

CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT STATEMENT


THE MANORS OF BELFOUNTAIN - 0 MISSISSAUGA ROAD
TOWN OF CALEDON, REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF PEEL, ONTARIO

Prepared for:

The Manors of Belfountain Corporation
7681 Highway 27 Unit 16
Woodbridge, ON L4L 4M5

ASI File: 18CH-156

April 2019



CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT STATEMENT

THE MANORS OF BELFOUNTAIN - 0 MISSISSAUGA ROAD TOWN OF CALEDON, REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF PEEL, ONTARIO

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2017, Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) was contracted by the Manors of Belfountain Corporation to conduct a Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment (CHRA) of a Plan of Subdivision for the property at 0 Mississauga Road, located on the west side of Mississauga Road, along the east side of Shaws Creek Road, and south of Old Main Street (Bush Street) in the Hamlet of Belfountain, Town of Caledon, Regional Municipality of Peel ("2018 CHRA") (ASI 2018). The 2018 CHRA resulted in the identification of 14 nineteenth- and twentieth-century cultural heritage resources, including seven built heritage resources and seven cultural heritage landscapes, within and adjacent to the Manors of Belfountain Study Area (ASI 2018).

The proposed development for the subject property at 0 Mississauga Road consists of a proposed Plan of Subdivision for the subject lands for the development of a 70-lot estate residential subdivision on approximately 70.35 hectares. Following the 2018 CHRA for the Plan of Subdivision, it was determined through additional consultation with the Town of Caledon, the Ministry of Transportation and Culture (MTCS), and the Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC) that a Cultural Heritage Impact Statement (CHIS) should be prepared for the subject property to evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed Plan of Subdivision on the existing property and adjacent cultural heritage resources.

As part of this report, an evaluation of the cultural heritage value of the subject property has been conducted using the criteria described in Ontario Regulation 9/06 and to determine the impact of the proposed development on any parts of the property determined to retain cultural heritage value. The evaluation of the property under Ontario Regulation 9/06 determined that the subject property at 0 Mississauga Road retains cultural heritage value, and the results of the impact assessment have determined that the proposed development at 0 Mississauga Road will conserve its cultural heritage value. While the proposed development will result in a change of land use within the subject property from agricultural to residential, the development plan has been designed to preserve significant elements of the remnant agricultural landscape.

The evaluation of the subject property at 0 Mississauga Road against Ontario Regulation 9/06 evaluation determined that the property at 0 Mississauga Road has physical, historical, and contextual value. As such, the following recommendations should be contemplated by Town of Caledon staff as part of the final approval of the proposed development application at the Manors of Belfountain:

1. Landscaping treatments, including the preservation of existing trees, vegetation, and stone mounds within the subject property and the introduction of new vegetation, should be carefully considered to ensure the proposed development is physically and visually compatible with the identified heritage attributes within the subject property and those identified built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes adjacent to the subject property.

2. Should the Plan of Subdivision for the subject property be approved, an Interpretation Strategy should be created to provide the public with a greater understanding of the history of the property. The Interpretation Strategy should include signage and should be accessible within the public realm.

3. This Cultural Heritage Impact Statement report should be sent to the Heritage Planning Department at the Town of Caledon for review and comment. Following the review and revision process, the final report should be submitted to the Town of Caledon as well as the Peel Art Gallery Museum and Archives (PAMA) for archival purposes.



PROJECT PERSONNEL

Senior Project Manager:	Katherine Hull, PhD, CAHP Partner and Director, Cultural Heritage Division
Cultural Heritage Specialist:	Laura Loney, MPlan, CAHP Cultural Heritage Specialist Project Manager - Cultural Heritage Division
Project Administrator	Carol Bella, Hon. BA Research Archaeologist and Administrative Assistant
Background Research:	Kirstyn Allam, BA (Hon), Advanced Diploma in Applied Museum Studies Cultural Heritage Assistant, Cultural Heritage Division Laura Loney
Field Review:	Laura Loney Andrew Clish, BES Senior Archaeologist
Report Preparation:	Laura Loney
Graphics Preparation:	Robin Latour, BA, MPhil Geomatics Specialist, Operations Division
Report Reviewers:	James Neilson, MES Cultural Heritage Specialist Project Manager - Cultural Heritage Division John Sleath, MA Associate Archaeologist Project Manager - Cultural Heritage Division Rebecca Sciarra, MA, CAHP Partner & Director, Business Services Division



TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY ii

PROJECT PERSONNEL iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS..... iv

1.0 INTRODUCTION 1

1.2 Property Owner Contact Information 3

1.3 Policy Framework 3

1.3.1 Planning Act (1990) and Provincial Policy Statement (2014)..... 3

1.3.2 Niagara Escarpment Plan (2017)..... 4

1.3.3 Town of Caledon Official Plan (April 2018 Consolidation) 6

1.4 Cultural Heritage Value..... 7

2.0 HISTORICAL RESEARCH 8

2.1 Indigenous Land Use and Settlement..... 8

2.2 Historical Euro-Canadian Land Use: Township Survey and Settlement 10

2.2.1 Township of Caledon..... 10

2.2.1 Land-Use History 10

3.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS 17

3.1 Existing Heritage Resources 17

3.2 Development Site – Existing Conditions..... 18

3.3 Identified Cultural Heritage Landscapes and Built Heritage Resources 20

4.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE 27

4.1 Existing Heritage Protection 27

4.2 Ontario Regulation 9/06 Evaluation 27

5.0 PROPOSED STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE 29

6.1 Proposed Development..... 30

6.2 Impact Assessment..... 30

6.3 Considered Alternatives and Mitigation Strategies..... 33

6.3.1 Alternatives 33

6.3.2 Mitigation Strategies..... 34

7.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS 35

8.0 REFERENCES 36

APPENDIX A - IDENTIFIED BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCES AND CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPES WITHIN AND ADJACENT TO THE SUBJECT PROPERTY 40

APPENDIX B – PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN 41

APPENDIX C – TREE INVENTORY AND PRESERVATION PLAN..... 42

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Site Map 1

Figure 2: Aerial Photograph of the Subject Property..... 2

Figure 3: 1859 Tremaine Map of Peel County, Annotated by ASI 12

Figure 4: 1877 Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Peel 13

Figure 5: 1917 Guidal Directory Map of Caledon Township 14

Figure 6: 1937 National Topographic Map 15



Figure 7: 1954 Aerial Photograph 16

Figure 8: 1994 National Topographic Map 17

Figure 9: Southwest view into the subject property from the Blair-Belfountain Cemetery 19

Figure 10: Looking southwest into the subject property along Mississauga Road..... 19

Figure 11: Looking west into agricultural fields along the south treeline within the subject property 19

Figure 12: Looking west into the woodlot at the east end of the subject property..... 19

Figure 13: Stone mounds and vegetation at the west end of the south treeline of subject property, looking south..... 20

Figure 14: Stone mounds and vegetation at the midpoint of the south treeline of the subject property, looking south..... 20

Figure 15: CHL 1 - Cemetery 21

Figure 16: Centrally-located driveway, looking north towards Mississauga Road 22

Figure 17: Looking west along Mississauga Road, showing remnant farmscape to the south 22

Figure 18: Concrete foundation within remnant farmscape to the south of the barn structure, looking southeast 22

Figure 19: Concrete foundation within remnant farmscape to the west of the remnant barn structure, looking west 22

Figure 20: Silo within the remnant farmscape, looking northwest 23

Figure 21: Barn structure ruins within the remnant farmscape, looking north 23

Figure 22: CHL 2 - Remnant Farm Complex 23

Figure 23: CHL 3 - Mississauga Road/Old Main Street..... 24

Figure 24: CHL 4 - Farm Complex, 17200 Mississauga Road..... 24

Figure 25: CHL 5 – 699 Bush Street..... 24

Figure 26: CHL 6 - Shaw Creek Road, south of Bush Street 24

Figure 27: CHL 7 - Belfountain and the Credit River Gorge 25

Figure 28: BHR 1 - 17170 Old Main Street 25

Figure 29: BHR 2 – 17176 Old Main Street 25

Figure 30: BHR 3 – 17180 Old Main Street 26

Figure 31: BHR 4 – 17190 Old Main Street 26

Figure 32: BHR 5 - 17196 Old Main Street 26

Figure 33: BHR 6 - 17204 Old Main Street 26

Figure 34: BHR 7 - 17153 Old Main Street 27

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Summary of built heritage resources (BHR) and cultural heritage landscapes (CHL) within and adjacent to the development site..... 20

Table 2: Evaluation of 0 Mississauga Road using Ontario Regulation 9/06..... 27

Table 3: Impact Assessment – 0 Mississauga Road 31

Table 4: Impact Assessment – Identified Adjacent CHRs..... 32



1.0 INTRODUCTION

In 2017, Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) was contracted by the Manors of Belfountain Corporation to conduct a Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment (CHRA) of a Plan of Subdivision for the property at 0 Mississauga Road, located on the west side of Mississauga Road, along the east side of Shaws Creek Road, and south of Old Main Street (Bush Street) in the Hamlet of Belfountain, Town of Caledon, Regional Municipality of Peel (“2018 CHRA”) (ASI 2018). The 2018 CHRA resulted in the identification of 14 nineteenth- and twentieth-century cultural heritage resources, including seven built heritage resources and seven cultural heritage landscapes, within and adjacent to the Manors of Belfountain Study Area (ASI 2018).

The proposed development for the subject property at 0 Mississauga Road includes a proposed Plan of Subdivision for the subject lands for the development of a 70-lot estate residential subdivision on approximately 70.35 hectares. Following the 2018 CHRA for the Plan of Subdivision, it was determined through additional consultation with the Town of Caledon, the Ministry of Transportation and Culture (MTCS), and the Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC), that a Cultural Heritage Impact Statement (CHIS) should be prepared for the subject property to evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed Plan of Subdivision on the existing property and adjacent cultural heritage resources.




Figure 1: Site Map

(Open Street Maps, Annotated by ASI)





Figure 2: Aerial Photograph of the Subject Property

For the purposes of this CHIS, analysis and site visits were conducted by Laura Loney, Cultural Heritage Specialist, with Andrew Clish, Senior Archaeologist, and background research was conducted by Kirstyn Allam, Cultural Heritage Assistant, under the senior project direction of Dr. Katherine Hull, Partner and Director, Cultural Heritage Division, ASI. The present CHIS follows the Ministry of Tourism, Cultural and Sports' *Ontario Heritage Toolkit* (2006), the Town of Caledon's *Official Plan* (April 2018 Consolidation), and the *Parks Canada Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada* (2010) (Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport 2006; Town of Caledon 2018b; Parks Canada 2010). Research was completed to investigate, document and evaluate the cultural heritage resources within and adjacent to the study area.

This document will provide:

- A description of the cultural heritage resources, including location, a detailed land use history of the site, and photographic documentation;
- An evaluation and description of the site's cultural heritage value based on archival research, site analysis, and municipally-accepted criteria for establishing cultural heritage significance;
- An assessment of the impacts of the proposed Plan of Subdivision; and
- A description of potential mitigation measures and recommendations for approval by the Town of Caledon and Niagara Escarpment Commission

1.2 Property Owner Contact Information

The Manors of Belfountain Corporation
7681 Highway 27 Unit 16
Woodbridge, ON L4L 4M5

1.3 Policy Framework

1.3.1 *Planning Act (1990) and Provincial Policy Statement (2014)*

The authority to request this Cultural Heritage Impact Statement arises from Section 2(d) of the *Planning Act* (Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing 1990). The *Planning Act* (1990) and related *Provincial Policy Statement (PPS)*, which was updated in 2014, make a number of provisions relating to heritage conservation (Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing 2014). One of the general purposes of the *Planning Act* is to integrate matters of provincial interest in provincial and municipal planning decisions. In order to inform all those involved in planning activities of the scope of these matters of provincial interest, Section 2 of the *Planning Act* provides an extensive listing. These matters of provincial interest shall be regarded when certain authorities, including the council of a municipality, carry out their responsibilities under the *Act*. One of these provincial interests is directly concerned with:

- 2.(d) the conservation of features of significant architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological or scientific interest

Part 4.7 of the *PPS* states that:

The official plan is the most important vehicle for implementation of this Provincial Policy Statement. Comprehensive, integrated and long-term planning is best achieved through official plans.

Official plans shall identify provincial interests and set out appropriate land use designations and policies. To determine the significance of some natural heritage features and other resources, evaluation may be required.

Official plans should also coordinate cross-boundary matters to complement the actions of other planning authorities and promote mutually beneficial solutions. Official plans shall provide clear, reasonable and attainable policies to protect provincial interests and direct development to suitable areas.

In order to protect provincial interests, planning authorities shall keep their official plans up-to-date with this Provincial Policy Statement. The policies of this Provincial Policy Statement continue to apply after adoption and approval of an official plan.



Those policies of relevance for the conservation of heritage features are contained in Section 2- Wise Use and Management of Resources, wherein Subsection 2.6 - Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Resources, makes the following provisions:

- 2.6.1 Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.

Several definitions that have specific meanings for use in a policy context accompany the policy statement. These definitions include built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes.

A built heritage resource is defined as: “a building, structure, monument, installation or any manufactured remnant that contributes to a property’s cultural heritage value or interest as identified by a community, including an Aboriginal community” (Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing 2014).

A cultural heritage landscape is defined as “a defined geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Aboriginal community. The area may involve features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or association” (Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing 2014). Examples may include, but are not limited to farmscapes, historical settlements, parks, gardens, battlefields, mainstreets and neighbourhoods, cemeteries, trailways, and industrial complexes of cultural heritage value.

In addition, significance is also more generally defined. It is assigned a specific meaning according to the subject matter or policy context, such as wetlands or ecologically important areas. Regarding cultural heritage and archaeology resources, resources of significance are those that are valued for the important contribution they make to our understanding of the history of a place, an event, or a people (Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing 2014).

Criteria for determining significance for the resources are recommended by the Province, but municipal approaches that achieve or exceed the same objective may also be used. While some significant resources may already be identified and inventoried by official sources, the significance of others can only be determined after evaluation (Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing 2014).

1.3.2 Niagara Escarpment Plan (2017)

The subject property is located within the boundaries of the Niagara Escarpment Plan (NEP). The NEP was established in response to the recognition of the Niagara Escarpment as a World Biosphere Reserve by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in 1990. This designation identifies the Niagara Escarpment and the land in its vicinity as a significant landform both nationally and internationally and endorses the NEP.

Implemented in 2010, the NEP is Canada’s first large-scale environmental land use plan. The enactment of the NEP upholds the biosphere reserve principles by balancing protection, conservation and sustainable development to ensure that the Niagara Escarpment will remain a natural environment for



future generations. Cultural heritage policies relevant to this assessment within the NEP include the following:

1.6 Minor Urban Centre

This land use designation identifies those rural settlements, villages and hamlets that are distributed throughout the Niagara Escarpment Plan area.

1.6.1 Objectives

1. To recognize, maintain and enhance existing rural settlements or provide concentration points for development and growth in rural areas.
4. To conserve cultural heritage resources, including features of interest to First Nation and Métis communities.
5. To ensure that new development is compatible with the identity and traditional character of Minor Urban Centres.
6. To direct the growth of villages, hamlets, and settlement areas away from Escarpment Natural Areas and Escarpment Protection Areas into Escarpment Rural Areas in a logical manner with the least possible environmental and agricultural disruption.
7. To ensure that any growth will be in accordance with a municipal official plan and/or secondary plan that is not in conflict with the Niagara Escarpment Plan.

2.10 Cultural Heritage

The objective is to conserve the Escarpment's cultural heritage resources, including significant built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes, and archaeological resources.

2. Where proposed development is likely to impact cultural heritage resources or areas of archaeological potential, the proponent shall undertake a heritage impact assessment and/or archaeological assessment. The proponent must demonstrate that heritage attributes will be conserved through implementation of proposed mitigative measures and/or alternative development approaches.
5. Removal of the property from the list on Appendix 3 shall require an amendment to the Niagara Escarpment Plan.

2.13 Scenic Resources and Landform Conservation

The objective is to ensure that development preserves the natural scenery, and maintains Escarpment Related Landforms and the open landscape character of the Escarpment.



Scenic Resources

1. Development shall ensure the protection of the scenic resources of the Escarpment.
2. Where a visual impact on the scenic resources is identified as a concern by the implementing authority, a visual impact assessment shall be required.

Landform Conservation

5. Planning, design and construction practices shall ensure that Escarpment Related Landforms are maintained and enhanced, and that development is visually compatible with the natural scenery and open landscape character of the Niagara Escarpment (Niagara Escarpment Commission 2017).

1.3.3 Town of Caledon Official Plan (April 2018 Consolidation)

As the subject property is located within the Town of Caledon, the *Town of Caledon Official Plan (April 2018 Consolidation)* was reviewed as part of this assessment (Town of Caledon 2018b). The following policies within Section 3.3 of the *Town of Caledon Official Plan* relate to the conservation of cultural heritage resources within the Town of Caledon:

3.3.3.1.5 Cultural Heritage Impact Statements

- a) Where it is determined that further investigations of cultural heritage resources beyond a Cultural Heritage Survey or Cultural Heritage Planning Statement are required, a Cultural Heritage Impact Statement may be required. The determination of whether a Cultural Heritage Impact Statement is required will be based on the following:
 - i) the extent and significance of cultural heritage resources identified, including archaeological resources and potential, in the Cultural Heritage Survey or Cultural Heritage Planning Statement and the recommendations of the Cultural Heritage Survey or Cultural Heritage Planning Statement;
 - ii) the potential for adverse impacts on cultural heritage resources; and
 - iii) the appropriateness of following other approval processes that consider and address impacts on cultural heritage resources.
- b) Where it is determined that a Cultural Heritage Impact Statement should be prepared, the Cultural Heritage Impact Statement shall be undertaken by a qualified professional with expertise in heritage studies and 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.

Where a Cultural Heritage Impact Statement is required, the proponent is encouraged to consult with the Town and other relevant agencies concerning the scope of the work to be undertaken.

3.3.3.1.15 Vegetation

The Town will encourage the conservation of significant cultural heritage vegetation. Retention of significant cultural heritage vegetation shall be a consideration in the design of any development. The conservation of significant cultural heritage vegetation along streets and roads shall be encouraged by the Town, except where removal is necessary because of disease, damage or to ensure public health and safety

3.3.3.4.1 Cultural Heritage Landscape Inventory

An inventory of candidate cultural heritage landscapes shall be prepared by the Town and maintained through the Heritage Resource Office. A cultural heritage landscape identified through this inventory shall be incorporated into the Plan by way of an Official Plan Amendment. A cultural heritage landscape identified by either this section or by a Cultural Heritage Survey will be appropriately conserved and may be considered for designation under the Ontario Heritage Act.

Prior to the preparation of the inventory of candidate cultural heritage landscapes, candidate cultural heritage landscapes shall be identified by the proponent of development or redevelopment proposals by way of a Cultural Heritage Surveys and, where necessary, a Cultural Heritage Impact Statements as described in Sections 3.3.3.1.4 and 3.3.3.1.5 of this Plan.

1.4 Cultural Heritage Value

The subject property is not listed on the Town of Caledon's Heritage Register, nor is it designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act or formally identified as a significant Cultural Heritage Landscape in an inventory of cultural heritage landscapes per Section 3.3.3.4.1 of the Town of Caledon's *Official Plan* (April 2018 Consolidation). The portion of the property identified as CHL 2 in the 2018 CHRA, which includes the farm remnants identified and located within the east half of subject property, is identified in the Town of Caledon's Built Heritage Resource Inventory (see Appendix A for a map showing built heritage resources and cultural heritage resources identified in the 2018 CHRA).



2.0 HISTORICAL RESEARCH

2.1 Indigenous Land Use and Settlement

Southern Ontario has been occupied by human populations since the retreat of the Laurentide glacier approximately 13,000 years before present (BP) (Ferris 2013). Populations at this time would have been highly mobile, inhabiting a boreal-parkland like the modern sub-arctic. By approximately 10,000 BP, the environment had progressively warmed (Edwards and Fritz 1988) and populations now occupied less extensive territories (Ellis and Deller 1990).

Between approximately 10,000-5,500 BP, the Great Lakes basins experienced low-water levels, and many sites which would have been located on those former shorelines are now submerged. This period produces the earliest evidence of heavy wood working tools, an indication of greater investment of labour in felling trees for fuel, to build shelter, and watercraft production. These activities suggest prolonged seasonal residency at occupation sites. Polished stone and native copper implements were being produced by approximately 8,000 BP; the latter was acquired from the north shore of Lake Superior, evidence of extensive exchange networks throughout the Great Lakes region. The earliest evidence for cemeteries dates to approximately 4,500-3,000 BP and is indicative of increased social organization, investment of labour into social infrastructure, and the establishment of socially prescribed territories (Ellis et al. 1990; Ellis et al. 2009; Brown 1995:13).

Between 3,000-2,500 BP, populations continued to practice residential mobility and to harvest seasonally-available resources, including spawning fish. Exchange and interaction networks broaden at this time (Spence et al. 1990:136, 138) and by approximately 2,000 BP, evidence exists for macro-band camps, focusing on the seasonal harvesting of resources (Spence et al. 1990:155, 164). It is also during this period that maize was first introduced into southern Ontario, though it would have only supplemented people's diet (Birch and Williamson 2013:13–15). Bands likely retreated to interior camps during the winter. It is generally understood that these populations were Algonquian-speakers during these millennia of settlement and land use.

From approximately 1,000 BP until approximately 300 BP, lifeways became more like that described in early historical documents. During the Early Iroquoian phase (AD 1000-1300), the communal site is replaced by the village focused on horticulture. Seasonal disintegration of the community for the exploitation of a wider territory and more varied resource base was still practised (Williamson 1990:317). By the second quarter of the first millennium BP, during the Middle Iroquoian phase (AD 1300-1450), this episodic community disintegration was no longer practised and populations now communally occupied sites throughout the year (Dodd et al. 1990:343). In the Late Iroquoian phase (AD 1450-1649) this process continued with the coalescence of these small villages into larger communities (Birch and Williamson 2013). Through this process, the socio-political organization of the First Nations, as described historically by the French and English explorers who first visited southern Ontario, was developed.

In the 1640s, the traditional enmity between the Haudenosaunee (Five Nation Iroquois) and the Wendat (and their Algonkian allies such as the Nippissing and Odawa) led to the dispersal of the Wendat. After the dispersal, the Haudenosaunee established a series of settlements at strategic locations along the trade routes inland from the north shore of Lake Ontario, including Teiaiaagon, near the mouth of the



Humber River; and Ganestiquiagon, near the mouth of the Rouge River. Their locations near the mouths of the Humber and Rouge Rivers, two branches of the Toronto Carrying Place, strategically linked these settlements with the upper Great Lakes through Lake Simcoe. The west branch of the Carrying Place followed the Humber River valley northward over the drainage divide, skirting the west end of the Oak Ridges Moraine, to the East Branch of the Holland River. Another trail followed the Don River watershed.

When the Seneca established Teiaiaagon at the mouth of the Humber, they were in command of the traffic across the peninsula to Lake Simcoe and the Georgian Bay. This area was strategically important for accessing and controlling long established economic networks. Prior to the arrival of the Seneca, these economic networks would have been used by indigenous groups for thousands of years. While the trail played an important part during the fur trade, people would also travel the trail to exploit the resources available to them across south-central Ontario, including the various spawning runs, such as the salmon coming up from Lake Ontario or herring or lake trout in Lake Simcoe.

Due, in large part, to increased military pressure from the French upon their homelands south of Lake Ontario, the Iroquois abandoned their north shore frontier settlements by the late 1680s, although they did not relinquish their interest in the resources of the area, as they continued to claim the north shore as part of their traditional hunting territory. The territory was immediately occupied or re-occupied by Anishinaabek groups, including the Mississauga, Ojibwa (or Chippewa) and Odawa, who, in the early seventeenth century, occupied the vast area extending from the east shore of Georgian Bay, and the north shore of Lake Huron, to the northeast shore of Lake Superior and into the upper peninsula of Michigan. Individual bands were politically autonomous and numbered several hundred people. Nevertheless, they shared common cultural traditions and relations with one another and the land. These groups were highly mobile, with a subsistence economy based on hunting, fishing, gathering of wild plants, and garden farming. Their movement southward also brought them into conflict with the Haudenosaunee.

Peace was achieved between the Iroquois and the Anishinaabek Nations in August of 1701 when representatives of more than twenty Anishinaabek Nations assembled in Montreal to participate in peace negotiations (Johnston 2004:10). During these negotiations, captives were exchanged and the Iroquois and Anishinaabek agreed to live together in peace. Peace between these nations was confirmed again at council held at Lake Superior when the Iroquois delivered a wampum belt to the Anishinaabek Nations.

In 1763, following the fall of Quebec, New France was transferred to British control at the Treaty of Paris. The British government began to pursue major land purchases to the north of Lake Ontario in the early-nineteenth century, the Crown acknowledged the Mississaugas as the owners of the lands between Georgian Bay and Lake Simcoe and entered negotiations for additional tracts of land as the need arose to facilitate European settlement.

The eighteenth century saw the ethnogenesis in Ontario of the Métis, when Métis people began to identify as a separate group, rather than as extensions of their typically maternal First Nations and paternal European ancestry (Métis National Council n.d.). Living in both Euro-Canadian and Indigenous societies, the Métis acted as agents and subagents in the fur trade but also as surveyors and interpreters. Métis populations were predominantly located north and west of Lake Superior, however,



communities were located throughout Ontario (MNC n.d.; Stone and Chaput 1978:607,608). During the early nineteenth century, many Métis families moved towards locales around southern Lake Huron and Georgian Bay, including Kincardine, Owen Sound, Penetanguishene, and Parry Sound (MNC n.d.). By the mid-twentieth century, Indigenous communities, including the Métis, began to advance their rights within Ontario and across Canada, and in 1982, the Métis were federally recognized as one of Canada's distinct Indigenous peoples. Recent decisions by the Supreme Court of Canada (Supreme Court of Canada 2003; Supreme Court of Canada 2016) have reaffirmed that Métis people have full rights as one of the Indigenous people of Canada under subsection 91(24) of the Constitution Act, 1867.

2.2 Historical Euro-Canadian Land Use: Township Survey and Settlement

2.2.1 Township of Caledon

The subject property is located within the former Township of Caledon, County of Peel. Historical research reveals that the land which encompasses the study area has a long and well-documented history extending to the early nineteenth century. The study area is located immediately south of the historic settlement of Belfountain.

The land within the Township of Caledon was acquired by the British from the Mississaugas in 1818. The first township survey was undertaken in 1819, and the first legal settlers occupied their land holdings in the following year. The township was named after the Roman designation for Scotland. Caledon was initially settled by the children of Loyalists, soldiers who served during the War of 1812, and by immigrants from England, Scotland, and Ireland. By the 1840s, the township was noted for its good farms (Smith 1846; Armstrong 1985; Rayburn 1997).

Early settlement of Belfountain (also Bellfountain, Bellefountain, Belfontain) occurred circa 1825 with the construction of a saw mill by William Frank on the Credit River. The settlement that grew around the mill became known as McCurdy Mills. Due to the rugged terrain in the area, straight concession roads could not be established, which defined the character of Old Main Street. By the mid-nineteenth century, the settlement had a general store, a tavern, and a blacksmith shop in addition to the mills. Belfountain came into prominence during the late nineteenth century when large scale quarrying began in the area and skilled stonecutters and quarry managers settled in the community with their families (Schienman 2009).

As with many of the previously discussed townships, many of the early settlers in Whitchurch were United Empire Loyalists, hired by the British to help fight in the American War of Independence, and Quakers, who were lured to the area with the promise of land grants and the ability to practice their faith in peace.

2.2.1 Land-Use History

The subject property at 0 Mississauga Road is located on part of Lot 9, Concession V in the former Township of Caledon. Starting at the southeast corner, Mississauga Road/Old Main Street runs north-south, forming the eastern boundary of the subject property. The right-of-way bends 45 degrees to the



west at roughly the middle of Lot 9, arcing to the northwest through the lot and forming the northeastern boundary of the subject property. The original north, south, and west boundaries of the property parcel then provide the border of the subject property.

Historical mapping, topographic maps, aerial photography, and land registry abstracts, along with archival materials, were reviewed to prepare a land-use history for the subject property. It should be noted that not all features of interest appear on historical mapping. Features such as farmhouses were generally not illustrated on the Tremaine series of maps and features of interest were not mapped systematically in the Ontario series of historical atlases, given that they were financed by subscription, and subscribers were given preference regarding the level of detail provided on the maps. Moreover, not every feature of interest would have been within the scope of the maps.

In 1834, the first patent was issued from the Crown to Archibald McArthur for 100 acres of the east half of Lot 9. Archibald McArthur, a Scottish labourer, according to the 1861 Census, sold the east half of Lot 9 to Peter Blair in 1848 (PAMA Archives). Peter Blair was born in Scotland, as was his wife Jane Miller. Their family of ten arrived in McCurdy's Village around 1846. The family left Scotland in 1837, and upon arriving in New York State six weeks later, settled on a farm near Ithaca where they lived for several years. The family then moved to Caledon on the advice from a friend, Alexander McLeish, and upon arrival they stayed with Alexander McLeish and his family until buying the McArthur farm on the east half of Lot 9, Concession V (Trimble 1975). The Patent for the west half of the lot (100 acres) was first given to John Gillies in 1840 (PAMA Archives). In 1849, John Gillies' spouse sold these 100 acres to Charles Roszell, and Roszell's spouse in turn sold the property to James McKeown (PAMA Archives).

The property owners indicated on the 1859 *Tremaine Map of Peel County* for the subject property include James McKeown (west half) and the Estate of P. (Peter) Blair (east half). The Tremaine Map also demonstrates that Mississauga Road (Old Main Street) and Shaw Creek Road were original concession roads, surveyed prior to 1859, and indicates that the settlement of "Bellefountain" was established by this time, occupying Lot 10, Concession V. The Credit River is depicted as flowing generally west-east, north of the study area. Unfortunately, no further cultural features are decipherable on the map (Figure 3).






Figure 3: 1859 Tremaine Map of Peel County, Annotated by ASI

(Tremaine 1859)

The north half of the west part of Lot 9 of the 100 acres was then sold to John Blair in 1863, while the south half of the west part of Lot 9 was sold the same year to Archibald Blair (PAMA Archives). Before 1898, Peter Blair attained ownership of both halves, and in 1898 he willed the property to his sons George and John Blair (PAMA Archives). Over time, the Blair family owned approximately 1,100 acres in the vicinity of Belfountain (Trimble 1975).

The 1877 *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Peel* identifies Peter Blair and his estate as the owners of the subject property, including both the east and west half of Lot 9, Concession 5 (Figure 4). The map also confirms that the same road network was in place during the mid-late nineteenth century with Mississauga Road (Old Main Street) acting as a primary thoroughfare for the settlement at “Belfountain.” It appears that the alignment of Mississauga Road was then further to the north, however the quality of the mapping prohibits a definitive judgement on the right of way. In addition, the 1877 Historical Atlas Map indicates that two farmsteads were present within Lot 9, Concession V at this time, one of which is located within the subject property (Figure 4). A structure is depicted on the north border near the middle of the angle, with an orchard to the west. Additionally, the 1871 Census identifies that the Blair family had a house, several barns and stables (Collections Canada 1871). The structure shown is likely part of the remnant farm complex that is extant on the subject property.






Figure 4: 1877 Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Peel

(Walker and Miles 1877)

Transactions within historical land abstracts indicate that the property was mortgaged and sold between members of the Blair family between 1848 and 1906. In 1896, Neilson Blair sold the east half of the Lot to Angus and Archibald Blair for \$450. Later that year, Archibald and Angus Blair sold the property to John Willis for \$6,900 (PAMA Archives). According to the 1921 Census, John Willis was a farmer (Ancestry 1921). Before purchasing the farm property, John worked in the quarries at the Forks of the Credit, and married his wife, Ethel McBride. Over time, John became involved in municipal politics and was Reeve of Caledon Township and Warden of Peel County in 1931 (Trimble 1975).

The 1917 *Guidal Directory* indicates that the Credit Forks Tile and Brick Company had established a location adjacent to the eastern boundary of the study area (Figure 5) (Guidal 1917). Development in Belfountain also appears to have extended to the north side of Mississauga Road (Old Main Street) by this time, occupying the north corner of Lot 9, Concession V. In addition, ownership of the subject property was split between G. Blair, who occupied the southwest half, and J. Willis, who occupied the northeast. G. Blair is shown as the owner of the west portion of the subject property and J. Willis as the owner of the east portion of the property, with Belfountain shown to the north of the subject property (Figure 5).




Figure 5: 1917 Guidal Directory Map of Caledon Township (Guidal 1917)

In 1929, George Blair et ux granted the 100 acres to Norman E. Storey (LRO). Norman Storey was born in Caledon Township and married Jemima Bass. A successful farmer, Storey also served as a Belfountain Public School trustee and a member of Caledon council from 1939 to 1940 (Trimble 1975).

In 1949, Jemima Storey and Elmer J. Storey et ux granted the property to Harry A. Willis, the son of John Willis (LRO). Harry A. Willis was a lawyer and called to the bar in 1929, and in 1946 was commissioned as a King’s Council and founded the law firm of Willis, Dingwall and Newell in 1953. Throughout his life, Willis held executive offices for several firms, organizations, and clubs. He also was involved in politics, working for the Conservative party at the provincial and federal levels, and was appointed to the Senate in 1962. Harry Willis married Mary Dryden in 1932 and eventually made their home in Belfountain at “Williswood” (Trimble 1975).

The 1937 National Topographic Map demonstrates that Mississauga Road (Old Main Street) is a secondary gravel road, and that the subject property is rural and located within an agricultural in context (Figure 6). Two structures are shown in the location of structures show on the 1877 Historical Atlas Map (Figure 4) and likely form part of the remnant farm complex extant on the subject property.



Figure 6: 1937 National Topographic Map

(Department of National Defence 1937)

Aerial photography from 1954 demonstrates that development continued along both sides of Mississauga Road (Old Main Street) northwest of the subject property (Figure 7). While the land tenure of the subject property cannot be determined by aerial photography alone, the tree massing and field division appear to indicate that this property was divided from the lot sometime prior to the photograph. However, the photograph confirms that the study area largely remained an agricultural landscape at this time with cultivated fields throughout most of the study area and woodlots visible on the north corner lining Mississauga Road (Old Main Street) (Figure 7).



Figure 7: 1954 Aerial Photograph

(Hunting Survey Corporation Limited 1954)

In 1962, Harry A. Willis began to divide the 100 acres and sold portions of the property to others, including Swansea Properties Limited (LRO). This company then sold the property to The Caledon Mountain Estates Limited, which changed its name to Caledon Mountain Recreational Properties Limited and sold the land to 272139 Ontario Limited (LRO).

The 1994 NTS map reveals that considerable changes took place within the northwest of the subject property, with the construction of new residences and a school. However, no further development occurred in the study area, which retained a mixture of fields and woodlots (Figure 8).




Figure 8: 1994 National Topographic Map
(Department of Energy, Mines and Resources 1994)

3.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS

3.1 Existing Heritage Resources

A review of the existing cultural heritage resources in and adjacent to the subject property were identified in the 2018 CHRA prepared by ASI.

Those resources consulted in this document included:

- The Town of Caledon’s *Heritage Register* (Town of Caledon 2018a);
- The *Town of Caledon Built Heritage Resources Inventory Report of Findings* (Stewart and Dilse 2008);
- The Town of Caledon’s *Cultural Heritage Landscapes Inventory* (Town of Caledon 2009);
- ASI’s 2010 “Cultural Heritage Assessment Report: Mississauga Road Improvements”
- The Niagara Escarpment Commission website for information on previously identified cultural heritage resources;¹
- The inventory of Ontario Heritage Trust easements ;²
- The Ontario Heritage Trust’s *Ontario Heritage Plaque Guide*, an online, searchable database of Ontario Heritage Plaques ;³
- *Ontario’s Historical Plaques website*;⁴

¹ Reviewed 23 November 2018 (<https://www.escarpment.org/ParksTourism/Neposs/Historical>)

² Reviewed 23 November 2018 (<http://www.heritagetrust.on.ca/en/index.php/property-types/easement-properties>)

³ Reviewed 23 November 2018 (<http://www.heritagetrust.on.ca/Resources-and-Learning/Online-Plaque-Guide.aspx>)

⁴ Reviewed 23 November 2018 (www.ontarioplaques.com)

- Inventory of known cemeteries/burial sites in the Ontario Ministry of Government and Consumer Services and the Ontario Genealogical Society's online databases;⁵
- Parks Canada's *Historic Places* (Parks Canada n.d.) ;⁶
- Parks Canada's *Directory of Federal Heritage Designations* {Citation};⁷
- Canadian Heritage River System;⁸
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) World Heritage Sites⁹; and,
- The Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (email communication 14 December 2017). A response received confirmed there are no identified Provincial Heritage Properties within or adjacent to the study area.¹⁰

Town of Caledon Heritage Planning staff confirmed via email between 5 November 2018 and 15 November 2018 to confirm that no properties within or adjacent to the development site had been listed on the Town of Caledon's Heritage Register or designated under Part IV or Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* since the completion of the 2018 CHRA (ASI).

3.2 Development Site – Existing Conditions

In 2014, a field review was first undertaken by Joel Konrad, Cultural Heritage Specialist (formerly of ASI) to document the existing conditions of the subject property, and to identify any built heritage resources or cultural heritage landscapes within or adjacent to the study area, for the purposes of a CHRA that was not formally submitted to the Town of Caledon due to a change in ownership of the property. A second field review was undertaken by John Sleath, Cultural Heritage Associate, ASI, in December 2017 for the 2018 CHRA to confirm resources identified in 2014 and to account for any changes in the study area since the 2014 site visit. For the purposes of this Cultural Heritage Impact Statement, a third field review was undertaken on 15 November 2018 by Laura Loney, Cultural Heritage Specialist, and Andrew Clish, Senior Field Director, to identify any changes to the existing condition of the development site. This third field review was preceded by a review of the 2018 CHRA in addition to available, current and historical, aerial photographs and maps (including online sources such as Google maps).

For ease of description, the subject property is described as generally east-west in orientation. The subject property is known as 0 Mississauga Road and is located on the west side of Mississauga Road, along the east side of Shaws Creek Road, and south of Old Main Street (Bush Street) in the Hamlet of Belfountain, Town of Caledon, Regional Municipality of Peel (Figure 9 and Figure 10). The subject property consists of agricultural fields under cultivation, separated by mature tree lines consisting of ash, oak, and maple, with a woodlot at the eastern edge of the property (Figure 11, Figure 12).

⁵ Reviewed 23 November 2018 (<http://vitacollections.ca/ogscollections/2818487/data?grd=3186> and <https://www.consumerbeware.mgs.gov.on.ca/eseach/cemeterySearch.do?eformsId=0>)

⁶ Reviewed 23 November 2018 (<http://www.historicplaces.ca/en/pages/about-apropos.aspx>)

⁷ Reviewed 23 November 2018 (http://www.pc.gc.ca/apps/dfhd/search-recherche_eng.aspx)

⁸ Reviewed 23 November 2018 (<http://chrs.ca/the-rivers/>)

⁹ Reviewed 23 November 2018 (<http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/>)

¹⁰ Contacted 14 December 2017 at registrar@ontario.ca.





Figure 9: Southwest view into the subject property from the Blair-Belfountain Cemetery

(ASI 2017)



Figure 10: Looking southwest into the subject property along Mississauga Road

(ASI 2017)



Figure 11: Looking west into agricultural fields along the south treeline within the subject property

(ASI 2018)



Figure 12: Looking west into the woodlot at the east end of the subject property

(ASI 2018)

Stone mounds are located throughout the tree lines between the existing agricultural, presumably moved to the edges of the fields as part of typical agricultural practice. James E. Gage notes in *Stone Removal and Disposal Practices in Agriculture & Farming* (2014) that typical agricultural field clearing practice involved cutting down trees, removing stumps, stones and brush, and filling holes, levelling the surface and breaking ground. Stone disposal methods often involved formal stone walls, dump walls (low, wide linear piles that look like broken-down stone walls), or piles along the sides or in the corners of fields. Gage notes that the stone removal process was complex and diversified, different for each farm, and that farmers' fields are typically constantly evolving agricultural landscapes (Gage 2014).

Naturalized vegetation and stone mounds were found throughout the site along existing treelines and vary in size and density. Town of Caledon Heritage Planner Douglas McGlynn conducted fieldwork in the southwest corner of the site on 6 October 2018 and identified stone mounds in several locations along the existing treelines, however the entire development site was not surveyed at that time. A Tree Inventory and Preservation Plan, prepared by Baker Turner Inc. (BTI) and dated June 2014, identifies the approximate locations of the existing stone mounds throughout the subject property (attached in Appendix C).



Figure 13: Stone mounds and vegetation at the west end of the south treeline of subject property, looking south

(ASI 2018)



Figure 14: Stone mounds and vegetation at the midpoint of the south treeline of the subject property, looking south

(ASI 2018)

Identified cultural heritage resources within the subject property include CHL 2, an abandoned farm complex identified in the 2018 CHRA in the eastern half of the development site (see Section 3.3 for a description and photographs of CHL 2).

3.3 Identified Cultural Heritage Landscapes and Built Heritage Resources

The 2018 CHRA identified several built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes adjacent to and within the proposed development site, identified below in Table 1 and mapped in Appendix A. Based on the review of available data, there were 12 previously identified resources within or adjacent to the development site (ASI 2018).

Table 1: Summary of built heritage resources (BHR) and cultural heritage landscapes (CHL) within and adjacent to the development site

Resource	Location	Type	Recognition
BHR 1	17170 Old Main Street	Residence	Listed, Town of Caledon BHR Inventory
BHR 2	17176 Old Main Street	Residence	Listed, Town of Caledon BHR Inventory
BHR 3	17180 Old Main Street	Residence	Listed, Town of Caledon BHR Inventory
BHR 4	17190 Old Main Street	Residence	Listed, Town of Caledon BHR Inventory (also in Stewart and Dilse; 24)
BHR 5	17190 Old Main Street	Residence	Listed-High Significance, Town of Caledon BHR Inventory (also in Stewart and Dilse; 24)
BHR 6	17204 Old Main Street	Community Hall	Listed-High Significance, Town of Caledon BHR Inventory

Resource	Location	Type	Recognition
BHR 7	17153 Old Main Street	Residence	Listed, Town of Caledon BHR Inventory
CHL 1	17025 Mississauga Road	Cemetery	Listed-High Significance, Town of Caledon BHR Inventory (also in Stewart and Dilse 2008; 42)
CHL 2	n/a	Remnant farm complex	Listed, Town of Caledon BHR Inventory
CHL 3	Mississauga Road/Old Main Street	Roadscape	Identified during field review
CHL 4	17200 Mississauga Road	Farm Complex	Listed-High Significance, Town of Caledon BHR Inventory (also in Stewart and Dilse; 24)
CHL 5	699 Bush Street	Residence; former farm complex	Listed-High Significance, Town of Caledon BHR Inventory (also in Stewart and Dilse 2008: 24; Scheinman 2009: 7-38, BC-7)
CHL 6	Shaw Creek Road (south of Bush Street)	Roadscape	Previously identified (ASI 2010)
CHL 7	Belfountain and Credit River Gorge	Cultural Heritage Landscape	Identified in the Town of Caledon's <i>Cultural Heritage Landscapes Inventory (Candidate CHL)</i>

The proposed development site includes CHL 2, and is adjacent to CHLs 1, 3-7, and BHRs 1-7.

CHL1 (17025 Mississauga Road) consists of the Blair-Belfountain Community Cemetery. It is situated on elevated ground, on the crest of a hill where Mississauga Road starts to decline into the valley where Belfountain is located. The property is bounded by tree lines and Mississauga Road. A laneway leads into the cemetery with stone pillars to mark the entrance. A modern retaining wall accommodates road grading activities and a metal culvert is also extant. The cemetery has been expanded to the southeast for new internments (ASI 2018).



Figure 15: CHL 1 - Cemetery

(ASI 2017)

CHL 2 (Figure 16 through Figure 22) is a remnant agricultural landscape that consists of a silo, a remnant stone barn, and scattered concrete foundations. The silo is of concrete construction and sits atop a hill

overlooking Mississauga Road (Figure 20). The remnant rubblestone barn is located directly to the south of the silo and is generally rectangular in shape and consisted of at least two separate rooms. Various circulation routes and wooden doorframes are visible within the remnant structure. The walls reach only ten feet at their highest (Figure 21). A rectangular concrete foundation is located approximately 20 metres to the west of the remnant barn structure while another generally square concrete foundation sits approximately 15 metres south of the remnant barn structure (Figure 18, Figure 19). The property is bounded by post and wire fencing and tree lines. A centrally located driveway is extant and the vegetation is generally overgrown (Figure 16) (ASI 2018).



Figure 16: Centrally-located driveway, looking north towards Mississauga Road

(ASI 2017)



Figure 17: Looking west along Mississauga Road, showing remnant farmscape to the south

(ASI 2017)



Figure 18: Concrete foundation within remnant farmscape to the south of the barn structure, looking southeast

(ASI 2018)



Figure 19: Concrete foundation within remnant farmscape to the west of the remnant barn structure, looking west

(ASI 2018)



Figure 20: Silo within the remnant farmscape, looking northwest

(ASI 2018)



Figure 21: Barn structure ruins within the remnant farmscape, looking north

(ASI 2018)



Figure 22: CHL 2 - Remnant Farm Complex

(ASI 2018)

CHL 3 consists of buildings forming part of a historical settlement, fencelines, and alignment of Mississauga Road. The generally north-south portion of the road retains gravel shoulders and mature treelines. The buildings on the south side of the generally east-west portion of the road are set close to the right-of-way and consist of a mixture of nineteenth and twentieth-century residential buildings. The streetscape lacks curbs and sidewalks and there are minimal shoulders. Mature vegetation and wooded fence lines are found throughout (Figure 23) (ASI 2018).

CHL 4 at 17200 Mississauga Road consists of a farmhouse, outbuilding, barn, tennis court, and pool. The one-and-a-half storey nineteenth-century farmhouse is of brick construction and reflects the Ontario Gothic architectural style. Two sympathetic brick additions are located at the north and the south of the farmhouse, the north retaining a rectangular footprint and one-and-a-half storeys and the south retaining a square footprint and single story. The barn retains an L-shaped footprint and consists of a steel roof, vertical barnboard, and stone foundations (Figure 24) (ASI 2018).



Figure 23: CHL 3 - Mississauga Road/Old Main Street
 (ASI 2017)



Figure 24: CHL 4 - Farm Complex, 17200 Mississauga Road
 (ASI 2017)

CHL 5 at 699 Bush Street consists of a farmhouse, outbuilding, and landscape features. The farmhouse, also known as the Drury Residence, is a two-storey, three-bay structure with symmetrical facade, central entrance, and gable roof; two-over-two sash windows; wood clapboard exterior; exterior chimney stack on the west elevation; and a porch on the front elevation covering the entire façade width. The house is located on elevated land, is set back from the right-of-way, and is surrounded by mature trees. Shrubbery and wooden fencing are located along the right-of-way (Figure 25) (ASI 2018).

CHL 6 (Shaw Creek Road, south of Bush Street) follows the original road allowances as indicated on historical mapping and contains elements evocative of its nineteenth-century origin. It features a narrow two-lane right-of-way; mostly gravel surface; and lacks shoulders. Undeveloped lands are located to either side of the right-of-way (Figure 26) (ASI 2018).



Figure 25: CHL 5 – 699 Bush Street
 (ASI 2017)



Figure 26: CHL 6 - Shaw Creek Road, south of Bush Street
 (ASI 2017)

CHL 7 (Belfountain and the Credit River Gorge) is an evolved landscape that combines settlements, both existing and disappeared, former milling and quarrying sites, railway heritage, recreational sites, and

natural sites, all with strong cultural associations within the context of the Credit River Gorge (Figure 27) (ASI 2018).



Figure 27: CHL 7 - Belfountain and the Credit River Gorge (ASI 2017)

BHR 1 (17170 Old Main Street) is an early twentieth-century, one-and-a-half storey residence that sits on the south side of Old Main Street to the north of the development site. The structure appears to be a frame building with vinyl siding, hipped roof covered with asphalt shingles, modern windows, and a half-storey addition on the front façade. The type of foundation upon which the structure rests was unable to be determined during field review (Figure 28) (ASI 2018).

BHR 2 (17176 Old Main Street) is a two-storey residence with clapboard and board-and-batten cladding and a gable roof with asphalt shingles. The foundation material was undetermined during field review (Figure 29) (ASI 2018).



Figure 28: BHR 1 - 17170 Old Main Street (ASI 2018)



Figure 29: BHR 2 – 17176 Old Main Street (ASI 2017)

BHR 3 (17180 Old Main Street) is an early twentieth-century, one-storey vernacular residence and retains a two-storey rear extension. A gabled roof with asphalt shingles rests upon the original structure while a flat roof covers the addition. The structure retains clapboard siding, a front porch, and concrete foundations (Figure 30) (ASI 2018).



Figure 30: BHR 3 – 17180 Old Main Street
(ASI 2017)



Figure 31: BHR 4 – 17190 Old Main Street
(ASI 2017)

BHR 5 (17196 Old Main Street) is a one-and-a-half storey, nineteenth-century stone regency cottage and is built on the stone foundation of an early Methodist Church (Stewart and Dilse 2008). The structure is of rubblestone construction and retains a hipped roof with asphalt shingles, a single internal rear brick chimney, a gabled dormer on the front façade, and modern casement windows (Figure 32) (ASI 2018).

BHR 6 (17204 Old Main Street) is known as the Belfountain Community Hall and was built in 1893 (Stewart and Dilse 2008). The structure has two storeys and a generally rectangular footprint sitting on stone foundations faced with concrete. The building retains wooden vertical board-and-batten siding, a gabled roof with asphalt shingles, 2/2 sash windows in original wooden frames, and an enclosed portico (Figure 33) (ASI 2018).



Figure 32: BHR 5 - 17196 Old Main Street
(ASI 2017)



Figure 33: BHR 6 - 17204 Old Main Street
(ASI 2017)

BHR 7 is a one-and-a-half storey frame structure and retains an L-shaped plan and gable roof. Exterior details of the residence are difficult to determine due to a high fence and significant tree cover (Figure 34).



Figure 34: BHR 7 - 17153 Old Main Street
 (ASI 2017)

A discussion of the proposed impacts to these identified cultural heritage landscapes and built heritage resources is included in Section 6.0 of this report.

4.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE

4.1 Existing Heritage Protection

CHL 2, which makes up the east half of the subject property, is listed on the Town of Caledon’s *Built Heritage Resource Inventory*. However, it is not listed on the Town of Caledon’s *Heritage Register* or designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, nor is it identified on the Town of Caledon’s *Cultural Heritage Landscapes Inventory*.

4.2 Ontario Regulation 9/06 Evaluation

Table 1 contains the evaluation of the subject property on the lands known in the year 2019 as 0 Mississauga Road against the criteria as set out in Ontario Regulation 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

Table 2: Evaluation of 0 Mississauga Road using Ontario Regulation 9/06

1. The property has design value or physical value because it:

<i>Ontario Heritage Act</i> Criteria	Yes/No	Analysis
i. is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method;	Yes	The existing farm path, silo, remnant stone barn, and scattered concrete foundations at the northeast corner of the subject property are remnants of a former farm complex and are no longer intact. However, the remnant

Table 2: Evaluation of 0 Mississauga Road using Ontario Regulation 9/06

		farm complex together with the tree-lined agricultural fields and stone mounds represent an evolved agricultural landscape within the Town of Caledon.
ii. displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or;	No	This property is not known to meet this criterion at this time.
iii. demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.	No	This property is not known to meet this criterion at this time.
<i>Ontario Heritage Act Criteria</i>		
i. has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community;	Yes	The subject property includes an abandoned farm complex consisting of a farm path, silo, remnant stone barn, and the concrete foundations of two outbuildings adjacent to Mississauga Road, several agricultural fields, separated by tree lines containing naturalized vegetation and stone mounds which are associated with common agricultural practices and which contribute to the agricultural history of the community.. The abandoned farm complex is likely associated with the Blair family, who at one time owned around 1,100 acres in the vicinity of Belfountain. The property is also associated with the Willis family, including Senator Henry Willis, who owned the west half of the property between 1906 and 1962.
ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or;	No	This property is not known to meet this criterion at this time.
iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.	No	This property is not known to meet this criterion at this time.

3. The property has contextual value because it:

<i>Ontario Heritage Act Criteria</i>	Yes/No	Analysis
i. is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area;	Yes	As an evolved agricultural landscape, the subject property supports the historical and existing agricultural character of the area to the southwest of the Hamlet of Belfountain.
ii. is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or;	Yes	The subject property is a remnant agricultural landscape within the former Township of Caledon and is physically and functionally linked to its surroundings within the Hamlet of Belfountain. The abandoned farm complex is visible from the south side Mississauga Road to the east of the Hamlet of Belfountain, while the existing agricultural



Table 2: Evaluation of 0 Mississauga Road using Ontario Regulation 9/06

		fields are visible along Shaw’s Creek Road along the west boundary of the subject property. Agricultural fields are extant to the immediate south and west of the subject property.
iii. is a landmark.	No	This property is not known to meet this criterion at this time.

This Ontario Regulation 9/06 evaluation has determined that the property at 0 Mississauga Road has physical, historical, and contextual value.

5.0 PROPOSED STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

The property at 0 Mississauga Road is located along the east side of Shaws Creek Road, on the west side of Mississauga Road, and south of Old Main Street (Bush Street) in the Hamlet of Belfountain within the Town of Caledon. The property contains a woodlot, remnant agricultural fields and a remnant farm complex including a farm path, silo, remnant stone barn, and scattered concrete foundations.

The property at 0 Mississauga Road has physical value as a remnant agricultural landscape within the Hamlet of Belfountain, Town of Caledon. Although the existing farm complex, consisting of a farm path, silo, remnant stone barn, and scattered concrete foundations, is no longer intact, these remnants, together with the existing agricultural fields with treelines, vegetation and stone mounds, are representative of the historical agricultural use within the property and within the surrounding context of a historically agricultural area.

The property at 0 Mississauga Road has historical and associative value due to its associations with the history of agriculture in the Hamlet of Belfountain, Town of Caledon as an historically agricultural property. The property also has associative value due to its associations with the Blair family, who at one time owned around 1,100 acres in the vicinity of Belfountain. The property is also associated with the Willis family, including Senator Henry Willis, who owned the west half of the property between 1906 and 1962.

The property at 0 Mississauga Road has contextual value due to its physical, functional, visual, and historical relationship to its surroundings as a remnant agricultural landscape within a primarily agricultural area to the south of the Hamlet of Belfountain, between Shaws Creek Road and Mississauga Road and is bordered by existing agricultural properties to the south and to the west.

Heritage Attributes:

- The extant physical ruins, including the farm path, silo, remnant stone barn, and scattered concrete foundations located within the area identified as CHL 2
- The tree lines with naturalized vegetation and remnant stone mounds associated with historical agricultural use located throughout the subject property



6.0 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

6.1 Proposed Development

ASI has evaluated the proposed development concept plan for the Manors of Belfountain dated 26 March 2019 (Appendix B). The proposed development is located within the subject property at 0 Mississauga Road, on Part of the East Half and West Half of Lot 9, Concession 5, W.H.S. in the Hamlet of Belfountain, Town of Caledon, Regional Municipality of Peel. The proposed development includes the creation of 70 new lots within the subject property, the introduction of a new street network, park, and areas of open space, including a substantial open space along the eastern boundary of the subject property along Mississauga Road.

The proposed development will retain the existing remnant farmscape (previously identified as CHL 2) at the northeast corner of the property which is identified as a heritage attribute. The proposed concept plan involves the retention of several existing treelines and stone mounds throughout the subject property, with some removal and modifications throughout the development site to accommodate new residential construction and roadways. New stormwater management ponds will be located along the north and south lot lines. The proposed development will also introduce a new walkway at the southeast corner of the property to connect the development site to Mississauga Road, formalizing an existing trail used by locals to access the subject property. The existing farm path associated with CHL 2 will remain, however the new walkway at the southeast corner will serve as the formal trail into the site.

6.2 Impact Assessment

To assess the potential impacts of the undertaking (see Appendix B for the development plan), the cultural heritage resource and identified cultural heritage attributes were considered against a range of possible impacts as outlined in the *Ontario Heritage Toolkit*, which include:

- 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 an associated 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 church to a multi-unit residence) where the change in use negates the property's cultural heritage value
- Land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect a cultural heritage resource, including archaeological resources.

Table 3: Impact Assessment – 0 Mississauga Road	
Impact	
Destruction, removal or relocation	<p>The proposed development will retain the existing remnant farmscape (CHL 2) in the northeast corner of the subject property.</p> <p>Portions of the existing treelines separating the extant agricultural fields will be removed as part of the proposed development, including some extant stone mounds. However, the proposed development maintains significant portions of these tree lines throughout the development, primarily along rear and side lot lines and with significant retention along Shaws Creek Road and along the south lot line. The built structures within the remnant farmscape in CHL 2 will be maintained in situ.</p>
Alteration	<p>Portions of the existing treelines separating the extant agricultural fields will be removed as part of the proposed development, including some extant stone mounds. However, the proposed development maintains significant portions of these tree lines throughout the development, primarily along rear and side lot lines and with significant retention along Shaws Creek Road and along the south lot line.</p> <p>The existing agricultural context will be altered with the construction of a residential subdivision within the subject property.</p> <p>The proposed public walkway at the southeast corner of the subject property will formalize an existing trail and provide a connection from Mississauga Road to the proposed park within the development site.</p>
Shadows	It is not anticipated that the proposed development will result in significant shadow impacts.
Isolation	The proposed development will result in the isolation of portions of the existing tree lines with stone mounds throughout the site.
Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views	No significant views have been identified within the subject property.
A change in land use	The proposed development will result in a change of land use from agricultural to residential.
Soil disturbance	Soil disturbances are anticipated throughout the property as part of the proposed development, however will be minimized.



Adjacent Identified Cultural Heritage Resources (CHR)

Table 4: Impact Assessment – Identified Adjacent CHRs		
Identified CHR	Address/Location	Potential Impacts
CHL 1	17025 Mississauga Road	No anticipated impacts
CHL 3	Mississauga Road/Old Main Street	There are no anticipated impacts as the proposed development concept plan includes a significant buffer of open space between the proposed development at the identified cultural heritage resource.
CHL 4	17200 Mississauga Road	Although the proposed development includes the creation of new lots on the west and south property lines of CHL 4, no significant views of CHL 4 from the public realm will be obstructed, however the agricultural context to the south and west of the existing property will become residential. Additionally, CHL 4 will maintain its relationship on the east side with the existing woodlot, and to the north will maintain a relationship with the Village of Belfountain. The development plan anticipates the retention of the existing treelines along the south lot line of CHL 4, providing a physical and visual buffer between CHL 4 and the proposed development.
CHL 5	699 Bush Street	The rear lot lines of proposed Lots 17, 18 and 19 will be adjacent to the proposed stormwater management pond, however there are no anticipated impacts to this identified cultural heritage resource.
CHL 6	Shaw Creek Road (south of Bush Street)	Existing trees along the east side of Shaws Creek Road within the subject property may be removed as part of the proposal, disrupting the existing roadscape.
CHL 7	Belfountain and the Credit River Gorge	There are no anticipated impacts as the proposed development concept plan includes a significant buffer of undeveloped space between the proposed development at the identified cultural heritage resource.
BHR 1	17170 Old Main Street	There are no anticipated impacts as the proposed development concept plan includes a significant buffer of undeveloped space between the proposed development at the identified cultural heritage resource.
BHR 2	17176 Old Main Street	There are no anticipated impacts as the proposed development concept plan includes a significant buffer of undeveloped space between the proposed development at the identified cultural heritage resource.



Table 4: Impact Assessment – Identified Adjacent CHRs		
Identified CHR	Address/Location	Potential Impacts
BHR 3	17180 Old Main Street	There are no anticipated impacts as the proposed development concept plan includes a significant buffer of undeveloped space between the proposed development at the identified cultural heritage resource.
BHR 4	17190 Old Main Street	There are no anticipated impacts as the proposed development concept plan includes a significant buffer of undeveloped space between the proposed development at the identified cultural heritage resource.
BHR 5	17196 Old Main Street	There are no anticipated impacts as the proposed development concept plan includes a significant buffer of undeveloped space between the proposed development at the identified cultural heritage resource.
BHR 6	17204 Old Main Street	There are no anticipated impacts as the proposed development concept plan includes a significant buffer of undeveloped space between the proposed development at the identified cultural heritage resource.
BHR 7	17153 Old Main Street	There are no anticipated impacts as the proposed development concept plan includes a significant buffer of open space between the proposed development at the identified cultural heritage resource.

Section 2.10.2 of the *Niagara Escarpment Plan (2017)* states that “Where proposed development is likely to impact cultural heritage resources or areas of archaeological potential . . . [t]he proponent must demonstrate that heritage attributes will be conserved through implementation of proposed mitigative measures and/or alternative development approaches.” As identified in Tables 3 and 4, the proposed development includes significant mitigative measures and approaches to conserve identified heritage attributes throughout the site.

6.3 Considered Alternatives and Mitigation Strategies

6.3.1 Alternatives

There are a range of alternatives that could be put forward as part of the future of the subject property. Three options are put forward as part of this exercise:

1. A “Do Nothing” Approach

A “Do Nothing” approach retains the subject property unchanged with all agricultural fields, treelines with stone mounds, and remnant farmscape conserved in situ. The subject property would remain undeveloped. This option would be successful in terms of preserving all elements



that contribute to the cultural heritage value of the property both directly and indirectly, and that of the adjacent identified cultural heritage resources, however, a “Do Nothing” approach would sterilize the site and would not provide any opportunities for the interpretation of the history of the site.

2. Redevelopment of the entire property without heritage considerations.

The full redevelopment of the property without heritage considerations would result in the demolition of the existing remnant farmscape, including silo, barn, concrete foundations and central driveway, and agricultural fields including the treelines with stone mounds and naturalized vegetation. This option would have significant negative impacts on the cultural heritage value of the subject property and the adjacent identified cultural heritage resources.

3. Development of the property with additional mitigation measures.

As currently proposed, the development considers elements of the cultural heritage value of the property, but additional mitigation measures could provide for a development that meets the needs of the community and reflects further on the cultural heritage value of the property. This option would build upon the existing proposal by recommending design principles for the proposed development, incorporating additional landscape elements, and developing a heritage interpretation strategy.

6.3.2 Mitigation Strategies

The proposed development incorporates several mitigation measures that will ensure the cultural heritage value of the property. These include:

- Maintaining the remnant farmscape in situ, including the existing silo, barn structure, concrete foundations, and central driveway (or farm path, as it extends south along the existing woodlot);
- Preserving the existing woodlot on the east end of the property, which serves as a physical buffer to the adjacent identified cultural heritage resources;
- Maintaining significant portions of existing treelines, including naturalized vegetation and stone mounds, in situ throughout the development site, and including the retention of the existing vegetation along the south lot line of CHL 4 to maintain a visual and physical buffer; and,
- Incorporating additional vegetation within the subject property and along property lines of adjacent identified cultural heritage resources.

The proposed development can provide for additional mitigation measures that will enhance the proposal. These mitigation measures include:

Landscape Elements

- Where new vegetation is required, species complementary to existing and historical vegetation types should be planted.



Interpretation and Commemoration Strategy

- The history of the subject property could be reflected in an interpretation strategy prepared by a qualified heritage consultant using signage and photos that outline the importance of the site's history within the Hamlet of Belfountain;
- The remnant farm complex can be preserved in-situ and identified with interpretive signage where appropriate; and
- As the proposed development does not anticipate the retention of all stone mounds in situ, these stones could be reused as part of a proposed landscape plan or within the interpretive strategy, such as wall features within proposed parks in the subdivision or as entrance features to the proposed development.

7.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed development at 0 Mississauga Road will conserve the cultural heritage value of the subject property. While the proposed development will result in a change of land use within the subject property from agricultural to residential, the development plan has been designed to preserve significant elements of the remnant farmscape. The existing farmscape (CHL 2) and significant portions of existing treelines and identified stone mounds will be retained as part of the development. Mitigation measures including an Interpretation and Commemoration strategy for the subject property and the adaptive re-use of remnant stone mounds will enhance the community's understanding of the history and evolution of the subject property within the Hamlet of Belfountain.

The evaluation of the subject property at 0 Mississauga Road against Ontario Regulation 9/06 evaluation has determined that the property at 0 Mississauga Road has physical, historical, and contextual value. The following recommendations should be contemplated by the Town of Caledon as part of the final design and approval of the proposed development at 0 Mississauga Road:

1. Landscaping treatments, including the preservation of existing trees, vegetation, and stone mounds within the subject property, and including the introduction of new vegetation, should be carefully considered to ensure the proposed development is physically and visually compatible with the identified heritage attributes within the subject property and those identified built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes adjacent to the subject property.
2. Should the Plan of Subdivision for the subject property be approved, an Interpretation Strategy should be created to provide the public with a greater understanding of the history of the property. The Interpretation Strategy should include signage and should be accessible within the public realm.
3. This Cultural Heritage Impact Statement report should be sent to the Heritage Planning Department at the Town of Caledon for review and comment. Following the review and revision



process, the final report should be submitted to the Town of Caledon as well as the Peel Art Gallery Museum and Archives (PAMA) for archival purposes.

8.0 REFERENCES

Ancestry

1921 Census of Canada. https://www.ancestry.ca/interactive/8991/1921_080-e003026730?pid=1300565&backurl=https://search.ancestry.ca/cgi-bin/sse.dll?indiv%3D1%26dbid%3D8991%26h%3D1300565%26tid%3D%26pid%3D%26usePUB%3Dtrue%26_phsrc%3DksH582%26_phstart%3DsuccessSource&treeid=&personid=&hintid=&usePUB=true&_phsrc=ksH582&_phstart=successSource&usePUBJs=true

Armstrong, F. H.

1985 *Handbook of Upper Canadian Chronology*. Dundurn Press, Toronto.

ASI

2018 *Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment: Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes. Existing Conditions and Impact Assessment. The Manors of Belfountain, Part of the East Half and West Half of Lot 9, Concession V, W.H.S.* July.

Birch, J., and R. F. Williamson

2013 *The Mantle Site: An Archaeological History of an Ancestral Wendat Community*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., Latham.

Brown, J.

1995 On Mortuary Analysis – with Special Reference to the Saxe-Binford Research Program. In *Regional Approaches to Mortuary Analysis*, L. A. Beck, editor, pp. 3–23. Plenum Press, New York.

Collections Canada

1871 Census. Province of Ontario, District No. 40, Sub-District A. Division. http://data2.collectionscanada.ca/1871/jpg/4396752_00641.jpg.

Department of Energy, Mines and Resources

1994 National Topographic Map. Orangeville.

Department of National Defence

1937 Orangeville Sheet. National Topographic System.

Dodd, C. F., D. R. Poulton, P. A. Lennox, D. G. Smith, and G. A. Warrick

1990 The Middle Ontario Iroquoian Stage. In *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650*, C. J. Ellis and N. Ferris, editors, pp. 321–360. Occasional Publication of the London Chapter OAS Number 5. Ontario Archaeological Society Inc., London.

Edwards, T.W.D., and P. Fritz

1988 Stable-Isotope Palaeoclimate Records from Southern Ontario, Canada: Comparison of Results from Marl and Wood. *Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences* 25:1397–1406.



Ellis, C. J., and D. B. Deller

1990 Paleo-Indians. In *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650*, C. J. Ellis and N. Ferris, editors, pp. 37–64. Occasional Publication of the London Chapter OAS Number 5. Ontario Archaeological Society Inc., London.

Ellis, C. J., I. T. Kenyon, and M. W. Spence

1990 The Archaic. In *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650*, C. J. Ellis and N. Ferris, editors, pp. 65–124. Occasional Publication of the London Chapter OAS Number 5. Ontario Archaeological Society Inc., London.

Ellis, C. J., P. A. Timmins, and H. Martelle

2009 At the Crossroads and Periphery: The Archaic Archaeological Record of Southern Ontario. In *Archaic Societies: Diversity and Complexity across the Midcontinent.*, T. D. Emerson, D. L. McElrath, and A. C. Fortier, editors, pp. 787–837. State University of New York Press, Albany, New York.

Ferris, N.

2013 Introduction: Seeing Ontario's Past Archaeologically. In *Before Ontario: The Archaeology of a Province*, M. K. Munson and S. M. Jamieson, editors, pp. 3–23. McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal and Kingston.

Gage, James E.

2014 Field Clearing: Stone Removal and Disposal Practices in Agriculture & Farming. *ASC Bulletin* 76.
https://www.academia.edu/15363525/Field_Clearing_Stone_Removal_and_Disposal_Practices_in_Agriculture_and_Farming_with_a_Case_Study_of_Stone_Removal_Activities_in_Joshua_He_mpesteads_Diary?auto=download.

Guidal

1917 Guidal Landowners Map of the Township of Caledon, Peel County. Map & Advertising Company Limited.

Hunting Survey Corporation Limited

1954 Digital Aerial Photographs. Southern Ontario 1954. University of Toronto Map & Data Library. maps.library.utoronto.ca/data/on/AP_1954/index.html.

Johnston, D.

2004 *Connecting People to Place: Great Lakes Aboriginal in Cultural Context*. Unpublished paper prepared for the Ipperwash Commission of Inquiry.
<http://www.attorneygeneral.jus.gov.on.ca/inquiries/ipperwash/transcripts.pdf>.

LRO

Lot 9, Concession 5 WHS Caledon Township, Peel County. Abstract Index to Deed Titles. Land Registry Office. Ontario Archives.
<https://www.onland.ca/ui/43/books/42275/viewer/430760?page=1>.



Métis National Council

n.d. The Métis Nation. <<http://www.metisnation.ca/index.php/who-are-the-metis>>.

n.d. Métis Historic Timeline. <http://www.metisnation.org/culture-heritage/m%C3%A9tis-timeline/>.

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing

1990 *Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13.*

2014 *Provincial Policy Statement, 2014.* Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Toronto, Ontario.

Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport

2006 Ontario Heritage Tool Kit. *Ontario Heritage Tool Kit.*
http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/heritage/heritage_toolkit.shtml.

Niagara Escarpment Commission

2017 Niagara Escarpment Plan. *Niagara Escarpment Commission.*
http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/heritage/heritage_toolkit.shtml.

PAMA Archives

Lot 9, Concession 5 WHS. Abstract Index for Caledon Townships. Available on Microfilm at PAMA.

Parks Canada

n.d. Canada's Historic Places. www.historicplaces.ca.

2010 Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada. Canada's Historic Places. <https://www.historicplaces.ca/media/18072/81468-parks-s+g-eng-web2.pdf>.

Rayburn, A.

1997 *Place Names of Ontario.* University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Schienman, A.

2009 *Town of Caledon South Albion-Bolton Community Plan, Employment Lands Needs Study and North Hill Supermarket. Final Report. Cultural Heritage Landscapes Assessment & Built Heritage Resources Assessment.*

Smith, W.H.

1846 *Smith's Canadian Gazetteer, Comprising Statistical and General Information Respecting All Parts of the Upper Province, or Canada West.* H. & W. Rowsell, Toronto.



Spence, M. W., R. H. Pihl, and C. Murphy

1990 Cultural Complexes of the Early and Middle Woodland Periods. In *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650*, C. J. Ellis and N. Ferris, editors. Occasional Publication of the London Chapter OAS Number 5. Ontario Archaeological Society Inc., London.

Stewart, Peter, and Paul Dilse

2008 Town of Caledon Built Heritage Resources Inventory. Town of Caledon, October 7. https://www.caledon.ca/en/explore/resources/Built_Heritage_Resources_Inventory_Report_2008.pdf.

Stone, L.M., and D. Chaput

1978 History of the Upper Great Lakes. In *Handbook of North American Indians*, Bruce G. Trigger, editor, pp. 602–609. Smithsonian Institution, Washington.

Supreme Court of Canada

2003 *R. v. Powley*. September 19. <https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/2076/index.do>.

2016 *Daniels v. Canada (Indian Affairs and Northern Development)*. April 14. <https://scc-csc.lexum.com/scc-csc/scc-csc/en/item/15858/index.do>.

Town of Caledon

2009 *Cultural Heritage Landscape Inventory Report*.

2018a Heritage Register. <https://www.caledon.ca/en/live/listing.asp>.

2018b Town of Caledon Official Plan. April. https://www.caledon.ca/en/townhall/resources/Official_Plan_Master_Copy_-_complete.pdf.

Tremaine, G.C.

1859 Tremaine's Map of the County of Peel. George C. Tremaine, Toronto.

Trimble, B.

1975 *Belfountain Caves Castles and Quarries in the Caledon Hills*. Herington Printing & Publishing Company, Erin.

Walker and Miles


1877 *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Peel, Ont.* Walker and Miles, Toronto.

Williamson, R. F.


1990 The Early Iroquoian Period of Southern Ontario. In *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650*, C. J. Ellis and N. Ferris, editors, pp. 291–320. Occasional Publication of the London Chapter OAS Number 5. Ontario Archaeological Society Inc., London.



APPENDIX A - IDENTIFIED BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCES AND CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPES WITHIN AND ADJACENT TO THE SUBJECT PROPERTY



APPENDIX B – PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PLAN



DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT PLAN
MANORS OF BELFOUNTAIN CORP

FILE # 21T-91015C

PART OF EAST HALF AND WEST HALF LOT 9
CONCESSION 5, W.H.S.
(HAMLET OF BELFOUNTAIN)
TOWN OF CALEDON,
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF PEELE

SURVEYORS CERTIFICATE
I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE BOUNDARIES OF THE LANDS TO BE SUBDIVIDED AS SHOWN ON THIS PLAN AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO ADJACENT LANDS ARE CORRECTLY AND ACCURATELY SHOWN.

SIGNED: ALISTER SANKEY, OLS
DAVID B. CHARLES SURVEYING LTD.
4255 SHERWOODTOWNE BLVD, SUITE 206
MISSISSAUGA, ON, L4Z 1Y5
PHONE: 905-271-6940
EMAIL: info@dbcsurveys.ca

DATE: _____

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
(UNDER SECTION 51(7) OF THE PLANNING ACT) INFORMATION REQUIRED BY CLAUSES A,B,C,D,E,F,G & J ARE SHOWN ON THE DRAFT AND KEY PLANS.
H) DRILLED WELLS TO BE PROVIDED
I) SANDY LOAM AND CLAY LOAM
K) PRIVATE SEPTIC TO BE PROVIDED; STORMWATER DESIGN IN DISCUSSIONS WITH THE TOWN

- NOTES**
- Developable Area (excludes Open Space & Woodlot) = 45.90 ha (113.38 ac)
 - 5% of Developable Area (2.30ha, 5.67ac) required for Park land dedication
 - 10 Total Lots; average lot size: 0.58ha (1.32ac)
 - 30m ROW; 22m ROW where sidewalks to be provided; Length - 2.834m (8.842')
 - 3m Public Walkway Width; 1.5m Sidewalk Width
 - 4m Street Width; Pavement Illustration is diagrammatic only
 - 22m/20m out-to-4m-ac Turning Radius
 - Local to local radii - approx. 14m
 - Streets 'A' & 'C' to Shaws Creek Rd. daylight triangles - 15.0 x 15.0
 - Top of Slope as stated in 1964, reviewed September 4 & 12, 2014
 - Delinea staked September 4 & 12, 2014

LEGEND:

- Property Line
- Tree Protection - Show Fence Hoarding
- Show Fence to be Retained
- Show Fence to be Removed
- Existing Fence Line to be Retained
- Existing Fence Line to be Removed
- Slope Direction and Percentage
- Existing Vegetation Grouping to be Retained
- Existing Vegetation Grouping to be Removed
- Existing Vegetation Grouping to be Salvaged
- Existing Dead/Living Vegetation Grouping to be Salvaged
- Existing Tree to be Preserved
- Existing Tree to be Retained
- Existing Tree to be Removed (Dead, Girdled or Damaged)
- Approximate Location and Orientation of Stone Rock Walls
- Stone Rock Walls to be Retained
- Tree Walls

LAND USE SCHEDULE			
LAND USE	LOTS/BLOCKS	AREA (HCT)	UNITS
ESTATE RESIDENTIAL	140	27.37	50.40
OPEN SPACE	71.74	19.86	49.81
PARK	72	3.36	8.00
10m BUFFER	73	0.80	1.97
STORMWATER POND	75	3.75	9.36
BI-CYCLED ON ROW (2.00m LENGTH)	76	0.06	0.06
ROAD WIDENING	77-78	0.00	0.00
PUBLIC WALKWAYS	79-82	0.20	0.48
TOTAL	62	70.28	175.87

Scale: 1=2000
March 26, 2019



APPENDIX C – TREE INVENTORY AND PRESERVATION PLAN

