Mississauga Road are nearly identical to the original concession roads at that time. Though likely skewed due to inaccuracies georeferencing historical maps, the 1859 map also depicts branches of the Credit River flowing through the north portion of the study area as well as to the east and west of the study area (Figure 2).

At the northeast end of the study area, the 1859 map portrays the "Coulter Estate" while at the south end of the study area, the village of "Church's Falls" is visible. Furthermore, four structures (likely farmhouses) are illustrated within the study area on the 1859 map (Figure 2). The northeastern-most farmhouse is within the property of Samuel Wallace (northwest half of Lot 17, Concession 3 WCR) and appears to be situated near the location of the present-day house at 18719 Main Street. The northwestern-most farmhouse is within the property of James Dodds (Lot 18, Concession 4 WCR) and appears to be situated in the same location as the present-day house with a large set-back at 18906 Main Street. The southwestern-most farmhouse is within the property of Duncan Cameron (Lot 17, Concession 4 WCR) and appears to be situated in the same location as the present-day house at 18667 Mississauga Road. Finally, the southernmost farmhouse is within the property of James Cameron (Lot 16, Concession 4 WCR) and appears to be situated in the same location as the present-day house at 18501 Mississauga Road.

Nearly two decades later, J.H. Pope's 1877 *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Peel* (Pope 1877) depicts the Lot 16 side road as similar to the present-day alignment for Charleston Sideroad. Furthermore, the branches of the Credit River are portrayed as traversing similar paths to those of 1859 and the Coulterville Estate remains at the northeast end of the study area. Notable changes include the renaming of the village of Church's Falls (at the south end of the study area) to "Cataract" and the establishment of the CVR along the northeast and southeast perimeter of the study area (Figure 2).

The 1877 map still illustrates the same four farmhouses shown in the 1859 map but also presents orchards adjacent to each structure. In addition to these four farmhouses, ten new (or newly illustrated) individual structures as well as the north blocks of Cataract village are depicted in the study area on the 1877 map. While the village blocks provide no proprietor information, the new individual structures include nine labeled "residences" (farmhouses) and one "schoolhouse" as suggested by the 1877 legend (Figure 2). From north to south, the first new farmhouse fronts the concession road in Lot 18, Concession 4 WCR, which is still listed as the property of the Dodd family (now under Joseph Dodd) and appears to be situated in the same location as another present-day house on the property which fronts Main Street. The second new farmhouse has an accompanying orchard and is in the southeast half of Lot 17, Concession 3 WCR, which became part of the expanded property of Samuel Wallace and appears to be situated near the location of the present-day barn at 18659 Main Street.

The third new farmhouse as well as the schoolhouse are in Lot 16, Concession 3 WCR, listed as part of the Coulter Estate, while the fourth new farmhouse is in the east corner of Lot 16, Concession 4 WCR, still listed as


the property of James Cameron and situated near the location of the present-day house at 1420 Charleston Sideroad. As for the fifth new farmhouse, it has an accompanying orchard and is in Lot 17, Concession 5 WCR, listed as the property of Joseph Morris and situated in the same location as the present-day house at 18682 Mississauga Road.

The sixth new farmhouse also has an accompanying orchard and is in the northeast half of Lot 15, Concession 4 WCR, listed as the property of Thomas McNicholl, while the seventh new farmhouse is in the southwest half of the same lot, listed as part of the Morris Estate and situated in the same location as the present-day remnants/foundation at 1055 Charleston Sideroad. The eighth new farmhouse is in the northeast half of Lot 15, Concession 4 WCR, listed as the property of William Richardson and situated in the same location as the present-day house at 833 Charleston Sideroad, while the ninth and final new farmhouse is in the northeast half of Lot 14, Concession 5 WCR, listed as the property of William Loughlin.


Available topographic maps and aerial images document the evolution of the study area during the 20th century. The 1937 and 1952 versions of the *Topographic Map, Ontario – Orangeville Sheet* by the Department of National Defence provide a more accurate representation of the waterbodies in the study area and suggest that branches of the Credit River flow through the west portion of the study area as well as to the east of the study area. The 1937 and 1952 maps also suggest that 12 of the 13 farmhouses portrayed within the study area in 1877 (or versions of them) were still extant and, furthermore, were accompanied by associated barns and/ or outbuildings (Figure 3). While the farmhouse on the former Coulter Estate appears to have been replaced with a structure closer to the Lot 16 side road, the schoolhouse on the former property is still illustrated and appears to be situated in the same location as the present-day house at 1626 Charleston Sideroad. East of the schoolhouse, two structures are visible on both the 1937 and 1952 maps and appear to be near the location of the present-day abandoned farm (only a silo remains) at 0 Charleston Sideroad. As for the north blocks of Cataract village, the 1937 and 1952 maps are the first to present the individual structures and lanes in this area, including a church situated in the same location as the present-day house at 48 William Street. Another notable change from the 1877 map is the conversion of the former CVR to the CPR (a transition that occurred in 1884, see Section 4.2.2.1) (Figure 3).




A 1954 aerial photograph by the Department of Lands and Forests presents the study area as identical to the previous topographic maps and confirms the majority of the study area remained rural agricultural land with tracts of woodlots interspersed throughout (Figure 4). By the time of the 1973 version of the *Orangeville Sheet* by Natural Resources Canada, additional structures have been built in Cataract village and at the intersections of Main Street and Charleston Sideroad (i.e., Coulterville) as well as Mississauga Road and Charleston Sideroad. While the number of outbuildings/ barns have changed for the 12 farmhouses illustrated in the 1877, 1937 and 1952 maps, the main houses still appear to be extant within the study area on the 1973 map. Furthermore, Charleston Sideroad appears to have been modified to its present-day alignment and the CPR line remains visible on the 1973 map (Figure 4). Though northern portions of the CPR line were decommissioned by 1996, the Brampton-Orangeville Railway was created in 2000 and has been operating freight traffic and a tour train on the line from Streetsville to Orangeville maintaining the use of the rail corridor within the study area to the present-day (Town of Caledon 2009).


1859



1877



- LEGEND**
-  CULTURAL HERITAGE REPORT STUDY AREA
 -  LICENCE BOUNDARY
 -  LIMIT OF EXTRACTION




NOTE(S)
1. ALL LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE

- REFERENCE(S)**
1. 1859 TREMAINE'S MAP OF THE COUNTY OF PEEL, CANADA WEST, GEO. R. TREMAINE, TORONTO, PUBLISHED BY C.R. & G. M. TREMAINE, 1859.
 2. 1877 TOWNSHIP OF CALEDON, PEEL COUNTY (ONTARIO MAP REF #20), ILLUSTRATED HISTORICAL ATLAS OF THE COUNTY OF PEEL, ONT. TORONTO, WALKER & MILES, 1877.
 3. LICENSE AND EXTRACTION LIMIT PROVIDED BY MHBC IN JUNE 2023.
 4. PROJECTION: TRANSVERSE MERCATOR DATUM: NAD 83 COORDINATE SYSTEM: UTM ZONE 17N

CLIENT
CBM AGGREGATES, A DIVISION OF ST. MARYS CEMENT INC. (CANADA)

PROJECT
CALEDON PIT/ QUARRY

TITLE
STUDY AREA OVERLAID ON 1859 AND 1877 HISTORICAL MAPS



CONSULTANT	YYYY-MM-DD	2023-07-18
 GOLDER MEMBER OF WSP	DESIGNED	AM
	PREPARED	BR
	REVIEWED	JK
	APPROVED	HM




PROJECT NO. 19129150	CONTROL 0018	REV. A	FIGURE 2
-------------------------	-----------------	-----------	-------------


PATH: S:\Client\Volume19129150\19129150_0404\HC-0002.mxd PRINTED ON: 2023-07-18 AT: 11:44:51 PM

IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM: ANSI B

PATH: S:\Client\Volume\19129150\19129150_040_HC-0003.mxd PRINTED ON: 2023-07-18 AT: 11:55:39 PM



- LEGEND**
-  CULTURAL HERITAGE REPORT STUDY AREA
 -  LICENCE BOUNDARY
 -  LIMIT OF EXTRACTION




- NOTE(S)**
1. ALL LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE
- REFERENCE(S)**
1. ORANGEVILLE, ONTARIO. 1:63,360. MAP SHEET 040P16, [ED. 1], 1937
 2. ORANGEVILLE (EAST) ONTARIO. 1:50,000. MAP SHEET 040P16, ED. 1, 1952
 3. LICENSE AND EXTRACTION LIMIT PROVIDED BY MHBC IN JUNE 2023.
 4. PROJECTION: TRANSVERSE MERCATOR DATUM: NAD 83 COORDINATE SYSTEM: UTM ZONE 17N

CLIENT
 CBM AGGREGATES, A DIVISION OF ST. MARYS CEMENT INC. (CANADA)

PROJECT
 CALEDON PIT/ QUARRY



TITLE
 STUDY AREA OVERLAID ON 1937 AND 1952 TOPOGRAPHIC MAPS




CONSULTANT	YYYY-MM-DD	2023-07-18
 GOLDER MEMBER OF WSP	DESIGNED	AM
	PREPARED	BR
	REVIEWED	JK
	APPROVED	HM


PROJECT NO. 19129150	CONTROL 0040	REV. 0.0	FIGURE 3
-------------------------	-----------------	-------------	-------------

IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM: ANSI B

PATH: S:\Client\Work\19129150\19129150_0040_HC-0004.mxd PRINTED ON: 2023-07-19 AT: 12:02:22 AM



- LEGEND**
-  CULTURAL HERITAGE REPORT STUDY AREA
 -  LICENCE BOUNDARY
 -  LIMIT OF EXTRACTION




NOTE(S)
1. ALL LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE

REFERENCE(S)
1. SOUTHERN ONTARIO, 1954, 437801, ONTARIO, DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS
2. ORANGEVILLE ONTARIO, 1:50,000, MAP SHEET 040P16, ED. 2, 1973
3. LICENSE AND EXTRACTION LIMIT PROVIDED BY MHBC IN JUNE 2023.
4. PROJECTION: TRANSVERSE MERCATOR DATUM: NAD 83 COORDINATE SYSTEM: UTM ZONE 17N

CLIENT
CBM AGGREGATES, A DIVISION OF ST. MARYS CEMENT INC. (CANADA)

PROJECT
CALEDON PIT/ QUARRY

TITLE
STUDY AREA OVERLAID ON 1954 AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH AND 1973 TOPOGRAPHIC MAP

CONSULTANT	YYYY-MM-DD	2023-07-19
 GOLDER MEMBER OF WSP	DESIGNED	AM
	PREPARED	BR
	REVIEWED	JK
	APPROVED	HM

PROJECT NO. 19129150 **CONTROL** 0040 **REV.** 0.0 **FIGURE** 4

IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM: ANSI B

5.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS

The study area contains part of Main Street, Mississauga Road, Charleston Sideroad, Cataract Road and Williams Street East. With the exception of portions of Cataract Road and Williams Street East, these are paved asphalt, two-lane roadways with wide to narrow partially paved/ partially gravelled shoulders often accompanied by ditches (Figure 5). Within the village of Cataract, Cataract Road and Williams Street East do not include shoulders or ditches.

Flanking the roadways within the study area are mainly large agricultural properties in the north, south and west, with smaller estate or village lots in the east (Cataract). While some of the driveways for the properties within the study area are paved (mainly in Cataract), the majority are soft capped, especially for the agricultural properties. Many of the properties contain mature deciduous and coniferous trees and some of the estate/ village lots also have maintained/ landscaped lawns.

Woodlots are also interspersed throughout the study area and branches of the Credit River flow approximately 270 m north of the study area, 95 m east of the study area (Figure 6), as well as through the western portion of the study area. Also, to the east of the study area, the Brampton-Orangeville Railway corridor (former CVR and CPR corridors) roughly follows the path of the river (Figure 7).

In addition to the ongoing farming activity and industry, the rural landscape in the study area includes large, ploughed fields often delineated by trees or brush (Figure 8).



Figure 5: Main Street north of Charleston Sideroad, exhibiting paved asphalt, two-lane roadway with partially paved and partially gravelled shoulder (latter under snow) accompanied by ditch, facing northwest.



Figure 6: Branch of the Credit River flowing under Charleston Sideroad to the northeast of the study area, facing southwest.



Figure 7: Brampton-Orangeville Railway corridor (former CVR/ CPR corridor) traversing under Charleston Sideroad to the northeast of the study area, facing southwest.



Figure 8: Rural landscape along Mississauga Road south of Charleston Sideroad, facing southeast.

5.1 Potential Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes

As described in Section 2.0, known and potential BHRs and CHLs were identified based on the MCM *Checklist*, which was supplemented by historical research and field investigations. Properties with a date of construction 40 or more years old were documented in the field and then assessed at a preliminary level for potential CHVI.

The study area proposed for this Cultural Heritage Report constitutes all property parcels within or crossed by the preliminary extraction area as well as all adjacent properties. Research and fieldwork for this Cultural Heritage Report identified that within the study area there are:

- Ten properties listed (not designated) on the Town of Caledon's *Heritage Register*
 - 18906 Main Street
 - 18719 Main Street
 - 18722 Main Street
 - 18473 Main Street
 - 1626 Charleston Sideroad
 - 1420 Charleston Sideroad
 - 18667 Mississauga Road
 - 18501 Mississauga Road
 - 48 William Street East
 - 833 Charleston Sideroad
- Seven properties identified on the Town of Caledon's *Built Heritage Resource Inventory (BHRI) of Pre-1946 Structures*
 - 18659 Main Street
 - 0 Charleston Sideroad
 - 71 William Street
 - 77 William Street
 - 89 William Street
 - 1055 Charleston Sideroad
 - 18205 Mississauga Road
- One CHL identified on the Town of Caledon's *Cultural Heritage Landscapes Inventory*
 - Former Credit Valley Railway
- Two properties identified through historical research and field investigation for this Cultural Heritage Report as potential BHRs
 - 18682 Mississauga Road

- 18309 Mississauga Road
- One potential CHL
 - Community of Cataract

These are listed (roughly north to south) in detail in the inventory presented in Table 2 and are mapped in Figure 9.



Available mid-19th to late 20th century topographic maps and aerial photographs as well as early 21st century satellite imagery were consulted to assist with determining the age of buildings or structures within the study area. The potential BHRs and CHLs above were assessed for significance at a preliminary level in this Cultural Heritage Report and determined to have potential CHVI since they demonstrate:


- Design or physical value
 - The structures were potentially built in an architectural style or form uncommon in their respective areas and period of construction and are executed with a high level of craftsmanship. Additionally, there is potential for rare, unique, or representative property features to be associated with the buildings or structures. This potential design/ physical value would need to be confirmed through the completion of a CHER.
- Historical or associative value
 - Based on background historical research, the properties were found to be directly associated with significant themes, events, beliefs, persons, organizations, or institutions, or had potential to contribute to the understanding of the community or culture. This potential historical/ associative value would need to be confirmed through the completion of a CHER.
- Contextual value
 - The properties define or support the character of their respective areas, or are physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to their surroundings, or considered landmarks of cultural heritage significance. This potential contextual value would need to be confirmed through the completion of a CHER.


As none of the properties identified in this Cultural Heritage Report have been designated under Part IV or V of the OHA, they are all classified as having potential CHVI and potential heritage attributes in the following Table 2. The CHVI and heritage attributes of a property can only be determined through the completion of a CHER which will confirm if a property meets the criteria for CHVI prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06.


To better understand the potential heritage attributes of properties within or crossed by the proposed development, additional fieldwork with permission-to-enter and preliminary heritage evaluations were completed. Preliminary evaluations for 18722 Main Street, 1055 Charleston Sideroad, 1420 Sideroad 18501 Mississauga Road, and 18677 Mississauga Road are presented in APPENDIX C of this report. WSP notes that these evaluations are preliminary in nature and must be confirmed through the completion of a property-specific CHER.


Table 2: Known and potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes within the study area


Address or Location	Cultural Heritage Status	Photograph	Description	Potential CHVI	Potential Heritage Attributes
Former CVR CHL	Identified on the Town of Caledon's <i>Cultural Heritage Landscapes Inventory</i>		<p>Described on the Town of Caledon's <i>Cultural Heritage Landscapes Inventory</i> as an "organically evolved and continuing landscape" which has directly shaped the landscape and continues its historic use as a rail line.</p> <p>Though only included as a CHL within Caledon, the 2008 <i>Mayfield West Secondary Plan Cultural Heritage Landscape Assessment</i> recommended that the CVR, in its entirety (i.e., across other municipalities), be identified as a CHL.</p> <p>Historical research conducted for this Cultural Heritage Report determined that the CVR was visible on historical mapping as early as 1877 and that the line was acquired by the CPR in 1884. Though northern portions of the CPR line were decommissioned by 1996, the Brampton-Orangeville Railway was created in 2000 and has been operating freight traffic and a tour train on the line from Streetsville to Orangeville maintaining the use of the historic rail corridor.</p>	<p>Statement of Significance from the <i>Cultural Heritage Landscapes Inventory</i> (Town of Caledon 2009):</p> <p>"Although only briefly operating as the Credit Valley Railway, the rise and decline of the CVR and its successors influenced the growth and development of a number of settlement areas in Chinguacousy and Caledon townships. The railway was constructed through some of the most challenging and scenic terrain in the region, and a number of Caledon's most notable historic and natural features are aligned along its length. Of the five rail lines that historically traversed the Town of Caledon, the CVR is one of only two that remains intact, and it still operates as an active rail line to this day."</p>	<p>Character-defining elements from the <i>Cultural Heritage Landscapes Inventory</i> (Town of Caledon 2009):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Historic rail corridor, embankments, track, signals, and structures associated with road and creek and river crossings ■ Adjacent vegetation including creek valleys and woodlands ■ Views to the railway and bridges as seen from roads and trails.
Community of Cataract (along Cataract Road southeast of Charleston Sideroad)	Potential CHL		<p>Cataract abuts the southern boundary of Coulterville and northern limits of Credit Gorge-Belfountain CHL which is identified in the Town of Caledon's <i>Cultural Heritage Landscapes Inventory</i>.</p> <p>Historical research conducted for this Cultural Heritage Report determined that Cataract was established c. 1858 and was formerly known as the village of Church's Falls which is visible on historical mapping (as "Church's Falls") as early as 1859. By 1877, the village was renamed "Cataract".</p>	<p>Design or physical value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Representative of a 19th century Township of Caledon village design (i.e., grid plan) <p>Historical or associative value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Association with the village of Cataract, formerly Church's Falls <p>Contextual value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Physical connection between the early village structures, lots and lanes ■ Maintenance and support of the historic village plan ■ Maintenance and support of the Former CVR CHL 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Original lots and lanes from 19th century village plan ■ Views of the Former CVR CHL


Address or Location	Cultural Heritage Status	Photograph	Description	Potential CHVI	Potential Heritage Attributes
18906 Main Street	Listed (not designated) on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i>		<p>Described on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i> as an arts and crafts style farmhouse with a plaster exterior commenced between 1850-1875 and 1900-1924.</p> <p>Historical research conducted for this Cultural Heritage Report determined that a farmhouse was located on the property as early as 1859 and appears to be situated in the same location as the present-day house with a large set-back at 18906 Main Street (top image). At that time the property was listed under James Dodds of Lot 18, Concession 4 WCR. By 1877, a second structure was constructed on the property fronting the concession road and appears to be situated in the same location as the present-day plaster façade house fronting Main Street (bottom image).</p> <p>The first house is a single-detached, two-storey structure with a T-shaped main block (with extensions to the northwest) and medium pitch gable and hip roof. The house is set back approximately 285 m from Main Street and is accessed by a partially paved, partially gravelled driveway to the northwest of the house.</p> <p>The second house is a single-detached, storey-and-a-half structure with a rectangular shaped main block, stone foundation and high pitch gable and hip roof. The house is set back approximately 10 m from Main Street and is accessed by the same driveway to the first house which runs south of this second house.</p> <p>To the south of the first house is a large barn with a metal gambrel roof as well as a smaller outbuilding with a metal gable roof (construction materials for both are indiscernible from ROW; details observed from satellite imagery). The barn and outbuilding are set-back approximately 335 m from Main Street and are accessed via a second partially paved/ gravelled driveway located to the south of the first driveway.</p> <p>The large property parcel extends to the northwest and southwest and consists of large, ploughed fields delineated by hedgerows/ treelines, interspersed with woodlots and traversed by a branch of the Credit River.</p>	<p>Design or physical value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Arts and crafts style farmhouse <p>Historical or associative value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ N/A <p>Contextual value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Physical connection between the farmhouses and outbuildings ■ Maintenance and support of the rural and natural landscape of area (large fields lined by hedge rows/ trees; Credit Valley River) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ First house main block with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Gable roof ■ T-shaped plan ■ Second house main block with <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Gable roof ■ Rectangular plan ■ Stone foundation ■ Large agricultural fields delineated by hedgerows/ treelines


Address or Location	Cultural Heritage Status	Photograph	Description	Potential CHVI	Potential Heritage Attributes
18719 Main Street	Listed (not designated) on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i>		<p>Described on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i> as an Italianate style farmhouse with a cut stone exterior dating 1875-1899.</p> <p>Historical research conducted for this Cultural Heritage Report determined that a farmhouse was located on the property as early as 1859 and appears to be situated near the location of the present-day house at 18719 Main Street. At that time, the property was listed under Samuel Wallace of the northwest half of Lot 17, Concession 3 WCR.</p> <p>The house is a single-detached, two-storey structure with a rectangular shaped main block (with an extension to the southeast) and low pitch hip roof. The house is set back approximately 50 m from Main Street and is accessed by a gravelled driveway to the northwest of the house.</p> <p>To the northeast of the house is a barn with a metal gable roof (construction material indiscernible from ROW) set-back approximately 93 m from Main Street and accessed via the same driveway to the house. To the northeast of the barn are the remnants of a foundation for an earlier outbuilding.</p> <p>The property parcel consists of ploughed fields delineated by hedgerows/ treelines and a woodlot to the northeast which backs on to the Brampton-Orangeville Railway corridor identified on the Town of Caledon's <i>Cultural Heritage Landscapes Inventory</i> as the Former CVR CHL.</p>	<p>Design or physical value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Italianate style farmhouse <p>Historical or associative value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ N/A <p>Contextual value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Physical connection between the farmhouse and outbuilding(s) ■ Maintenance and support of the rural landscape of area (fields lined by hedge rows/ trees) ■ Maintenance and support of the Former CVR CHL 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ House main block with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Hip roof ■ Rectangular shaped plan ■ Stone construction ■ Agricultural field delineated by hedgerows/ treelines ■ Views of the Former CVR CHL


Address or Location	Cultural Heritage Status	Photograph	Description	Potential CHVI	Potential Heritage Attributes
18722 Main Street	Listed (not designated) on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i>		<p>Described on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i> as an Italianate style farmhouse with a red brick exterior dating 1875-1899.</p> <p>Historical research conducted for this Cultural Heritage Report determined that a farmhouse and barn were located on the property as early as 1937 and appear to be situated in the same location as the present-day house and barn at 18722 Main Street.</p> <p>The house is a single-detached, two-storey structure with a slight L-shaped main block and medium pitch hip roof. The house is set back approximately 20 m from Main Street and is accessed by a gravelled driveway to the southeast of the house.</p> <p>To the southwest of the house is a timber framed barn with a metal gable roof and stone foundation set-back approximately 75 m from Main Street and accessed via the same driveway to the house. The barn appears to be of the Central Ontario Barn style popular during the latter half of the 19th century.</p> <p>The large property parcel extends to the northwest and consists of large, ploughed fields delineated by hedgerows/ treelines, interspersed with woodlots and traversed by a branch of the Credit River.</p> <p>NOTE: A preliminary heritage evaluation for this property is presented in APPENDIX C.</p>	<p>Design or physical value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Italianate style farmhouse ■ Central or Southern Ontario Barn style ■ Board and Batten outbuilding <p>Historical or associative value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ N/A <p>Contextual value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Spatial organization and range of forms in building complex maintains and supports local character ■ Historical connection to 18667 Mississauga Road 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Italianate style farmhouse: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Two storey residence with L shaped floorplan. ■ Projecting bay feature on northeast elevation with decorative bargeboard on gable. ■ Medium pitch hip roof featuring a wide overhang, decorative paired brackets. ■ Red brick construction with dichromatic stone accents. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Stone quoins carved in a Drafted Margins pattern, decorative stone window heads, stone lug sills also carved in Drafted Margins pattern. ■ Segmental arched windows with original wooden frames. ■ Parged stone foundation. ■ Central or Southern Ontario Style Barn. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Timber framed barn. ■ Gable roof. ■ Field stone foundation. ■ Ramp on the northwest elevation. ■ Board and batten outbuilding. ■ Mature vegetation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Group of four deciduous trees lining the southeast side of the driveway. ■ Cluster of coniferous trees on the northwest side of the house.


Address or Location	Cultural Heritage Status	Photograph	Description	Potential CHVI	Potential Heritage Attributes
18659 Main Street	Identified on the Town of Caledon's <i>BHRI of Pre-1946 Structures</i>		<p>The property is identified on the Town of Caledon's <i>BHRI of Pre-1946 Structures</i> for its treelined laneway and barn.</p> <p>Historical research conducted for this Cultural Heritage Report determined that a barn was located on the property as early as 1937 and appears to be situated in the same location as the present-day barn at 18659 Main Street. Though the present-day bungalow on the property is of later construction, it is possible the barn is associated with the earlier farmhouse on the property visible on the 1877 historical mapping. At that time the property was listed under Samuel Wallace of the southeast half of Lot 17, Concession 3 WCR and was the second structure constructed on Wallace's property (first was built by 1859).</p> <p>The barn is a timber framed structure with a metal gable roof and stone foundation. The barn appears to be of the Central Ontario Barn style popular during the latter half of the 19th century. The barn is set back approximately 130 m from Main Street and is accessed by a treelined gravelled driveway to the northwest of the barn.</p> <p>To the southwest of the barn is a one-storey (bungalow) red brick house set-back approximately 95 m from Main Street and accessed via the same driveway to the barn.</p> <p>The property parcel consists of ploughed fields delineated by hedgerows/ treelines which back on to the Brampton-Orangeville Railway corridor identified on the Town of Caledon's <i>Cultural Heritage Landscapes Inventory</i> as the Former CVR CHL.</p>	<p>Design or physical value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Central Ontario Barn style <p>Historical or associative value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ N/A <p>Contextual value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Physical connection between the outbuilding and surrounding farm ■ Maintenance and support of the rural landscape of area (fields lined by hedge rows/ trees) ■ Maintenance and support of the Former CVR CHL 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Barn with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Timber frame ■ Rectangular plan ■ Stone foundation ■ Treelined laneway ■ Agricultural field delineated by hedgerows/ treelines ■ Views of the Former CVR CHL


Address or Location	Cultural Heritage Status	Photograph	Description	Potential CHVI	Potential Heritage Attributes
18473 Main Street	Listed (not designated) on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i>		<p>Described on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i> as a Gothic Revival style farmhouse with a red brick exterior dating 1875-1899.</p> <p>Historical research conducted for this Cultural Heritage Report determined that a farmhouse and barn were located on the property as early as 1937 and the former appears to be situated in the same location as the present-day house at 18473 Main Street. The barn is no longer extant.</p> <p>The house is a single-detached, storey-and-a-half structure with a T-shaped main block (with an extension to the east) and medium pitch gable roof. The house is set back approximately 57 m from Main Street and is accessed by a treelined gravelled driveway with stone boundary walls to the southeast of the house which lead to a two-door wooden driveshed.</p> <p>Though now a small parcel, the property was originally part of the larger Coulter Estate depicted on historical mapping as early as 1859.</p>	<p>Design or physical value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Gothic Revival style farmhouse/ cottage <p>Historical or associative value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Association with former Coulter Estate for which Coulterville is named <p>Contextual value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Maintenance and support of the rural landscape of area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ House main block with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Gable roof ■ T-shaped plan ■ Treelined laneway ■ Stone boundary walls


Address or Location	Cultural Heritage Status	Photograph	Description	Potential CHVI	Potential Heritage Attributes
1626 Charleston Sideroad	Listed (not designated) on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i>		<p>Described on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i> as a 19th century schoolhouse dating to 1879.</p> <p>Historical research conducted for this Cultural Heritage Report determined that a school was located on the property as early as 1877 and appears to be situated in the same location as the present-day house conversion at 1626 Charleston Sideroad.</p> <p>The house is a single-detached, storey-and-a-half, red brick structure with a rectangular shaped main block (with a large garage extension to the southwest) and medium pitch gable roof. The house is set back approximately 60 m from Charleston Sideroad and is accessed by a gravelled driveway to the southeast of the house.</p> <p>Though now a small parcel, the property was originally part of the larger Coulter Estate visible on historical mapping as early as 1859.</p>	<p>Potential CHVI</p> <p>Design or physical value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 19th century schoolhouse design <p>Historical or associative value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Association with former Coulter Estate for which Coulterville is named <p>Contextual value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintenance and support of the rural landscape of area within the context of public institutions in a rural setting 	<p>Potential Heritage Attributes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> House (converted) main block with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gable roof Rectangular plan



Address or Location	Cultural Heritage Status	Photograph	Description	Potential CHVI	Potential Heritage Attributes
0 Charleston Sideroad	Identified on the Town of Caledon's <i>BHRI of Pre-1946 Structures</i>		<p>The property is identified on the Town of Caledon's <i>BHRI of Pre-1946 Structures</i> as a former farmstead east of 1626 Charleston Sideroad.</p> <p>Historical research conducted for this Cultural Heritage Report determined that two structures, likely a farmhouse and outbuilding, were located on the property as early as 1937 and appear to be situated near the same location as the present-day silo (only visible remnant of the former farm) at 0 Charleston Sideroad.</p> <p>Characteristics of the silo include that it appears to be a dilapidated, unroofed, concrete structure. It is set back approximately 117 m from Charleston Sideroad and is accessed by an overgrown dirt and grass driveway to the north of the silo.</p> <p>The large property parcel consists of large unploughed fields now dominated by woodlots, shrubs and tall grasses which back on to the Brampton-Orangeville Railway corridor identified on the Town of Caledon's <i>Cultural Heritage Landscapes Inventory</i> as the Former CVR CHL.</p>	<p>Design or physical value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Remnants of silo structure <p>Historical or associative value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ N/A <p>Contextual value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Physical connection between the silo remnants and former surrounding farm. ■ Maintenance and support of the Former CVR CHL 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Silo remnants with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Concrete construction ■ Views of the Former CVR CHL

<p>1420 Charleston Sideroad</p>	<p>Listed (not designated) on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i></p>		<p>Described on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i> as an Italianate style farmhouse with a red brick exterior and paired windows dating 1875-1899.</p> <p>Historical research conducted for this Cultural Heritage Report determined that a farmhouse was constructed on the property between 1877 and 1937. In 1877, the property was listed under James Cameron of the southeast half of Lot 16, Concession 4 WCR and was the third structure constructed on Cameron's property (first was built by 1859, the second was located at the eastmost corner of the property by 1877).</p> <p>The house is a single-detached, two-storey structure with a T-shaped main block (with a large extension to the northwest and southwest) and medium pitch hip roof. The house is set back approximately 95 m from Charleston Sideroad and is accessed by a paved driveway to the southeast of the house.</p> <p>To the northwest of the house is a small outbuilding with a metal gambrel roof (construction material indiscernible from ROW) set-back approximately 120 m from Charleston Sideroad and accessed via the same driveway to the house (which wraps around the southwest side of the house). To the north of the barn are the remnants of a foundation from an earlier outbuilding.</p> <p>NOTE: A preliminary heritage evaluation for this property is presented in APPENDIX C.</p>	<p>Design or physical value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Main block of the Italianate style farmhouse ■ Barn foundation ruins <p>Historical or associative value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ N/A <p>Contextual value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Physical connection between the farmhouse and outbuilding. ■ Maintenance and support of the rural landscape of area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Residence main block: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Two storey Italianate style farmhouse with red brick exterior. ■ Cut stone foundations with carved top course. ■ Hip roof with wide eaves and paired brackets. ■ Decorative elements of the main block: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Decorative stone and brick accents (keystone eyebrow arches and drafted margin carved lug sills). – Accents carved into the wooden window frame heads. ■ Porches along the southeast and northeast elevations, creating a wrap around effect for the east corner of the house: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Wooden arcades and square posts with decorative scrollwork and filigree accents. – Mansard roof and second storey access of the southeast elevation, hipped roof with curved underside of the northeast elevation. – Stone foundation. ■ Bay window: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – mansard roof with decorative brackets in groups of three, same stone window heads and sills as the rest of the main block windows, and buff brick decorative panels below the windows. ■ Barn foundation ruins. ■ Mature vegetation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Deciduous and coniferous trees lining the driveway.
---------------------------------	--	---	--	--	---




Address or Location	Cultural Heritage Status	Photograph	Description	Potential CHVI	Potential Heritage Attributes
18667 Mississauga Road	Listed (not designated) on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i>		<p>Described on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i> as a mid-19th century farmstead dating c. 1850-1874.</p> <p>Historical research conducted for this Cultural Heritage Report determined that a farmhouse was located on the property as early as 1859 and appears to be situated in the same location as the present-day house at 18667 Main Street. At that time, the property was listed under Duncan Cameron of Lot 17, Concession 4 WCR.</p> <p>The house is a single-detached, storey-and-a-half, red brick structure with a rectangular shaped main block and saltbox roof. The house appears to be of the gable front, side hall type, is set back approximately 182 m from Mississauga Road and is accessed by a treelined gravelled driveway to the northwest of the house.</p> <p>To the north of the house are two outbuildings (one wooden and one metal) and a large T-shaped timber framed barn (with a southwest extension) with a metal gable roof and stone foundation set-back approximately 190 m from Mississauga Road and accessed via the same driveway to the house. The barn appears to be of the Central Ontario Barn style popular during the latter half of the 19th century.</p> <p>The large property parcel consists of large, ploughed fields delineated by hedgerows/ treelines, interspersed with woodlots and traversed by a branch of the Credit River.</p> <p>NOTE: A preliminary heritage evaluation for this property is presented in APPENDIX C.</p>	<p>Design or physical value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Gable front, side hall type main block of the residence ■ Central or Southern Ontario Barn style of the barn complex ■ Outbuilding No. 1 <p>Historical or associative value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ N/A <p>Contextual value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Spatial organization and range of forms in building complex maintains and supports local character ■ Physical connection between the farmhouse and outbuildings ■ Historical connection to 18722 Main Street 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Fieldstone wall. ■ Residence main block: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Rectangular footprint with side hall floorplan ■ Parged stone foundations. ■ Gable roof. ■ Red brick (stretcher bond) with contrasting buff coloured brick detailing including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Quoins. – Decorative diamond pattern on gable of southeast elevation. – Stretcher and solder brick flat arches above openings. ■ Original interior and storm windows on the northeast elevation. ■ Decorative wooden trim around original entrance on southeast elevation. ■ Barn complex (Central or Southern Ontario style) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Fieldstone foundations with cut stone cornerstones. ■ Timber frame construction. ■ Outbuilding No. 1 (driveshed) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Timber frame construction ■ Diamond shaped gable window on southwest elevation ■ Maltese/diamond cross shaped cut out on gable of northeast elevation ■ Mature tree lines <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Along driveway and ROW ■ Fieldstone walls at the foot of the driveway



Address or Location	Cultural Heritage Status	Photograph	Description	Potential CHVI	Potential Heritage Attributes
18682 Mississauga Road	Property of potential CHVI		<p>Historical research conducted for this Cultural Heritage Report determined that a farmhouse was located on the property as early as 1877 and appears to be situated in the same location as the present-day house at 18682 Mississauga Road. At that time, the property was listed under Joseph Morris of Lot 17, Concession 5 WCR.</p> <p>Based on satellite imagery, the house is a single-detached structure (construction material indiscernible from ROW) with a T-shaped main block (with extension to the northwest), set back approximately 120 m from Mississauga Road and accessed by a treelined paved driveway to the northwest of the house.</p> <p>To the west of the house is a metal outbuilding set-back approximately 190 m from Mississauga Road and accessed via the same driveway to the house (which turns west after approaching the house).</p> <p>The large property parcel consists of large, ploughed fields delineated by hedgerows/ treelines, interspersed with woodlots and traversed by a branch of the Credit River.</p>	<p>Design or physical value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ N/A <p>Historical or associative value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ N/A <p>Contextual value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Physical connection between the farmhouse and outbuildings ■ Maintenance and support of the rural and natural landscape of area (large fields lined by hedge rows/ trees; Credit Valley River) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ House main block with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ T-shaped plan ■ Treelined laneway ■ Large agricultural fields delineated by hedgerows/ treelines


Address or Location	Cultural Heritage Status	Photograph	Description	Potential CHVI	Potential Heritage Attributes
18501 Mississauga Road	Listed (not designated) on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i>		<p>Described on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i> as a Neoclassical style farmhouse with vertical board exterior and an addition at the rear, dating c. 1850-1874.</p> <p>Historical research conducted for this Cultural Heritage Report determined that a farmhouse was located on the property as early as 1859 and appears to be situated in the same location as the present-day house at 18501 Mississauga Road. At that time, the property was listed under James Cameron of Lot 16, Concession 4 WCR.</p> <p>The house is a single-detached, storey-and-a-half, buff brick structure with a rectangular shaped main block (with a large one-storey extension to the northeast) and saltbox roof. The house is set back approximately 181 m from Mississauga Road and is accessed by a gravelled driveway to the southeast of the house.</p> <p>To the east of the house is a large timber framed barn with a metal gambrel roof and possible concrete faced stone foundation set-back approximately 219 m from Mississauga Road and accessed via the same driveway to the house. The barn appears to be of the Central Ontario Barn style popular during the latter half of the 19th century. Additional outbuildings on the property include a wooden shed with metal gable roof to the south of the house, two large concrete silos with an indeterminate outbuilding to the northwest of the house and a complex of four metal outbuildings and three metal silos to the northeast of the house.</p> <p>The property parcel consists of ploughed fields delineated by hedgerows/ treelines.</p> <p>NOTE: A preliminary heritage evaluation for this property is presented in APPENDIX C.</p>	<p>Design or physical value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ One-and-a-half storey main block of the farmhouse ■ Barn No. 1 ■ Barn No. 1 <p>Historical or associative value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ N/A <p>Contextual value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Spatial organization and range of forms in building complex maintains and supports local character ■ Physical connection between the farmhouse and outbuildings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Main residence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Original one-and-a-half storey main block with rectangular floor plan and gable roof ■ Barn No. 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Timber frame construction ■ Fieldstone foundation ■ Gable roof ■ Barn No. 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Concrete block foundations ■ Timber frame construction ■ Metal gambrel roof. ■ Mature vegetation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Coniferous windbreaks around the house <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Perpendicular to Mississauga Road, in a northeast to southwest orientation, to the northwest of the main building complex.


Address or Location	Cultural Heritage Status	Photograph	Description	Potential CHVI	Potential Heritage Attributes
48 William Street East	Listed (not designated) on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i>		<p>Described on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i> as a Gothic Revival style church building which has since been converted to a residence, dating c. 1875-1899.</p> <p>Historical research conducted for this Cultural Heritage Report determined that a church was located on the property as early as 1937 and appears to be situated in the same location as the present-day house conversion at 48 William Street East.</p> <p>Based on satellite imagery, the house is a single-detached, red brick structure (likely one-storey or a storey-and-a-half) with a rectangular shaped main block (with a large extension to the southwest) and high pitch gable roof. The house is set back approximately 32 m from William Street East and is accessed by a paved asphalt driveway to the southwest of the house. There is a tennis court to the rear (northwest) of the house.</p> <p>The property is located within the village of Cataract. Historical research determined that Cataract was established c. 1858 and was formerly known as the village of Church's Falls which is visible on historical mapping (as "Church's Falls") as early as 1859. By 1877, the village was renamed "Cataract".</p>	<p>Design or physical value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gothic Revival style church <p>Historical or associative value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Association with the village of Cataract, formerly Church's Falls <p>Contextual value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintenance and support of the historic village plan Maintenance and support of the rural landscape of area within the context of public institutions in a rural village setting Physical connection between the early village lots and lanes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> House (converted) main block with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gable roof Rectangular plan Original lots and lanes from 19th century village plan
71 William Street East	Identified on the Town of Caledon's <i>BHRI of Pre-1946 Structures</i>		<p>The property is identified on the Town of Caledon's <i>BHRI of Pre-1946 Structures</i> (no description provided), however, historical research conducted for this CHR could not identify the structure on pre-1973 mapping.</p> <p>Characteristics of the house, observable from satellite imagery, include that it is a single-detached, wood frame structure with a rectangular shaped main block and two dormer windows on the front/ northwest façade. The house is set back approximately 29 m from William Street East and is accessed by a paved asphalt driveway leading to a detached wood frame garage northeast of the house.</p> <p>The property is located within the village of Cataract. Historical research determined that Cataract was established c. 1858 and was formerly known as the village of Church's Falls which is visible on historical mapping (as "Church's Falls") as early as 1859. By 1877, the village was renamed "Cataract".</p>	<p>Design or physical value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A <p>Historical or associative value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A <p>Contextual value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintenance and support of the historic village plan Physical connection between the early village lots and lanes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Original lots and lanes from 19th century village plan

Address or Location	Cultural Heritage Status	Photograph	Description	Potential CHVI	Potential Heritage Attributes
77 William Street East	Identified on the Town of Caledon's <i>BHRI of Pre-1946 Structures</i>		<p>The property is identified on the Town of Caledon's <i>BHRI of Pre-1946 Structures</i> as a frame building with log façade, however, historical research conducted for this Cultural Heritage Report could not identify the structure on pre-1973 mapping.</p> <p>The house is a single-detached, one-storey structure with a rectangular shaped main block (with garage extension to southwest) and medium pitch gable roof with synthetic shingles. The house is set back approximately 25 m from William Street East and is accessed by a paved asphalt driveway to the southwest of the house.</p> <p>The property is located within the village of Cataract. Historical research determined that Cataract was established c. 1858 and was formerly known as the village of Church's Falls which is visible on historical mapping (as "Church's Falls") as early as 1859. By 1877, the village was renamed "Cataract".</p>	<p>Design or physical value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Frame building with log façade <p>Historical or associative value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ N/A <p>Contextual value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Physical connection between the early village lots and lanes ■ Maintenance and support of the historic village plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ House main block with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Log façade ■ Rectangular plan ■ Original lots and lanes from 19th century village plan
89 William Street East	Identified on the Town of Caledon's <i>BHRI of Pre-1946 Structures</i>		<p>The property is identified on the Town of Caledon's <i>BHRI of Pre-1946 Structures</i> as built in 1977, however, historical research conducted for this CHR determined that a structure was located on the property as early as 1937 and appears to be situated near the same location as the present-day house at 89 William Street East.</p> <p>The house is a single-detached, storey-and-a-half, wood frame structure with a log façade, L-shaped main block and medium pitch cross-gable roof with stone chimney. The house is set back approximately 21 m from William Street East and is accessed by a paved asphalt driveway leading to a detached wood frame garage northeast of the house. There is a pool to the southwest of the house.</p> <p>The property is located within the village of Cataract. Historical research determined that Cataract was established c. 1858 and was formerly known as the village of Church's Falls which is visible on historical mapping (as "Church's Falls") as early as 1859. By 1877, the village was renamed "Cataract".</p>	<p>Design or physical value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Frame building with log façade <p>Historical or associative value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Association with the village of Cataract, formerly Church's Falls <p>Contextual value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Physical connection between the early village structures, lots and lanes ■ Maintenance and support of the historic village plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ House main block with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Log façade ■ L-shaped plan ■ Cross-gable roof ■ Stone chimney ■ Original lots and lanes from 19th century village plan

Address or Location	Cultural Heritage Status	Photograph	Description	Potential CHVI	Potential Heritage Attributes
1055 Charleston Sideroad	Identified on the Town of Caledon's <i>BHRI of Pre-1946 Structures</i>	  	<p>The property is identified on the Town of Caledon's <i>BHRI of Pre-1946 Structures</i> as the "property across the road at the southeast corner of Mississauga Road and Charleston Road".</p> <p>Historical research conducted for this Cultural Heritage Report determined that a farmhouse was located on the property as early as 1877 and appears to be situated in the same location as the present-day foundation remnants at 1055 Charleston Sideroad. At that time, the property was listed as part of the Morris Estate in the southwest half of Lot 15, Concession 4 WCR. The present-day outbuilding on the property appears to be of later construction.</p> <p>The foundation remnants appear to be rubble fieldstone. The foundation is set back approximately 73 m from Charleston Sideroad and is accessed by an overgrown dirt and grass driveway to the northeast of the foundation.</p> <p>To the southeast of the foundation are the remnants of a smaller structure's foundation and to the north of the foundation is a one-storey board and batten shed with metal roof set-back approximately 62 m from Charleston Sideroad and accessed via the same driveway to the foundation.</p> <p>The property parcel consists of ploughed fields delineated by hedgerows/ treelines.</p> <p>NOTE: A preliminary heritage evaluation for this property is presented in APPENDIX C.</p>	<p>Design or physical value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ N/A <p>Historical or associative value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ N/A <p>Contextual value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Spatial organization and range of forms in building complex maintains and supports local character ■ Physical connection between the remnant outbuilding(s) and former surrounding farm 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Rubble fieldstone foundations for both barn ruins. ■ Treelines delineating the edge of the farm building complex.

Address or Location	Cultural Heritage Status	Photograph	Description	Potential CHVI	Potential Heritage Attributes
18309 Mississauga Road	Property of potential CHVI		<p>While historical research conducted for this Cultural Heritage Report did not identify the presence of a farmhouse on the property before 1973, the hewn log construction suggests the structure may have been relocated or reassembled from repurposed materials (like 18205 Mississauga Road).</p> <p>Characteristics of the house include that it is a single-detached, storey-and-a-half structure with a rectangular shaped main block (with an extension to the northeast) and medium pitch gable roof. The house is set back approximately 30 m from Mississauga Road and is accessed by a paved asphalt driveway. To the west of the house is a detached garage of recent construction.</p>	<p>Design or physical value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Hewn log constructed house <p>Historical or associative value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ N/A <p>Contextual value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ House main block with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Hewn log construction ■ Rectangular shaped plan
18205 Mississauga Road	Identified on the Town of Caledon's <i>BHRI of Pre-1946 Structures</i>		<p>The property is identified on the Town of Caledon's <i>BHRI of Pre-1946 Structures</i> as built with logs/ wood from the Ottawa Valley, however, historical research conducted for this Cultural Heritage Report could not identify the structure on pre-1973 mapping.</p> <p>The house is a single-detached, storey-and-a-half structure with a rectangular shaped main block (and small extension to the southeast), medium pitch gable roof, and two dormer windows on the front/ southwest façade. The house is set back approximately 32 m from Mississauga Road and is accessed by a paved asphalt driveway leading to a detached garage of recent construction (appears to be vertical siding) southeast of the house.</p>	<p>Design or physical value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Ottawa Valley wood/ log construction <p>Historical or associative value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ N/A <p>Contextual value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ House main block with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Log façade ■ Rectangular plan

Address or Location	Cultural Heritage Status	Photograph	Description	Potential CHVI	Potential Heritage Attributes
833 Charleston Sideroad	Listed (not designated) on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i>		<p>Described on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i> as a late Neoclassical style farmhouse dating c. 1875-1899.</p> <p>Historical research determined that a farmhouse was located on the property as early as 1877 and appears to be situated in the same location as the present-day house at 833 Charleston Sideroad. At that time, the property was listed under William Richardson of the northeast half of Lot 15, Concession 4 WCR.</p> <p>The house is a single-detached, two-storey wood frame structure with a rectangular shaped main block (with a small one-storey wood frame extension to the northeast) and low-pitch gable roof. The house is set back approximately 50 m from Charleston Sideroad and is accessed by a gravelled driveway to the northeast of the house.</p> <p>To the north of the house is a large timber framed barn (including a large extension to the east) with a relatively new metal gable roof but indeterminate foundation. It is set-back approximately 35 m from Charleston Sideroad and accessed via the same driveway to the house. The barn appears to be of the Central Ontario Barn style popular during the latter half of the 19th century. Additional outbuildings on the property include a silo to the southwest of the barn, two wooden sheds to the southeast of the barn and one metal shed to the northwest of the house.</p> <p>The large property parcel consists of large, ploughed fields delineated by hedgerows/ treelines.</p>	<p>Design or physical value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Late Neoclassical style farmhouse ■ Central Ontario Barn style <p>Historical or associative value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ N/A <p>Contextual value:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Physical connection between the farmhouse and outbuildings ■ Spatial organization and range of forms in building complex maintains and supports local character ■ Maintenance and support of the rural landscape of area (large fields lined by hedge rows/ trees) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ House main block with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Wood frame ■ Rectangular shaped plan ■ Barn with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Timber frame ■ Large agricultural fields delineated by hedgerows/ treelines



- LEGEND**
- POTENTIAL CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPE
 - LANDSCAPE IDENTIFIED ON TOWN OF CALEDON CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPES INVENTORY
 - PROPERTY LISTED (NOT DESIGNATED) ON THE TOWN OF CALEDON HERITAGE REGISTER
 - POTENTIAL BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE
 - PROPERTY IDENTIFIED ON TOWN OF CALEDON BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE INVENTORY OF PRE-1946 STRUCTURES
 - CULTURAL HERITAGE REPORT STUDY AREA
 - WATERCOURSE
 - ROAD
 - WATERBODY
 - UNEVALUATED WETLAND
 - OTHER EVALUATED WETLAND
 - PROVINCIALLY SIGNIFICANT WETLAND
 - PROPERTY PARCEL
 - LICENCE BOUNDARY
 - LIMIT OF EXTRACTION



- NOTE(S)**
1. ALL LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE
- REFERENCE(S)**
1. BASEDATA MNR F LIO OBTAINED APRIL 2019
 2. WATERCOURSES OBTAINED FROM CREDIT VALLEY CONSERVATION AUTHORITY OPEN DATA PORTAL, NOVEMBER 2022 IN COMBINATION WITH SITE WATERCOURSE SURVEY PROVIDED BY FIRST BASE SOLUTIONS NOVEMBER 2021.
 3. IMAGERY FIRSTBASE SOLUTIONS SPRING 2019 (15CM RESOLUTION) AND SOURCE: ESRI, MAXAR, EARTHSTAR GEOGRAPHICS, AND THE GIS USER COMMUNITY
 4. LICENSE AND EXTRACTION LIMIT PROVIDED BY MHBC IN JUNE 2023.
 5. PROJECTION: TRANSVERSE MERCATOR DATUM: NAD 83 COORDINATE SYSTEM: UTM ZONE 17N

CLIENT
 CBM AGGREGATES, A DIVISION OF ST. MARYS CEMENT INC. (CANADA)

PROJECT
 CALEDON PIT/ QUARRY

TITLE
 POTENTIAL BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCES AND CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPES WITHIN THE STUDY AREA

CONSULTANT	DATE	REVISION
	YYYY-MM-DD	2023-07-19
	DESIGNED	AM
	PREPARED	BR
	REVIEWED	JK
	APPROVED	HM

PROJECT NO. 19129150 **CONTROL** 0040 **REV.** 0.0 **FIGURE** 9

PATH: S:\Client\Work\19129150\19129150_0000_Cultural_Heritage\19129150_0000_0000.mxd PRINTED ON: 2023-07-19 AT: 12:05:24 AM
 IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM: ANSI B

6.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS

6.1 Assessment Methodology

When determining the impact that a development or site alteration may have on known or potential BHRs or CHLs, the MCM *Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process* advises that the following “negative impacts” be considered:

- *Destruction* of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes, or features
- *Alteration* that is not sympathetic or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance
- *Shadows* created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden
- *Isolation* of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship
- *Direct or indirect obstruction* of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features
- *A change in land use* such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces
- *Land disturbances* such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect a cultural heritage resource.

Other potential impacts may also be considered, such as encroachment or construction vibration, particularly for heritage attributes within 60 m of proposed construction.

6.2 Impact Assessment

As outlined in Section 5.1 there are several known or potential BHRs and CHLs within the study area. Table 3 below includes an analysis of impacts to the potential BHRs and CHLs (roughly north to south), recommends conservation / mitigation measures, and considers alternatives.

Based on this analysis, the project will avoid impacts to the majority of potential BHRs and CHLs except for 18722 Main Street, 1055 Charleston Sideroad, 1420 Charleston Sideroad, 18501 Mississauga Road, and 18677 Mississauga Road. To inform the impact assessment and offer focused mitigation recommendations, preliminary heritage evaluations were completed for these properties to identify their potential CHVI and heritage attributes (see APPENDIX C).

Table 3: Impact Assessment and Conservation Recommendations for Known and Potential BHRs and CHLs within the Study Area

Address or Location and Heritage Status	Analysis of Impact to Identified Cultural Heritage Resources	Conservation/ Mitigation Measures	Consideration of Alternatives
<p>Former CVR CHL Identified on the Town of Caledon's <i>Cultural Heritage Landscapes Inventory</i></p>	<p>The proposed extraction area will be in the property parcel directly adjacent to the CHL but is not anticipated to directly or indirectly impact the CHL, nor adversely affect the CHL's potential CHVI and heritage attributes, which are linked to its rail corridor (including associated embankments/ structures), vegetation, and views from roadways/ bridges.</p> <p>The proposed extraction area, of which the proposed construction activities include extraction (blasting) as well as the possible use of temporary workspaces/ laydown areas, vegetation removal, and heavy machinery/ traffic, is approximately 125 m north of the CHL.</p> <p>Vibration during the proposed construction activities is not anticipated to impact the CHL's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the CHL is not within the 60 m zone suggested for vibration monitoring (Carmen <i>et al.</i> 2012: 31).</p> <p>Similarly, fugitive dust emissions from the proposed construction activities are not anticipated to impact the CHL's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the CHL is approximately 125 m away from these activities.</p> <p>Shadows from the proposed construction activities are also not anticipated to impact the CHL's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because once again the CHL is approximately 125 m away from these activities and, furthermore, there are no upstanding features proposed.</p> <p>Isolation of the CHL's potential heritage attributes due to the proposed construction activities is not expected as the activities are approximately 125 m away from the CHL and will not disrupt the connection between the rail corridor, vegetation, and views from roadways/ bridges.</p> <p>Finally, direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas is not expected as the proposed construction activities are approximately 125 m away from the CHL and will not obstruct any views of the Former CVR that exist within or through the properties adjacent to the CHL.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As no direct or indirect impacts are anticipated, no further cultural heritage study or mitigation is recommended. ■ If design alterations or conditions require adjacent excavation or construction to extend into the CHL, or a property directly adjacent to the CHL, a CHER is required. If required, the CHER should confirm if the property meets the criteria prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06. ■ If the CHER determines the property has CHVI, conduct an HIA during detailed design to determine the appropriate mitigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As no impacts to the CHL are anticipated, no alternatives have been considered.
<p>Community of Cataract (along Cataract Road southeast of Charleston Sideroad) Potential CHL</p>	<p>The proposed extraction area will be in the property parcel directly adjacent to the CHL but is not anticipated to directly or indirectly impact the CHL, nor adversely affect the CHL's potential CHVI and heritage attributes, which are linked to its original village plan and views of the Former CVR CHL.</p> <p>The proposed extraction area, of which the proposed construction activities include extraction (blasting) as well as the possible use of temporary workspaces/ laydown areas, vegetation removal, and heavy machinery/ traffic, is approximately 412 m northwest of the bend in Cataract Road (i.e., the central hub of the CHL).</p> <p>Vibration during the proposed construction activities is not anticipated to impact the CHL's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the CHL is not within the 60 m zone suggested for vibration monitoring (Carmen <i>et al.</i> 2012: 31).</p> <p>Similarly, fugitive dust emissions from the proposed construction activities are not anticipated to impact the CHL's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the CHL is approximately 412 m away from these activities.</p> <p>Shadows from the proposed construction activities are also not anticipated to impact the CHL's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because once again the CHL is approximately 412 m away from these activities and, furthermore, there are no upstanding features proposed.</p> <p>Isolation of the CHL's potential heritage attributes due to the proposed construction activities is not expected as the activities are approximately 412 m away from the CHL and will not disrupt the connection between the original village plan or Former CVR.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As no direct or indirect impacts are anticipated, no further cultural heritage study or mitigation is recommended. ■ If design alterations or conditions require adjacent excavation or construction to extend into the CHL, or a property directly adjacent to the CHL, a CHER is required. If required, the CHER should confirm if the property meets the criteria prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06. ■ If the CHER determines the property has CHVI, conduct an HIA during detailed design to determine the appropriate mitigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As no impacts to the CHL are anticipated, no alternatives have been considered.

Address or Location and Heritage Status	Analysis of Impact to Identified Cultural Heritage Resources	Conservation/ Mitigation Measures	Consideration of Alternatives
	<p>Finally, direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas is not expected as the proposed construction activities are approximately 412 m northwest of the CHL, i.e., the opposite direction of the Former CVR, and thus will not obstruct any views of the Former CVR that exist within or through the properties adjacent to the CHL.</p>		
<p>18906 Main Street Listed (not designated) on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i></p>	<p>The proposed extraction area will be in the property parcel directly adjacent to the property but is not anticipated to directly or indirectly impact the property, nor adversely affect the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes, which are linked to its BHRs (two farmhouses) and surrounding agricultural fields.</p> <p>The proposed extraction area, of which the proposed construction activities include extraction (blasting) as well as the possible use of temporary workspaces/ laydown areas, vegetation removal, and heavy machinery/ traffic, is approximately 435 m southeast of the south house, 550 m southeast of the north house, and 200 m southwest of the agricultural fields.</p> <p>Vibration during the proposed construction activities is not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because no BHRs are within the 60 m zone suggested for vibration monitoring (Carmen <i>et al.</i> 2012: 31).</p> <p>Similarly, fugitive dust emissions from the proposed construction activities are not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the BHRs are approximately 435 to 550 m away from these activities.</p> <p>Shadows from the proposed construction activities are also not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because once again the BHRs are approximately 435 to 550 m away from these activities and, furthermore, there are no upstanding features proposed.</p> <p>Isolation of the property's potential heritage attributes due to the proposed construction activities is not expected as the activities are 435 to 550 m away from the BHRs and will not disrupt their connection with the surrounding agricultural fields.</p> <p>Finally, direct, or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas due to the proposed construction activities is not expected as no significant views or vistas were identified for the property.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As no direct or indirect impacts are anticipated, no further cultural heritage study or mitigation is recommended. ■ If design alterations or conditions require adjacent excavation or construction to extend into the property, a CHER is required. If required, the CHER should confirm if the property meets the criteria prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06. ■ If the CHER determines the property has CHVI, conduct an HIA during detailed design to determine the appropriate mitigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As no impacts to the BHRs and surrounding agricultural fields are anticipated, no alternatives have been considered.
<p>18719 Main Street Listed (not designated) on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i></p>	<p>The proposed extraction area will be in the property parcel directly adjacent to the property (opposite Main Street) but is not anticipated to impact the property directly or indirectly, nor adversely affect the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes, which are linked to its BHR (i.e., the Italianate style farmhouse), surrounding agricultural fields, and views of the Former CVR CHL.</p> <p>The proposed extraction area, of which the proposed construction activities include extraction (blasting) as well as the possible use of temporary workspaces/ laydown areas, vegetation removal, and heavy machinery/ traffic, is approximately 75 m southwest of the BHR and 50 m southwest of the agricultural fields.</p> <p>Vibration during the proposed construction activities is not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the BHR is not within the 60 m zone suggested for vibration monitoring (Carmen <i>et al.</i> 2012: 31). While within the 60-m zone, it is not anticipated that the agricultural fields would be susceptible to vibration.</p> <p>Similarly, fugitive dust emissions from the proposed construction activities are not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the BHR is approximately 75 m away from these activities.</p> <p>Shadows from the proposed construction activities are also not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because once again the BHR is approximately 75 m away from these activities and, furthermore, there are no upstanding features proposed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As no direct or indirect impacts are anticipated, no further cultural heritage study or mitigation is recommended. ■ If design alterations or conditions require adjacent excavation or construction to extend into the property, a CHER is required. If required, the CHER should confirm if the property meets the criteria prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06. ■ If the CHER determines the property has CHVI, conduct an HIA during detailed design to determine the appropriate mitigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As no impacts to the BHR, surrounding agricultural fields, or views of the Former CVR CHL are anticipated, no alternatives have been considered.

Address or Location and Heritage Status	Analysis of Impact to Identified Cultural Heritage Resources	Conservation/ Mitigation Measures	Consideration of Alternatives
	<p>Isolation of the property's potential heritage attributes due to the proposed construction activities is not expected as the activities are approximately 75 m away from the BHR and will not disrupt its connection with the surrounding agricultural fields or Former CVR.</p> <p>Finally, direct, or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas is not expected as the proposed construction activities are 75 m southwest of the BHR, i.e., the opposite direction of the Former CVR, and thus will not obstruct any views of the Former CVR that exist within or through the property.</p>		
<p>18722 Main Street Listed (not designated) on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i></p>	<p>The proposed extraction area will encompass the majority of the property parcel, and is anticipated to directly impact the property, potentially adversely affecting the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes which are linked to its BHRs (i.e., the Italianate style farmhouse and timber frame barn).</p> <p>The proposed extraction area, of which the proposed construction activities include extraction (blasting) as well as the possible use of temporary workspaces/ laydown areas, vegetation removal, and heavy machinery/ traffic, is between 90 to 135 m southeast of the farmhouse, outbuilding, and mature vegetation, and 35 m from the barn.</p> <p>The location of the proposed construction activities may require demolition/ destruction of the barn, resulting in permanent removal of a potential heritage attribute linked to the property's CHVI (major direct impact).</p> <p>Vibration during the proposed construction activities is also anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the barn is within the 60 m zone suggested for vibration monitoring (Carmen <i>et al.</i> 2012: 31). Overall, any potential vibration impacts would be indirect, temporary and site-specific to the physical heritage attributes of the barn.</p> <p>Similarly, fugitive dust emissions from the proposed construction activities are anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the barn is within 35 m of these activities.</p> <p>Shadows from the activities are not anticipated to impact the farmhouse, barn or outbuilding because there are no upstanding features proposed.</p> <p>Isolation of the property's potential heritage attributes due to the proposed construction activities is expected as the demolition/ destruction of the barn will disrupt the farmhouse's connection to the components of the property.</p> <p>Finally, direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas is not expected as no significant views or vista were identified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ A major direct impact is anticipated for this property. To inform the impact assessment and offer focused mitigation recommendations, a preliminary heritage evaluation was completed to identify the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes (see APPENDIX C). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Based on the results of the preliminary heritage evaluation the portion of the property mapped on Figure 10 has CHVI. As a result: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Prior to any site alteration or extraction within these areas, a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) shall be required. The HIA should include a full evaluation of the property using the criteria prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06, provide a Statement of CHVI with list of heritage attributes, identify all direct and indirect impacts, and recommend site-specific mitigation measures to ensure the CHVI and heritage attributes of the property are conserved in accordance with provincial requirements; ■ Until the site-specific mitigation measures of the HIA are implemented a construction buffer shall be established to reduce the risk of accidental damage from vehicles, heavy equipment operation, or other activities of the mineral aggregate operation. The area of cultural heritage potential includes a 50 m construction buffer. This construction buffer shall be demarcated with temporary fencing and clearly marked as a "no-go-zone"; ■ Until the site-specific mitigation measures of the HIA are implemented the licensee shall implement the recommendations of the blast impact assessment related to the areas of cultural heritage potential to ensure the structural integrity of the built heritage resources are maintained; and

Address or Location and Heritage Status	Analysis of Impact to Identified Cultural Heritage Resources	Conservation/ Mitigation Measures	Consideration of Alternatives
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Until the site-specific mitigation measures of the HIA are implemented, if the property is vacated a qualified specialist shall develop a mothball plan for the property to conserve its heritage attributes during the vacancy period.
<p>18659 Main Street Identified on the Town of Caledon's <i>BHRI of Pre-1946 Structures</i></p>	<p>The proposed extraction area will be located in the property parcels directly adjacent to the property but is not anticipated to directly or indirectly impact the property, nor adversely affect the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes, which are linked to its BHR (i.e., the timber frame barn), treelined laneway, surrounding agricultural fields, and views of the Former CVR CHL.</p> <p>The proposed extraction area, of which the proposed construction activities include extraction (blasting) as well as the possible use of temporary workspaces/ laydown areas, vegetation removal, and heavy machinery/ traffic, is approximately 162 m southwest of the BHR and 37 m southwest of the treelined laneway and agricultural fields.</p> <p>Vibration during the proposed construction activities is not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the BHR is not within the 60-m zone suggested for vibration monitoring (Carmen <i>et al.</i> 2012: 31). While within the 60-m zone, it is not anticipated that the treelined laneway or agricultural fields would be susceptible to vibration.</p> <p>Similarly, fugitive dust emissions from the proposed construction activities are not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the BHR is approximately 162 m away from these activities.</p> <p>Shadows from the proposed construction activities are also not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because once again the BHR is approximately 162 m away from these activities and, furthermore, there are no upstanding features proposed.</p> <p>Isolation of the property's potential heritage attributes due to the proposed construction activities is not expected as the activities are approximately 162 m away from the BHR and will not disrupt its connection with the surrounding agricultural fields, treelined laneway, or Former CVR.</p> <p>Finally, direct, or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas is not expected as the proposed construction activities are 162 m southwest of the BHR, i.e., the opposite direction of the Former CVR, and thus will not obstruct any views of the Former CVR that exist within or through the property.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As no direct or indirect impacts are anticipated, no further cultural heritage study or mitigation is recommended. If design alterations or conditions require adjacent excavation or construction to extend into the property, a CHER is required. If required, the CHER should confirm if the property meets the criteria prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06. If the CHER determines the property has CHVI, conduct an HIA during detailed design to determine the appropriate mitigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As no impacts to the BHR, treelined laneway, surrounding agricultural fields, or views of the Former CVR CHL are anticipated, no alternatives have been considered.
<p>18473 Main Street Listed (not designated) on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i></p>	<p>The proposed extraction area will be in the property parcels directly adjacent to the property but is not anticipated to directly or indirectly impact the property, nor adversely affect the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes, which are linked to its BHR (i.e., the Gothic Revival style farmhouse), treelined laneway and stone boundary wall.</p> <p>The proposed extraction area, of which the proposed construction activities include extraction (blasting) as well as the possible use of temporary workspaces/ laydown areas, vegetation removal, and heavy machinery/ traffic, is approximately 68 m northwest and 130 m southwest of the BHR, as well as 75 m southwest of the treelined laneway and stone boundary wall.</p> <p>Vibration during the proposed construction activities is not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the BHR and stone boundary wall are not within the 60 m zone suggested for vibration monitoring (Carmen <i>et al.</i> 2012: 31).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As no direct or indirect impacts are anticipated, no further cultural heritage study or mitigation is recommended. If design alterations or conditions require adjacent excavation or construction to extend into the property, a CHER is required. If required, the CHER should confirm if the property meets the criteria prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As no impacts to the BHR, treelined laneway or stone boundary wall are anticipated, no alternatives have been considered.

Address or Location and Heritage Status	Analysis of Impact to Identified Cultural Heritage Resources	Conservation/ Mitigation Measures	Consideration of Alternatives
	<p>Similarly, fugitive dust emissions from the proposed construction activities are not anticipated to impact the property’s potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the BHR is approximately 68 to 130 m away from these activities.</p> <p>Shadows from the proposed construction activities are also not anticipated to impact the property’s potential CHVI and heritage attributes because once again the BHR is approximately 68 to 130 m away from these activities and, furthermore, there are no upstanding features proposed.</p> <p>Isolation of the property’s potential heritage attributes due to the proposed construction activities is not expected as the activities are approximately 68 to 130 m away from the BHR and will not disrupt its connection with the treelined laneway or stone boundary wall.</p> <p>Finally, direct, or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas is not expected as no significant views or vista were identified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ If the CHER determines the property has CHVI, conduct an HIA during detailed design to determine the appropriate mitigation. 	
<p>1626 Charleston Sideroad Listed (not designated) on the Town of Caledon’s <i>Heritage Register</i></p>	<p>The proposed extraction area will be in the property parcel directly adjacent to the property but is not anticipated to directly or indirectly impact the property, nor adversely affect the property’s potential CHVI and heritage attributes, which are linked to its BHR (i.e., the former schoolhouse).</p> <p>The proposed extraction area, of which the proposed construction activities include extraction (blasting) as well as the possible use of temporary workspaces/ laydown areas, vegetation removal, and heavy machinery/ traffic, is approximately 91 m northwest of the BHR.</p> <p>Vibration during the proposed construction activities is not anticipated to impact the property’s potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the BHR is not within the 60 m zone suggested for vibration monitoring (Carmen <i>et al.</i> 2012: 31).</p> <p>Similarly, fugitive dust emissions from the proposed construction activities are not anticipated to impact the property’s potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the BHR is approximately 91 m away from these activities.</p> <p>Shadows from the proposed construction activities are also not anticipated to impact the property’s potential CHVI and heritage attributes because once again the BHR is approximately 91 m away from these activities and, furthermore, there are no upstanding features proposed.</p> <p>Isolation of the property’s potential heritage attributes due to the proposed construction activities is not expected as the activities are approximately 91 m away from the BHR and no known connection between the BHR and surrounding structures or features were identified.</p> <p>Finally, direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas is not expected as no significant views or vista were identified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As no direct or indirect impacts are anticipated, no further cultural heritage study or mitigation is recommended. ■ If design alterations or conditions require adjacent excavation or construction to extend into the property, a CHER is required. If required, the CHER should confirm if the property meets the criteria prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06. ■ If the CHER determines the property has CHVI, conduct an HIA during detailed design to determine the appropriate mitigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As no impacts to the BHR are anticipated, no alternatives have been considered.
<p>0 Charleston Sideroad Identified on the Town of Caledon’s <i>BHRI of Pre-1946 Structures</i></p>	<p>The proposed extraction area will be in the property parcels directly adjacent to the property but is not anticipated to directly or indirectly impact the property, nor adversely affect the property’s potential CHVI and heritage attributes, which are linked to its BHR (i.e., the silo remnants) and views of the Former CVR CHL.</p> <p>The proposed extraction area, of which the proposed construction activities include extraction (blasting) as well as the possible use of temporary workspaces/ laydown areas, vegetation removal, and heavy machinery/ traffic, is approximately 297 m northwest of the BHR.</p> <p>Vibration during the proposed construction activities is not anticipated to impact the property’s potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the BHR is not within the 60 m zone suggested for vibration monitoring (Carmen <i>et al.</i> 2012: 31).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As no direct or indirect impacts are anticipated, no further cultural heritage study or mitigation is recommended. ■ If design alterations or conditions require adjacent excavation or construction to extend into the property, a CHER is required. If required, the CHER should confirm 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As no impacts to the BHR or views of the Former CVR CHL are anticipated, no alternatives have been considered.

Address or Location and Heritage Status	Analysis of Impact to Identified Cultural Heritage Resources	Conservation/ Mitigation Measures	Consideration of Alternatives
	<p>Similarly, fugitive dust emissions from the proposed construction activities are not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the BHR is approximately 297 m away from these activities.</p> <p>Shadows from the proposed construction activities are also not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because once again the BHR is approximately 297 m away from these activities and, furthermore, there are no upstanding features proposed.</p> <p>Isolation of the property's potential heritage attributes due to the proposed construction activities is not expected as the activities are 297 m away from the BHR and will not disrupt its connection with the Former CVR.</p> <p>Finally, direct, or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas is not expected as the proposed construction activities are 297 m southwest of the BHR, i.e., the opposite direction of the Former CVR, and thus will not obstruct any views of the Former CVR that exist within or through the property.</p>	<p>if the property meets the criteria prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ If the CHER determines the property has CHVI, conduct an HIA during detailed design to determine the appropriate mitigation. 	
<p>1420 Charleston Sideroad Listed (not designated) on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i></p>	<p>The proposed extraction area will encompass the majority of the property parcel, and is anticipated to directly impact the property, potentially adversely affecting the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes which are linked to its BHR (i.e., the Italianate style farmhouse, barn foundation ruins, mature vegetation, and fieldstone wall).</p> <p>The proposed extraction area encompasses the entire property, on which the proposed construction activities will include extraction (blasting) as well as the possible use of temporary workspaces/ laydown areas, vegetation removal, and heavy machinery/ traffic.</p> <p>The location of the proposed construction activities suggests the possible demolition/ destruction of the farmhouse, barn foundation ruins, mature vegetation, and fieldstone wall, which will result in a change in land use and permanent removal of all potential CHVI and heritage attributes identified for the property (major direct impact).</p> <p>Given the possible demolition/ destruction of the property's heritage attributes, indirect impacts from vibration, fugitive dust emissions and shadows have not been assessed.</p> <p>While the isolation of the property's potential heritage attributes from the surrounding neighbourhood is not expected (as no known connection between the property and nearby structures or features were identified), the isolation of the potential heritage attributes within the property is expected as the possible demolition/ destruction will remove the connection between the BHRs and landscape features identified as heritage attributes.</p> <p>Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas is not expected as no significant views or vista were identified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ A major direct impact is anticipated for this property. To inform the impact assessment and offer focused mitigation recommendations, a preliminary heritage evaluation was completed to identify the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes (see APPENDIX C). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Based on the results of the preliminary heritage evaluation the portion of the property mapped on Figure 10 contains cultural heritage value. As a result: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Prior to any site alteration or extraction within these areas, a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) shall be required. The HIA should include a full evaluation of the property using the criteria prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06, provide a Statement of CHVI with list of heritage attributes, identify all direct and indirect impacts, and recommend site-specific mitigation measures to ensure the CHVI and heritage attributes of the property are conserved in accordance with provincial requirements; ■ Until the site-specific mitigation measures of the HIA are implemented a construction buffer shall be established to reduce the risk of accidental damage from vehicles, heavy equipment operation, or other activities of the mineral aggregate operation. The area of cultural heritage potential includes a 50 m construction buffer. This construction buffer shall be demarcated with temporary fencing and clearly marked as a "no-go-zone"; ■ Until the site-specific mitigation measures of the HIA are implemented the licensee shall implement the recommendations of the blast impact

Address or Location and Heritage Status	Analysis of Impact to Identified Cultural Heritage Resources	Conservation/ Mitigation Measures	Consideration of Alternatives
			<p>assessment related to the areas of cultural heritage potential to ensure the structural integrity of the built heritage resources are maintained; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Until the site-specific mitigation measures of the HIA are implemented, if the property is vacated a qualified specialist shall develop a mothball plan for the property to conserve its heritage attributes during the vacancy period.
<p>18667 Mississauga Road Listed (not designated) on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i></p>	<p>The proposed extraction area will encompass the majority of the property parcel and is anticipated to directly impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes which are linked to its BHRs (i.e., the farmhouse, barn complex, outbuilding no. 1, and fieldstone walls) and mature treelines.</p> <p>The proposed extraction area encompasses the farmhouse, complex, outbuilding no. 1, mature treelines, and fieldstone walls. Proposed construction activities will include extraction (blasting) as well as the possible use of temporary workspaces/ laydown areas, vegetation removal, and heavy machinery/ traffic.</p> <p>The location of the proposed construction activities suggests the possible demolition/ destruction of the farmhouse, barn complex, outbuilding no. 1, mature treelines, and fieldstone walls, which will result in permanent removal of all potential CHVI and heritage attributes identified for the property (major direct impact).</p> <p>Given the possible demolition/ destruction of the BHRs on the property, indirect impacts from vibration, fugitive dust emissions and shadows have not been assessed.</p> <p>While the isolation of the property's potential heritage attributes from the surrounding neighbourhood is not expected (as no known connection between the property and nearby structures or features were identified), the isolation of the potential heritage attributes within the property is expected as the possible demolition/ destruction will remove the connection between the BHRs and landscape features identified as heritage attributes.</p> <p>Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas is not expected as no significant views or vista were identified.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A major direct impact is anticipated for this property. To inform the impact assessment and offer focused mitigation recommendations, a preliminary heritage evaluation was completed to identify the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes (see APPENDIX C). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the results of the preliminary heritage evaluation the portion of the property mapped on Figure 10 contains cultural heritage value. As a result: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prior to any site alteration or extraction within these areas, a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) shall be required. The HIA should include a full evaluation of the property using the criteria prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06, provide a Statement of CHVI with list of heritage attributes, identify all direct and indirect impacts, and recommend site-specific mitigation measures to ensure the CHVI and heritage attributes of the property are conserved in accordance with provincial requirements; Until the site-specific mitigation measures of the HIA are implemented a construction buffer shall be established to reduce the risk of accidental damage from vehicles, heavy equipment operation, or other activities of the mineral aggregate operation. The area of cultural heritage potential includes a 50 m construction buffer. This construction buffer shall be demarcated with temporary fencing and clearly marked as a "no-go-zone"; Until the site-specific mitigation measures of the HIA are implemented the licensee shall implement the recommendations of the blast impact assessment related to the areas of cultural heritage potential to ensure the

Address or Location and Heritage Status	Analysis of Impact to Identified Cultural Heritage Resources	Conservation/ Mitigation Measures	Consideration of Alternatives
			<p>structural integrity of the built heritage resources are maintained; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Until the site-specific mitigation measures of the HIA are implemented, if the property is vacated a qualified specialist shall develop a mothball plan for the property to conserve its heritage attributes during the vacancy period.
<p>18682 Mississauga Road Property of potential CHVI</p>	<p>The proposed extraction area will be in the property parcel directly adjacent to the property but is not anticipated to directly or indirectly impact the property, nor adversely affect the property’s potential CHVI and heritage attributes, which are linked to its BHR (i.e., the farmhouse), treelined laneway, and surrounding agricultural fields.</p> <p>The proposed extraction area, of which the proposed construction activities include extraction (blasting) as well as the possible use of temporary workspaces/ laydown areas, vegetation removal, and heavy machinery/ traffic, is approximately 150 m northeast of the BHR but only 50 m northeast of the agricultural fields and treelined laneway.</p> <p>Vibration during the proposed construction activities is not anticipated to impact the property’s potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the BHR is not within the 60 m zone suggested for vibration monitoring (Carmen <i>et al.</i> 2012: 31). While within the 60-m zone, it is not anticipated that the treelined laneway or agricultural fields would be susceptible to vibration.</p> <p>Similarly, fugitive dust emissions from the proposed construction activities are not anticipated to impact the property’s potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the BHR is approximately 150 m away from these activities.</p> <p>Shadows from the proposed construction activities are also not anticipated to impact the property’s potential CHVI and heritage attributes because once again the BHR is approximately 150 m away from these activities and, furthermore, there are no upstanding features proposed.</p> <p>Isolation of the property’s potential heritage attributes due to the proposed construction activities is not expected as the activities are 150 m away from the BHR and will not disrupt its connection with the treelined laneway or surrounding agricultural fields.</p> <p>Finally, direct, or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas due to the proposed construction activities is not expected as no significant views or vistas were identified for the property.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As no direct or indirect impacts are anticipated, no further cultural heritage study or mitigation is recommended. If design alterations or conditions require adjacent excavation or construction to extend into the property, a CHER is required. If required, the CHER should confirm if the property meets the criteria prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06. If the CHER determines the property has CHVI, conduct an HIA during detailed design to determine the appropriate mitigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As no impacts to the BHR, treelined laneway or surrounding agricultural fields are anticipated, no alternatives have been considered.
<p>18501 Mississauga Road Listed (not designated) on the Town of Caledon’s <i>Heritage Register</i></p>	<p>The proposed extraction area will encompass the majority of the property parcel, and is anticipated to directly impact the property, potentially adversely affecting the property’s potential CHVI and heritage attributes which are linked to its BHRs (i.e., the farmhouse, two barns, and mature vegetative windbreak).</p> <p>The proposed extraction area encompasses the area of the farmhouse, two barns, and mature vegetative windbreak. The proposed construction activities will include extraction (blasting) as well as the possible use of temporary workspaces/ laydown areas, vegetation removal, and heavy machinery/ traffic.</p> <p>The location of the proposed construction activities suggests the possible demolition/ destruction of the farmhouse, two barns, and mature vegetative windbreak, which will result in a change in land use and permanent removal of all potential CHVI and heritage attributes identified for the property (major direct impact).</p> <p>Given the possible demolition/ destruction of the BHRs on the property, indirect impacts from vibration, fugitive dust emissions and shadows have not been assessed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A major direct impact is anticipated for this property. To inform the impact assessment and offer focused mitigation recommendations, a preliminary heritage evaluation was completed to identify the property’s potential CHVI and heritage attributes (see APPENDIX C). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on the results of the preliminary heritage evaluation the portion of the property mapped on Figure 10 contains cultural heritage value. As a result: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prior to any site alteration or extraction within these areas, a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) shall be required. The HIA should include a full evaluation of the property using the criteria prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06, provide a Statement of CHVI with list of heritage attributes, identify all direct and indirect

Address or Location and Heritage Status	Analysis of Impact to Identified Cultural Heritage Resources	Conservation/ Mitigation Measures	Consideration of Alternatives
	<p>While the isolation of the property’s potential heritage attributes from the surrounding neighbourhood is not expected (as no known connection between the property and nearby structures or features were identified), the isolation of the potential heritage attributes within the property is expected as the possible demolition/ destruction will remove the connection between the BHRs and landscape features identified as heritage attributes.</p> <p>Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas is not expected as no significant views or vista were identified.</p>		<p>impacts, and recommend site-specific mitigation measures to ensure the CHVI and heritage attributes of the property are conserved in accordance with provincial requirements;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Until the site-specific mitigation measures of the HIA are implemented a construction buffer shall be established to reduce the risk of accidental damage from vehicles, heavy equipment operation, or other activities of the mineral aggregate operation. The area of cultural heritage potential includes a 50 m construction buffer. This construction buffer shall be demarcated with temporary fencing and clearly marked as a "no-go-zone"; ■ Until the site-specific mitigation measures of the HIA are implemented the licensee shall implement the recommendations of the blast impact assessment related to the areas of cultural heritage potential to ensure the structural integrity of the built heritage resources are maintained; and ■ Until the site-specific mitigation measures of the HIA are implemented, if the property is vacated a qualified specialist shall develop a mothball plan for the property to conserve its heritage attributes during the vacancy period.
<p>48 William Street East Listed (not designated) on the Town of Caledon’s <i>Heritage Register</i></p>	<p>The proposed extraction area will be in the property parcel directly adjacent to the property but is not anticipated to directly or indirectly impact the property, nor adversely affect the property’s potential CHVI and heritage attributes, which are linked to its BHR (i.e., the former church) and surrounding village lot.</p> <p>The proposed extraction area, of which the proposed construction activities include extraction (blasting) as well as the possible use of temporary workspaces/ laydown areas, vegetation removal, and heavy machinery/ traffic, is approximately 270 m northwest of the BHR and 196 m northwest of the surrounding village lot.</p> <p>Vibration during the proposed construction activities is not anticipated to impact the property’s potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the BHR is not within the 60 m zone suggested for vibration monitoring (Carmen <i>et al.</i> 2012: 31).</p> <p>Similarly, fugitive dust emissions from the proposed construction activities are not anticipated to impact the property’s potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the BHR is approximately 270 m away from these activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As no direct or indirect impacts are anticipated, no further cultural heritage study or mitigation is recommended. ■ If design alterations or conditions require adjacent excavation or construction to extend into the property, a CHER is required. If required, the CHER should confirm if the property meets the criteria prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06. ■ If the CHER determines the property has CHVI, conduct an HIA during detailed design to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As no impacts to the BHR and surrounding village lot are anticipated, no alternatives have been considered.


Address or Location and Heritage Status	Analysis of Impact to Identified Cultural Heritage Resources	Conservation/ Mitigation Measures	Consideration of Alternatives
	<p>Shadows from the proposed construction activities are also not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because once again the BHR is approximately 270 m away from these activities and, furthermore, there are no upstanding features proposed.</p> <p>Isolation of the property's potential heritage attributes due to the proposed construction activities is not expected as the activities are 270 m away from the BHR and will not disrupt its connection with the surrounding village lot.</p> <p>Finally, direct, or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas due to the proposed construction activities is not expected as no significant views or vistas were identified for the property.</p>	<p>determine the appropriate mitigation.</p>	
<p>71 William Street East Identified on the Town of Caledon's <i>BHRI of Pre-1946 Structures</i></p>	<p>The proposed extraction area will be in the property parcel directly adjacent to the property (opposite William Street East) but is not anticipated to directly or indirectly impact the property, nor adversely affect the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes, which are linked to its surrounding village lot.</p> <p>The proposed extraction area, of which the proposed construction activities include extraction (blasting) as well as the possible use of temporary workspaces/ laydown areas, vegetation removal, and heavy machinery/ traffic, is approximately 327 m northwest of the village lot.</p> <p>Vibration during the proposed construction activities is not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because no BHRs are within the 60 m zone suggested for vibration monitoring (Carmen <i>et al.</i> 2012: 31).</p> <p>Similarly, fugitive dust emissions from the proposed construction activities are not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the village lot is approximately 327 m away from these activities.</p> <p>Shadows from the proposed construction activities are also not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because once again the village lot is approximately 327 m away from these activities and, furthermore, there are no upstanding features proposed.</p> <p>Isolation of the property's potential heritage attributes due to the proposed construction activities is not expected as the activities are 327 m away from the village lot and will not disrupt its connection with the surrounding original village lots, lanes, or structures.</p> <p>Finally, direct, or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas due to the proposed construction activities is not expected as no significant views or vistas were identified for the property.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As no direct or indirect impacts are anticipated, no further cultural heritage study or mitigation is recommended. ■ If design alterations or conditions require adjacent excavation or construction to extend into the property, a CHER is required. If required, the CHER should confirm if the property meets the criteria prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06. ■ If the CHER determines the property has CHVI, conduct an HIA during detailed design to determine the appropriate mitigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As no impacts to the surrounding village lot are anticipated, no alternatives have been considered.
<p>77 William Street East Identified on the Town of Caledon's <i>BHRI of Pre-1946 Structures</i></p>	<p>The proposed extraction area will be in the property parcel directly adjacent to the property (opposite William Street East) but is not anticipated to impact the property directly or indirectly, nor adversely affect the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes, which are linked to its BHR (i.e., frame/ log house) and surrounding village lot.</p> <p>The proposed extraction area, of which the proposed construction activities include extraction (blasting) as well as the possible use of temporary workspaces/ laydown areas, vegetation removal, and heavy machinery/ traffic, is approximately 350 m northwest of the BHR and 327 m northwest of the village lot.</p> <p>Vibration during the proposed construction activities is not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the BHR is not within the 60 m zone suggested for vibration monitoring (Carmen <i>et al.</i> 2012: 31).</p> <p>Similarly, fugitive dust emissions from the proposed construction activities are not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the BHR and village lot are approximately 327 to 350 m away from these activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As no direct or indirect impacts are anticipated, no further cultural heritage study or mitigation is recommended. ■ If design alterations or conditions require adjacent excavation or construction to extend into the property, a CHER is required. If required, the CHER should confirm if the property meets the criteria prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06. ■ If the CHER determines the property has CHVI, conduct an HIA during detailed design to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As no impacts to the BHR and surrounding village lot are anticipated, no alternatives have been considered.

Address or Location and Heritage Status	Analysis of Impact to Identified Cultural Heritage Resources	Conservation/ Mitigation Measures	Consideration of Alternatives
	<p>Shadows from the proposed construction activities are also not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because once again the BHR and village lot are approximately 327 to 350 m away from these activities and, furthermore, there are no upstanding features proposed.</p> <p>Isolation of the property's potential heritage attributes due to the proposed construction activities is not expected as the activities are 327 to 350 m away from the BHR and village lot and will not disrupt their connection with each other, nor with the surrounding original village lots, lanes, and structures.</p> <p>Finally, direct, or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas due to the proposed construction activities is not expected as no significant views or vistas were identified for the property.</p>	<p>determine the appropriate mitigation.</p>	
<p>89 William Street East Identified on the Town of Caledon's <i>BHRI of Pre-1946 Structures</i></p>	<p>The proposed extraction area will be in the property parcel directly adjacent to the property (opposite William Street East) but is not anticipated to impact the property directly or indirectly, nor adversely affect the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes, which are linked to its BHR (i.e., frame/ log house) and surrounding village lot.</p> <p>The proposed extraction area, of which the proposed construction activities include extraction (blasting) as well as the possible use of temporary workspaces/ laydown areas, vegetation removal, and heavy machinery/ traffic, is approximately 348 m northwest of the BHR and 327 m northwest of the village lot.</p> <p>Vibration during the proposed construction activities is not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the BHR is not within the 60-m zone suggested for vibration monitoring (Carmen <i>et al.</i> 2012: 31).</p> <p>Similarly, fugitive dust emissions from the proposed construction activities are not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the BHR and village lot are approximately 327 to 348 m away from these activities.</p> <p>Shadows from the proposed construction activities are also not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because once again the BHR and village lot are approximately 327 to 348 m away from these activities and, furthermore, there are no upstanding features proposed.</p> <p>Isolation of the property's potential heritage attributes due to the proposed construction activities is not expected as the activities are 327 to 348 m away from the BHR and village lot and will not disrupt their connection with each other, nor with the surrounding original village lots, lanes, and structures.</p> <p>Finally, direct, or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas due to the proposed construction activities is not expected as no significant views or vistas were identified for the property.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As no direct or indirect impacts are anticipated, no further cultural heritage study or mitigation is recommended. ■ If design alterations or conditions require adjacent excavation or construction to extend into the property, a CHER is required. If required, the CHER should confirm if the property meets the criteria prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06. ■ If the CHER determines the property has CHVI, conduct an HIA during detailed design to determine the appropriate mitigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As no impacts to the BHR and surrounding village lot are anticipated, no alternatives have been considered.
<p>1055 Charleston Sideroad Identified on the Town of Caledon's <i>BHRI of Pre-1946 Structures</i></p>	<p>The proposed extraction area will encompass the majority of the property parcel, and is anticipated to directly impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes which are linked to its BHR (i.e., the foundation remnants) and mature treelines.</p> <p>The proposed extraction area encompasses the area of the foundation remnants and mature treelines, Proposed construction activities include extraction (blasting) as well as the possible use of temporary workspaces/ laydown areas, vegetation removal, and heavy machinery/ traffic.</p> <p>The location of the proposed construction activities suggests the possible demolition/ destruction of the foundation remnants and mature treelines which will result in a change in land use and permanent removal of all potential CHVI and heritage attributes identified for the property (major direct impact).</p> <p>Given the possible demolition/ destruction of the BHR on the property, indirect impacts from vibration, fugitive dust emissions and shadows have not been assessed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ A major direct impact is anticipated for this property. To inform the impact assessment and offer focused mitigation recommendations, a preliminary heritage evaluation was completed to identify the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes (see APPENDIX C). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Based on the results of the preliminary heritage evaluation the portion of the property mapped on Figure 10 contains cultural heritage value. As a result: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Prior to any site alteration or extraction within these areas, a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) shall be required. The HIA should include a full evaluation of the property using the criteria prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06, provide a Statement of CHVI with list of heritage attributes, identify all direct and indirect impacts, and recommend site-specific

Address or Location and Heritage Status	Analysis of Impact to Identified Cultural Heritage Resources	Conservation/ Mitigation Measures	Consideration of Alternatives
	<p>While the isolation of the property’s potential heritage attributes from the surrounding neighbourhood is not expected (as no known connection between the property and nearby structures or features were identified), the isolation of the potential heritage attributes within the property is expected as the possible demolition/ destruction will remove the connection between the BHR and landscape features identified as heritage attributes.</p> <p>Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas is not expected as no significant views or vista were identified.</p>		<p>mitigation measures to ensure the CHVI and heritage attributes of the property are conserved in accordance with provincial requirements;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Until the site-specific mitigation measures of the HIA are implemented a construction buffer shall be established to reduce the risk of accidental damage from vehicles, heavy equipment operation, or other activities of the mineral aggregate operation. The area of cultural heritage potential includes a 50 m construction buffer. This construction buffer shall be demarcated with temporary fencing and clearly marked as a "no-go-zone"; ■ Until the site-specific mitigation measures of the HIA are implemented the licensee shall implement the recommendations of the blast impact assessment related to the areas of cultural heritage potential to ensure the structural integrity of the built heritage resources are maintained; and ■ Until the site-specific mitigation measures of the HIA are implemented, if the property is vacated a qualified specialist shall develop a mothball plan for the property to conserve its heritage attributes during the vacancy period.
<p>18309 Mississauga Road Property of potential CHVI</p>	<p>The proposed extraction area will be located in the property parcel directly adjacent to the property but is not anticipated to directly or indirectly impact the property, nor adversely affect the property’s potential CHVI and heritage attributes, which are linked to its BHR (i.e., the log house).</p> <p>The proposed extraction area, of which the proposed construction activities include extraction (blasting) as well as the possible use of temporary workspaces/ laydown areas, vegetation removal, and heavy machinery/ traffic, is approximately 82 m southeast, 92 m northwest and 168 m northeast of the BHR.</p> <p>Vibration during the proposed construction activities is not anticipated to impact the property’s potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the BHR is not within the 60-m zone suggested for vibration monitoring (Carmen <i>et al.</i> 2012: 31).</p> <p>Similarly, fugitive dust emissions from the proposed construction activities are not anticipated to impact the property’s potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the BHR is approximately 82 to 168 m away from these activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As no direct or indirect impacts are anticipated, no further cultural heritage study or mitigation is recommended. ■ If design alterations or conditions require adjacent excavation or construction to extend into the property, a CHER is required. If required, the CHER should confirm if the property meets the criteria prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06. ■ If the CHER determines the property has CHVI, conduct an HIA during detailed design to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As no impacts to the BHR are anticipated, no alternatives have been considered.

Address or Location and Heritage Status	Analysis of Impact to Identified Cultural Heritage Resources	Conservation/ Mitigation Measures	Consideration of Alternatives
	<p>Shadows from the proposed construction activities are also not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because once again the BHR is approximately 82 to 168 m away from these activities and, furthermore, there are no upstanding features proposed.</p> <p>Isolation of the property's potential heritage attributes due to the proposed construction activities is not expected as the activities are approximately 82 to 168 m away from the BHR.</p> <p>Finally, direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas due to the proposed construction activities is not expected as no significant views or vistas were identified for the property.</p>	<p>determine the appropriate mitigation.</p>	
<p>18205 Mississauga Road Identified on the Town of Caledon's <i>BHRI of Pre-1946 Structures</i></p>	<p>The proposed extraction area will be located in the property parcel directly adjacent to the property but is not anticipated to directly or indirectly impact the property, nor adversely affect the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes, which are linked to its BHR (i.e., the log house).</p> <p>The proposed extraction area, of which the proposed construction activities include extraction (blasting) as well as the possible use of temporary workspaces/ laydown areas, vegetation removal, and heavy machinery/ traffic, is approximately 96 m northwest and 132 m northeast of the BHR.</p> <p>Vibration during the proposed construction activities is not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the BHR is not within the 60-m zone suggested for vibration monitoring (Carmen <i>et al.</i> 2012: 31).</p> <p>Similarly, fugitive dust emissions from the proposed construction activities are not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the BHR is approximately 96 to 132 m away from these activities.</p> <p>Shadows from the proposed construction activities are also not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because once again the BHR is approximately 96 to 132 m away from these activities and, furthermore, there are no upstanding features proposed.</p> <p>Isolation of the property's potential heritage attributes due to the proposed construction activities is not expected as the activities are approximately 96 to 132 m away from the BHR.</p> <p>Finally, direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas due to the proposed construction activities is not expected as no significant views or vistas were identified for the property.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As no direct or indirect impacts are anticipated, no further cultural heritage study or mitigation is recommended. ■ If design alterations or conditions require adjacent excavation or construction to extend into the property, a CHER is required. If required, the CHER should confirm if the property meets the criteria prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06. ■ If the CHER determines the property has CHVI, conduct an HIA during detailed design to determine the appropriate mitigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As no impacts to the BHR are anticipated, no alternatives have been considered.
<p>833 Charleston Sideroad Listed (not designated) on the Town of Caledon's <i>Heritage Register</i></p>	<p>The proposed extraction area will be in the property parcel directly adjacent to the property but is not anticipated to impact the property directly or indirectly, nor adversely affect the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes, which are linked to its BHRs (i.e., the late Neoclassical style farmhouse and timber frame barn) and surrounding agricultural fields.</p> <p>The proposed extraction area, of which the proposed construction activities include extraction (blasting) as well as the possible use of temporary workspaces/ laydown areas, vegetation removal, and heavy machinery/ traffic, is approximately 462 m northeast of the farmhouse and 410 m northeast of the barn, but only 52 m northeast of the agricultural fields.</p> <p>Vibration during the proposed construction activities is not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the BHRs are not within the 60 m zone suggested for vibration monitoring (Carmen <i>et al.</i> 2012: 31). While within the 60-m zone, it is not anticipated that the agricultural fields would be susceptible to vibration.</p> <p>Similarly, fugitive dust emissions from the proposed construction activities are not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because the BHRs are approximately 410 to 462 m away from these activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As no direct or indirect impacts are anticipated, no further cultural heritage study or mitigation is recommended. ■ If design alterations or conditions require adjacent excavation or construction to extend into the property, a CHER is required. If required, the CHER should confirm if the property meets the criteria prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06. ■ If the CHER determines the property has CHVI, conduct an HIA during detailed design to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As no impacts to the BHRs and surrounding agricultural fields are anticipated, no alternatives have been considered.

Address or Location and Heritage Status	Analysis of Impact to Identified Cultural Heritage Resources	Conservation/ Mitigation Measures	Consideration of Alternatives
	<p>Shadows from the proposed construction activities are also not anticipated to impact the property's potential CHVI and heritage attributes because once again the BHRs are approximately 410 to 462 m away from these activities and, furthermore, there are no upstanding features proposed.</p> <p>Isolation of the property's potential heritage attributes due to the proposed construction activities is not expected as the activities are approximately 410 to 462 m away from the BHRs and will not disrupt their connection with each other, nor with the surrounding agricultural fields.</p> <p>Finally, direct, or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas due to the proposed construction activities is not expected as no significant views or vistas were identified for the property.</p>	<p>determine the appropriate mitigation.</p>	



- LEGEND**
- TOWN/VILLAGE
 - ROAD
 - RAILWAY
 - WATERCOURSE
 - WATERBODY
 - LICENCE BOUNDARY
 - LIMIT OF EXTRACTION
 - 50 m BUFFER



- REFERENCE(S)**
1. BASEDATA MNRF LIO OBTAINED APRIL 2019
 2. WATERCOURSES OBTAINED FROM CREDIT VALLEY CONSERVATION AUTHORITY OPEN DATA PORTAL, NOVEMBER 2022 IN COMBINATION WITH SITE WATERCOURSE SURVEY PROVIDED BY FIRST BASE SOLUTIONS NOVEMBER 2021.
 3. IMAGERY FIRSTBASE SOLUTIONS SPRING 2019 (15CM RESOLUTION) AND SOURCES: ESRI, HERE, GARMIN, INTERMAP, INCREMENT P CORP., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GEOBASE, IGN, KADASTER NL, ORDANCE SURVEY, ESRI JAPAN, METI, ESRI CHINA (HONG KONG), (C) OPENSTREETMAP CONTRIBUTORS, AND THE GIS USER COMMUNITY SOURCE: ESRI, MAXAR, EARTHSTAR GEOGRAPHICS, AND THE GIS USER COMMUNITY
 4. LICENSE AND EXTRACTION LIMIT PROVIDED BY MHBC IN JUNE 2023.
 5. PROJECTION: TRANSVERSE MERCATOR DATUM: NAD 83 COORDINATE SYSTEM: UTM ZONE 17N

CLIENT
CBM AGGREGATES, A DIVISION OF ST. MARYS CEMENT INC. (CANADA)

PROJECT
CALEDON PIT / QUARRY

TITLE
CULTURAL HERITAGE 50 M CONSTRUCTION BUFFER

CONSULTANT	YYYY-MM-DD	2023-07-19
GOLDER MEMBER OF WSP	DESIGNED	SO
	PREPARED	SO
	REVIEWED	JK
	APPROVED	HM

PROJECT NO.	CONTROL	REV.	FIGURE
19129150	0040	0.0	10

PATH: S:\Client\Volunteer\CA_Caledon\Long_Pit_5_Caledon\09_PRCO\19129150\00_PRCO\19129150\00_40_0010.mxd PRINTED ON: 2023-07-19 AT: 12:08:51 AM

IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM: ANSI B

6.3 Traffic Impacts

In accordance with the Town of Caledon *Official Plan*, this section includes an evaluation of cultural heritage resources in so far as they relate to roads not identified pursuant to section 5.11.2.5.1. APPENDIX B includes an illustration of the traffic impacts of the proposed quarry provided by TYLin as part of the Traffic Study. This study shows:

- 5% of heavy vehicle traffic will travel from the primary site access road west along Charleston Sideroad.
- 95% of heavy vehicle traffic will travel east along Charleston sideroad towards Hurontario Street (with 90% travelling south and 5% travelling north on Hurontario Street)
- Car traffic will travel primarily to the east of the primary site access, with approximately 65-70% inbound from Highway 10, and 60-80% outbound to Highway 10, depending on time of day/week
- 15-27% of car traffic will arrive and depart on Charleston Sideroad to the west
- 7-20% of car traffic - inbound and outbound - will travel on Mississauga Road, the majority of that being south of Charleston Sideroad, and a small minority being north
- A minority of all car traffic (1-2%) will travel along Regional Road 136

Pursuant to Section 5.11.2.5.1. of the Town of Caledon *Official Plan* (Schedule J), Hurontario Street (Highway 10), the affected portions of Charleston Sideroad, and Regional Road 136 are High-Capacity Arterials, and no impact assessment is required with respect to traffic on those roads.

Mississauga Road is the only road that is not identified pursuant to 5.11.2.5.1. Given that the traffic impacts to Mississauga Road will be a minority of the inbound (9-20%) and outbound (7-8%) car traffic, and none of the heavy vehicle traffic, there will be no resulting impacts to any identified cultural heritage resources.

7.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on this Cultural Heritage Report, it is concluded that:

- Surrounding cultural heritage landscapes and built heritage resources will not be impacted by the proposed Caledon Pit/Quarry;
- The majority of the proposed Caledon Pit/Quarry does not include significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes;
- Portions of the following listed (not designated) or inventoried heritage properties are located within the proposed Caledon Pit/Quarry and contain cultural heritage potential: 18722 Main Street, 1055 Charleston Sideroad, 1420 Charleston Sideroad, 18501 Mississauga Road, and 18667 Mississauga Road;
- These areas have been identified on Figure 11 of the Cultural Heritage Assessment and the Aggregate Resources Act Site Plans and no site alteration or development is permitted until a Heritage Impact Assessment is completed. The HIA should include a full evaluation of the property using the criteria prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06, provide a Statement of CHVI with list of heritage attributes, identify all direct and indirect impacts, and recommend site-specific mitigation measures to ensure the CHVI and heritage attributes of the property are conserved in accordance with provincial requirements.
- Based on the recommendations of this report significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage resources are conserved.

Based on this Cultural Heritage Report the following technical recommendations shall be included in the Aggregate Resources Act Site Plans for the proposed Caledon Pit / Quarry:

- The area of cultural heritage potential as mapped on Figure 11 shall be identified on the Aggregate Resources Act Site Plans. This includes portions of the properties located at 18722 Main Street, 1055 Charleston Sideroad, 1420 Charleston Sideroad, 18501 Mississauga Road, and 18667 Mississauga Road;
- Prior to any site alteration or extraction within these areas, a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) shall be required. The HIA should include a full evaluation of the property using the criteria prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06, provide a Statement of CHVI with list of heritage attributes, identify all direct and indirect impacts, and recommend site-specific mitigation measures to ensure the CHVI and heritage attributes of the property are conserved in accordance with provincial requirements;
- Until the site-specific mitigation measures of the HIA are implemented a construction buffer shall be established to reduce the risk of accidental damage from vehicles, heavy equipment operation, or other activities of the mineral aggregate operation. The area of cultural heritage potential includes a 50 m construction buffer. This construction buffer shall be demarcated with temporary fencing and clearly marked as a “no-go-zone”;
- Until the site-specific mitigation measures of the HIA are implemented the licensee shall implement the recommendations of the blast impact assessment related to the areas of cultural heritage potential to ensure the structural integrity of the built heritage resources are maintained; and
- Until the site-specific mitigation measures of the HIA are implemented, if the property is vacated a qualified specialist shall develop a mothball plan for the property to conserve its heritage attributes during the vacancy period.

8.0 REFERENCES

- Blumenson, John. 1990. Ontario Architecture: A Guide to Styles and Building Terms, 1784 to Present. Fitzhenry & Whiteside, Toronto.
- Bond, Stephen and Worthing, Derek. 2016. Managing Built Heritage: The Role of Cultural Values and Significance. Second Edition. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester.
- Canadian Atlas Online, The. 2015. "Mixedwood Plains Ecozone." Electronic document:
http://www.canadiangeographic.ca/atlas/themes.aspx?id=mixedwood&sub=mixedwood_basics_ecozones
. Last accessed: March 11, 2019.
- Canada's Historic Places. 2010. Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada. Second Edition. Canada's Historic Places, Ottawa.
- Carmen, Richard A., Buehler, David, Mikesell, Stephen, and Carolyn L. Searls. 2012. Current Practices to Address Construction Vibration and Potential Effects to Historic Buildings Adjacent to Transportation Projects. Wilson, Ihrig and Associates, ICF International, and Simpson, Gumpertz and Heger, Incorporated for the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), Washington, DC.
- Chapman, Lyman John and Donald F. Putnam. 1984. The Physiography of Southern Ontario. 3rd edition. Ontario Geological Survey Special Volume 2. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Toronto.
- Credit Valley Conservation. 2022. Credit Valley Watershed – Key Facts. [online] Accessed at: <https://cvc.ca/our-watershed/?msclkid=16b41333bb221ecae743e1505df479a>
- Find a Grave. n.d. Alton Cemetery, Alton, Peel Regional Municipality, Ontario, Canada. Find a Grave: Lehi, Utah, 2022. Online Resource. Accessed August 22, 2022:
<https://www.findagrave.com/cemetery/2529671/alton-cemetery>
- Gentilcore, R. Louis and Kate Donkin. 1973. Land surveys of southern Ontario: an introduction and index to the field notebooks of the Ontario land surveyors 1784-1859. Cartographica Monograph No. 8. BV Gutsell. Department of Geography, York University, Toronto.
- Golder Associates Ltd. (Golder). 2021 (draft). Cultural Heritage Screening Report – Proposed Caledon Quarry Licence Application. Report on file, Golder Associates Ltd., London, Ontario.
- 2022a (draft). Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment, Proposed Caledon Quarry, Part of Lots 15 to 17, Concession 4 WCR, and Lot 16, Concession 3 WCR, Former Township of Caledon, County of Peel, now the Town of Caledon, Peel Region, Ontario. Report on file, Golder Associates Ltd., London, Ontario.
- 2022b (draft). Natural Environment Report: Proposed Caledon Quarry. Report on file, Golder Associates Ltd., Mississauga, Ontario.
- Government of Ontario. 2020. Provincial Policy Statement (2020). Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Toronto. [online]. Accessed: <https://www.ontario.ca/page/provincial-policy-statement-2020>
2017. Technical Bulletin: management approaches or industrial fugitive dust sources. Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks, Toronto. [online]. Accessed:
<https://www.ontario.ca/page/technical-bulletin-management-approaches-industrial-fugitive-dust-sources>

2014. Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties. Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism, Toronto.

2007. InfoSheet: Eight Guiding Principles in the Conservation of Built Heritage Properties. Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism, Queen's Printer for Ontario.

1990. Environmental Assessment Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. E.18. [online] Accessed at: <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90e18>

1990. The Planning Act R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13. [online]. Accessed: <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90p13>

1990. Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18. [online]. Accessed: <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90o18>

Home to Home Inspections Ltd. 2022. Home Inspection Report, 1420 Charleston Sdrd, Alton, Ontario, L7K 1N1. On file with report author.

Historic Scotland. 1999. Historic Landuse Assessment. Historic Scotland, Edinburgh.

Hubka, Thomas C. 2013. Houses without Names: Architectural Nomenclature and the Classification of America's Common Houses. University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) Australia. 2013. Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance, The Burra Charter. Accessed online, January 2020: <https://australia.icomos.org/publications/charters/>

International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) Canada. 1983. Appleton Charter for the Protection and Enhancement of the Built Environment. ICOMOS Canada, Ottawa.

Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC). 2011. A History of Treaty-Making in Canada. [online] Accessed at: <https://www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1314977704533/1314977734895>

Lynch, John. 1874. Directory of the County of Peel for 1873-74. Brampton ON: Brampton Progress Chromatic Print House. [online] Accessed: <https://static.torontopubliclibrary.ca/da/pdfs/37131055372924d.pdf>

McGill University. n.d. County Atlas Project: Russel County Map. [online] Accessed at: <https://digital.library.mcgill.ca/Countyatlas/searchmapframes.php>

Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM). 2015. Criteria for Evaluating Potential for Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes: A Checklist for the Non-Specialist. Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism, Toronto.

2006. Ontario Heritage Tool Kit: Heritage Property Evaluation – A Guide to Listing, Researching, and Evaluating Cultural Heritage Property in Ontario Communities. Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism, Toronto.

2006. Ontario Heritage Tool Kit: Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process. Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism, Toronto.

2006. Ontario Heritage Tool Kit: Designating Heritage Properties: A Guide to Municipal Designation of Individual Properties Under the Ontario Heritage Act. Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism, Toronto.

2006. Ontario Heritage Tool Kit: Heritage Conservation Districts: A Guide to Designation Under the Ontario Heritage Act. Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism, Toronto.

1992. Guideline for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments. Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism, Toronto.

1980. Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments. Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries, Toronto.

New Zealand Transport Agency. 2015. Historic Heritage Impact Assessment Guide for State Highway Projects. New Zealand Government, Wellington.

Ontario Land Registry. n.d.(a). Peel County (43), Caledon, Book A: West Hurontario Street; Concession 4 to 6; East Hurontario Street and West Hurontario Street; Concession 1 to 6; Villages. Onland, Ontario Land Property Records Portal: Teranet Inc., 2022. Online Resource. Accessed July 17, 2022: <https://www.onland.ca/ui/>

n.d.(b). Peel County (43), Caledon, Book B. West Hurontario Street; Concession 4 to 6. Onland, Ontario Land Property Records Portal: Teranet Inc., 2022. Online Resource. Accessed July 17, 2022: <https://www.onland.ca/ui/>

n.d.(c). Peel County (43), Caledon; Concession 4, West Hurontario Street. Onland, Ontario Land Property Records Portal: Teranet Inc., 2022. Online Resource. Accessed July 17, 2022: <https://www.onland.ca/ui/>

Peel Art Gallery, Museum and Archives (PAMA) 2014. Heritage Property Research Guide. [online] Accessed at: <https://pama.peelregion.ca/en/pamascollection/resources/Heritage%20Property%20Research%20Guide%20-%20Draft%2019%20-%20Final.pdf>

n.d. William Perkins Bull Fonds: Family Files. Peel Art Gallery, Museum, and Archives: Brampton, Ontario.

1897. Assessment Roll: Municipality of Caledon. E. N. Delaney, Assessor. Peel Art Gallery, Museum, and Archives: Brampton, Ontario.

Parks Canada Agency. n.d. Parks Canada Directory of Federal Heritage Designations. [online] Accessed at: http://www.pc.gc.ca/apps/dfhd/search-recherche_eng.aspx

1974. Canadian Historic Sites: Occasional Papers in Archaeology and History No. 10. National Historic Parks and Sites Branch, Parks Canada, Indian and Northern Affairs, Ottawa.

1980. Canadian Inventory of Historic Building Exterior Recording Training Manual. Parks Canada, Ottawa.

Pope, J.H. 1877. Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Peel. Walker & Miles, Toronto.

Ontario Council of University Libraries. n.d. Historical Topographic Map Digitization Project: Orangeville Sheet. [online] Accessed at: <https://ocul.on.ca/topomaps/collection/>

Randl, Chad. 2001. Temporary Protection No. 3: Protecting a Historic Structure during Adjacent Construction. U.S. Department of the Interior National Parks Service Cultural Resources Tech Notes. <http://www.nps.gov/tps/how-to-preserve/tech-notes/Tech-Notes-Protection03.pdf>. Last Accessed: 20 November 2015.

Stothers, David and Richard Yarnell. 1977. An agricultural revolution in the lower Great Lakes. In Geobotany, R. C. Romans (ed.), pp. 209-232. Plenum, New York.

Town of Caledon. 2019. Terms of Reference: Heritage Impact Assessment. Caledon, Ontario.

2022. Official Plan. Caledon, Ontario.

n.d. Heritage Register. [online] Accessed at: <https://www.caledon.ca/en/living-here/heritage-designation.aspx>)

2009. Cultural Heritage Landscapes Inventory. [online] Accessed at: <https://www.caledon.ca/en/living-here/cultural-heritage-landscapes.aspx>)

Tremaine, George. 1859. Tremaine's Map of the County of Peel, Canada West. Geo. R and G.M. Tremaine, Toronto.

University of Toronto Ontario Historical County Maps Project. n.d. Peel County Map. [online] Accessed at: <https://utoronto.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=8cc6be34f6b54992b27da17467492d2f>

Votorantim Cimentos – CBM Aggregates. 2021. Proposed CBM Caledon Quarry Virtual Information Session – Project Update.

Walker, Meredith and Peter Marquis-Kyle. 2004. The Illustrated Burra Charter: Good Practice for Heritage Places. ICOMOS Australia, Burwood.

Walker and Miles. 1877. The Historical Atlas of the County of Peel, Ont. J.H. Pope, Surveyor. Walker and Miles: Toronto, 1877.

Walton, George. 1837. The City of Toronto and the Home District Commercial Directory and Register with Almanack and Calendar for 1837. T. Dalton and W.J. Coates, Toronto [online] Accessed at: <https://static.torontopubliclibrary.ca/da/pdfs/706129.pdf>

Signature Page

We trust that this report meets your current needs. If you have any questions, or if we may be of further assistance, please contact the undersigned.

Golder Associates Ltd.



Alisha Mohamed, MA

Cultural Heritage Specialist




Michael Teal, MA

Director, Archaeology and Heritage, Ontario



Johanna Kelly, MA

Cultural Heritage Specialist



Heidi Schopf, MES, CAHP

Built Heritage and Cultural Landscape Team Lead



Henry Cary, PhD, CAHP, RPA

Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist

AM/RN/MT/ca

[https://woodplc.sharepoint.com/teams/culturalheritage/shared documents/cultural heritage \(bhr and chl\) team/working files/projects/cbm caledon quarry/19129150-5700-r01-revb 13dec2022 cbm caledon quarry chr_draft.docx](https://woodplc.sharepoint.com/teams/culturalheritage/shared%20documents/cultural%20heritage%20(bhr%20and%20chl)%20team/working%20files/projects/cbm%20caledon%20quarry/19129150-5700-r01-revb%2013dec2022%20cbm%20caledon%20quarry%20chr_draft.docx)

APPENDIX A

Terms of Reference

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

DATE August 19, 2022

Project No. 19129150

TO David Hanratty, PGeo
CBM Aggregates

CC Jennifer Deleemans, Mike Lebreton

FROM Heather Melcher

EMAIL heather_melcher@golder.com

PROPOSED CBM CALEDON QUARRY TERMS OF REFERENCE – ARCHAEOLOGY AND CULTURAL HERITAGE

Golder Associates Ltd. (Golder) has been retained by CBM Aggregates (CBM), a division of St. Marys Cement Inc. (Canada) to complete archaeological and cultural heritage technical studies to accompany an application to the Ministry of Northern Development, Mines, Natural Resources and Forestry (NDMNR) for a new Class A Quarry Below Water licence under the *Aggregate Resources Act* (ARA) (project). These studies will also be used for a Planning Act approval and application for Town of Caledon Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendment. Furthermore, these studies will provide an assessment of the application taking into consideration the applicable in-effect policies contained in the relevant Provincial Plans, Region of Peel Official Plan and Town of Caledon Official Plan. The properties to be licensed are located on Charleston Sideroad and Mississauga Road, Town of Caledon, Region of Peel, Ontario (site). The site is approximately 262.4 hectares (ha) in size (Figure 1).




Figure 1: Proposed CBM Caledon Quarry Location

This Terms of Reference (TOR) includes a summary of the assessment and deliverables associated with the archaeology and cultural heritage components. Where relevant, these studies shall be shared with other technical experts completing studies for the application to avoid internal inconsistencies.

1.0 ARCHAEOLOGY

Golder will undertake a work program for the Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessments on the site, which will be the preliminary license boundary as shown in Figure 1. The site consists primarily of open cultivated fields, uncultivated land including overgrown farmland and farmstead/residential areas, and wooded areas.

The objectives of the Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessments are to evaluate the archaeological potential of the site, identify archaeological resources that may be present, and provide information from which to make recommendations regarding the need for additional archaeological work (Stage 3) for identified archaeological sites. The Stage 1 and 2 assessments will be undertaken in compliance with the requirements of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's (MTCS) 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*.

1.1 Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment

The Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment will include the following tasks as they relate to the site:

- Review of relevant archaeological, historical, and environmental literature.
- Review of an updated listing of archaeological sites from the Ontario Archaeological Sites Database (OASD) within 1 km and any previous archaeological assessments within 50 m.
- Where possible, consultation with individuals knowledgeable about the site.
- Review of topographic maps, historical settlement maps, and archaeological management plans, where available.

1.2 Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment

A Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment is intended to provide an inventory of archaeological sites present within the site. It should be completed as part of the archaeological investigation because the site is in an area of archaeological potential given the proximity of known registered archaeological sites, historical transportation routes, and water sources. Moreover, aerial imagery of the site appears to show significant undisturbed areas with sufficient integrity to contain possible archaeological resources.

Given the nature of the lands within the site, the Stage 2 assessment will consist of a combination of pedestrian survey and shovel test pit survey. It is assumed that the open lands currently being used as cultivated fields can be ploughed and can be assessed by pedestrian survey. Once ploughed, these areas should be systematically walked at 5 metre (m) intervals to map and collect artifacts found on the ground surface, as per the requirements of the MHSTCI. If artifacts are identified, then the survey should be intensified at 1 m intervals for a minimum of 20 m around the recovered artifact. To facilitate the visual identification of potential archaeological sites during the pedestrian survey, all open agricultural land within the site must be adequately ploughed to achieve a required surface visibility of at least 80%. This is best achieved through the use of a mouldboard plough followed by disc ploughing.

For uncultivated lands within the site (e.g., overgrown areas, grassy areas associated with structures), the Stage 2 assessment will be completed by hand excavating shovel test pits at 5 m intervals. The test pits should meet MHSTCI requirements and be approximately 30 cm in diameter and, where possible, and excavated 5 cm into sterile subsoil. The soil from all test pits should be screened through 6 mm wire mesh to facilitate the recovery of artifacts. Upon discovery of cultural resources, test pit intervals may be reduced to 2.5 m within 5 m of artifact-yielding test pits and one or more 1 m² test units may be excavated to ensure full capture of cultural materials revealed, and to determine whether a recommendation for a Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment is required. All test pits and test units will be backfilled upon completion.

Areas within the site with greater than 20% slope, previous disturbance, and/or are permanently wet may be documented and excluded from the Stage 2 survey as they typically have low to no archaeological potential. Large wooded areas, specifically significant woodlands, on the site can be excluded from Stage 2 survey if they will be outside of the proposed extraction area. These areas should be photo-documented for reporting purposes concurrently with the pedestrian and test pit surveys.

If artifacts are identified during the Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment, then they will be collected, their location recorded using a hand-held GPS, and then be cleaned and catalogued for analysis.

1.3 Stage 3 Archaeological Assessments

Golder will undertake Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment at archaeological sites identified within the project site that meet the criteria outlined by the MHSTCI.

The objectives of each Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment are as follows:

- To determine the extent of the archaeological site and the characteristics of the artifacts;
- To collect a representative sample of artifacts;
- To assess the cultural heritage value or interest of the archaeological site; and,
- To determine the need for mitigation of development impacts (Stage 4) and recommend appropriate strategies for mitigation and future conservation.

The Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment of each identified site will commence with the establishment of a site datum followed by test unit excavation. A Stage 3 controlled surface pick-up (CSP) may not be necessary if an intensified Stage 2 CPS survey meeting MHSTCI requirements is completed as part of the Stage 2 archaeological fieldwork.

The placement of test units at each site will follow excavation strategies outlined in the MHSTCI' *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*. All Stage 3 test units will be excavated to subsoil, at which time the subsoil will be assessed for signs of cultural features. If signs of cultural features are identified, then they will be drawn, photographed, and covered with geo-textile fabric before being backfilled to protect the features. If no cultural features are identified, then excavation will resume and continue into the first 5 cm of subsoil. All soils excavated from the test units will be screened through hardware cloth with an aperture no larger than 6 mm to facilitate the recovery of artifacts that may be present. Upon completion of Stage 3 activities, the excavated units will be backfilled, and the area returned to grade.

Recovered artifacts will be tagged in the field by their provenience and collected for subsequent washing, cataloguing and analysis.

1.4 Deliverables

A report will be prepared providing the results of the Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessments. The report will have sections outlining purpose, methodology, background research, analysis, conclusions, and recommendations for additional archaeological work (Stage 3) at identified archaeological sites, if required.

Separate Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment reports will be produced for each applicable archaeological site providing the results of the archaeological work. Each Stage 3 report will have sections outlining purpose, methodology, background research, analysis, conclusions, and recommendations as to whether additional archaeological investigation (Stage 4 mitigation) is required.

The final Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment report and each Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment report must be submitted to the MTCS for acceptance, as per the licensing requirements.

1.5 Indigenous Engagement

Indigenous engagement considers the interest of Indigenous communities in the archaeological assessment, the protection of Indigenous archaeological sites, and the disposition of Indigenous artifacts and ancestral remains. Effective engagement requires good planning and should begin early in a project.

As per archaeology licensing requirements, Indigenous communities must be engaged by a licensed archaeologist during Stage 3 assessments when assessing cultural heritage value or interest of Indigenous archaeological sites and following Stage 3 assessments when formulating a Stage 4 strategy to mitigate impacts to Indigenous archaeological sites through avoidance and protection or excavation.

It is increasingly becoming more common to engage Indigenous communities prior to the Stage 3 assessment with increasing interest from some Indigenous communities to be involved at the Stage 1 and 2 level. Given this, Golder has been working with CBM to contact interested Indigenous communities to invite them to send a Field Liaison Representatives (FLRs) for all archaeological investigations to participate in and/or observe fieldwork, to ensure their interests are considered. Golder will work with CBM to sign agreements for FLR participation, which is customarily between the communities and the proponent, in this case CBM.

2.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT

2.1 Cultural Heritage Report

Golder will undertake a work program for a Cultural Heritage Report: Existing Conditions and Preliminary Impact Assessment (CHR) to identify known and potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes within the study area, assess the potential impacts of the proposed quarry, and provide mitigation recommendations. The study area for the CHR will be all property parcels within or crossed by the preliminary limit of extraction area within the site (Figure 1) as well as all adjacent properties.

The CHR is based on the MTCS¹ *Criteria for Evaluating Potential for Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes* (2016) checklist and *Ontario Heritage Tool Kit: Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process*, as well as recognized conservation manuals such as *Canada's Historic Places Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada*. The CHR will involve the following tasks:

- Collect Background Data
 - Federal, provincial, and municipal heritage registers and inventories, and historical and topographical maps will be reviewed to identify known and potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes within the study area. Information will also be gathered from archival and published sources to understand the geographic, historical, and municipal policy context of the study area.
- Engage Stakeholders
 - Golder will contact heritage planning staff at the Town of Caledon for further information on existing conditions in the study area, and to identify any additional requirements, concerns, or issues early in the assessment.
- Undertake Field Investigation
 - A field investigation will be conducted to document known cultural heritage resources and identify potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes in the study area. All properties will be documented from publicly accessible rights-of-way. The field investigation will be aided by a vegetation plan and topographical mapping to assist in identifying cultural heritage features.
- Evaluate Potential Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes
 - Based on the research, engagement and field investigation, each potential built heritage resource and cultural heritage landscape will be identified and assessed at a preliminary level using criteria based upon *Ontario Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act*.
- Compile Inventory of Existing Conditions
 - Based on the collected information, a detailed inventory will be compiled of all known and potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes in the study area. This inventory will be shared with the Golder visual assessment team for incorporation into the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) for the Project.
- Assess Impacts
 - The proposed quarry will be assessed at a preliminary level for its potential impact on the identified (known and potential) built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes. This assessment will use the examples of direct and indirect impacts provided in the MHTSCI *Ontario Heritage Tool Kit: Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process*.

¹ Note that this ministry is currently named the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI).

- Recommend Conservation or Mitigation Strategies
 - Based on the identified potential impacts, Golder will recommend conservation or mitigation strategies to avoid or reduce adverse effects to the identified (known and potential) built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes. This may include recommending property specific Cultural Heritage Evaluation Reports (CHERs) or Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs). If any CHERs or HIAs are required for the Project, these studies will incorporate the results of other applicable studies completed for the Project (e.g., VIA, blasting/vibration impact assessment).

2.2 Deliverable

A report will be developed providing sections outlining the purpose, methodology, background research, evaluations, impact assessment, conclusions, and recommendations, including figures, as appropriate.


3.0 CLOSURE

We trust that this technical memorandum meets your current needs. Please contact Golder and CBM with any questions or comments.

Golder Associates Ltd.



Michael Teal, MA
Director, Archaeology and Heritage



Heather Melcher, MSc
Director, Ecology

HM/AR/MT/HC/mp/wlw


[https://golderassociates.sharepoint.com/sites/114392/project files/6 deliverables/terms of reference/arch-ch tor/19129150-tm-rev1-cbm caledon quarry archaeology and cultural heritage tor-19aug2022.docx](https://golderassociates.sharepoint.com/sites/114392/project%20files/6%20deliverables/terms%20of%20reference/arch-ch%20tor/19129150-tm-rev1-cbm%20caledon%20quarry%20archaeology%20and%20cultural%20heritage%20tor-19aug2022.docx)


APPENDIX B


Caledon Quarry Traffic Data


Legend
 xx A.M. Peak Hour Traffic
 (xx) P.M. Peak Hour Traffic
 {xx} Saturday Peak Hour Traffic


Figure 1
Future Total 2032
Traffic Volumes



































APPENDIX C

Preliminary Cultural Heritage Evaluations

1.0 18722 MAIN STREET

1.1 Property History

The property at 18722 Main Street is located within Lot 17, Concession 4, West of Hurontario Street (W.H.S.), in the Township of Caledon, former Peel County. This property shares a historical lot with 18667 Mississauga Road, which is located to the northeast. These properties were original one 200-acre lot that belonged to Duncan Cameron Sr. during the 19th century. The property was divided in half between Duncan A. Cameron and James Cameron when Duncan Sr. died in 1902. This property belonged to Duncan A. Cameron from 1902 onwards.

The land was originally wooded with maple, elm, beech, and bass, and the soil was a black loam (PAMA n.d., Reel 08, 0663). The patent for the 200-acre Lot 17 was granted to John Johnson Brown in 1822 as a United Empire Loyalist (U.E.L.) land grant (Ontario Land Registry, n.d.(a), 308). John J. Brown was one of five children—four sons and one daughter—of Joseph Brown, a U.E.L. who served in Butler's Rangers during the Revolutionary War and moved to Grantham Township, Lincoln County, Canada in 1884. All five of Joseph's children located their U.E.L. grants in Caledon West and were among the pioneers of the township (PAMA n.d., Reel 08, 0691).

John J. and his wife (a Miss MacDonald) sold Lot 17 to Duncan Cameron for \$150 in May 1846 (Ontario Land Registry, n.d.(a), 308). Cameron was a Scottish immigrant; born in 1816, Duncan arrived in Canada with his parents John and Helen Cameron, his five brothers, and two sisters, in 1828. The Camerons had seven sons, but one, David, died on the journey across the Atlantic (PAMA, n.d., 8509). The family settled at Lot 16, Concession 4 W.H.S. in 1836. When Duncan purchased the adjacent Lot 17 in 1846, he was about 30 years old.

Tremaine's 1859 map of the County of Peel shows Duncan Cameron as owner of the entire 200 acres of Lot 17, and a house located near the south-southwest corner of the property, set back from both the concession and adjacent Lot 16 (Tremaine 1859, Figure 2). The 1861 Census shows Duncan (45) living with his wife Catherine Cameron (nee. Shaw, 32) seven daughters (ages 4 to 15), and Catherine Shaw (75) possibly his mother-in-law (1861 Personal Census, District 6, Caledon, 80). The Agricultural Census of the same years shows Duncan with 200 acres, of which 130 were cultivated, 100 being crop (41 acres of wheat, 5 acres of peas, 12 acres of oats, 1 acre of potatoes, and 1 acre of turnips), and 30 pasture; the farm had a total value of \$5500 (1861 Agricultural Census, District 6, Caledon, 85).

The 1871 Census provides additional details about the Cameron family. Duncan (54) and Catherine (44) expanded their family to 10 children: Helen (25), Katie (22), Mary (20), Maggie (18), Sarah (16), Flora (14), Duncan (9), James (7), and Marjory (4). The Cameron's were Baptists (1871 Census, Schedule 1, Cardwell 40/A, Caledon No.4, 43). Along with Lot 17, Duncan Cameron was owner of two town building lots, and two houses (Ibid., Schedule 3, 8). The farmland appears to have remained the same with 200 acres, 130 cultivated acres (30 wheat, 1 in potatoes, 25 hay), 25 pasture, 1 ½ orchard (Ibid., Schedule 4, 8). Other assets and products of the farm included 4 horses, 1 colts/fillies, 8 milch cows, 14 other horned cattle, 60 sheep, 10 swine, 6 beehives and yearly production of 600 pounds butter, 100 pounds cheese, 35 pounds honey, and 200 pounds wool (Ibid., Schedule 5, 8).

The 1877 Historical Atlas map shows Duncan Cameron as owner of the whole 200 acres of Lot 17, with a house located on the southwest half of the property (Walker and Miles 1877, Figure 2). This house appears to the northwest of the house location on the 1859 map (Tremaine 1859), although this could be a discrepancy in the recording. The orchards on the property are shown to the east of the house. A June 1898 article in the Orangeville Banner reports the death of a young man, Joseph Flaherty, at a barn raising on the property of a Duncan Cameron, three miles south of Alton, which is surely Lot 17 (PAMA n.d., 8482).

Duncan Cameron remained the owner of Lot 17 until his death in 1902; his will was entered into land registry on October 15th of that year. Execution of Cameron's will divided the acreage of Lot 17 equally between his two sons, with the southwest half, including the original house, going to the elder son Duncan A. and the northeast half to the younger son James A. (Ontario Land Registry n.d.(b), 433). The property at 18722 Main Street belonged to Duncan A. Cameron from 1902 onwards.

A chronological understanding of the property is provided in Table B- 1.

Table B- 1: Chronological summary of the property at 18722 Main Street.

Year	Description	Source
1859 and 1877	Mapping indicates that the property was in the hands of Duncan Cameron in the latter portion of the 19th century. No structures are shown in the location of the extant house. A farmhouse is illustrated on both maps at the southwest end of the property, fronting present-day Mississauga Road.	1859 Tremaine's Map of the County of Peel (Tremaine 1859) 1877 Illustrated Historical Atlas (Pope 1877)
1902	The lot is divided in half and the southwest half was transferred to Duncan A. Cameron, the eldest son of Duncan Cameron Sr.	Land registry records
1937	A house and barn are illustrated matching the configuration of the extant complex on the property. Vegetative boundaries of agricultural fields can be identified, suggesting that the northwest, southwest, and east limits of the fields were established by this time.	1937 Topographic Map, Ontario – Orangeville Sheet (Department of National Defence 1937)
1954	The arrangement of the building complex, agricultural fields, and vegetative boundaries are visible in the same configuration as present-day.	1954 Aerial Photograph (Hunting Survey Ltd. 1954)

1.1.1 Property History Summary

The property at 18722 Main Street (Lot 17, Concession 4 WCR) was listed under Duncan Cameron for the second half of the 19th century. Until at least 1877 the farmhouse for this property was located elsewhere (and is still standing at 18667 Mississauga Road) however during the late 19th or early 20th century both a house and barn had been constructed in the location and configuration of the extant structures at 18722 Main Street. The southeast portion of this property was transferred to Duncan A. Cameron, the eldest son of Duncan Cameron Sr., following his father's death in 1902. The agricultural nature of the property, established in the 19th century, developed further in the early 20th century. Vegetative hedgerows or treelines delineating the agricultural fields can be seen on topographic mapping from 1937. This arrangement persisted through the 20th century and is still seen today.

1.2 Existing Conditions

A field review to establish the existing conditions and identify preliminary heritage attributes of the property at 18667 Mississauga Road was conducted on 16 November 2022 by WSP Cultural Heritage Specialists Chelsea Dickenson and Robert Pinchin. Weather conditions for the exterior inspection were ideal (sunny and cool). Access to the interior of the residence was not permitted.

The property is described on the Town of Caledon's Heritage Register as an Italianate style farmhouse with a red brick exterior dating to 1875-1899.

Landscape Setting

- Central building complex is accessed from Main Street by a gravelled driveway.
 - Four mature trees line the southeast side of the driveway.
- Mature tree stand located on the northwest side of the residence.
- Agricultural fields delineated by hedgerows/treelines and fences.
 - These agricultural fields appear to be typical of those found in southwestern Ontario and do not have unique attributes associated with them
- Portions of the property consist of wooded lands.
- Circulation routes extend from the driveway, south past the barn, to the agricultural fields as well as leading from the driveway, around the rear of the outbuilding and residence, north towards Main Street.
- A small tributary of the Credit River traverses the property.

Residence

- Italianate style farmhouse, an architectural style popular during the second half of the 19th century.
- Two storey residence with very slight L-shaped main block.
 - Northeast elevation features a projecting frontispiece which stands the full height of the house and is topped by a gable roof, reminiscent of the 'tower' feature, a distinctive element of the Italianate style.
- Medium pitch hip roof features wide overhang with decorative paired brackets
 - Paired brackets are present on all elevations except for the southwest elevation (likely due to earlier additions present on this elevation).
- Decorative bargeboard trim on the gable of the projecting bay of the northeast elevation, a decorative element more frequently associated with the Gothic Revival or Queen Anne style.
 - Some damage and missing sections to the bargeboard.
- Three external chimneys (two on the northwest elevation and one on the southeast elevation).
- Red brick construction (stretcher bond) with dichromatic stone accents (stone quoins carved in a Drafted Margin pattern and stone window accents).
- Segmental arched windows with original wooden frames (and wooden storm windows), decorative stone eyebrow arches above window heads, and plain stone lug sills.
- Parged stone foundation.

- Communications from the owner indicate that the interior basement floor is dirt.
- Small rear addition, featuring a gable roof, wooden clapboard siding, and cement foundation, currently acts as the main entrance.
 - Staining of the brick indicates that this addition is a replacement of an earlier addition.

Outbuildings

- At the rear (southwest) of the house is a small board and batten outbuilding.
 - Access to the interior was not provided at the time of the site visit.
- Timber framed barn with a metal gable roof and stone foundation (Central or Southern Ontario Style).
 - Built up ramp on the northwest elevation.
 - Small (four bents) in size.
 - Likely pre-dates 1890s.
 - Some damage noted to the wooden flooring and the exterior walls.

1.3 Photographs



Plate 1: View across driveway towards house and barn, facing southwest



Plate 2: Oblique view of east and north elevations of residence



Plate 3: Oblique view of west and south elevations, including rear addition



Plate 4: Detail of decorative brackets and stone accents



Plate 5: North and west elevations of the barn



Plate 6: Agricultural fields and landscape context, facing north towards the house and barn (visible in the background at the centre of the photo).

1.4 Preliminary Ontario Regulation 9/06 Evaluation

The criteria for determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (CHVI) of a property are set out in Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. A property may be worthy of designation under the *Ontario Heritage Act* if it meets one or more of criteria of O. Reg. 9/06.

The property at 18722 Main Street, was subject to a high level, preliminary evaluation against O. Reg. 9/06 to evaluate the property's potential CHVI. Table B- 4 provides a summary of the preliminary evaluation outcome for the property. A preliminary list of potential heritage attributes is provided in Section 1.5.

Table B- 2: Preliminary Evaluation of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest for 18667 Mississauga Road

Criteria		Potential to Meet Criteria	Discussion
1. The property has design value or physical value because it:	i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method.	✓	<p>The exterior of this residence retains most of its original architectural finishes including: 1) red brick exterior laid out in a stretcher bond, 2) projecting bay feature on northeast elevation, 3) hip roof with wide overhang and decorative paired brackets, 4) segmental arched windows with original wooden frames, 5) dichromatic stone accents including carved quoins and lug sills, and decorative stone window eyebrow arches, 6) parged stone foundations.</p> <p>The barn feature materials and styles which are representative examples of late 19th outbuildings in central Ontario, including stone foundations, timber frame construction, and a gable roof.</p> <p>The Italianate style farmhouse, Central or Southern Ontario Style Barn, the board and batten outbuilding, and mature vegetation are representative examples of a 19th century farmstead in the Town of Caledon and have potential to meet this criterion.</p>
	ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.	✗	The property does not have potential to meet 1.ii of O. Reg. 9/06. While the core of the farmstead is a representative example of an Italianate style farmhouse and Central Ontario style barn and a late 19th century farm complex, the structures and landscape components do not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit sufficient to meet this criterion.
	iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement	✗	The property does not have potential to meet 1.iii of O. Reg. 9/06 as no built or landscape components on the property were found to display a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
2. The property has historical	i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person,	✗	The property does not have potential to meet 2.i of O. Reg. 9/06 since there is no evidence at this stage to indicate that this property has direct association

Criteria		Potential to Meet Criteria	Discussion
value or associative value because it:	activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community.		with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community.
	ii. Yields or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture	✗	The property does not have potential to meet 2.ii of O. Reg. 9/06 since there is no evidence at this stage to suggest that the property yields or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture.
	iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community	✗	The property does not have potential to meet 2.iii of O. Reg. 9/06 since there is no evidence at this time that the property reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a community.
3. The property has contextual value because it:	i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area	✓	Similar to other properties in the vicinity, 18722 Main Street has a long driveway leading to a small complex of structures that includes a farmhouse, barns and outbuildings, and mature vegetation. This spatial organization and mix of structural elements maintains and supports the rural agricultural character of the wider area.
	ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings	✓	<p>The property, and its intact configuration as a 19th century farmstead, is situated in an agricultural or rural setting, nestled among several 19th century farmsteads in close proximity. The house, barn, outbuilding, and mature vegetation on the property are both physically and historically linked to each other and physically and historically linked to their surroundings.</p> <p>The property is historically linked to 18667 Mississauga Road as they shared a historical lot in the nineteenth century, owned by Duncan Cameron Sr. The historical lot was divided in half and passed to Duncan Cameron Sr. sons, the north half (containing present day 18722 Main Street) was passed to Duncan</p>

Criteria		Potential to Meet Criteria	Discussion
			A. Cameron and the south half (containing present day 18667 Mississauga Road) to James Cameron.
	iii. Is a landmark	X	This property does not have potential to meet 3.iii of O. Reg. 9/06 as it is not considered a landmark in the community.

1.5 Preliminary Identification of Heritage Attributes



- Italianate style farmhouse:
 - Two storey residence with L shaped floorplan.
 - Projecting bay feature on northeast elevation with decorative bargeboard on gable.
 - Medium pitch hip roof featuring a wide overhang, decorative paired brackets.
 - Red brick construction with dichromatic stone accents.
 - Stone quoins carved in a Drafted Margins pattern, decorative stone window heads, stone lug sills also carved in Drafted Margins pattern.
 - Segmental arched windows with original wooden frames.
 - Parged stone foundation.
- Central or Southern Ontario Style Barn.
 - Timber framed barn.
 - Gable roof.
 - Field stone foundation.
 - Ramp on the northwest elevation.
- Board and batten outbuilding.
- Mature vegetation.
 - Group of four deciduous trees lining the southeast side of the driveway.
 - Cluster of coniferous trees on the northwest side of the house.

1.6 Mapping



LEGEND

	HERITAGE ATTRIBUTE
	PROPERTY FEATURE
	50 m BUFFER
	LICENCE BOUNDARY
	LIMIT OF EXTRACTION
	PROPERTY PARCEL



- REFERENCE(S)**
1. BASEDATA MNR/LIO OBTAINED APRIL 2019
 2. IMAGERY FIRSTBASE SOLUTIONS SPRING 2019 (15CM RESOLUTION) AND SOURCES: ESRI, HERE, GARMIN, INTERMAP, INCREMENT P CORP., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GEOBASE, IGN, KADASTER NL, ORDNANCE SURVEY, ESRI JAPAN, METI, ESRI CHINA (HONG KONG), (C) OPENSTREETMAP CONTRIBUTORS, AND THE GIS USER COMMUNITY
 3. LICENSE AND EXTRACTION LIMIT PROVIDED BY MHBC IN JUNE 2023.
 4. PROJECTION: TRANSVERSE MERCATOR DATUM: NAD 83 COORDINATE SYSTEM: UTM ZONE 17N

CLIENT
CBM AGGREGATES, A DIVISION OF ST. MARYS CEMENT INC. (CANADA)

PROJECT
CALEDON PIT / QUARRY

TITLE
LOCATION OF PRELIMINARY HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES FOR 18722 MAIN STREET

CONSULTANT	YYYY-MM-DD	2023-07-19
	DESIGNED	SO
MEMBER OF WSP	PREPARED	SO
	REVIEWED	GWS
	APPROVED	HM

PROJECT NO.	CONTROL	REV.	FIGURE
19129150	0040	0.0	B-1

PATH: S:\Client\Workitems_Clients\19129150\PROJ\19129150_0040_18722 Main Street.mxd PRINTED ON: 2023-07-19 AT: 5:00:32 PM

IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM: ANSI B

2.0 1055 CHARLESTON SIDEROAD

2.1 Property History

The property at 1055 Charleston Sideroad is located within Lot 15, Concession 4, West of Hurontario Street (W.H.S.), in the Township of Caledon, former Peel County. The land was originally wooded with maple, elm, beech, and bass, and the soil was a black loam (PAMA n.d., Reel 08, 0665). The patent for the 200-acre Lot 15 was granted to Joseph Brown Jr. in 1822 as a United Empire Loyalist (U.E.L.) land grant (Ontario Land Registry, n.d.(a), 306). Joseph Jr. was one of five children - four sons and one daughter - of Joseph Brown, a U.E.L. who served in Butler's Rangers during the Revolutionary War and moved to Grantham Township, Lincoln County, Canada in 1884. All five of Joseph's children located their U.E.L. grants in Caledon West and were among the pioneers of the township (PAMA n.d., Reel 08, 0691).

Joseph Jr. and his wife sold the entirety of the lot in June 1847 to Solomon John Johnson Brown for \$125; the relationship between these parties could not be definitively established. As of the 1851 Census, Solomon J. J. Brown (25) was resident in Niagara Township with his parents Joseph and Almira Brown, and five siblings, including a brother Henry J. (23) (1851 Personal Census, District 2, Caledon, 145). In March 1859, Solomon Brown transferred the east half of Lot 15 to Henry James Brown, likely his brother, by indenture of \$550. Tremaine's 1859 map of the County of Peel shows the entire Lot 15 owned by the Estate of Jos. Brown, deceased, and no structures on the property (Tremaine 1859, Figure 2).

The Brown-family owners of Lot 15 do not appear in the census records for Caledon Township. The 1861 Agricultural census shows the Lot in the use of two farmers, James McBrien, and Thomas McGoldrick. McBrien is listed as holder of 100 acres on Lot 15, with 35 under cultivation (26 acres of wheat, 1 acre of potatoes, and 8 acres of pasture). McGoldrick is also listed as holder of 100 acres, with 40 under cultivation (20 acres of wheat, 1 acre of peas, 2 acres of oats, 1 acre of turnip, 1 acre of potatoes, and 10 acres of pasture). The estimated value of each hundred acres was \$1000 (1861 Agricultural Census, District 6, Caledon, 86). It is likely that Thomas McGoldrick was farming the east half of the lot, as he purchased one hundred acres from Henry James Brown and his wife for \$1000 in March 1862. In the same month, Solomon J. J. Brown and his wife sold the west half of Lot 15 to Joseph Morris for \$1000 (Ontario Land Registry, n.d.(a), 306).

The 1861 Census shows Joseph Morris (37), living with his wife Martha (37), and five children: Edward (15), Margaret (10), Elizabeth (8), William (6), and Joseph (4) (1861 Personal Census, District 6, Caledon, 77). At that time, Morris was farming Lot 17, Concession 5. Shortly after acquiring the west half of Lot 15, Con. 4 Joseph and Martha gave a mortgage on the property to William Barnard for \$200, possibly for construction of a residence. In April 1868, the couple transferred the property to their eldest son, Edward, for consideration of \$1 (Ontario Land Registry, n.d.(b), 431). Edward Morris married Elizabeth Jane McNichol, of Irish ancestry and born in Rockport, Niagara Township, United States (Find a Grave 2022). Elizabeth's brother, Thomas McNichol, purchased the east half of Lot 15 in two parts, the east part in 1862 and the west part in 1867.

The 1871 Census shows Edward Morris (25) and Eliza Jane (25) with one daughter, Sarah E. (2). The Morris' and McNichols were Presbyterian (1871 Census, Schedule 1, Cardwell 40/A, Caledon No.4, 44). Edward Morris is listed as the owner of 100 acres, with one house, and two barns/stables (Ibid., Schedule 3, 8). Of the 100 acres, 70 were identified as improved, including 39 acres of wheat, a half acre of potatoes, 29 acres of hay, 8 acres of pasture, and 1 orchard (Ibid., Schedule 4, 8). Other assets and products of the farm included 2 horses, 4 milch cows, 8 other horned cattle, 8 sheep, 7 swine, and yearly production of 300 pounds butter, and 32 pounds wood (Ibid., Schedule 5, 8).

The 1877 Historical Atlas map shows Edward Morris as the owner of the west half of Lot 15, Con. 4 W.H.S. (Walker and Miles 1877, Figure 2). One structure is shown on the property, slightly to the northeast of the southwest corner of the property, adjacent to the sideroad. Eliza Morris died in 1888 at the age of 47. The 1891 Census shows Edward Morris still living in Caledon West with his daughter “Lizzie” (Sarah Elizabeth) (1891 Census, Schedule 1, Cardwell 54/D, Caledon, 82). The 1897 Tax Assessment shows Edward Morris, age 49, as owner of 100 acres at Lot 15, Con. 4, with 85 acres cleared, and an assessed value of \$3300 (PAMA 1897, Division 7, 43). Edward continued to own the west 100-acres of Lot 15 until he sold it in October 1911 to Arch. R. McArthur for \$8500 (Ontario Land Registry, n.d.(b), 431).

A chronological understanding of the property is provided in Table B- 4.

Table B- 3: Chronological summary of the property at 1055 Charleston Sideroad.

Year	Description	Source
1877	Mapping indicates that the property was in the hands of the Morris Estate. A farmhouse is illustrated in the same location as the present-day remnants/foundation at 1055 Charleston Sideroad.	1877 Illustrated Historical Atlas (Pope 1877)
1937	A house and barn are illustrated on the property. The house is located closer to the roadway, but the barn appears to match the orientation and location of the extant ruins. The same configuration is seen on mapping and aerial photos throughout the remainder of the 20th century.	1937 Topographic Map, Ontario – Orangeville Sheet (Department of National Defence 1937)
1954	The location of the building complex and arrangement of agricultural fields and vegetative boundaries are visible in the same configuration as present-day. A second outbuilding can be seen. Together with the earlier outbuilding, this pair of structures matches the orientation and configuration of the two extant ruins. This second outbuilding does not appear to be mapped on 20th century topographic mapping.	1954 Aerial Photograph (Hunting Survey Ltd. 1954)

2.1.1 Property History Summary

A farmhouse was located on the property at 1055 Charleston Sideroad (Lot 15, Concession 4 WCR) as early as 1877, at which time the property was listed as part of the Morris Estate. An associated orchard is illustrated on 1877 mapping in addition to the farmhouse. The agricultural nature of the property was established in the 19th century and developed further in the early 20th century. By the 1930s, at least one of the structures which make up the extant ruins had been constructed. The second was in existence by 1954 but is not shown on 20th century topographic mapping.

2.2 Existing Conditions

A field review to establish the existing conditions and identify preliminary heritage attributes of the property at 1055 Charleston Sideroad was conducted on 16 November 2022 by WSP Cultural Heritage Specialists Chelsea

Dickenson and Robert Pinchin. Weather conditions for the exterior inspection were ideal (overcast and cool). Access to building interiors was not permitted.

The property is identified on the Town of Caledon's *BHRI of Pre-1946 Structures* as the "property across the road at the southeast corner of Mississauga Road and Charleston Road".

Landscape Setting

- Property is accessed from Charleston Sideroad, via an overgrown dirt and grass driveway leading to the (former) building complex.
- Three large field stones mark the entrance to the driveway.
- Several agricultural fields delineated by hedgerows, treelines, and wood and wire fencing.
 - These agricultural fields appear to be typical of those found in southwestern Ontario and do not have unique attributes associated with them
- Two stands of mature trees are present on either side of the (former) building complex.

Residence

- No longer extant.

Outbuildings

- Standing outbuilding, consisting of one-storey board and batten shed with metal roof, appears to be a modern construction.
- Larger foundation ruins (Barn No. 1), approximately 73 m from Charleston Sideroad:
 - Likely foundation for a barn.
 - Made of parged fieldstone.
 - Wooden door and window frames, featuring tongue and groove joinery.
- Smaller foundation ruins (Barn No. 2) located to the rear (southeast) of the larger ruins.
 - Made of parged fieldstone with concrete additions.
 - Frame lean-to addition.

2.3 Photographs



Plate 7: View across extant outbuilding and ruins at 1055 Charleston Sideroad, facing northeast



Plate 8: Larger fieldstone foundation ruins



Plate 9: Detail showing wood doorframe and window frames and parged fieldstone foundations



Plate 10: Smaller fieldstone foundation ruins



Plate 11: Interior of smaller fieldstone foundation ruins

2.4 Preliminary Ontario Regulation 9/06 Evaluation

The criteria for determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (CHVI) of a property are set out in Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. A property may be worthy of designation under the *Ontario Heritage Act* if it meets one or more of criteria of O. Reg. 9/06.

The property at 1055 Charleston Sideroad, was subject to a high level, preliminary evaluation against O. Reg. 9/06 to evaluate the property's potential CHVI. Table B- 4 provides a summary of the preliminary evaluation outcome for the property. A preliminary list of potential heritage attributes is provided in Section 2.5.

Table B- 4: Preliminary Evaluation of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest for 18667 Mississauga Road


Criteria		Potential to Meet Criteria	Discussion
1. The property has design value or physical value because it:	i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method.	✘	The property does not have potential to meet 1.i of O. Reg. 9/06. The extant structures and landscape components do not appear to be a rare, unique, representative, or early example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method.
	ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.	✘	The property does not have potential to meet 1.ii of O. Reg. 9/06. The extant structures and landscape components do not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit sufficient to meet this criterion.
	iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement	✘	The property does not have potential to meet 1.iii of O. Reg. 9/06 as no extant built or landscape components on the property were found to display a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
2. The property has historical value or associative value because it:	i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community.	✘	The property does not have potential to meet 2.i of O. Reg. 9/06 since there is no evidence at this stage to indicate that this property has direct association with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community.
	ii. Yields or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture	✘	The property does not have potential to meet 2.ii of O. Reg. 9/06 since there is no evidence at this stage to suggest that the property yields or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture.
	iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community	✘	The property does not meet 2.iii of O. Reg. 9/06 since the property does not reflect the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a community.

Criteria		Potential to Meet Criteria	Discussion
3. The property has contextual value because it:	i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area	✓	Similar to other properties in the vicinity, 1055 Charleston Sideroad has a long driveway leading to a small complex of structures that includes outbuildings and mature vegetation. This spatial organization and mix of structural elements maintains and supports the rural agricultural character of the wider area.
	ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings	✓	The property, with remnant barn ruins, is situated in an agricultural or rural setting, nestled among several 19th century farmsteads in close proximity. The extant ruins and vegetative hedgerows/treelines on the property are both physically and historically linked to each other and physically and historically linked to their surroundings.
	iii. Is a landmark	✗	This property does not have potential to meet 3.iii of O. Reg. 9/06 as it is not considered a landmark in the community.



2.5 Preliminary Identification of Heritage Attributes

- Rubble fieldstone foundations for both barn ruins.
- Hedgerows/treelines delineating the edge of the farm building complex.

2.6 Mapping



- LEGEND**
- HERITAGE ATTRIBUTE
 - PROPERTY FEATURE
 - 50 m BUFFER
 - LICENCE BOUNDARY
 - LIMIT OF EXTRACTION
 - PROPERTY PARCEL



- REFERENCE(S)**
1. BASEDATA MNRFB LIO OBTAINED APRIL 2019
 2. IMAGERY FIRSTBASE SOLUTIONS SPRING 2019 (15CM RESOLUTION) AND SOURCES: ESRI, HERE, GARMIN, INTERMAP, INCREMENT P CORP., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GEOBASE, IGN, KADASTER NL, ORDNANCE SURVEY, ESRI JAPAN, METI, ESRI CHINA (HONG KONG), (C) OPENSTREETMAP CONTRIBUTORS, AND THE GIS USER COMMUNITY
 3. LICENSE AND EXTRACTION LIMIT PROVIDED BY MHBC IN JUNE 2023.
 4. PROJECTION: TRANSVERSE MERCATOR DATUM: NAD 83 COORDINATE SYSTEM: UTM ZONE 17N

CLIENT
CBM AGGREGATES, A DIVISION OF ST. MARYS CEMENT INC. (CANADA)

PROJECT
CALEDON PIT / QUARRY

TITLE
LOCATION OF PRELIMINARY HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES FOR 1055 CHARLESTON SIDEROAD

CONSULTANT	YYYY-MM-DD	2023-07-19
GOLDER MEMBER OF WSP	DESIGNED	SO
	PREPARED	SO
	REVIEWED	JK
	APPROVED	HM

PROJECT NO. 19129150	CONTROL 0040	REV. 0.0	FIGURE B-2
-------------------------	-----------------	-------------	---------------

R:\14\19129150\19129150_0000_PRCDD\0040_Cultural_Images\19129150_0040_HC0008-2.mxd PRINTED ON: 2023-07-19 AT: 1:12:25 PM

IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM: ANSI B

3.0 1420 CHARLESTON SIDEROAD

3.1 Property History

The 1420 Charleston Sideroad property is located within Lot 16, Concession 4, West of Hurontario Street (W.H.S.), in the Township of Caledon, former Peel County. The Lot was patented in two 100-acre parts to the Canada Company; the west half in September 1832, and the east half in November 1833. A description of the adjacent Lot 17 indicated that the land was originally wooded with maple, elm, beech, and bass, and the soil was a black loam (PAMA n.d., Reel 08, 0663). Both halves of the Lot were purchased by John Cameron in April 1836 at a price of \$50 each (Ontario Land Registry, n.d.(a), 307).

John Cameron was a Scottish immigrant; born in 1782, he travelled to Canada from Perthshire, Scotland in 1828 with his wife Helen (Ferguson), seven sons, and two daughters. One of the sons, David, died on the journey across the Atlantic (PAMA, n.d., 8509). The family settled at Lot 16, Concession 4 W.H.S. in 1836. One of John's sons, Duncan Cameron purchased the adjacent 200-acres to the north, Lot 17, in 1846. John Cameron died in 1848 and his estate settled in 1852 with his youngest surviving son, James Cameron (born 1824) purchasing all 200-acres of Lot 16 from his brothers and mother for \$200 (Ontario Land Registry, n.d.(a), 307). The 1851 Census shows Mrs. Cameron (Helen, 64) living with her sons Hugh (36), Donald (29), and James (26) (1851 Personal Census, District 2, Caledon, 135). Duncan was, by this time, living at Lot 17 with his wife and children.

Tremaine's 1859 map of the County of Peel shows James Cameron as owner of the entire 200 acres of Lot 16, Concession 4 W.H.S, and a house located centrally on the southwest half of the property, extant today at 18501 Mississauga Road (Tremaine 1859, Figure 2). A family history of the Camerons, written by Annie Beatty in 1935, states that the house on the property was built by James Cameron in 1850 (PAMA n.d., 8511). The 1861 Census shows James Cameron, a farmer, living with his wife Mary (McGill), three sons, and two daughters.² The Agricultural Census of the same year shows James Cameron at Concession 4, Lot 16, with 300 acres, of which 200 were cultivated, 123 being crop (79 acres of wheat, 5 acres of peas, 7 acres of oats, 1 acre of potatoes, and 1 acre of turnips), 73 being pasture, and 2 being orchards. The the farm had a total value of \$7500 (1861 Agricultural Census, District 6, Caledon, 86). While 300 acres is more than the size of this Lot, the 1859 map also shows James as owner of Lot 16, Concession 5 W.H.S., which could account for this additional acreage.

The 1871 Census shows James (44) and Mary (43) Cameron living with eight children: John (18), Annie J. (15), Margaret E. (13), James (11), Peter (9), Mary (7), George A. (5), and David (2). Both James and the eldest son, John, are listed as farmers. The Cameron's were Baptists (1871 Census, Schedule 1, Cardwell 40/A, Caledon No.4, 43). James Cameron is listed as the owner of 400 acres, with one house and four barns/stables (Ibid., Schedule 3, 8). Of the 400 acres, 210 were identified as improved, including 70 acres of wheat, 3/4 of an acre of potatoes, 40 acres of hay, 20 acres of pasture, and 2 acres of orchards, which produced 50 bushels of apples (Ibid., Schedule 4, 8). Other assets and products of the farm included 7 horses, 1 colts/fillies, 7 milch cows, 18 other horned cattle, 60 sheep, 8 swine and yearly production of 400 pounds butter, 150 pounds cheese, and 400 pounds wool (Ibid., Schedule 5, 8).

The 1877 Historical Atlas map shows James Cameron as owner of the whole 200 acres of Lot 16, Con. 4 W.H.S, as well has the adjacent 200-acre property at Lot 16, Con. 5 (Walker and Miles 1877, Figure 2). Two structures are shown on the property; the first is located near the southwest corner of the Lot with an adjacent orchard to the

² The ages of the family have been recorded incorrectly in the 1861 census, so they are not listed here.

northeast, while the second is in the very northeast corner of the property. Neither house is illustrated in the location of the extant house at 1420 Charleston Road.

James Sr. continued to own the entire lot for another 17 years. In January 1897, James and Mary sold the southwest 50 acres of the southwest half of the lot to their son, James Cameron Jr. for \$1250 (Ontario Land Registry, n.d.(b), 432). The boundaries of this part are not specified in the abstract book, but the modern property boundary suggests that the delineation was made by a straight line parallel to the Concession Road. This transfer would have included the extant house and barns on the southwest half of the property shown on the 1859 and 1877 maps. Despite this ownership change, it appears to have been the younger son, George A. who was farming Lot 16, Con. 4 at the time. In the 1897 Tax Assessment, G. A. Cameron was assessed the entirety of the 200-acre lot, with 150 acres improved, the remaining 50 acres being woodlot, and a tax value of \$7000 (PAMA 1897, Division 7, 38).

The 1901 census shows James Cameron Jr. (40) living with his wife Debora (36), and son David A. (5) (1901 Census, Schedule 1, Cardwell 51/D, Caledon No.7, 4). James Sr. and Mary Cameron are shown living with George A. (35), his wife Charlotte (33), and their two sons John H. (4) and Andrew (2). They were most likely resident at the house near the northeast corner of the Lot, though it's likely that the extant house at 1420 Charleston Road had been constructed by this point and so possible that they resided here instead. In March of 1901 James Sr. and Mary transferred the northeastern 150 acres of the Lot to George Cameron for \$1 (Ontario Land Registry, n.d.(b), 432).

A chronological understanding of the property is provided in Table B- 5.

Table B- 5: Chronological summary of the property at 1420 Charleston Road.

Year	Description	Source
1877	Mapping indicates that James Cameron was living on the property at this time. A farmhouse is illustrated to the east of the extant house. This would have been the second farmhouse constructed on the property, the first being located at present day 18501 Mississauga Road. The extant house is not shown.	1877 Illustrated Historical Atlas (Pope 1877)
1937	A house and two barns (located to the northwest of the house) are illustrated matching the configuration of the extant complex on the property. The fields surrounding the farm complex are no longer part of the same parcel however historically would have been associated with the residence. Treelines are shown in approximately the same alignment as the present-day northeast and southeast limits of the agricultural fields, suggesting that these field limits were established by this time.	1937 Topographic Map, Ontario – Orangeville Sheet (Department of National Defence 1937)
1954	The arrangement of the building complex, agricultural fields, and vegetative boundaries are visible in the same configuration as present-day.	1954 Aerial Photograph (Hunting Survey Ltd. 1954)

3.1.1 Property History Summary

The extant house at 1420 Charleston Road was likely constructed between 1877 and 1937. A farmhouse is illustrated to the northeast of the extant house on 1877 mapping and by 1937 a farm complex is illustrated in the location of the extant structures. It's possible that the farmhouse depicted on the 1877 map is the extant house and its location is due to the approximation that historical maps often employ but more likely that the extant house was the second house built by the Cameron family at the north end of Lot 16, Concession 4 WCR (or third overall structure on the Lot). The agricultural nature of the property was established in the 19th century and developed further in the early 20th century. By the 1930s, two barns had been established on the property and wooded areas of the property and treelines delineating the agricultural fields are shown on topographic mapping. This arrangement persisted through the 20th century and is still seen today.

3.2 Existing Conditions

A field review to establish the existing conditions and identify preliminary heritage attributes of the property at 1420 Charleston Road was conducted on 18 November 2022, by WSP Cultural Heritage Specialists Chelsea Dickenson and Robert Pinchin. Weather conditions for the exterior inspection were ideal (sunny and cool). Access to the interior of the residence was not permitted.

The property is described on the Town of Caledon's Heritage Register as an Italianate style farmhouse with a red brick exterior and paired windows dating to approximately 1875-1899.

Landscape Setting

- The property has been severed from the original parcel but would have historically been associated with the surrounding agricultural fields.
 - While these agricultural fields are not still within the parcel, they appear to be typical of those found in southwestern Ontario and do not have unique attributes associated with them.
- The building complex is accessed from Main Street by a winding, paved driveway which wraps around the southwest side of the house.
 - Mature deciduous and coniferous trees are present on either side of the driveway.
- Vegetative windbreaks stand along the northeast and southwest boundary of the property.
- A low fieldstone wall extends approximately 140 metres from the road to the rear of the property, on the southwest side of the driveway.

Residence

- The house is a two-storey irregular shaped red brick structure with a hipped roof and two additions on the main (original) block.
- The residence is clad in red brick with contrasting detailing (stone arches and sills accent the windows of the main block and a buff-coloured soldier brick arches and stone sills accent the windows of the additions)
- Two major additions have been added to the original main block of the house, meaning the house is comprised of three parts:
 - The main block:
 - Cut stone foundations:

- Three courses visible on exterior, topmost course features carvings mimicking the border of Drafted Margin pattern.
- Two storey Italianate style farmhouse with red brick (stretcher bond) exterior.
- Medium pitch hip roof features wide overhang with decorative paired brackets on all elevations.
- Paired segmental arched windows feature decorative stone heads, wooden frames with decorative arched heads, and stone lug sills carved in a Drafted Margin pattern.
- Home inspection notes that some windows have been upgraded to be modern vinyl double hung type while some original wood hung windows remain. The report notes that some of these have not been opened for many years and are stuck. These are protected by storm windows (Home to Home Inspections Ltd. 2022).
- Decorative porch wraps around the east corner of the house
 - Stone foundation extends the length of the porch and two roofs (one for the southeast elevation and one for the northeast elevation) sit atop wooden arcades supported by square posts feature decorative scrollwork and filigree accents. The southeast elevation porch features a mansard roof with a second storey access while the northeast portion features a hipped roof the underside of which is curved, creating a scooped shape. Both porch roof styles are original based on historical photographs.
- Northeast elevation features a bay window on the main floor and an enclosed sunroom, which links the rear addition and the main block and has replaced an earlier porch.
 - Bay window features mansard roof with decorative brackets in groups of three, same stone window heads and sills as the main block, and buff brick decorative panels below the windows.
- The second storey windows of the southwest elevation have buff brick arched heads, rather than the segmental stone arches of the rest of the windows of the main block.
- Basement is accessible from the exterior on the southwest elevation.
- The rear addition:
 - One-storey with a medium pitch hip roof clad in red brick (stretcher bond) with cement block foundations.
 - Bay windows on the northeast and northwest elevations.
 - feature buff brick buff-coloured soldier brick, flat arches above the windows, painted stone lintels, and recessed buff brick decorative panels below the windows.
 - Decorative wooden doors on northwest elevation.
- The side addition:
 - One-storey with shed roof clad in red brick (stretcher bond).
 - Entrances located on the northwest and southeast elevations, featuring decorative wooden doors.
 - Northwest elevation features double doors, located next to the wooden doors on the rear addition.

- Southeast elevation features single door flanked by two side light windows and topped with a soldier course segmental arch of buff brick.
- Four square slider windows along the southwest elevation, feature buff brick buff-coloured soldier brick, flat arches above the windows and stone lintels.

Outbuildings

- Barn foundation ruins:
 - Located at the rear (northwest end) of the property.
 - Parged stone foundations with graffiti dating to the early 20th century.
 - “H.R.C./J.H.C./MAYS(?)/190_8_”
 - A wooden covered area has been added to the ruins, featuring red brick flooring.
- 20th century outbuilding:
 - Timber construction with gambrel roof (clad in asphalt shingles).
 - Constructed between 1954 and 2001, based on aerial mapping.

3.3 Photographs



Plate 12: View up the driveway towards house, facing northwest



Plate 13: South elevation of the residence



Plate 14: East elevation of the residence



Plate 15: Oblique view of north and west elevations, including rear and side additions



Plate 16: Late 20th century outbuilding



Plate 17: Barn foundation ruins, looking southwest



Plate 18: Closeup of inscription on barn ruins



Plate 19: Low fieldstone wall along the southwest side of the property

3.4 Preliminary Ontario Regulation 9/06 Evaluation

The criteria for determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (CHVI) of a property are set out in Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. A property may be worthy of designation under the *Ontario Heritage Act* if it meets one or more of criteria of O. Reg. 9/06.

The property at 1420 Charleston Road, was subject to a high level, preliminary evaluation against O. Reg. 9/06 to evaluate the property's potential CHVI. Table B- 6 provides a summary of the preliminary evaluation outcome for the property. A preliminary list of potential heritage attributes is provided in Section 3.5.

Table B- 6: Preliminary Evaluation of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest for 1420 Charleston Road

Criteria		Potential to Meet Criteria	Discussion
1. The property has design value or physical value because it:	i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method.	✓	<p>The exterior of this residence retains most of its original architectural finishes including: 1) red brick exterior laid out in a stretcher bond, 2) hip roof with wide overhanging eaves and decorative paired brackets, 3) segmental arched windows with original wooden frames and carved accents, 4) dichromatic stone accents including stone window eyebrow arches and carved lug sills, 5) porches featuring stone foundations, mansard and hipped rooflines, wooden arcades, square posts, and decorative accents including scrollwork, filigree decorations, and curved underside of the roofing on the northeast elevation 6) bay window with mansard roof, matching stone window heads and sills, and buff brick decorative panels and, 7) cut stone foundations with carved top course.</p> <p>The Italianate style farmhouse, barn foundation ruins, fieldstone wall, and mature vegetation are representative examples of a 19th century farmstead in the Town of Caledon and have potential to meet this criterion.</p>
	ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.	✗	The property does not have potential to meet 1.ii of O. Reg. 9/06. While the core of the farmstead is a representative example of an Italianate style farmhouse and a late 19th century farm complex, the structures and landscape components do not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit sufficient to meet this criterion.
	iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement	✗	The property does not have potential to meet 1.iii of O. Reg. 9/06 as no built or landscape components on the property were found to display a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
2. The property has historical	i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity,	✗	The property does not have potential to meet 2.i of O. Reg. 9/06 since there is no evidence at this stage to indicate that this property has direct association

Criteria		Potential to Meet Criteria	Discussion
value or associative value because it:	organization or institution that is significant to a community.		with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community.
	ii. Yields or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture	✗	The property does not have potential to meet 2.ii of O. Reg. 9/06 since there is no evidence at this stage to suggest that the property yields or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture.
	iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community	✗	The property does not have potential to meet 2.iii of O. Reg. 9/06 since there is no evidence at this time that the property reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a community.
3. The property has contextual value because it:	i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area	✓	Similar to other properties in the vicinity, 1420 Charleston Sideroad has a long driveway leading to a small complex of structures that includes a farmhouse, barns and outbuildings, and mature vegetation. This spatial organization and mix of structural elements maintains and supports the rural agricultural character of the wider area.
	ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings	✓	The property, and its intact configuration as a 19th century farmstead, is situated in an agricultural or rural setting, nestled among several 19th century farmsteads in close proximity. The house, barn ruins, fieldstone wall, and mature vegetation on the property are both physically and historically linked to each other and physically and historically linked to their surroundings.
	iii. Is a landmark	✗	This property does not have potential to meet 3.iii of O. Reg. 9/06 as it is not considered a landmark in the community.

3.5 Preliminary Identification of Heritage Attributes

- Residence main block:
 - Two storey Italianate style farmhouse with red brick exterior.
 - Cut stone foundations with carved top course.
 - Hip roof with wide eaves and paired brackets.
 - Decorative elements of the main block:
 - Decorative stone and brick accents (keystone eyebrow arches and drafted margin carved lug sills).
 - Accents carved into the wooden window frame heads.
 - Porches along the southeast and northeast elevations, creating a wrap around effect for the east corner of the house:
 - Wooden arcades and square posts with decorative scrollwork and filigree accents.
 - Mansard roof and second storey access of the southeast elevation, hipped roof with curved underside of the northeast elevation.
 - Stone foundation.
 - Bay window:
 - mansard roof with decorative brackets in groups of three, same stone window heads and sills as the rest of the main block windows, and buff brick decorative panels below the windows.
- Barn foundation ruins.
- Mature vegetation:
 - Deciduous and coniferous trees lining the driveway.
- Fieldstone wall.

3.6 Mapping

4.0 18501 MISSISSAUGA ROAD

4.1 Property History

The property at 18501 Mississauga Road is located within Lot 16, Concession 4, West of Hurontario Street (W.H.S.), in the Township of Caledon, former Peel County. The Lot was patented in two 100-acre parts to the Canada Company; the west half in September 1832, and the east half in November 1833. A description of the adjacent Lot 17 indicated that the land was originally wooded with maple, elm, beech, and bass, and the soil was a black loam (PAMA n.d., Reel 08, 0663). Both halves of the Lot were purchased by John Cameron in April 1836 at a price of \$50 each (Ontario Land Registry, n.d.(a), 307).

John Cameron was a Scottish immigrant; born in 1782, he travelled to Canada from Perthshire, Scotland in 1828 with his wife Helen (Ferguson), seven sons, and two daughters. One of the sons, David, died on the journey across the Atlantic (PAMA, n.d., 8509). The family settled at Lot 16, Concession 4 W.H.S. in 1836. One of John's sons, Duncan Cameron purchased the adjacent 200-acres to the north, Lot 17, in 1846. John Cameron died in 1848 and his estate settled in 1852 with his youngest surviving son, James Cameron (born 1824) purchasing all 200-acres of Lot 16 from his brothers and mother for \$200 (Ontario Land Registry, n.d.(a), 307). The 1851 Census shows Mrs. Cameron (Helen, 64) living with her sons Hugh (36), Donald (29), and James (26) (1851 Personal Census, District 2, Caledon, 135). Duncan was, by this time, living at Lot 17 with his wife and children.

Tremaine's 1859 map of the County of Peel shows James Cameron as owner of the entire 200 acres of Lot 16, Concession 4 W.H.S, and a house located centrally on the southwest half of the property, in the same location as the extant house at 18501 Mississauga Road (Tremaine 1859, Figure 2). A family history of the Camerons, written by Annie Beatty in 1935, states that the house on the property was built by James Cameron in 1850 (PAMA n.d., 8511). The 1861 Census shows James Cameron, a farmer, living with his wife Mary (McGill), three sons, and two daughters.³ The Agricultural Census of the same year shows James Cameron at Concession 4, Lot 16, with 300 acres, of which 200 were cultivated, 123 being crop (79 acres of wheat, 5 acres of peas, 7 acres of oats, 1 acre of potatoes, 1 acre of turnips), 73 being pasture, and 2 being orchards; the farm had a total value of \$7500 (1861 Agricultural Census, District 6, Caledon, 86). While 300 acres is more than the size of this Lot, the 1859 map also shows James as owner of Lot 16, Concession 5 W.H.S., which could account for this additional acreage.

The 1871 Census shows James (44) and Mary (43) Cameron living with eight children: John (18), Annie J. (15), Margaret E. (13), James (11), Peter (9), Mary (7), George A. (5), and David (2). Both James and the eldest son, John, are listed as farmers. The Cameron's were Baptists (1871 Census, Schedule 1, Cardwell 40/A, Caledon No.4, 43). James Cameron is listed as the owner of 400 acres, with one house and four barns/stables (Ibid., Schedule 3, 8). Of the 400 acres, 210 were identified as improved, including 70 acres of wheat, 3/4 of an acre of potatoes, 40 acres of hay, 20 acres of pasture, and 2 acres of orchards, which producing 50 bushels of apples (Ibid., Schedule 4, 8). Other assets and products of the farm included 7 horses, 1 colts/fillies, 7 milch cows, 18 other horned cattle, 60 sheep, 8 swine and yearly production of 400 pounds butter, 150 pounds cheese, and 400 pounds wool (Ibid., Schedule 5, 8).

The 1877 Historical Atlas map shows James Cameron as owner of the whole 200 acres of Lot 16, Con. 4 W.H.S, as well as the adjacent 200-acre property at Lot 16, Con. 5 (Walker and Miles 1877, Figure 2). Two structures are shown on the property. The first structure is located near the southwest corner of the Lot with an adjacent

³ The ages of the family have been recorded incorrectly in the 1861 census, so they are not listed here.

orchard to the northeast (in the same location as the extant house at 18501 Mississauga Road), while the second is in the very northeast corner of the property.

James Sr. continued to own the entire lot for another 17 years. In January 1897, James and Mary sold the southwest 50 acres of the southwest half of the lot to their son, James Cameron Jr. for \$1250 (Ontario Land Registry, n.d.(b), 432). The boundaries of this part are not specified in the abstract book, but the modern property boundary suggests that the delineation was made by a straight line parallel to the Concession Road. This transfer would have included the extant house and barns on the southwest half of the property shown on the 1859 and 1877 maps. Despite this ownership change, it appears to have been the younger son, George A. who was farming Lot 16, Con. 4 at the time. In the 1897 Tax Assessment, G. A. Cameron was assessed the entirety of the 200-acre lot, with 150 acres improved, the remaining 50 acres being woodlot, and a tax value of \$7000 (PAMA 1897, Division 7, 38).

The 1901 census shows James Cameron Jr. (40) living with his wife Debora (36), and son David A. (5) (1901 Census, Schedule 1, Cardwell 51/D, Caledon No.7, 4). James Sr. and Mary Cameron are shown living with George A. (35), his wife Charlotte (33), and their two sons John H. (4) and Andrew (2). They were most likely resident at the house near the northeast corner of the Lot. In March of 1901, James Sr. and Mary transferred the northeastern 150 acres of the Lot to George Cameron for \$1 (Ontario Land Registry, n.d.(b), 432).

A chronological understanding of the property is provided in Table B- 7.

Table B- 7: Chronological summary of the property at 18501 Mississauga Road.

Year	Description	Source
1859	Mapping indicates that James Cameron was living on the property at this time. A farmhouse is illustrated in the location of the extant house at 18501 Mississauga Road.	1859 Tremaine's Map of the County of Peel (Tremaine 1859)
1877	James Cameron is still noted as the occupant of the property. A farmhouse is illustrated in the location of the extant house at 18501 Mississauga Road. An orchard is also shown to the northeast of the house.	1877 Illustrated Historical Atlas (Pope 1877)
1937	A house and four barns (located to the northeast and northwest of the house) are illustrated. The house and barns to the northwest appear to match the configuration of the extant house and barn on the property. Treelines are shown in approximately the same alignment as the present-day northwest limits of the agricultural fields, suggesting that these field limits were established by this time.	1937 Topographic Map, Ontario – Orangeville Sheet (Department of National Defence 1937)
1954	The arrangement of the building complex, agricultural fields, and vegetative boundaries are visible in the same configuration as present-day. Details of the structures present at this time are not discernable.	1954 Aerial Photograph (Hunting Survey Ltd. 1954)

4.1.1 Property History Summary

A farmhouse was located on this property as early as 1859 and appears to be situated in the same location as the extant house at 18501 Mississauga Road. At that time, the property was owned by James Cameron of Lot 16, Concession 4 WCR. The agricultural nature of the property was established in the 19th century and developed further in the early 20th century. By the 1930s, several barns had been established on the property and vegetative hedgerows or treelines delineated the agricultural fields. This arrangement persisted through the 20th century and is still seen today.

4.2 Existing Conditions

A field review to establish the existing conditions and identify preliminary heritage attributes of the property at 18501 Mississauga Road was conducted on 18 November 2022 by WSP Cultural Heritage Specialists Chelsea Dickenson and Robert Pinchin. Weather conditions for the exterior inspection were ideal (sunny and cool). Access to the interior of the residence was not permitted.

The residence is described on the Town of Caledon's Heritage Register as a Neoclassical style farmhouse with vertical board exterior and an addition at the rear, dating c. 1850-1874.

Landscape Setting

- The property is accessed from Mississauga Road, by a long, gravel driveway which leads to the central building complex
 - Circulation routes extend through the complex, connecting each of the outbuildings, and lead to the agricultural fields.
- Two mature coniferous tree lines act as windbreaks for the farm complex.
 - One row extends parallel to Mississauga Road (approximately northwest to southeast) and acts as the southwest boundary of the complex.
 - 2004 imagery shows this row as very young plants.
 - The second row is oriented perpendicular to Mississauga Road (approximately northeast to southwest) and extends along the northwest boundary of the main residence and the northernmost outbuildings.
 - Appears to include a mix of conifers, some of which appear to be fairly mature (i.e., may have been planted around the turn of the 20th century). The scale of the 1954 aerial photograph does not allow for confirmation.
- The property parcel consists of agricultural fields delineated by hedgerows and treelines.
 - These agricultural fields appear to be typical of those found in southwestern Ontario and do not have unique attributes associated with them

Residence

- The house is a one-and-a-half storey, gable front structure with a saltbox roof. A one storey addition stands on the northeast elevation, also with a saltbox roof. The entire house is clad in modern vinyl or aluminum board and batten style siding.
- Two major additions have been added to the original main block of the house, meaning the house is comprised of three parts:

- The original main one-and-a-half storey block, with a rectangular floor plan and gable roof.
 - Unable to determine original building materials.
- The one-and-a-half storey side addition, added to the northeast elevation of the original main block, includes the current entrance to the house.
 - The roofline of this addition extends from the gable of the main block, creating a saltbox style roof.
 - A wide shed dormer projects from the northeast roof slope, above the addition.
 - The southeast and northeast elevations feature fieldstone veneer wainscoting. On the southeast elevation, this indicates the limit of the main block of the house as the wainscoting is present on the addition only.
- The perpendicular addition on the northeast elevation.
 - Doorway entrance on the southeast elevation.
 - Features modern sliding or hung windows on all elevations.

Outbuildings

- The building complex features two barns, six outbuildings, and seven silos.
- Barn No. 1
 - Located to the northwest of the main complex, outside of the western vegetative windbreak.
 - Part of a smaller complex that includes two concrete silos, a steel Quonset addition on the southeast elevation of the barn (behind the silos), and a corrugated metal clad addition with a saltbox roof on the southwest elevation.
 - The barn features stone foundations, timber frame construction, and a gable roof.
- Barn No. 2
 - Concrete block foundations, timber frame construction, and a metal gambrel roof.
 - The built-up ramp is supported by concrete wingwalls
 - Red paint is faded but visible and two large white painted diamond shapes decorate the sliding doors at the top of the ramp.
- Both Barn No. 1 and No. 2 are currently in use.
- Modern outbuildings, include two wooden sheds, one small shed, four aluminum storage sheds, and six metal silos.
 - Outbuilding No. 1 (wooden drive shed)
 - Southern most building of the farm complex, located at the top of the driveway to the south of the residence.
 - Wooden shed with metal saltbox roof and concrete foundation.
 - Outbuilding No. 2 (small aluminum shed)
 - Located to the north of the residence, between the residence and Outbuilding No. 3.

- Prefab aluminum shed with large barn style doors and gable roof, constructed on a concrete pad.
- Outbuilding No. 3 (large aluminum shed)
 - Located to the north of Outbuilding No. 2, Between Outbuildings No. 2 and 4.
 - Large aluminum shed with gable roof, constructed on a concrete pad.
- Outbuilding No. 4 (aluminum shed with metal silo)
 - Northern most building of the farm complex, located to the northwest of Outbuilding No. 5.
 - Large aluminum shed with gable roof, constructed on a concrete pad.
 - Metal silo located at rear (northeast elevation).
- Outbuilding No. 5
 - Located to the north of Outbuilding No. 3, Between Outbuildings No. 3 and 4.
 - Wooden shed with gable roof and small addition on the rear
 - Metal silo located at rear (northeast elevation).
- Small shed
 - Located to the north of the residence
 - 2x4 frame with plywood and aluminum siding and saltbox roof. Supported on wooden base.
- Silos
 - Two are currently associated with outbuildings (No. 4 and 5).
 - Four are located between Outbuildings No. 3 and 4.
- The property also includes temporary structures (chicken coops and storage structures) which are recent additions to the property.

4.3 Photographs



Plate 20: View towards the building complex, facing northwest



Plate 21: Oblique view of south and east elevations of the residence.

Plate 22: Oblique view of north and west elevation of the residence.



Plate 23: Oblique view of west elevation and steel Quonset addition of Barn No. 1.



Plate 24: Oblique view of east and north elevations of Barn No. 2.

4.4 Preliminary Ontario Regulation 9/06 Evaluation

The criteria for determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (CHVI) of a property are set out in Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. A property may be worthy of designation under the *Ontario Heritage Act* if it meets one or more of criteria of O. Reg. 9/06.

The property at 18501 Mississauga Road, was subject to a high level, preliminary evaluation against O. Reg. 9/06 to evaluate the property's potential CHVI. Table B- 8 provides a summary of the preliminary evaluation outcome for the property. A preliminary list of potential heritage attributes is provided in Section 4.5.

Table B- 8: Preliminary Evaluation of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest for 18501 Mississauga Road

Criteria		Potential to Meet Criteria	Discussion
1. The property has design value or physical value because it:	i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method.	✓	<p>The property has potential to meet 1.i of O. Reg. 9/06. The original one-and-a-half storey main block of the house has a rectangular floor plan and gable roof. The original main block has been reclad, obscuring details which would indicate the style and condition of the original house. Historical mapping shows a farmhouse in the location of the extant house as early as 1859.</p> <p>Both barns feature materials and styles which are representative examples of late 19th and early 20th century outbuildings in central Ontario.</p> <p>Barn No. 1 features materials and styles popular in rural central Ontario during the late 19th century, stone foundations, timber frame construction, and a gable roof.</p> <p>Barn No. 2 features materials and styles popular in rural central Ontario during the early 20th century, concrete block foundations, timber frame construction and a gambrel roof.</p> <p>The main block of the farmhouse, both barns, and mature vegetation are representative examples of a 19th century farmstead in the Town of Caledon and have potential to meet this criterion.</p>
	ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.	✗	The property does not have potential to meet 1.ii of O. Reg. 9/06. While the core of the farmstead is a representative example of a 19th century farm complex, the structures and landscape components do not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit sufficient to meet this criterion.
	iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement	✗	The property does not have potential to meet 1.iii of O. Reg. 9/06 as no built or landscape components on the property were found to display a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.

Criteria		Potential to Meet Criteria	Discussion
2. The property has historical value or associative value because it:	i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community.	✗	The property does not have potential to meet 2.i of O. Reg. 9/06 since there is no evidence at this stage to indicate that this property has direct association with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community.
	ii. Yields or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture	✗	The property does not have potential to meet 2.ii of O. Reg. 9/06 since there is no evidence at this stage to suggest that the property yields or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture.
	iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community	✗	The property does not have potential to meet 2.iii of O. Reg. 9/06 since there is no evidence at this time that the property reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a community.
3. The property has contextual value because it:	i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area	✓	Similar to other properties in the vicinity, 18501 Mississauga Road has a long driveway leading to a small complex of structures that includes a farmhouse, barns and outbuildings, and mature vegetation. This spatial organization and mix of structural elements maintains and supports the rural agricultural character of the wider area.
	ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings	✓	The property, and its intact configuration as a 19th century farmstead, is situated in an agricultural or rural setting, nestled among several 19th century farmsteads in close proximity. The house, two barns, and mature vegetation on the property are both physically and historically linked to each other and physically and historically linked to their surroundings.
	iii. Is a landmark	✗	This property does not have potential to meet 3.iii of O. Reg. 9/06 as it is not considered a landmark in the community.

4.5 Preliminary Identification of Heritage Attributes

- Main residence
 - Original one-and-a-half storey main block with rectangular floor plan and gable roof
- Barn No. 1
 - Timber frame construction
 - Fieldstone foundation
 - Gable roof
- Barn No. 2
 - Concrete block foundations
 - Timber frame construction
 - Metal gambrel roof.
- Mature vegetation
 - Coniferous windbreaks around the house
 - Perpendicular to Mississauga Road, in a northeast to southwest orientation, to the northwest of the main building complex.

4.6 Mapping

5.0 18667 MISSISSAUGA ROAD

5.1 Property History

The property at 18667 Mississauga Road is located within Lot 17, Concession 4, West of Hurontario Street (W.H.S.), in the Township of Caledon, former Peel County. This property shares a historical lot with 18722 Main Street, which is located to the southwest. These properties were original one 200-acre lot that belonged to Duncan Cameron Sr. during the 19th century. The property was divided in half between Duncan A. Cameron and James Cameron, when Duncan Sr. died in 1902. This property belonged to James Cameron from 1902 onwards.

The land was originally wooded with maple, elm, beech, and bass, and the soil was a black loam (PAMA n.d., Reel 08, 0663). The patent for the 200-acre Lot 17 was granted to John Johnson Brown in 1822 as a United Empire Loyalist (U.E.L.) land grant (Ontario Land Registry, n.d.(a), 308). John J. Brown was one of five children - four sons and one daughter - of Joseph Brown, a U.E.L. who served in Butler's Rangers during the Revolutionary War and moved to Grantham Township, Lincoln County, Canada in 1884. All five of Joseph's children located their U.E.L. grants in Caledon West and were among the pioneers of the township (PAMA n.d., Reel 08, 0691).

John J. and his wife (a Miss MacDonald) sold Lot 17 to Duncan Cameron for \$150 in May 1846 (Ontario Land Registry, n.d.(a), 308). Cameron was a Scottish immigrant; born in 1816, Duncan arrived in Canada with his parents John and Helen Cameron, his five brothers, and two sisters, in 1828. The Camerons had seven sons, but one, David, died on the journey across the Atlantic (PAMA, n.d., 8509). The family settled at Lot 16, Concession 4 W.H.S. in 1836. When Duncan purchased the adjacent Lot 17 in 1846, he was about 30 years old.

Tremaine's 1859 map of the County of Peel shows Duncan Cameron as owner of the entire 200 acres of Lot 17, and a house located near the south-southwest corner of the property, set back from both the concession and adjacent Lot 16 (Tremaine 1859, Figure 2). The 1861 Census shows Duncan (45) living with his wife Catherine Cameron (nee. Shaw, 32) seven daughters (ages 4 to 15), and Catherine Shaw (75) possibly his mother-in-law (1861 Personal Census, District 6, Caledon, 80). The Agricultural Census of the same years shows Duncan with 200 acres, of which 130 were cultivated, 100 being crop (41 acres of wheat, 5 acres of peas, 12 acres of oats, 1 acre of potatoes, 1 acre of turnips), and 30 pasture; the farm had a total value of \$5500 (1861 Agricultural Census, District 6, Caledon, 85).

The 1871 Census provides additional details about the Cameron family. Duncan (54) and Catherine (44) expanded their family to 10 children: Helen (25), Katie (22), Mary (20), Maggie (18), Sarah (16), Flora (14), Duncan (9), James (7), and Marjory (4). The Cameron's were Baptists (1871 Census, Schedule 1, Cardwell 40/A, Caledon No.4, 43). Along with Lot 17, Duncan Cameron was owner of two town building lots, and two houses (Ibid., Schedule 3, 8). The farmland appears to have remained the same with 200 acres, 130 improved (30 acres of wheat, 1 acre of potatoes, 25 acres of hay), 25 acres of pasture, 1 ½ orchard (Ibid., Schedule 4, 8). Other assets and products of the farm included 4 horses, 1 colts/fillies, 8 milch cows, 14 other horned cattle, 60 sheep, 10 swine, 6 beehives and yearly production of 600 pounds butter, 100 pounds cheese, 35 pounds honey, and 200 pounds wool (Ibid., Schedule 5, 8).

The 1877 Historical Atlas map shows Duncan Cameron as owner of the whole 200 acres of Lot 17, with a house located on the southwest half of the property (Walker and Miles 1877, Figure 2), apparently to the northwest of the house location on the 1859 map (Tremaine 1859), although this could be a discrepancy in the recording. The orchards on the property are shown to the east of the house. A June 1898 article in the Orangeville Banner reports the death of a young man, Joseph Flaherty, at a barn raising on the property of a Duncan Cameron, three miles south of Alton, which is surely Lot 17 (PAMA n.d., 8482).

Duncan Cameron remained the owner of Lot 17 until his death in 1902; his will was entered into land registry on October 15 of that year. Execution of Cameron's Will divided the acreage of Lot 17 equally between his two sons, with the southwest half, including the original house, going to the elder son Duncan A. and the northeast half to the younger son James A. (Ontario Land Registry n.d.(b), 433). This property belonged to James Cameron following his father's death in 1902.

A chronological understanding of the property is provided in Table B- 9.

Table B- 9: Chronological summary of the property at 18667 Mississauga Road.

Year	Description	Source
1859	Mapping indicates that Duncan Cameron was living on the property at this time. A farmhouse is illustrated in the location of the extant house at 18667 Mississauga Road.	1859 Tremaine's Map of the County of Peel (Tremaine 1859)
1877	Duncan Cameron is still noted as the occupant of the property. A farmhouse is illustrated in the location of the extant house at 18667 Mississauga Road. An orchard is also shown to the east of the house.	1877 Illustrated Historical Atlas (Pope 1877)
1902	The lot is divided in half and the northeast half was transferred to James Cameron	Land registry records
1937	A house and two barns (located to the northwest of the house) are illustrated matching the configuration of the extant complex on the property. Treelines are shown in approximately the same alignment as the present-day northeast and southeast limits of the agricultural fields, suggesting that these field limits were established by this time.	1937 Topographic Map, Ontario – Orangeville Sheet (Department of National Defence 1937)
1954	The arrangement of the building complex, agricultural fields, and vegetative boundaries are visible in the same configuration as present-day.	1954 Aerial Photograph (Hunting Survey Ltd. 1954)

5.1.1 Property History Summary

A farmhouse was located on this property as early as 1859 and appears to be situated in the same location as the extant house at 18667 Mississauga Road. At that time, the property was listed under Duncan Cameron of Lot 17, Concession 4 WCR. The southeast portion of this property was transferred to James Cameron following his father's death in 1902. The agricultural nature of the property was established in the 19th century and developed further in the early 20th century. By the 1930s two barns had been established on the property and vegetative hedgerows or treelines delineated the agricultural fields. This arrangement persisted through the 20th century and is still seen today.

5.2 Existing Conditions

A field review to establish the existing conditions and identify preliminary heritage attributes of the property at 18667 Mississauga Road was conducted on 16 November 2022 by WSP Cultural Heritage Specialists Chelsea

Dickenson and Robert Pinchin. Weather conditions for the exterior inspection were ideal (sunny and cool). Access to the interior of the residence was granted by Votorantim Cimentos.

The property is described on the Town of Caledon's *Heritage Register* as a mid-19th century farmstead dating to c. 1850-1874.

Landscape Setting

- The building complex is accessed from Mississauga Road by a gravelled driveway marked by collected field stones and tree lines.
 - Mature tree line both sides of the driveway and extend along the road ROW.
 - Field stones have been collected and piled into low walls to line the lower ¼ of the driveway and extend along the road ROW.
 - A painting based on a photograph of the property dating to the 1950s shows that this fieldstone wall may have extended further in the past (**Plate 25**).
- Fieldstone piles are located throughout the property, likely collected during field clearing, delineating fields.
- Wire and post fencing marks the boundary between the property and the road ROW.
- The east corner of the property is occupied by a woodlot, the rest of the land consists of agricultural fields. A small pond is located to the south of the residence on the property.
 - The agricultural fields appear to be typical of those found in southwestern Ontario and do not have unique attributes associated with them
- Circulation routes link the buildings in the complex with the fields.
- A small tributary of the Credit River traverses the property



Plate 25: 1985 Painting of 18667 Mississauga Road, based on photograph of the property from the 1950s (provided by the tenant).

Residence

- The house is a one-and-a-half storey, gable front, red brick structure with a rectangular shaped main block, and saltbox roof
- The residence is clad in red brick with contrasting buff coloured brick detailing (quoins, a diamond pattern on the southwest elevation, and a mix of stretcher/solider brick arches)
- Two major additions have been added to the original main block of the house, meaning the house is comprised of three parts:
 - The original main block, with a rectangular floor plan and gable roof.
 - Containing a kitchen, living area, and bathroom on the main floor and four rooms on the upper storey.
 - The side addition, which is generally sympathetic in style and materials to the original main block, with a roofline that extends from the gable of the main block, creating a saltbox style roof.

- Containing a living area and storage area on the main floor.
- The rear addition, which creates a summer kitchen.
- Main block:
 - Clad in red brick (laid in stretcher bond pattern).
 - Foundation appears to be parged stone (visible within the basement).
 - The southwest elevation:
 - Features a buff brick diamond pattern within the gable end, with cross detailing in the centre and at each of the four corners.
 - Two main floor windows and two upper storey windows, all one-over-one sash style, appear to have wood trim and storm windows. All four windows have buff bricks laid in a flat arch, the main floor topped by a soldier course and the upper storey topped with a stretcher course. All four windows appear to have had sills which have been removed.
 - One basement window is framed in concrete.
 - The southeast elevation:
 - A small, enclosed porch or vestibule has been added to the southeast elevation.
 - Features horizontal siding, a shed style roof, and a centered doorway flanked by rectangular windows on either side.
 - An interior doorway leading into the house, likely the original entrance, features wide wooden trim with molded pilasters on either side.
 - This porch was added in the late 20th century, replacing an earlier, larger porch which had been destroyed in an ice storm during the 1950s (date estimated by the property owner). This earlier porch is visible in Plate 25 and the existing porch is not present in a photo provided by the owner dating to the early 1970s (Plate 26).
 - Three main floor windows and two upper storey windows do not appear to be original to the house. All three main floor windows are six-over-one sash windows with wood trim. The main floor windows do not have any other decorative elements. The two upper storey windows are two-pane slider windows with narrow concrete lug sills.
 - Internal cement block chimney.
- Side addition:
 - The house has been extended on the northwest elevation of the original main block, with a one-storey addition that is generally sympathetic in style and materials. The roofline has been extended to create a saltbox style roof.
 - This addition is divided into a living area (south portion) and storage (north portion), a wooden door connects the two spaces. Water damage is evident in the ceiling of the living area.
 - The red brick on this addition is laid in a Scottish bond pattern on both exterior elevations (the northwest and southwest).

- The limit of the main block of the house can be identified where the stretcher bond of the main block transitions to Scottish bond which covers the side addition.
- The southwest elevation:
 - Doorway entrance is topped with a soldier course of buff brick laid in a flat arch. The door features a wood frame, plain trim, and a single flat rectangular transom window. A modern metal screen door acts as a storm door. A stone or concrete lug sill is present beneath.
- The northwest elevation:
 - Features three main floor windows, all six-over-six sash interior windows with painted wood trim and aluminum storm windows. All three are decorated with a flat arch of buff bricks in a soldier course and a painted wood lug sill.
- Rear addition:
 - A frame and plywood addition to the rear (northeast) elevation sits atop a concrete pad and extends along the rear elevation of the main block, before connecting to a larger summer kitchen, of similar construction.
 - Within the rear addition, the northeast elevation of the main block includes a door and window. The window features a six-over-six sash style window with an original (or older) wooden storm window. Both feature the same buff brick soldier course header as the exterior elevations.
 - This addition predates the mid-20th century and appears to have originally had two chimneys (Plate 25).




Plate 26: Photograph of 18667 Mississauga Road provided by the tenant, dating to the “early 1970s”.

Outbuildings

- Barn complex:
 - The large H-shaped barn features two large barns connected by a breezeway.
 - Two timber framed barns sit atop parged stone foundations with cut stone cornerstones
 - Barns are connected by a timber framed breezeway with a metal gable roof.
 - Southern barn was re clad in aluminum siding in the 1950s after an ice storm (see Plate 25 and Plate 26), northern barn is wooden.
 - Both barns are of the Central or Southern Ontario style, popular in the late 19th century.
- Two outbuildings located to the northeast of the house:
 - Outbuilding No. 1 (drive shed).
 - Timber framed with a metal gable roof.

- Features diamond shaped gable window on southwest elevation.
- Maltese/diamond cross shaped cut out on gable of northeast elevation.
- Outbuilding No. 2
 - Rectangular floor plan with metal gable roof and red metal siding.
 - Modern construction, likely dates to 1970s based on conversation with owner

5.3 Photographs



Plate 27: View southwest towards outbuildings



Plate 28: Oblique view of north and west elevations of residence



Plate 29: Oblique view of south and east elevations



Plate 30: Rear addition, facing southwest



Plate 31: Barn complex, facing east



Plate 32: North and west elevations of Outbuilding No. 1



Plate 33: East and north elevations of Outbuilding No. 2



Plate 34: View north of mature trees and low stone walls lining driveway



Plate 35: View southeast of mature treeline along the southern edge of the property and the ROW

5.4 Preliminary Ontario Regulation 9/06 Evaluation

The criteria for determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (CHVI) of a property are set out in Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. A property may be worthy of designation under the *Ontario Heritage Act* if it meets one or more of criteria of O. Reg. 9/06.

The property at 18667 Mississauga Road, was subject to a high level, preliminary evaluation against O. Reg. 9/06 to evaluate the property's potential CHVI. Table B- 10 provides a summary of the preliminary evaluation outcome for the property. A preliminary list of potential heritage attributes is provided in Section 5.5.

Table B- 10: Preliminary Evaluation of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest for 18667 Mississauga Road

Criteria		Potential to Meet Criteria	Discussion
1. The property has design value or physical value because it:	i. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method.	✓	<p>The residence retains the majority of its original architectural finishes including: 1) rectangular footprint with side hall floorplan, 2) parged stone foundations, 3) saltbox roof 4) red brick siding laid in stretcher bond with contrasting buff coloured brick detailing (quoins, diamond pattern on southeast elevation, stretcher and soldier brick flat arches above openings), 5) original wooden interior and storm windows, and 6) decorative wooden trim around original entrance.</p> <p>The barn complex and outbuilding no. 1 feature materials and styles which are representative examples of late 19th and early 20th century outbuildings in central Ontario.</p> <p>The barn complex features field and cut stone foundations, and timber frame construction.</p> <p>The outbuilding no. 1 features timber frame construction and decorative details (diamond shaped gable window and Maltese/diamond cross shaped cut out on gable).</p> <p>The main block of the farmhouse, barn complex, outbuilding no.1, low fieldstone walls, and mature vegetation are representative examples of a 19th century farmstead in the Town of Caledon and have potential to meet this criterion.</p>
	ii. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.	✗	<p>The property does not have potential to meet 1.ii of O. Reg. 9/06. While the core of the farmstead is a representative example of an Italianate style farmhouse and a late 19th century farm complex, the structures and landscape components do not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit sufficient to meet this criterion.</p>


Criteria		Potential to Meet Criteria	Discussion
	iii. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement	✗	The property does not have potential to meet 1.iii of O. Reg. 9/06 as no built or landscape components on the property were found to display a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
2. The property has historical value or associative value because it:	i. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community.	✗	The property does not have potential to meet 2.i of O. Reg. 9/06 since there is no evidence at this stage to indicate that this property has direct association with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community.
	ii. Yields or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture	✗	The property does not have potential to meet 2.ii of O. Reg. 9/06 since there is no evidence at this stage to suggest that the property yields or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture.
	iii. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community	✗	The property does not have potential to meet 2.iii of O. Reg. 9/06 since there is no evidence at this time that the property reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a community.
3. The property has contextual value because it:	i. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area	✓	Similar to other properties in the vicinity, 18667 Mississauga Road has a long driveway leading to a small complex of structures that includes a farmhouse, barns and outbuildings, and mature vegetation. This spatial organization and mix of structural elements maintains and supports the rural agricultural character of the wider area.
	ii. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings	✓	The property, and its intact configuration as a 19th century farmstead, is situated in an agricultural or rural setting, nestled among several 19th century farmsteads in close proximity. The house, barn complex, outbuilding no. 1, and mature vegetation on the property are both physically and historically

Criteria		Potential to Meet Criteria	Discussion
			<p>linked to each other and physically and historically linked to their surroundings.</p> <p>The property is historically linked to 18722 Main Street as they shared a historical lot in the nineteenth century, owned by Duncan Cameron Sr. The historical lot was divided in half and passed to Duncan Cameron Sr. sons, the north half (containing present day 18722 Main Street) was passed to Duncan A. Cameron, and the south half (containing present day 18667 Mississauga Road) to James Cameron.</p>
	iii. Is a landmark	X	This property does not have potential to meet 3.iii of O. Reg. 9/06 as it is not considered a landmark in the community.

5.5 Preliminary Identification of Heritage Attributes


- Residence main block:
 - Rectangular footprint with side hall floorplan
 - Parged stone foundations.
 - Gable roof.
 - Red brick (stretcher bond) with contrasting buff coloured brick detailing including:
 - Quoins.
 - Decorative diamond pattern on gable of southeast elevation.
 - Stretcher and soldier brick flat arches above openings.
 - Original interior and storm windows on the northeast elevation.
 - Decorative wooden trim around original entrance on southeast elevation.
- Barn complex (Central or Southern Ontario style)
 - Fieldstone foundations with cut stone cornerstones.
 - Timber frame construction.
- Outbuilding No. 1 (driveshed)
 - Timber frame construction
 - Diamond shaped gable window on southwest elevation
 - Maltese/diamond cross shaped cut out on gable of northeast elevation
- Mature tree lines
 - Along driveway and ROW
- Fieldstone walls at the foot of the driveway

5.6 Mapping



LEGEND

- WATERCOURSE
- HERITAGE ATTRIBUTE
- PROPERTY FEATURE
- 50 m BUFFER
- LICENCE BOUNDARY
- LIMIT OF EXTRACTION
- PROPERTY PARCEL



REFERENCE(S)

1. BASEDATA MNRF LIO OBTAINED APRIL 2019
2. WATERCOURSES OBTAINED FROM CREDIT VALLEY CONSERVATION AUTHORITY OPEN DATA PORTAL, NOVEMBER 2022 IN COMBINATION WITH SITE WATERCOURSE SURVEY PROVIDED BY FIRST BASE SOLUTIONS NOVEMBER 2021.
3. IMAGERY FIRSTBASE SOLUTIONS SPRING 2019 (15CM RESOLUTION) AND SOURCES: ESRI, HERE, GARMIN, INTERMAP, INCREMENT P CORP., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GEOBASE, IGN, KADASTER NL, ORDNANCE SURVEY, ESRI JAPAN, METI, ESRI CHINA (HONG KONG), (C) OPENSTREETMAP CONTRIBUTORS, AND THE GIS USER COMMUNITY
4. LICENSE AND EXTRACTION LIMIT PROVIDED BY MHBC IN JUNE 2023.
5. PROJECTION: TRANSVERSE MERCATOR DATUM: NAD 83 COORDINATE SYSTEM: UTM ZONE 17N

CLIENT
 CBM AGGREGATES, A DIVISION OF ST. MARYS CEMENT INC.
 (CANADA)

PROJECT
 CALEDON PIT / QUARRY

TITLE
**LOCATION OF PRELIMINARY HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES FOR
 18667 MISSISSAUGA ROAD**

CONSULTANT	YYYY-MM-DD	2023-07-19
DESIGNED	SO	
PREPARED	SO	
REVIEWED	JK	
APPROVED	HM	

PROJECT NO. 19129150 CONTROL 0040 REV. 0.0 FIGURE B-5

R:\TH\5\Clients\Watermain\Chimney\Lang_Pit_5_Caledon\99_PRCO\19129150\00_PRCO\0040_PRCO\0040_HC\0040-5.mxd PRINTED ON: 2023-07-19 AT: 12:14 PM

IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM: ANSI B

APPENDIX D

Curriculum Vitae

Education

M.A. Anthropology and Archaeology, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Newfoundland, 2001

B.A. Archaeology (honours), Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario, 1998

Certifications

Professionally Licensed Archaeologist, Ontario

Golder Committees / Working Groups

HSSE Committee Representative – Archaeology/Bioscience/Surface Water

Canadian Federal Client Team

Votorantim Cimentos Client Development Group

Cultural Heritage Technical Committee

Memberships

Ontario Archaeology Society

WSP Golder Associates Ltd. – London

Michael Teal is Director of Archaeology and Heritage within WSP Golder's Environmental Planning division in Ontario. He is located in London, Ontario and has been with the company for 10 years. Michael is a licensed professional Ontario archaeologist (P364) with over 25 years of experience in cultural resource management, including 10 years with the federal government at Parks Canada and 15 years in non-federal and private sectors. His work experience has given him a strong understanding of regulatory requirements for archaeology in Ontario and on Canadian federal lands. In addition, Michael has supported the growth and development of Golder's relationships with many Indigenous communities in Ontario by: establishing Master Service Agreement for archaeological field technician services; creating sub-consultant agreements with Indigenous owned businesses; providing archaeological services for Indigenous-led projects and businesses; participating in Golder-led Indigenous consultation and engagement awareness events; and, helping to create mentor work placement agreements to provide work experience for Indigenous youth.

Employment History

Golder Associates Ltd., a member of WSP – London, Ontario
Director, Archaeology and Heritage, Ontario (2021 to present)

Golder Associates Ltd., – London, Ontario
Senior Archaeologist (2012 to 2021)

Parks Canada Agency – Ontario Service Centre, Cornwall
Archaeologist (2002 to 2012)

Various Consultancies
Archaeologist (1997 to 2001)

SELECT PROJECT EXPERIENCE – AGGREGATE PROJECTS

**Proposed St Marys
Thomas Quarry
Extension**
St Marys, Ontario

Archaeology Lead and Task Manager. Stage 1, 2, and 3 archaeological assessments for Votorantim Cimentos North America of 45 ha land parcel for proposed pit extension. Role included communication with the client, health and safety plan preparation, and budget and schedule management. Planned and coordinated field program for Stage 2 and 3 archaeological assessments, interpreted all archaeological data, and conducted technical review of prepared report. Stage 4 recommended to mitigate impacts to identified mid-19th century historical sites. Active engagement with interested Indigenous communities.

**Port Colborne Quarry
Expansion**
Port Colborne, Ontario

Archaeology Task Lead, and archaeology licensee for Stage 3 Archaeological Assessments of nine pre-contact Indigenous sites for license application to expand Port Colborne Quarry. Role included communication with the client, health and safety plan preparation, and budget and schedule management. Planned and coordinated field program for Stage 3 archaeological assessments, interpreted all archaeological data, and conducted technical review of prepared reports. Active engagement with interested Indigenous communities.

**Proposed
Flamborough Quarry
Extension**
Flamborough, Ontario

Project Manager. Stage 1 and 2 archaeological assessments for CRH Canada Group Inc. of 27.5 ha land parcel for proposed pit extension. Role included communication with the client, health and safety plan preparation, and budget and schedule management. Planned and coordinated field program for Stage 2 archaeological assessments, interpreted all archaeological data, and conducted technical review of prepared report. Active engagement with interested First Nations communities.

Paris Pit Due Diligence
Paris, Ontario

Project Manager. Stage 1 and 2 archaeological assessments for CRH Canada Group Inc. of 9.4 ha land parcel prior to extraction activities. Role included communication with the client, health and safety plan preparation, and budget and schedule management. Planned and coordinated field program for Stage 2 archaeological assessments, interpreted all archaeological data, and conducted technical review of prepared report.

**Proposed Limestone
Quarry Bruce County**
Bruce County, Ontario

Project Manager. Stage 1 and 2 archaeological assessment of 15.5 ha land parcel for proposed pit. No archaeological sites were identified, and no further work was recommended. Role included communication with the client, health and safety plan preparation, and budget and schedule management. Planned and coordinated field program for Stage 2 archaeological assessments, interpreted all archaeological data, and conducted technical review of prepared report. Active engagement with interested First Nations communities.

**Kayanase Proposed
Facility Expansion**
Six Nations Reserve No.
40, Ontario

Project Manager. Stage 1 and 2 archaeological assessment of 4 ha land parcel prior to a proposed facility expansion by Kayanase Greenhouse. Assessment resulted in the identification of several pre-contact Indigenous and historical sites, of which three were recommended for further assessment. Avoidance and protection plans were developed for the three sites through engagement with the Indigenous community. Construction monitoring services were also provided as part of the avoidance and protection plan.

**Former Camp
Ipperwash
Investigation**
Former Camp
Ipperwash, Ontario

Archaeological Advisor (Golder Associates Ltd.). Provision of archaeological advice to DND to identify, protect, and mitigate impacts to cultural resources during UXO, Environmental, and Cultural Resource Investigation of former Camp Ipperwash. Regular liaison with DND project managers and interfacing with First Nation and independent contractors; assistance in the development of GIS mapping of cultural resources for site planning; review and comment on archaeological work plans, interim results and reports; site inspections and participation in stakeholder meetings.

**Niagara Ranges /
Battlefield of Fort
George National
Historic Site of Canada**
Niagara-on-the-Lake,
Ontario

Project Manager. Provision of archaeological support services during UXO clearance activities, and for subsequent soil investigations on the property known as the Niagara Ranges. Archaeological field work as part of the support services totalled 17 days between October 20 and November 24, 2015, and for four days between January 11 and January 14, 2016. All field work activities were performed in accordance with the Parks Canada *Guidelines for the Management of Archaeological Resources* and *Archaeological Recording Manual: Excavations and Surveys*.

SELECT PROJECT EXPERIENCE – MUNICIPAL PROJECTS**Woodhull Cemetery**
London, Ontario

Project Manager. Stage 1 background study followed by Stage 2 archaeology survey and GPR survey to identify potential archaeological sites and unmarked burial features. Fieldwork resulted in the identification of one archaeological site and several possible burial features that were recommended for further investigation to meet regulatory requirements. Project involved consultation with municipal and provincial governments and local Indigenous communities.

W12A Landfill Site
London, Ontario

Project Manager. Stage 1 background study followed by Stage 2 archaeology survey of future waste disposal areas as part of the City of London's due diligence process. Fieldwork resulted in the identification of one disturbed archaeological site that was not recommended for further investigation. Project involved consultation with municipal government and local Indigenous communities.

Mud Creek Sub-watershed Class Environmental Assessment
London, Ontario

Project Manager and Archaeology Lead. Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment for study area comprised of 31 land parcels in the City of London. Reporting included background desktop research, evaluation of archaeological potential, and recommendations for appropriate Stage 2 assessment, where required.

SELECT PROJECT EXPERIENCE – INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS**Amherstburg Wastewater Servicing Plan**
Amherstburg, Ontario

Project Manager and Archaeology Lead; Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment for 4.2 km long study corridor. Following a property inspection and archaeological survey reporting included background desktop research, evaluation of archaeological potential, and recommendations for further work, where required.

Brantford Water Treatment Complex
Brantford, Ontario

Project Manager and Archaeology Lead; Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessments for the Brantford Water Treatment Complex. Field work included a property inspection followed by Stage 2 test trenching to identify potential cultural resources. Stage 1 reporting included desktop research, evaluation of archaeological potential, and recommendations for appropriate Stage 2 assessment. Stage 2 reporting involved summarizing field assessment results and making recommendations for further work, where required.

Commissioners Road West Realignment EA
London, Ontario

Archaeology Lead; Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment for linear corridor in the City of London. Field work included a property inspection and reporting included background desktop research, evaluation of archaeological potential, and recommendations for appropriate Stage 2 assessment, where required.

Infrastructure Renewal Program, Contract D, Main Street, Lambeth
London, Ontario

Archaeology Lead; Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment for linear corridor in the City of London. Field work included a property inspection and reporting included background desktop research, evaluation of archaeological potential, and recommendations for appropriate Stage 2 assessment, where required.

SELECT PROJECT EXPERIENCE – OIL AND GAS PROJECTS

**Stage 1 and 2
Archaeological
Assessments, TCPL
Northern Ontario
Infrastructure
Operations and
Maintenance Program**
Various Locations,
Ontario

Project Manager. Provided technical guidance and oversight for Stage 1 and Stage 2 archaeological assessments at various TCPL work sites in northern Ontario. Completed daily quality control and quality assurance reviews of field data and ensured compliance fieldwork and reporting was being completed to *MTCS Standards and Guidelines*.

SELECT PROJECT EXPERIENCE – FEDERAL

**Stony Point Clearance
and Remediation
Project –
Archaeological
Investigations**
Former Camp
Ipperwash, Ontario

Archaeological Field Leader/Senior Archaeologist. Provision of archaeological support services during UXO clearance activities at Stony Point, Ontario for the Department of National Defence (DND). Archaeological objectives were to identify, protect, and assess the significance of cultural resources encountered and to determine the need for archaeological mitigation through either excavation or avoidance and protection. Attend update meetings and technical discussions and regular liaison with Kettle and Stony Point First Nation representatives.

**Parks Canada
Archaeological Impact
Assessment for
Proposed Renewal
Upgrades**
Point Pelee National
Park, Ontario

Project Manager and Field Lead. Archaeological survey through shovel testing of areas of high archaeological potential within proposed renewal upgrades at tip of Point Pelee National Park, Ontario. Provision of a report with survey results, conclusions regarding the archaeological significance and heritage value of findings, and recommendations for additional investigation, where required.

**Parks Canada
Archaeological Impact
Assessment for
Proposed Trails**
Rouge National Urban
Park, Ontario

Project Manager. Archaeological survey through shovel testing of areas of high archaeological potential along 3.5 km of proposed trail corridors and parking lot areas in Rouge National Urban Park, Ontario. Provision of a report with survey results, conclusions regarding the archaeological significance and heritage value of findings, and recommendations for additional investigation, where required.

**Parks Canada Artifact
Review and Analysis**
Point Pelee National
Park, Ontario

Project Manager. Review and analysis of artifacts previously recovered for the Point Pelee National Park 2011 Visitor Centre Septic Tank Project and provision of a summary report.



Education

*Master of Arts Archaeology,
Wilfrid Laurier University,
Waterloo, 2013*

*Post-Baccalaureate
Heritage and Collections
Management, University of
Victoria, Victoria, 2015*

*Bachelor of Arts
Archaeology, Wilfrid Laurier
University, Waterloo, 2011*

Certifications

*Applied Research Licence
(R1149), Ministry of
Heritage, Sport, Tourism
and Culture Industries,
as of January 2017*

WSP Golder Associates Ltd. – Mississauga

Cultural Heritage Specialist

Alisha started her career in cultural resource management in 2008 and completed her Bachelor of Arts (2011) and Master of Arts (2013) at Wilfrid Laurier University. After graduation, Alisha undertook numerous contract positions at the Ontario Heritage Trust as well as multiple cultural resource management firms in Ontario. In 2015, she completed post-graduate heritage and collections management courses through the University of Victoria which today she applies to her position as Cultural Heritage Specialist and Archaeologist. Alisha has been with Golder Associates Ltd. since 2016 and during her time at Golder has been the lead material culture analyst, researcher and report writer for numerous projects across the province. Alisha has extensive knowledge of Euro-Canadian material culture as well as strong archival research skills following numerous cultural heritage assessments.

Employment History

WSP Golder Associates Ltd. – Mississauga

Cultural Heritage Specialist/ Archaeologist (2016 to Present)

CRM Lab Archaeology and Heritage Management – Toronto

Lab Manager (2013 to 2016)

Ontario Heritage Trust – Toronto

Lab Technician (2012 to 2016)

Canadian Air and Space Museum (formerly Toronto Aerospace Museum) – Toronto

Interim Collections Manager/ Curator (2011)

RECENT PROJECT EXPERIENCE – PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Airport Road Development, Brampton

Project Manager, field investigator and report writer for Heritage Impact Assessment (2022)

Trafalgar Road Development, Halton Hills

Project Manager and field investigator for Heritage Impact Assessment (2022)

Hydro One Chatham to St. Clair Transmission Line Project

Project Manager for Cultural Heritage Existing Conditions, Preliminary Impact Assessment, Cultural Heritage Evaluation Reports and Heritage Impact Assessments (2021-2022)

MTO Highway 7 Widening, Class EA, City of Kawartha Lakes

Interim Project Manager for Cultural Heritage Existing Conditions, Preliminary Impact Assessment and Stage 3 and 4 Archaeological Field Program (2021-2022)

**Hydro One St.
Andrews and Kent
Transformer Stations**

Project Manager for Cultural Heritage Evaluation Reports and Heritage Impact Assessments (2021-2022)

**Springwater County
Road 53 Intersection
Improvements EA**

Project Manager for Heritage Impact Assessment, Heritage Documentation Report and Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment (2021-2022)

**Hydro One Chatham to
Lakeshore
Transmission Line
Project**

Project Manager for Cultural Heritage Existing Conditions, Preliminary Impact Assessment, Cultural Heritage Evaluation Reports and Heritage Impact Assessments (2020-2022)

RECENT PROJECT EXPERIENCE – BUILT/ CULTURAL HERITAGE

**Oxford Gideon
Intersection
Improvements EA,
London**

Researcher and report writer for Cultural Heritage Report: Existing Conditions and Preliminary Impact Assessment (2021-2022)

CBM Caledon Quarry

Field investigator, researcher and report writer for Cultural Heritage Screening Report (2021)

**Mattamy Cook House
Relocation Project,
Caledon**

Cultural Heritage Monitor for dismantling and storage of listed heritage property (2020-2022)

**MTO 401 and Norris
Whitney Bridge
Rehabilitation Project,
Belleville and Prince
Edward County**

Researcher and report writer for Cultural Heritage Screening Reports and Cultural Heritage Report: Existing Conditions and Preliminary Impact Assessment (2020-2022)

TRAINING

Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005, Accessible Standards for Customer Service Course

WHIMIS

Anti-Bribery/Anti-Corruption



HENRY CARY, Ph.D., CAHP, RPA

Senior Archaeologist & Team Lead/ Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist



Areas of practice

Archaeology

Cultural Heritage

Languages

English

PROFILE

Dr. Henry Cary has over 20 years public and private-sector experience directing cultural heritage projects in diverse environments across southern and northern Canada. His expertise is in the historic architecture and cultural landscapes of North America, with specialization in industrial and military heritage. He has produced heritage evaluations, impact assessments and conservation plans for a wide range of properties in Ontario, from a pre-War of 1812 stone house in Niagara to the 1930 Glengrove Transformer Station in Toronto, and multiple properties in heritage conservation districts and character areas in the City of Hamilton, City of Vaughan, and Town of Collingwood. He has also evaluated several industrial sites for Hydro One Networks Inc. and the City of Hamilton and has provided policy advice to the City of Cambridge on managing its heritage structural walls. Prior to joining WSP E&I Canada Limited, Dr. Cary worked for Parks Canada, notably for the Fort Henry National Historic Site Conservation Program and Western Arctic Field Unit, then served as Heritage Manager for the Town of Lunenburg UNESCO World Heritage Site before moving to consulting positions with CH2M and WSP Golder. He is a member of the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP) and Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA), and an Adjunct Professor at Saint Mary's University.

EDUCATION

Ph.D., War Studies (Historical Archaeology/Architectural History), Royal Military College of Canada	2013
M.A., Historical Archaeology, Memorial University	2004
Combined B.A. Hons w. Distinction, Pre-contact Archaeology/ Social Anthropology, Wilfrid Laurier University	2000

PROFESSIONAL DESIGNATIONS

Province of Ontario License to Conduct Archaeological Fieldwork, Professional Class, No. P327, since 2009	2009- present
Ministry of Transport Ontario RAQs-approved for Archaeology/Heritage	2016- present

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP), since 2016	CAHP
Registered Professional Archaeologist (RPA), since 2015	RPA

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Certificate in Technical Writing, Dalhousie University	2022
Certificate in Project Management, University of British Columbia,	2014

AWARDS

McCain Postdoctoral Teaching Fellowship, Mount Allison University	2020-21
Parks Canada Chief Executive Officer Award of Excellence	2011
FA Aldrich Fellowship, Memorial University	2000-2002
Gold Medal for Anthropology	2000



HENRY CARY, Ph.D., CAHP, RPA

Senior Archaeologist & Team Lead/ Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist

CAREER

Senior Archaeologist & Team Lead, WSP E&I Canada Limited, Burlington, Ontario	2022 – Present
Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist & Senior Archaeologist, WSP Golder, London, Ontario	2015 – 2021
Archaeology Field Manager, CH2M, Calgary, Alberta	2014 – 2015
Heritage Manager, Town of Lunenburg UNESCO World Heritage Site, Lunenburg, Nova Scotia	2012-2014
Field Unit Archaeologist, Western Arctic Field Unit, Parks Canada, Inuvik, Northwest Territories	2009-2012
Project Archaeologist, Ontario Service Centre, Parks Canada, Cornwall, Ontario	2002-2009

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

- **Cultural Heritage Impact Statement, New Civic Development for The Ottawa Hospital, Carling Avenue at Prince of Wales Drive and Preston Street, City of Ottawa (2021).** Discipline lead and principal author for a cultural heritage impact statement (CHIS) for the proposed New Civic Development of The Ottawa Hospital (TOH), adjacent to the Rideau Canal UNESCO World Heritage Site and within a portion of the Canadian Experimental Farm (CEF) National Historic Site.
- **Cultural Heritage Evaluation and Heritage Impact Assessment, Three Grand River Crossings, City of Brantford (2020-2021).** Discipline lead and report author for a cultural heritage evaluation report and subsequent heritage impact assessment for the Lorne Bridge (built 1923), Brant’s Crossing Bridge (1913), and Toronto, Hamilton, and Buffalo Crossing Bridge (1893) spanning the Grand River in Brantford.
- **Heritage Impact Assessment, Heritage Structure Report, Heritage Documentation Report, & Heritage Conservation Plan – 12259 Chinguacousy Road, Town of Caledon (2015-2021).** Principal investigator, task manager, and report author of multiple heritage studies for a municipally listed, mid-19th century log farmhouse and twelve associated outbuildings on a large rural property. Reporting for the studies included determining the farm’s structural sequence, producing measured drawings, coordinating archival research and reporting with junior staff, developing mitigation strategies, and a comprehensive conservation plan to guide moving the structures prior to the property’s development for residential housing.
- **Cultural Heritage Screening Report & Cultural Heritage Assessment Report, Regional Water System Upgrades in the City of Cambridge and Township of North Dumfries, Region of Waterloo (2020).** Discipline lead and report author for a cultural heritage screening and subsequent assessment of potential elevated water tank sites. Field investigations and background research identified fifteen known and potential cultural heritage resources in the project study areas.
- **Environmental Project Report and Cultural Heritage Assessment Report – Toronto Downtown Relief Line, City of Toronto (2020).** Discipline lead and task manager for an environmental project report (EPR) and cultural heritage assessment report (CHAR) for a 7.5-km-long subway line corridor with multiple stations routed through downtown Toronto commercial and residential districts. Reporting for the EPR and CHAR included identification and evaluation of over



100 known and potential cultural heritage resources in the project study area, application of Ontario heritage evaluation criteria and policies, coordinating archival research, field work, and reporting with junior staff, and consultation and securing approvals from the MCM.

- **Desjardins Canal Cultural Heritage Assessment, Dundas, City of Hamilton (2020).** Principal investigator and author for a heritage evaluation of the Desjardins Canal and associated features in the town of Dundas and Cootes Paradise. Built between 1827 and 1837, the Desjardins Canal was expanded and changed in course through the 19th century. Field investigations included landscape survey and mapping, determining the structural sequence, application of City of Hamilton heritage evaluation criteria to a large industrial type site, coordinating archival research and reporting with junior staff, and engaging a number of stakeholders including the Royal Botanical Gardens.
- **Environmental Assessment and Heritage Impact Assessment – NextBridge East-West Tie Transmission Project, Northwestern Ontario (2019).** Discipline lead and task manager for an environmental assessment and supplementary heritage impact assessment of a proposed 450-km long transmission line project between Thunder Bay and Wawa Ontario. Reporting for the EA and HIA included arranging logistics for the field investigations, evaluation of six potential heritage assets including a Second World War internment camp, application of Ontario heritage evaluation criteria, coordinating archival research and reporting with junior staff, and securing approvals from the MCM.
- **Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report, Bruce’s or Carrick Mill, Bruce’s Mill Conservation Area, Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville (2019).** Principal investigator, task manager, and report author for a cultural heritage evaluation of the Bruce’s Mill and associated features, built between 1856 and 1858. Field investigations included landscape survey and mapping of the mill complex, determining the structural sequence, evaluation using Ontario Regulation 9/06 for a large industrial site, and coordinating archival research and reporting with junior staff. The project also required engaging heritage staff from the Town and Toronto and Region Conservation Authority.
- **Cultural Heritage Evaluation and Heritage Impact Assessment, Power Downtown Project, City of Toronto (2019).** As part of the Power Downtown Project, Hydro One required a heritage evaluation of the Terauley Transformer Station, listed as the “Toronto Hydro-Electric Dynamo House” with a date of circa 1889. Following the Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties, the evaluation determined that Terauley has a complex structural history and found that the property met the criteria for cultural heritage value or interest as prescribed in Ontario Regulation 9/06. From this evaluation, a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) was conducted to ensure that installing new underground transmission circuits would not impact the property’s heritage attributes.
- **Heritage Conservation Statement & Cultural Heritage Impact Statement, Ottawa New Edinburgh Club (ONEC) Boathouse Recognized Federal Heritage Building, City of Ottawa (2019).** Discipline lead and technical reviewer for a heritage conservation statement and cultural heritage impact statement to support rehabilitation of the Ottawa New Edinburgh Club (ONEC) Boathouse, a Recognized Federal Heritage Building on the Ottawa River owned by the National Capital Commission. The conservation statement recommended a series of rehabilitation actions based on the Standards & Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada while the assessment considered the impacts of the proposed rehabilitation on the building’s character-defining

elements. The studies involved field documentation and analysis of the structural history as well as extensive consultation with stakeholders.

- **Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report, Heritage Assessment Recommendation Report, and Statement of Cultural Heritage Value – RH Saunders Generating Station (2018).** Discipline lead and technical reviewer for a heritage evaluation of the RH Saunders Generating Station (GS). Reporting for the project involved engaging local stakeholders, evaluation using the Ontario Regulation 9/06 and Ontario Regulation 10/06, and meeting the requirements outlined in the OPG *Heritage Identification and Evaluation Manual* and MCM *Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties*.
- **Nashville Road Development, Nashville-Kleinburg Heritage Conservation District, City of Vaughan (2018).** Principal investigator and senior advisor for a heritage impact assessment of a large residential development within the Nashville-Kleinburg Heritage Conservation District (HCD). Project tasks included conducting field investigations, coordinating archival research, and providing recommendations ensure the proposed development would not adversely impact individual properties or the cultural heritage values of the HCD.
- **Cultural Heritage Assessment Report, Baseline Road Bus Rapid Transit Corridor, City of Ottawa, ON (2017).** Discipline lead and technical reviewer for a cultural heritage assessment report as part of an environmental assessment for an extensive transit corridor with 25 new stations. The assessment considered the impacts of the proposed project on the heritage values of the Greenbelt, the Central Experimental Farm National Historic Site, and Rideau Canal National Historic Site, and recommended a detailed list of conservation and mitigation measures based on provincial and federal guidance. The report was accepted as comprehensive by the City, NCC, and Parks Canada.
- **Nation Rise Wind Farm Heritage Impact Assessment, Municipality of North Stormont, Ontario (2017).** Technical reviewer, task manager, and lead field investigator for a heritage impact assessment for the Nation Rise Wind Farm, covering 10,947 hectares northwest of Cornwall. Reporting for the HIA included fieldwork to document 43 properties, identification and evaluation of 18 potential cultural heritage resources in the project study area, application of Ontario heritage evaluation criteria and policies, and coordinating archival research, and reporting with junior staff. The project also involved securing approvals from the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries, as well as meeting the reporting requirements under the Renewable Energy Act (REA).
- **Structural Walls Policy Development, City of Cambridge (2016).** Principal investigator, task manager, and author of a technical memorandum assessing the heritage potential of structural walls in the City of Cambridge inventory and recommending conservation measures to support the City of Cambridge Asset Management Plan.



HEIDY SCHOPF, MES, CAHP

Built Heritage and Cultural Landscape Team Lead



PROFILE

Heidy Schopf is the Built Heritage and Cultural Landscape Team Lead for WSP E&I Canada Limited. She is a Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist and has worked in the field of cultural resource management since 2007. Ms. Schopf is a Professional Member of the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP).

Ms. Schopf has worked on hundreds of cultural heritage projects in Ontario, including Cultural Heritage Reports, Cultural Heritage Evaluation Reports (CHERs), Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs), Strategic Conservation Plans (SCP), heritage documentation (photography, photogrammetry, and LiDAR), Heritage Conservation District (HCD) Studies, and heritage peer review. She regularly provides cultural heritage conservation guidance to public and private sector clients. Heidy is a Senior Project Manager and has managed and delivered cultural heritage work under a variety of processes, including: *Environmental Assessment Act*, *Planning Act*, *Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP)*, and the *Ontario Heritage Act*. She has extensive and applied knowledge of Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport (MTCS) guidance documents for heritage properties.

Ms. Schopf has had the privilege of working with Indigenous Nations on several projects to gather Indigenous perspectives on cultural heritage and integrate this shared learning into WSP's heritage work.

Areas of practice

- Cultural Heritage Assessment Reports
- Cultural Heritage Report: Existing Conditions and Preliminary Impact Assessments
- Cultural Heritage Evaluation Reports
- Heritage Impact Assessments
- Strategic Conservation Plans
- Heritage Documentation (Photography and 3DLiDAR)
- Heritage Conservation District Studies
- Peer Review
- Project Management

Languages

English

EDUCATION

Master of Environmental Studies (MES), Planning Program, York University	2011
Bachelor of Arts (BA), Anthropology and World History, McGill University	2007

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Senior Project Manager Certificate, Wood Environment & Infrastructure Solutions Canada Limited (Wood)	2022
Subject Matter Expert in Cultural Heritage, Global Technical Expert Network (GTEN), Wood	2021
MetroInx Personal Track Safety Program	2020
CN Contractor Orientation Course	2020
RAQs Certified in Environmental/Heritage/Natural Sciences, MTO	2020
Secret (Level II) Federal Security Clearance, PWGSC	2017

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals, since 2015	CAHP
--	------

CAREER

Built Heritage and Cultural Landscape Team Lead, WSP E&I Canada Limited	2022 – Present
Built Heritage and Cultural Landscape Team Lead, Wood	2019 – 2022
Cultural Heritage Specialist, Stantec	2016 – 2019
Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI)	2011 – 2016



PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Environmental Assessment

- **Cultural Heritage Assessment Report for the Hespeler Pedestrian Bridge Schedule ‘B’ Municipal Class EA, City of Cambridge, Ontario** (Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist, Wood, 2022-ongoing). Acted as the Cultural Heritage task manager and coordinated completion of background research, information gathering, field review, and report writing. Participated in engagement meetings with local Indigenous Nations. Carried out senior review of the cultural heritage deliverable.
- **Niagara Region, Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments, Phase I and II South Niagara Wastewater Treatment Plant, Niagara Falls, Ontario** (Project Manager and Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist, Wood, 2020-ongoing). Coordinated CHIA background research, information gathering, and field review. Completed senior review of deliverable. Review of invoices and submission of change orders to client.
- **Cultural Heritage Assessment Report: Existing Conditions and Impact Assessment Schedule C MCEA for Regional Road 37 (Merritt Road) and Regional Road 54 (Rice Road), in the Town of Pelham, City of Thorold, and City of Welland, Ontario** (Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist, Wood, 2020-ongoing). Coordinated CHAR background research, information gathering, and field review. Completed senior review of deliverable.
- **Upper Wellington Street (Limeridge Road to Stone Church Road) Municipal Class EA MHSTCI Checklist, Ontario** (Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist, Wood, 2020-ongoing). Coordinated Checklist and completed senior review of deliverable.
- **Cultural Heritage Assessment Report, Arterial Roads (Parts A and B) Within Hwy 427 Industrial Secondary Plan Area, City of Brampton, Ontario** (Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist, Wood, 2020-ongoing). Coordinated CHAR update, including background research, information gathering, and field review. Completed senior review of deliverable.
- **West Street and Charing Cross Street Municipal Class EA, Cultural Heritage Assessment Report: Existing Conditions and Impact Assessment, City of Brantford, Ontario** (Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist, 2020). Coordinated background research and completed fieldwork, and inventory of cultural heritage resources. Completed an impact assessment and recommended mitigation measures. Recommended further studies where direct impacts were anticipated to cultural heritage resources.
- **Gordon Dean Avenue – Municipal Class EA, MHSTCI Checklist and Memo, City of Hamilton, Ontario** (Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist, 2020). Coordinated background review, field review, information gathering, and completion of MHSCT Screening Checklist. Provided senior guidance and review for deliverable.

- **Speedvale Avenue East Reconstruction EA, Cultural Heritage Assessment Report: Existing Conditions and Impact Assessment, City of Guelph, Ontario** (Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist, Wood, 2019-2020). Carried out all aspects of the Cultural Heritage Report including background research, fieldwork, and inventory of cultural heritage resources. Completed an impact assessment and recommended mitigation measures. Recommended further studies where direct impacts were anticipated to cultural heritage resources.
- **Boyne Active Transportation Link, Cultural Heritage Assessment Report, Town of Milton, Ontario** (Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist, Wood, 2020). Coordinated background research and carried out fieldwork. Created an inventory of cultural heritage resources for properties with potential or protected cultural heritage value or interest. Completed an impact assessment and no issues were identified. No further work recommended.

Heritage Impact Assessments

- **Heritage Impact Assessment: Doon Village Road Bridge Rehabilitation, Doon Bridges #1 and #2 (Bridge ID #802 and #803), City of Kitchener, Ontario. (Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist, 2022)** Coordinated the completion of the HIA and completed senior QA/QC of the deliverable. Presented findings to the City of Kitchener Heritage Committee and drafted the heritage permit to support restoration work proposed for the bridges.
- **Cultural Heritage Impact Statement, Macville Lands Proposed Official Plan Amendment (POPA), Town of Caledon, Peel Region, Ontario (Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist, 2022)** Carried out fieldwork and completed Senior QA/QC for the draft and final deliverable.
- **Heritage Impact Assessment, The Newhouse Farm, 12891 Hurontario Street, Town of Caledon, Ontario (Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist, 2022)** Completed Senior QA/QC for the draft and final deliverable.
- **Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment for the College Street School, 132 College Street, Township of West Lincoln, Niagara Region, Ontario (Project Manager and Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist 2022)** Coordinated the preparation of a CHIA for the College Street School (132 College Street), including information gathering, background research, fieldwork, heritage evaluation, impact assessment, and report writing. Completed senior QA/QC of the draft and final deliverable.
- **Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment for the Smith House, 5602 Robinson Street, City of Niagara Falls, Regional Municipality of Niagara, Ontario (Project Manager and Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist 2022)** Coordinated the preparation of a CHIA for 5602 Robinson Street in the City of Niagara Falls, including information gathering, background research, fieldwork, heritage evaluation, impact assessment, and report writing. Completed senior QA/QC of the draft and final deliverable.

- **Heritage Impact Assessment for 150 Randall Street, 125 Navy Street, and 143 Church Street, Town of Oakville, Ontario (Project Manager and Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist 2020)** Completed an Heritage Impact Assessment for a proposed mixed use development in downtown Oakville that was located adjacent to three designated heritage properties, one listed heritage property, and a Heritage Conservation District. Completed a detailed impact assessment and recommended conservation guidance to mitigate indirect impacts.
- **Heritage Impact Assessment, 1352 Wharncliffe Avenue Road South, City of London (Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist, Wood, 2019)** Carried out consultation, coordinated background research, and completed fieldwork, reporting, and heritage evaluation against O. Reg. 9/06. Recommended mitigation measures and next steps.
- **Heritage Impact Statement, 2096 Wonderland Road North, City of London, Ontario (Cultural Heritage Specialist, Stantec, 2018)** Carried out a Heritage Impact Assessment for a listed heritage property in the City of London. Reported fieldwork results, coordinated background research, consulted with the municipality and relevant agencies. Evaluated the property against O. Reg. 9.06 of the Ontario Heritage Act, identified heritage attributes, and drafted a statement of significance. Explored mitigation measures and recommended next steps for the preservation of the property.
- **Heritage Impact Statement for 144 Brock Street (Pig’s Ear), 442-448 George Street North (Morrow Building), and 450 George Street North (Black Horse), City of Peterborough, Ontario (Project Manager and Cultural Heritage Specialist, Stantec, 2017-2018)** Heritage Impact Statement for three properties in downtown Peterborough. Carried out fieldwork, report writing, impact assessment, and recommended mitigation measures. Carried out project management tasks including development of scope and cost, client communication, meetings, and billing.

PUBLICATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Publications

- Foster, Jennifer and Heidy Schopf. (2017). *Mineral Migration: Extracting, Recomposing, Demolishing, and Recolonizing Toronto’s Landscape*. Landscript 5, Material culture: assembling and disassembling landscapes, Jane Hutton (ed.). 2017.
- Schopf, Heidy. (2016). *The Leslie Street Spit: Urban wilderness and cultural heritage landscape*. Ground: Landscape Architect Quarterly.
- Schopf, Heidy and Jennifer Foster. (2014). *Buried Localities: Archaeological Exploration of a Toronto Dump and Wilderness Refuge*. *Local Environment: The International Journal of Justice and Sustainability*, Vol.19, Issue 10, Special Issue: Urban Post-Industrial Greenspace.



JOHANNA KELLY, MSc.

Cultural Heritage Specialist | Staff Archaeologist



PROFILE

Johanna Kelly is a Cultural Heritage Specialist and Staff Archaeologist for WSP E&I Canada Limited. She has worked in the field of cultural resource management since 2007. Ms. Kelly holds a professional archaeological license (P1017).

Ms. Kelly has worked on a wide variety of projects throughout Ontario, including Cultural Heritage Reports, Heritage Impact Assessments (HIAs), Cultural Heritage Evaluation Reports (CHERs), Strategic Conservation Plans (SCPs), heritage documentation (photography and photogrammetry), Heritage Conservation District (HCD) studies and plans, and archaeological assessments. She is a Project Manager and has managed and delivered cultural heritage work under a variety of processes, including: *Environmental Assessment Act, Planning Act, Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP)*, and the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Ms. Kelly also has extensive experience as a bioarchaeologist, conducting Burial Site Investigations as ordered by the Registrar of Burials.

Areas of practice

- *Cultural Heritage Screenings*
- *Identification and evaluation of built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes*
- *Mitigation of proposed impacts on heritage resources*
- *Heritage survey techniques*
- *Heritage documentation (photography and photogrammetry)*
- *Heritage conservation*
- *Archaeological Assessments*
- *Bioarchaeology and osteology*

EDUCATION

Master of Science (MSc.), Biological Anthropology, University of Toronto 2010

Bachelor of Arts, honours (BA), Biological Anthropology, McMaster University 2007

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals, Intern Member	CAHP
Society for the Study of Architecture in Canada	SSAC
Ontario Archaeological Society	OAS
Canadian Association for Biological Anthropology	CABA

Languages

English

CAREER

Cultural Heritage Specialist / Staff Archaeologist, WSP E&I Canada Limited, Manitoba & Ontario	2022 - Present
Cultural Heritage Specialist / Staff Archaeologist, Wood, Manitoba & Ontario	2022
Bioarchaeologist and Cultural Heritage Project Manager, Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI), Ontario	2018 – 2022
Bioarchaeologist and Cultural Heritage Assistant, ASI, Ontario	2015 – 2018
Archaeologist, Socio-cultural Division, Golder Associates Limited (now WSP), British Columbia	2014 – 2015
Bioarchaeologist and Archaeologist, ASI, Ontario	2007 – 2014



PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Select Environmental Assessment Projects

- **Mill Street Growth Related Detailed Design Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment, Town of Caledon, Ontario**
(Project Manager and Cultural Heritage Specialist, ASI, 2021). Identification of cultural heritage resources within and/or adjacent to the study area and made recommendations regarding preferred alternatives based on potential impacts to heritage resources. Coordinated background research and field review. Completed review of deliverable. Prepared invoices and submission of deliverables to client.
- **Humber Station Road Growth Related Detailed Design Phase 2, Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment, Town of Caledon, Ontario**
(Project Manager and Cultural Heritage Specialist, ASI, 2021). Identification of cultural heritage resources within and/or adjacent to the study area and made recommendations regarding preferred alternatives based on potential impacts to heritage resources. Coordinated background research and field review. Completed review of deliverable. Prepared invoices and submission of deliverables to client.
- **Clearview Township Water Servicing Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment, Clearview Township, Ontario**
(Project Manager and Cultural Heritage Specialist, ASI, 2020). Identification of cultural heritage resources within and/or adjacent to the study area and made recommendations regarding preferred alternatives based on potential impacts to heritage resources.
- **Sunnidale Street Sanitary Improvements Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment, Town of Stayner, Ontario**
(Project Manager and Cultural Heritage Specialist, ASI, 2020). Identification of cultural heritage resources within and/or adjacent to the study area and made recommendations regarding preferred alternatives based on potential impacts to heritage resources.
- **St. Paul Avenue Reconstruction Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment, City of Brantford, Ontario**
(Project Manager and Cultural Heritage Specialist, ASI, 2020). Identification of cultural heritage resources within and/or adjacent to the study area and made recommendations regarding preferred alternatives based on potential impacts to heritage resources. Coordinated background research and field review. Completed review of deliverable. Prepared invoices and submission of deliverables to client.
- **Campbellford Bridge/Trent River Crossing and Arterial Road Network Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment, Municipality of Trent Hills, Ontario**
(Project Manager and Cultural Heritage Specialist, ASI, 2020). Identification of cultural heritage resources within and/or adjacent to the study area and made recommendations regarding preferred alternatives based on potential impacts to heritage resources. Coordinated background research and conducted field review. Completed review of deliverable. Prepared invoices and submission of deliverables to client.
- **Elgin Mills Road Corridor Improvements Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment, City of Markham, Ontario**



(Project Manager and Cultural Heritage Specialist, ASI, 2020). Identification of cultural heritage resources within and/or adjacent to the study area and made recommendations regarding preferred alternatives based on potential impacts to heritage resources. Coordinated background research and field review. Completed review of deliverable. Prepared invoices and submission of deliverables to client.

— **Basement Flooding Remediation and Water Quality Improvement Study Area 45, City of Toronto, Ontario**

(Project Manager and Cultural Heritage Specialist, ASI, 2020). Identification of cultural heritage resources within and/or adjacent to the study area and made recommendations regarding preferred alternatives based on potential impacts to heritage resources. Coordinated background research and field review. Completed review of deliverable. Prepared invoices and submission of deliverables to client.

— **Newcastle Water Pollution Control Plant Upgrades Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment, Municipality of Clarington, Ontario**

(Project Manager and Cultural Heritage Specialist, ASI, 2020). Identification of cultural heritage resources within and/or adjacent to the study area and made recommendations regarding preferred alternatives based on potential impacts to heritage resources. Coordinated background research and field review. Completed review of deliverable. Prepared invoices and submission of deliverables to client.

— **Kanata Highway Maintenance Patrol Yard Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment, City of Ottawa, Ontario**

(Project Manager and Cultural Heritage Specialist, ASI, 2020). Identification of cultural heritage resources within and/or adjacent to the study area and made recommendations regarding preferred alternatives based on potential impacts to heritage resources.

— **Teston Road Area Transportation Improvements Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment, City of York, Ontario**

(Project Manager and Cultural Heritage Specialist, ASI, 2020). Identification of cultural heritage resources within and/or adjacent to the study area and made recommendations regarding preferred alternatives based on potential impacts to heritage resources.

— **Ferguson Lake Road Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment, Township of Greater Madawaska, Ontario**

(Project Manager and Cultural Heritage Specialist, ASI, 2020). Identification of cultural heritage resources within and/or adjacent to the study area and made recommendations regarding preferred alternatives based on potential impacts to heritage resources.

— **Columbia Way Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment, Town of Caledon, Ontario**

(Project Manager and Cultural Heritage Specialist, ASI, 2020). Identification of cultural heritage resources within and/or adjacent to the study area and made recommendations regarding preferred alternatives based on potential impacts to heritage resources.

— **Heritage Road Watermain Construction Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment, City of Brampton and City of Mississauga, Ontario**



(Project Manager and Cultural Heritage Specialist, ASI, 2020). Identification of cultural heritage resources within and/or adjacent to the study area and made recommendations regarding preferred alternatives based on potential impacts to heritage resources.

— **Eastern Ontario Waste Handling Facility Future Development Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment, Township of North Stormont, Ontario**

(Project Manager and Cultural Heritage Specialist, ASI, 2020). Identification of cultural heritage resources within and/or adjacent to the study area and made recommendations regarding preferred alternatives based on potential impacts to heritage resources.

— **Derry Road East and Bramalea Road Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment, City of Mississauga, Ontario**

(Project Manager and Cultural Heritage Specialist, ASI, 2020). Identification of cultural heritage resources within and/or adjacent to the study area and made recommendations regarding preferred alternatives based on potential impacts to heritage resources.

Select Heritage Impact Assessments

— **6516 Sixth Line Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Heritage Impact Assessment, Town of Milton, Ontario**

(Cultural Heritage Specialist, 2022-ongoing). Cultural heritage evaluation of the property at 6516 Sixth Line. Conducted background research, analysis, report writing, heritage evaluation, and recommendations.

— **Sir Adam Beck Generating Station Heritage Impact Assessment, Town of Niagara Falls, Ontario**

(Cultural Heritage Specialist, 2022-ongoing). Impact Assessment of proposed upgrades to the Sir Adam Beck Generating Station. Conducted background research, analysis, report writing, and recommendations.

— **Duffy's Lane Bridge (Structure B22072010) Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Heritage Impact Assessment, Town of Caledon, Ontario**

(Project Manager and Cultural Heritage Specialist, ASI, 2021). Coordinated background research, fieldwork, heritage evaluation, impact assessment, and recommended mitigation measures.

— **Black River Road/Victoria Falls Bridge (structure ID 400019) Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Heritage Impact Assessment, City of Kawartha Lakes, Ontario**

(Project Manager and Cultural Heritage Specialist, ASI, 2021). Carried out background research, fieldwork, heritage evaluation, impact assessment, and recommended mitigation measures.

— **120 Grand Road Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report and Heritage Impact Assessment, Municipality of Trent Hills, Ontario**

(Project Manager and Cultural Heritage Specialist, ASI, 2020). Cultural heritage evaluation of the property at 120 Grand Road. Carried out fieldwork, analysis, report writing, heritage evaluation, and recommendations. Identified impacts and recommendations to mitigate negative impacts to the site.



golder.com