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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) was contracted by HDR | iTRANS, Toronto, on behalf of Northumberland County, to conduct a cultural heritage assessment as part of the Reconstruction of County Road 2 Class Environmental Assessment Study. The project extends from Hamilton Road in Port Hope to William Street in Cobourg, Northumberland County. The overall project will consider existing and future transportation issues, surface water drainage requirements, property needs and traffic management options for the County Road 2 corridor.

The results of historical research confirmed that the study corridor features a historically surveyed thoroughfare in a rural, agricultural area that dates back to the nineteenth century. The field review confirmed that the study corridor retains elements associated with early residential and agricultural development both of which date predominantly to the nineteenth century and early twentieth century. A total of sixteen cultural heritage resources were identified within the study corridor.

County Road 2 road improvements may have a variety of impacts upon built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes. Impacts can include: direct impacts that result in the loss of resources through demolition or alteration, or the displacement of resources through relocation; and indirect impacts that result in the disruption of resources by introducing physical, visual, audible or atmospheric elements that are not in keeping with the resources and/or their setting.

Based on the results of background research and data collection, field survey, and analysis of potential impacts of the undertaking, the following recommendations have been developed.

1. Road improvement activities should be suitably planned to avoid impacts to identified cultural heritage resources.

2. Impacts to CHL 3 and CHL 6 have been identified, and may result in the removal of mature trees in proximity to the existing ROW through encroachment and construction activities. Where possible, mature vegetation should remain and be protected during construction activities. No further action is required to mitigate this impact.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) was contracted by HDR | iTRANS, Toronto, on behalf of Northumberland County, to conduct a cultural heritage assessment as part of the Reconstruction of County Road 2 Class Environmental Assessment Study (Figure 1). The project extends from Hamilton Road in the Municipality of Port Hope to William Street in the Town of Cobourg, Northumberland County. The overall project will consider existing and future transportation issues, surface water drainage requirements, property needs and traffic management options for the County Road 2 corridor.

The purpose of this report is to present a built heritage and cultural landscape inventory of cultural heritage resources in the study corridor, identify general impacts to identified cultural heritage resources, and propose appropriate mitigation measures. This research was conducted under the project direction of Rebecca A. Sciarra, Cultural Heritage Specialist.

Figure 1: Location of the study corridor, Northumberland County.

2.0 BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT CONTEXT

2.1 Approach and Methodology

This cultural heritage assessment considers cultural heritage resources in the context of improvements to specified areas, pursuant to the Environmental Assessment Act. This assessment addresses above ground cultural heritage resources over 40 years old. Use of a 40 year old threshold is a guiding principle when conducting a preliminary identification of cultural heritage resources (Ministry of Transportation 2006; Ministry of Transportation 2007; Ontario Realty Corporation 2007). While identification of a resource that is 40 years old or older does not confer outright heritage significance, this threshold provides a means to collect information about resources that may retain heritage value. Similarly, if a resource is slightly younger than 40 years old, this does not preclude the resource from retaining heritage value.

For the purposes of this assessment, the term cultural heritage resources was used to describe both cultural landscapes and built heritage features. A cultural landscape is perceived as a collection of
individual built heritage features and other related features that together form farm complexes, roadsides, and nucleated settlements. Built heritage features are typically individual buildings or structures that may be associated with a variety of human activities, such as historical settlement and patterns of architectural development.

The analysis throughout the study process addresses cultural heritage resources under various pieces of legislation and their supporting guidelines. Under the Environmental Assessment Act (1990) environment is defined in Subsection 1(c) to include:

- cultural conditions that influence the life of man or a community, and;
- any building, structure, machine, or other device or thing made by man.

The Ministry of Culture is charged under Section 2 of the Ontario Heritage Act with the responsibility to determine policies, priorities and programs for the conservation, protection and preservation of the heritage of Ontario and has published two guidelines to assist in assessing cultural heritage resources as part of an environmental assessment: Guideline for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments (1992), and Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments (1981). Accordingly, both guidelines have been utilized in this assessment process.

The Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments (Section 1.0) states the following:

When speaking of man-made heritage we are concerned with the works of man and the effects of his activities in the environment rather than with movable human artifacts or those environments that are natural and completely undisturbed by man.

In addition, environment may be interpreted to include the combination and interrelationships of human artifacts with all other aspects of the physical environment, as well as with the social, economic and cultural conditions that influence the life of the people and communities in Ontario. The Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments distinguish between two basic ways of visually experiencing this heritage in the environment, namely as cultural landscapes and as cultural features.

Within this document, cultural landscapes are defined as the following (Section 1.0):

The use and physical appearance of the land as we see it now is a result of man’s activities over time in modifying pristine landscapes for his own purposes. A cultural landscape is perceived as a collection of individual man-made features into a whole. Urban cultural landscapes are sometimes given special names such as townscores or streetscapes that describe various scales of perception from the general scene to the particular view. Cultural landscapes in the countryside are viewed in or adjacent to natural undisturbed landscapes, or waterscapes, and include such land uses as agriculture, mining, forestry, recreation, and transportation. Like urban cultural landscapes, they too may be perceived at various scales: as a large area of homogeneous character; or as an intermediate sized area of homogeneous character or a collection of settings such as a group of farms; or as a discrete example of specific landscape character such as a single farm, or an individual village or hamlet.
A cultural feature is defined as the following (Section 1.0):

…an individual part of a cultural landscape that may be focused upon as part of a broader scene, or viewed independently. The term refers to any man-made or modified object in or on the land or underwater, such as buildings of various types, street furniture, engineering works, plantings and landscaping, archaeological sites, or a collection of such objects seen as a group because of close physical or social relationships.

The Minister of Tourism and Culture has also published Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties (April 2010; Standards and Guidelines hereafter). These Standards and Guidelines apply to properties the Government of Ontario owns or controls that have cultural heritage value or interest. They are mandatory for ministries and prescribed public bodies and have the authority of a Management Board or Cabinet directive. Prescribed public bodies include:

- Agricultural Research Institute of Ontario
- Hydro One Inc.
- Liquor Control Board of Ontario
- McMichael Canadian Art Collection
- Metrolinx
- The Niagara Parks Commission.
- Ontario Heritage Trust
- Ontario Infrastructure Projects Corporation
- Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corporation
- Ontario Power Generation Inc.
- Ontario Realty Corporation
- Royal Botanical Gardens
- Toronto Area Transit Operating Authority
- St. Lawrence Parks Commission

The Standards and Guidelines provide a series of definition considered during the course of the assessment:

A provincial heritage property is defined as the following (14):

Provincial heritage property means real property, including buildings and structures on the property, that has cultural heritage value or interest and that is owned by the Crown in right of Ontario or by a prescribed public body; or that is occupied by a ministry or a prescribed public body if the terms of the occupancy agreement are such that the ministry or public body is entitled to make the alterations to the property that may be required under these heritage standards and guidelines.

A provincial heritage property of provincial significance is defined as the following (14):

Provincial heritage property that has been evaluated using the criteria found in Ontario Heritage Act O. Reg. 10/06 and has been found to have cultural heritage value or interest of provincial significance.

A built heritage resource is defined as the following (13):
...one or more significant buildings (including fixtures or equipment located in or forming part of a building), structures, earthworks, monuments, installations, or remains associated with architectural, cultural, social, political, economic, or military history and identified as being important to a community. For the purposes of these Standards and Guidelines, “structures” does not include roadways in the provincial highway network and in-use electrical or telecommunications transmission towers.

A cultural heritage landscape is defined as the following (13):

... a defined geographical area that human activity has modified and that has cultural heritage value. Such an area involves one or more groupings of individual heritage features, such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites, and natural elements, which together form a significant type of heritage form distinct from that of its constituent elements or parts. Heritage conservation districts designated under the Ontario Heritage Act, villages, parks, gardens, battlefields, mainstreets and neighbourhoods, cemeteries, trails, and industrial complexes of cultural heritage value are some examples.

Additionally, the Planning Act (1990) and related Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) make a number of provisions relating to heritage conservation. 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:

2.0 ...protecting cultural heritage and archaeological resources for their economic, environmental, and social benefits.

Part 4.5 of the PPS states that:

Comprehensive, integrated and long-term planning is best achieved through municipal official plans. Municipal official plans shall identify provincial interests and set out appropriate land use designations and policies. Municipal official plans should also coordinate cross-boundary matters to complement the actions of other planning authorities and promote mutually beneficial solutions.

Municipal 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 a municipal official plan.

Those policies of particular 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 cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.

A number of 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.

**Built heritage resources** mean one or more buildings, structures, monuments, installations or remains associated with architectural, cultural, social, political, economic, or military history, and identified as being important to a community.

**Cultural heritage landscapes** mean a defined geographical area of heritage significance that has been modified by human activities. Such an area is valued by a community, and is of significance to the understanding of the history of a people or place. Examples include farmscapes, historic settlements, parks, gardens, battlefields, mainstreets and neighbourhoods, cemeteries, trailways, and industrial complexes of cultural heritage value (PPS 2005).

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. With regard to 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 (PPS 2005).

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 (PPS 2005).

Accordingly, the foregoing guidelines and relevant policy statement were used to guide the scope and methodology of the cultural heritage assessment.

2.2 Data Collection

In the course of the cultural heritage assessment, all potentially affected cultural heritage resources within the study corridor are subject to inventory. Short form names are usually applied to each resource type, (e.g. barn, residence). Generally, when conducting a preliminary identification of cultural heritage resources, three stages of research and data collection are undertaken to appropriately establish the potential for and existence of cultural heritage resources in a particular geographic area.

Background historic research, which includes consultation of primary and secondary source research and historic mapping, is undertaken to identify early settlement patterns and broad agents or themes of change in a study corridor. This stage in the data collection process enables the researcher to determine the presence of sensitive heritage areas that correspond to nineteenth and twentieth century settlement and development patterns. To augment data collected during this stage of the research process, federal, provincial, and municipal databases and/or agencies are consulted to obtain information about specific properties that have been previously identified and/or designated as retaining cultural heritage value. Typically, resources identified during these stages of the research process are reflective of particular architectural styles, associated with an important person, place, or event, and contribute to the contextual facets of a particular place, neighbourhood, or intersection.
A field review is then undertaken to confirm the location and condition of previously identified cultural heritage resources. The field review is also utilized to identify cultural heritage resources that have not been previously identified on federal, provincial, or municipal databases.

Several investigative criteria are utilized during the field review to appropriately identify new cultural heritage resources. These investigative criteria are derived from provincial guidelines, definitions, and past experience. A built structure or landscape is identified as a cultural heritage resource that should be considered during the course of the environmental assessment. A resource will be considered if it is 40 years or older\(^1\), and if the resource satisfies at least one of the following three categories:

**Design/Physical Value:**
- It is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method
- It displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit
- It demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement
- The site and/or structure retains original stylistic features and has not been irreversibly altered so as to destroy its integrity

**Historical/Associative Value:**
- It has a direct association with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to: the County of Northumberland; the Province of Ontario; Canada; or the world heritage list
- It yields, or had the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of: the County of Northumberland; the Province of Ontario, Canada; or the world heritage list
- It demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to: the County of Northumberland, the Province of Ontario; Canada; or the world heritage list

**Contextual Value:**
- It is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area
- It is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings
- It is a landmark
- It illustrates a significant phase in the development of the community or a major change or turning point in the community’s history
- The landscape contains a structure other than a building (fencing, culvert, public art, statue, etc.) that is associated with the history or daily life of that area or region
- There is evidence of previous historic and/or existing agricultural practices (e.g. terracing, deforestation, complex water canalization, apple orchards, vineyards, etc.)

If a resource meets one or more of the categories, it will be identified as a cultural heritage resource and is subject to further research where appropriate and when feasible. Typically, further historical research and consultation is required to determine the specific significance of the identified cultural heritage resource.

---

\(^{1}\) Use of a 40 year old threshold is a guiding principle when conducting a preliminary identification of cultural heritage resources (Ministry of Transportation 2006; Ministry of Transportation 2007; Ontario Realty Corporation 2007). While identification of a resource that is 40 years old or older does not confer outright heritage significance, this threshold provides a means to collect information about resources that may retain heritage value. Similarly, if a resource is slightly younger than 40 years old, this does not preclude the resource from retaining heritage value.
When identifying cultural heritage landscapes, the following categories are typically utilized for the purposes of the classification during the field review:

**Farm complexes:** comprise two or more buildings, one of which must be a farmhouse or barn, and may include a tree-lined drive, tree windbreaks, fences, domestic gardens and small orchards.

**Roadscapes:** generally two-lanes in width with absence of shoulders or narrow shoulders only, ditches, tree lines, bridges, culverts and other associated features.

**Waterscapes:** waterway features that contribute to the overall character of the cultural heritage landscape, usually in relation to their influence on historic development and settlement patterns.

**Railscapes:** active or inactive railway lines or railway rights of way and associated features.

**Historical settlements:** groupings of two or more structures with a commonly applied name.

**Streetscapes:** generally consists of a paved road found in a more urban setting, and may include a series of houses that would have been built in the same time period.

**Historical agricultural Landscapes:** generally comprises a historically rooted settlement and farming pattern that reflects a recognizable arrangement of fields within a lot and may have associated agricultural outbuildings, structures, and vegetative elements such as tree rows;

**Cemeteries:** land used for the burial of human remains.

Results of data collection are contained in Section 3.0; while Sections 4.0 and 5.0 contain conclusions and recommend mitigation measures with respect to the undertaking.

### 3.0 BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT

#### 3.1 Introduction

This section provides a brief summary of historic research and a description of identified above ground cultural heritage resources that may be affected by the proposed County Road 2 reconstruction. A review of available primary and secondary source material was undertaken to produce a contextual overview of the study corridor, including a general description of Euro-Canadian settlement and land-use. Historically, the study corridor is located in the former Township of Hamilton, County of Northumberland.
3.2 Township Survey and Settlement

3.2.1 Township of Hamilton

The survey of the former Township of Hamilton, County of Northumberland was started by Augustus Jones in 1791-1792 and completed by William Hambly by 1796. The township is bounded by Rice Lake to the north, Lake Ontario to the South, Hope Township to the west and Haldimand Township to the east. It is named after Henry Hamilton, Lieutenant Governor of Quebec from 1782-1785 (Milne, n.d.).

The township was first settled by United Empire Loyalists and immigrants from England and Scotland. Early pioneer families included the Ashes, Purdys, Harrises, and Goheens. In 1797, lots in the broken front of concessions 1 and 2 were assigned to over 60 settlers brought together by entrepreneurs Asa Danforth (later responsible for constructing the Danforth Road), Aaron Greeley, and Josiah Keeler. Many of the grantees, however never lived in the township. Others received grants through military service or government influence (Milne, n.d.)

The present-day site of Cobourg was first settled in 1798 by Eluid Nickerson and Cobourg soon became the main centre in the township. The town expanded even more rapidly after 1832 when a harbour was built at the foot of Division Street. Lumber was the chief export commodity shipped from Cobourg’s harbour. Cobourg was also a regular port of call for Durham boats and early steamers on Lake Ontario. The port was located on the York to Kingston Road, and was a stopover for stages and Cobourg’s inns and hotels prospered as a result.

Other hamlets that developed in the township include Baltimore, Bewdley, Camborne, Cold Springs, Gore’s Landing, and Harwood.

3.2.2 Nineteenth Century Historic Map Review

The 1878 Illustrated Historical Atlas of the Counties of Northumberland and Durham, Ontario was reviewed to determine the potential for the presence of cultural heritage resources located within the study corridor. Historically, the study corridor consisted of the road allowance between Concession A and Concession I, from Lot 21 to Lot 35, in the former Township of Hamilton, County of Northumberland (Figure 2). County Road 2 is a historically surveyed thoroughfare travelling east-west across the township.

Table 1 provides a summary of the study corridor’s historic location and associated features depicted on the 1876 historic mapping. It should be noted, however, that not all features of interest were mapped systematically in the Ontario series of historical atlases, given that they were financed by subscription, and subscribers were given preference with regard to the level of detail provided on the maps. Moreover, not every feature of interest would have been within the scope of the atlases.
**Figure 2:** Approximate location of the study corridor overlaid on a map of Hamilton Township, 1878.  
Source: *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the Counties of Northumberland and Durham, Ontario*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conc.</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Property Owner(s)</th>
<th>Historic Feature(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>M. Burnham</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>M. Burnham</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Walter Underwood</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>M. Nicholls</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>James Cunningham</td>
<td>Homestead, Toll Gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mathias Carr</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. G. Hagerman</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>L. Rowe</td>
<td>2 homesteads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Mathias Carr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Mary L. Jones</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>R. Hight</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Carr</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>J. Carr</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G. Ruddock</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>G. Ruddock</td>
<td>School House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>W. Clemence</td>
<td>Homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>W. Clemence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>J. Wade</td>
<td>Toll Gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Henry Toms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Molsom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.2.3 Twentieth Century Map Review

A review of more recent topographic mapping illustrates how the study corridor developed in the twentieth century (Figure 3). The map review revealed that few additional houses had been built during the first part of the twentieth century (see Figure 3). By 1938, not many more houses had been constructed along County Road 2. A review of the 1965 topographic map shows that although there are some additional houses along County Rd 2, settlement patterns remain largely unchanged with only a few additional houses constructed between 1938 and 1965. Major changes during this period included the construction of Highway 401 which is located to the north of the study corridor. Railway development in the study corridor was vigorous during the nineteenth and early twentieth century with the earliest line constructed by the Grand Trunk Railway in 1856. One of the earliest lines which ran through the study corridor was the Grand Trunk Railway line constructed in 1856. Followed soon after by a second track in 1891 two more lines were constructed: a Canadian Northern (later Canadian National) line in 1911 and a Canadian Pacific line in 1913 (Andreae 1997). By 1938 one of these lines, most likely the early Grand Trunk line, had been abandoned.
3.3   Existing Conditions

In order to make a preliminary identification of existing built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes within the study corridor, a number of municipal resources were consulted. The Town of Cobourg Heritage Register\(^2\), which includes both designated and non-designated properties, was reviewed. Inventories of designated properties for the Municipality of Port Hope and the Township of Hamilton were also consulted\(^3\). In order to determine if any non-designated properties of cultural heritage interest have been identified by these two last municipalities, the Township of Hamilton Planning Department and the Municipality of Port Hope Heritage Advisory Committee were contacted. The Municipality of Port Hope is currently compiling an inventory of listed properties and did not have a complete inventory in September 2010. The Township of Hamilton has been contacted but ASI has not yet received a reply.

A review of the three municipal inventories of designated properties revealed that there are no properties designated under Part IV or Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* within or adjacent to the study corridor. A

---

\(^2\) http://www.cobourg.ca/heritage-register.html
review of the Town of Cobourg Heritage Register revealed that are also no non-designated properties of heritage interest within or adjacent to the study corridor.

A field review was undertaken by Lindsay Popert, ASI, in August 2010 to document the existing conditions of the study corridor. The field review revealed that County Road 2 is a busy east-west thoroughfare. The study corridor is made up of a variety of small industrial and commercial enterprises dating to the twentieth century and residences and farms dating from the mid-nineteenth century through to the early twentieth century. The residential properties are predominantly mid-nineteenth to early twentieth century structures. In addition to these residential properties, there are a number of properties which are comprised of nineteenth century structures and a mix of nineteenth century barns and outbuildings with some newer, twentieth century structures. Many of these properties and landscapes feature mature vegetation and many of the farm fields are currently under cultivation. The middle section of the study corridor—from Hamilton Road in the west to Lovshin Road in the east—is characterised by farms and small residential holding. The more commercial aspects are located at both the west and east end of the study corridor. These tend to be late twentieth century in date and include, in the west, a small industrial complex west of Hamilton Road. Large box stores a mall and other smaller commercial lots are located near William Street at the east end of the study corridor.

A total of ten cultural heritage landscapes and six built heritage resources were identified within the study corridor. Table 2 provides a list of identified cultural heritage resources, which includes a photograph and brief description of the resource. Section 6.0 provides location mapping of identified cultural heritage resources.
## Table 2: Identified Built Heritage Resources (BHR) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHL) in the Study Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Feature Type</th>
<th>Description/Comment</th>
<th>Recognition/Reference(s)</th>
<th>Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHR-1</td>
<td>7340 County Rd 2</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>This 1½ storey Ontario Gothic cottage this structure may date to the nineteenth century. The structure features a gable roof with gabled dormer on the front elevation. The foundation is unknown. The window and frame in the dormer appears to be original; all other windows modern. Clad in wooden siding with an asphalt roof, this structure is located on a small residential lot, set back from road with the house itself located on a small terrace. A mature tree sits at the junction between County Road 2 and the driveway. A second, mature tree is located closer to house at the rear of lawn.</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR-2</td>
<td>7346 County Rd 2</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>This dwelling dates to the early twentieth century. This 1½ storey residence is constructed of red brick with a gable roof and cinder block foundations. An enclosed porch is located on the front elevation and the porch and the main roof are both shingled with red asphalt. The windows on the front and side elevations are modern. The structure is set back from County Rd 2 and sits on a level parcel of land with a clear view to the road. Plantings on this parcel include mature, deciduous trees at the side of property and a smaller conifer along the driveway.</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR-3</td>
<td>7650 County Rd 2</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Dense plantings and mature trees at the front of the property and along the driveway somewhat obscure the view of this nineteenth century, 2 storey brick residence. A single storey, modern, frame addition is located on the rear of the main structure. The house has a gable roof and it and the ground floor porch are roofed in metal. The house has an internal chimney located at the east gable end. The house appears to have a number of extant period features including a wrap-around porch and front door with sidelights. The porch also may have original gingerbread trim. Windows are obstructed from view by the plantings and no additional information about the structure could be collected during the field review.</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td><img src="https://via.placeholder.com/150" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Feature Type</td>
<td>Description/Comment</td>
<td>Recognition/Reference(s)</td>
<td>Photo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR-4</td>
<td>7789 County Rd 2</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>This nineteenth century structure sits amidst a small grouping of late twentieth century houses. The 2 storey brick residence features a hipped roof clad with asphalt shingles and features an internal chimney. Visible windows have all been replaced and are modern. Further additions to this dwelling include a two storey wooden deck/porch located on the rear elevation. The structure itself is set back from the road on level ground. The landscape is bare; the only trees on this property are modern conifers located to the rear of the dwelling.</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR-5</td>
<td>7949 County Rd 2</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>This large-scale structure is set well back from County Rd 2, on a level landscape of manicured lawns and mature mixed plantings—some of which partially obscure the roadside views to the house. Dating to the nineteenth century, this 2 storey brick structure has been painted white. The structure has a hipped roof with a front gabled dormer and flat roof porch on the front elevation. The nature of the foundation is unknown. The dormer window and upper porch window both appear to be original. The other windows also appear to be original with six over six panes although they have been fitted with modern storm windows and shutters on the front elevation. Although the front door and sidelights are likely in their original configuration, the door is modern and the sidelights have been modified.</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR-6</td>
<td>1116 County Rd 2</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>A small-scale, single storey dwelling, this early twentieth century dwelling dating to c. 1938 is located in the midst of a paved lot and car dealership. Exhibiting a hipped roof with asphalt shingles and an internal chimney, the structure is clad in synthetic siding. A small enclosed porch sitting on posts is located on the front elevation; a smaller wooden porch/steps sits on the side elevation, providing access to the structure. The foundation appears to be poured concrete. All the windows on this structure are modern. Although this structure sits on a paved lot, there is a single mature (deciduous) tree located on the west side and a mature grouping of trees at the rear of property.</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2: Identified Built Heritage Resources (BHR) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHL) in the Study Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Feature Type</th>
<th>Description/Comment</th>
<th>Recognition/Reference(s)</th>
<th>Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHL-1</td>
<td>Address Unknown Farm Complex</td>
<td>Located off County Rd 2 on a service road, this property consists of a 1 ½ storey farmhouse and a barn situated within an agricultural landscape. The property is heavily planted along the road and front of property, somewhat obscuring the roadside views. The main dwelling features a gable roof with asphalt shingles and is clad in board and batten siding. The windows on this structure are modern. Adjacent to the house is a detached garage, also with a gabled roof and with board and batten siding. The 1 ½ storey barn is painted red and has a gabled roof with asphalt shingles and two metal ventilators.</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td><img src="image.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL-2</td>
<td>7373 County Rd 2 Farm Complex</td>
<td>This complex consists of a nineteenth century residence, a barn and an associated agricultural landscape. The two storey, brick house is situated on level ground and set back from the road. The front lawn is dotted with mature plantings and the driveway is lined with mature deciduous trees. A number of mature trees are also located between the house and adjacent barn. The dwelling has a tiled, gabled roof with two internal chimneys located at each of the gable ends. The windows appear to be modern. The large barn features a gambrel, metal-clad roof.</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td><img src="image.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL-3</td>
<td>7464 County Rd 2 Farm Complex</td>
<td>This property features a stone dwelling which likely dates to the early twentieth century, with a single storey extension, a large barn, concrete silo, drive shed and associated agricultural landscape made up of fields, farmyard, a creek located on the west side of property and mature plantings around the house. The 1 ½ storey house exhibits features associated with the Craftsman architectural style, featuring light-coloured stone block exterior and foundations with darker quoins. The metal-clad gambrel roof features three shed dormers. Many of the original features of this structure, including the windows, appear to be intact. A flat-roofed porch sits on the front elevation and with a single storey stone extension on the east elevation and a one storey frame extension on the rear elevation. Located to the west of the driveway is a large gambrel roof barn with metal roof and concrete foundations. Also making up the farmyard is a drive shed and the cement silo. Both are metal roofed. Mature trees line the driveway and mark a boundary between the east side of front lawn and the fields which surround the property.</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td><img src="image.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Identified Built Heritage Resources (BHR) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHL) in the Study Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Feature Type</th>
<th>Description/Comment</th>
<th>Recognition/Reference(s)</th>
<th>Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHL-4</td>
<td>7641 County Rd 2</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>This complex consists of: a 1½ storey, brick house with a 1½ storey, brick extension resting on a field stone foundation; a small gabled barn with field stone foundations and a small frame structure surrounded by fields. The main dwelling has a gabled roof clad in asphalt shingles with a projecting gabled bay and two gabled dormers. Both gabled dormers have original gingerbread trim as does the front porch which is also gabled. The porch also features a gabled roof. The rear extension is roofed with metal while the rear porch exhibits both asphalt shingles and metal roofing material. The windows appear to be modern. The barn also features an extension with a gambrel roof. The landscape is generally bare with few plantings apart from mature deciduous trees located to the front of the house, near the road. The property and fields are marked by a modern post and wire fence.</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Photo" /> <img src="image2.jpg" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL-5</td>
<td>7694 County Rd 2</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>Within this farm complex the house and agricultural landscape are of particular note with the outbuildings and detached garage dating to the twentieth century. The dwelling itself likely dates to the nineteenth century and features a gabled roof and dormer. Both the dormer and the gabled porch exhibit gingerbread detailing. The porch also features a small enclosed frame porch with windows and sidelights. The windows on this structure appear to be original. The material of the foundations is unknown. The large 1½ storey outbuilding located adjacent to the house is modern. The house sits on level ground with few plantings in front yard; mature conifers border the driveway/property. The house is located close to the road.</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL-6</td>
<td>7834 County Rd 2</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>The front of this property is heavily planted with mixed, mature trees. The barn is set back from the road at the end of a long drive which itself is lined with mature deciduous trees. An older driveway—now grassed over—runs from the road, directly to the house. The brick house which dates to the nineteenth century is a two storey brick structure with a hipped roof. There are gabled dormers and a porch; the dormers have gingerbread trim. In addition to the house the property consists of a large barn with gambrel roof. This barn has a smaller extension and at least one other open shed. The property includes fields and paddocks.</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td><img src="image4.jpg" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL-7</td>
<td>7875 County Rd 2</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>This property consists of a house, at least two barns and fields. The house is a 2 storey, stucco-covered structure with a hipped roof clad in asphalt shingles. A single storey extension is at the rear. The extension is also stuccoed and has a gable, asphalt-shingled roof. The main dwelling has an external chimney stack and the extension has a single internal chimney at the gable end. The windows on the house are original 2/2 sash windows. The front porch has a gabled roof clad in metal with gingerbread trim. The front door appears to have sidelights which may be original. There are at least two gambrel-roofed barns on this property of varying sizes. There is a long driveway into the property and the house and barns sit well back from the road with the house located in close proximity to the fields. Mature deciduous trees are sited to the east of the house. The fields sit at the front of the property (along the road) and property line is marked here by a modern post and wire fence.</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td><img src="image5.jpg" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Archaeological Services Inc.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Feature Type</th>
<th>Description/Comment</th>
<th>Recognition/Reference(s)</th>
<th>Photo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHL-8</td>
<td>7960 County Rd 2</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>Consisting of two dwellings, a barn and an agricultural landscape this property is located in close proximity to the road. The first of these dwellings and the barns are in poor/derelict condition and are no longer in use. The barn is two storeys with gambrel roof which is clad in metal sheets and a cinderblock foundation. There are two single storey additions and a 1½ storey extension with open bays. The uninhabited house is a single storey, hipped roof structure with an internal chimney. The building is likely constructed of rusticated concrete blocks and appears to have original windows. The second dwelling is a 1½ storey, brick residence located to the east of these structures and is separated by a line of mature deciduous trees. This structure has a gabled roof with dormers and these and the porch have gingerbread trim. The front gable has decorative bargeboard and a projecting gabled bay window. All the windows on this structure are modern. At the rear there is a single storey gabled extension which appears to be stuccoed. Like the other dwelling this structure sits close to County Road 2.</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Photo" /> <img src="image2.png" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL-9</td>
<td>8062 County Rd 2</td>
<td>Farm Complex</td>
<td>The main dwelling on this property has suffered a fire and has been gutted. This two storey, brick structure featured a central projecting bay with bay windows on first floor. First floor windows and door have decorative carved stone accents and there is quoining on the central bay as well as at main corners. The door is partially destroyed but remains of sidelights and fanlight are extant. The house is somewhat set back from the road with access via a driveway lined with mature deciduous tree. The driveway continues to the outbuilding located in close proximity to rear and side of house. The line of trees separates the house yard and the fields and farmyard areas. The barn is a two storey, L-shaped structure with gable and gambrel roofs and most likely has a fieldstone foundation. Located between the barn and the road is a single storey outbuilding clad in corrugated metal and roofed with metal sheets. This is at least a three bay structure and may be open on the east elevation. The barn and outbuilding are separated from fields and house by a modern post and wire fence. Fields are located at the front of the property along the road and no fences mark this boundary. The property is level with the road and presents flat topography.</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Photo" /> <img src="image4.png" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL-10</td>
<td>Court House Rd</td>
<td>Streetscape</td>
<td>This landscape is made up of a group of early-to-mid twentieth century houses which sit together at the top of a small hill on an historic road. These three houses are each somewhat rundown. Two of these structures are 1½ and the third a single storey. All are roofed with asphalt shingles and feature modern windows. Two of the structures have chimneys; one an internal chimney at the gable end and the second, an external chimney stack. All of these structures sit close proximity to the road. Plantings are minimal with only a few small mature deciduous trees. This property extends north from County Road 2.</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Following consideration of the three design alternatives (Alternative Design 1: Widen on both sides of County Road 2; Alternative Design 2: Widen on the north side of County Road 2; Alternative Design 3: Widen on the south side of County Road 2), Alternative Design 1 was selected as the preferred alignment (See Appendix A, drawings provided by HDR/iTRANS in December 2011).

To assess the potential impacts of the undertaking, identified cultural heritage resources were considered against a range of possible impacts as outlined in the Ministry of Tourism and Culture document entitled Screening for Impacts to Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (September 2010), which include:

- Destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attribute or feature (III.1).
- Alteration which means a change in any manner and includes restoration, renovation, repair or disturbance (III.2).
- Shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the visibility of a natural feature of plantings, such as a garden (III.3).
- Isolation of a heritage attribute from it surrounding environment, context, or a significant relationship (III.4).
- Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas from, within, or to a built and natural feature (III.5).
- A change in land use such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces (III.6).
- Soil Disturbance such as a change in grade, or an alteration of the drainage pattern or excavation (III.7)

The following table (Table 3) will consider the potential impacts of the recommended plan on identified cultural heritage resources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Potential Impacts</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHR 1 No impacts are expected.</td>
<td>There are no further concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 2 No impacts are expected.</td>
<td>There are no further concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 3 No impacts are expected.</td>
<td>There are no further concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 4 No impacts are expected.</td>
<td>There are no further concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 5 No impacts are expected.</td>
<td>There are no further concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 6 No impacts are expected.</td>
<td>There are no further concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 1 No impacts are expected.</td>
<td>There are no further concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 2 No impacts are expected.</td>
<td>There are no further concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 3 Encroachment on to the property may result in the removal of mature vegetation located along the southern limits of the property.</td>
<td>Where possible, mature vegetation should remain and be protected during construction activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 4 No impacts are expected.</td>
<td>There are no further concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 5 No impacts are expected.</td>
<td>There are no further concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 6 Encroachment on to the property may result in the removal of mature vegetation along the southern limits of the property.</td>
<td>Where possible, mature vegetation should remain and be protected during construction activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 7 No impacts are expected.</td>
<td>There are no further concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 8 No impacts are expected.</td>
<td>There are no further concerns.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Analysis of potential impacts of the recommended plan on identified cultural heritage resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Potential Impacts</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHL 9</td>
<td>No impacts are expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 10</td>
<td>No impacts are expected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

The results of historical research confirmed that the study corridor features a historically surveyed thoroughfare in a rural, agricultural area that dates back to the nineteenth century. The field review confirmed that the study corridor retains elements associated with early residential and agricultural development both of which date predominantly to the nineteenth century and early twentieth century. A total of sixteen cultural heritage resources were identified within the study corridor.

The following provides a summary of field review and data collection findings:

- A total of six built heritage resources and ten cultural heritage landscapes were identified in the study corridor;
- None of the identified cultural heritage resources in the study corridor were previously identified by local municipalities. There are no cultural heritage resources in the study corridor that are designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act*;
- Of the identified cultural heritage resources, six are residences (BHR 1 - BHR 6), nine are farm complexes (CHL 1 - CHL 9) and one is a streetscape (CHL 10); and
- Identified cultural heritage resources are historically, architecturally, and contextually associated with nineteenth century and early to mid twentieth century land use patterns and urban development.

6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

County Road 2 road improvements may have a variety of impacts upon built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes. Impacts can include: direct impacts that result in the loss of resources through demolition or alteration, or the displacement of resources through relocation; and indirect impacts that result in the disruption of resources by introducing physical, visual, audible or atmospheric elements that are not in keeping with the resources and/or their setting.

Based on the results of background research and data collection, field survey, and analysis of potential impacts of the undertaking, the following recommendations have been developed.

1. Road improvement activities should be suitably planned to avoid impacts to identified cultural heritage resources.
2. Impacts to CHL 3 and CHL 6 have been identified, and may result in the removal of mature trees in proximity to the existing ROW through encroachment and construction activities. Where possible, mature vegetation should remain and be protected during construction activities. No further action is required to mitigate this impact.
7.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE LOCATION MAPPING

Figure 4: Location of Built Heritage Resources (BHR) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHL) in the Study Corridor
Figure 5: Location of Built Heritage Resources (BHR) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHL) in the Study Corridor
Figure 6: Location of Built Heritage Resources (BHR) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHL) in the Study Corridor.
Figure 7: Location of Built Heritage Resources (BHR) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHL) in the Study Corridor
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The Preferred Alignment (as of December 2011).