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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ASI was contracted by Hatch to conduct a Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment for the Environmental Assessment as Part of the Growth Development Projects-Assignment 3: Hewitt’s study. This project, located within the Hewitt’s Secondary Plan Area (City of Barrie OPA NO. 39, By-law No.2014-78), includes arterial road widening and two grade-separated railways crossings. The study area is centered around a portion of the right-of-ways of Yonge Street, Lockhart Road, Mapleview Drive, and Big Bay Point Road, and is comprised primarily of rural agricultural land in the southern portion of the City of Barrie at the border of the adjacent Town of Innisfil.

The results of background historic research and a review of secondary source material, including historic mapping, revealed a study area with a rural land use history dating back to the mid-nineteenth century. The results of the field review indicate that there are 32 cultural heritage resources within the study area, including: nine farmscapes (CHLs 1, 3, 8, 11-16, and 20); ten residences (CHLs 4, 5, 7, 10, BHRs 1-5); four remnant farmscapes (CHLs 9, 17-19), one historic settlement area (CHR 6), one church with cemetery (CHR 2), one former school (CHR 23), one watercourse (CHL 22), four roadscape (CHL 24-27) and one rail line (CHR 21). CHR 1 and CHR 2 were formerly listed by the Town of Innisfil, however, they were annexed by the City of Barrie in 2008, and were never transferred to the City of Barrie Heritage Register.

Infrastructure improvements may have a variety of impacts upon cultural heritage resources. As such, the proposed improvements should be planned to avoid impacts to any cultural heritage resources.

Based on the results of background data collection and field review, the following recommendations were developed for the Hewitt’s Secondary Plan study area:

1. Staging and construction activities should be suitably planned and undertaken to avoid impacts to identified cultural heritage resources;

2. Once a preferred alternative or detail designs of the proposed work are available, this report will be updated with a confirmation of impacts of the undertaking on cultural heritage resources identified within and/or adjacent to the study area and will recommend appropriate mitigation measures. Mitigation measures may include, but are
not limited to, completing a heritage impact assessment or documentation report, or employing suitable measures such as landscaping, buffering or other forms of mitigation, where appropriate. In this regard, provincial guidelines should be consulted for advice and further heritage assessment work should be undertaken as necessary; and,

3. Should future work require an expansion of the study area then a qualified heritage consultant should be contacted in order to confirm the impacts of the proposed work on potential heritage resources.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

ASI was contracted by Hatch to conduct a Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment for the Environmental Assessment as Part of the Growth Development Projects-Assignment 3: Hewitt’s study. This project, located within the Hewitt’s Secondary Plan Area (City of Barrie OPA NO. 39, By-law No.2014-78), includes arterial road widening and two grade-separated railways crossings. The study area is centered around a portion of the right-of-ways of Yonge Street, Lockhart Road, Mapleview Drive, and Big Bay Point Road, and is comprised primarily of rural agricultural land in the southern portion of the City of Barrie at the border of the adjacent Town of Innisfil (Figure 1).

The purpose of this report is to present a built heritage and cultural landscape inventory of cultural heritage resources, identify existing conditions of the project, identify impacts to cultural heritage resources, and propose appropriate mitigation measures. This research was conducted under the senior project management of Lindsay Graves, Cultural Heritage Specialist and Assistant Manager of the Cultural Heritage Division at ASI.

![Figure 1: Location of the study area](Base Map:©OpenStreetMap and contributors, Creative Commons-Share Alike License (CC-BY-SA))
2.0 BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT CONTEXT

2.1 Legislation and Policy Context

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 resource was used to describe both cultural heritage landscapes and built heritage resources. A cultural landscape is perceived as a collection of individual built heritage resources and other related features that together form farm complexes, roadscapes and nucleated settlements. Built heritage resources 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 Tourism, Culture and Sport 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 heritage landscapes and as cultural features.
Within this document, cultural heritage 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 townscapes 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, Culture, and Sport 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 definitions 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), which was updated in 2014, 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.(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 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 significant 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.

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” (PPS 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” (PPS 2014). Examples may include, but are not limited to farmscapes, historic 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. 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 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 (PPS 2014).

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

The City of Barrie’s Official Plan (June 2014 Consolidation, Section 3.4, ‘Cultural Heritage Conservation’), Hewitt’s Secondary Plan Amendment (OPA No. 39, June 2014, Section 9.4.4.3) and the Town of Innisfil’s Official Plan (April 2011 Consolidation, Section 6: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology) have set out a number of policies with regard to cultural heritage resources. Policies that are relevant to this study are included below.

2.2.1 City of Barrie

3.4.1 GOALS

(a) To encourage the conservation of the City's cultural heritage resources including, but not limited to, buildings, structures, areas, districts, open spaces, and landscapes, artefacts of historical and/or architectural significance and to co-ordinate these conservation efforts with development and redevelopment initiatives. (Mod D (y)(i))

(b) To promote an understanding of, and appreciation for, the original settlement of the area and the historic development of the City.

(c) To encourage and foster public awareness of, and participation in, the conservation, restoration and utilization of cultural heritage resources.

(d) To control the demolition, destruction, and inappropriate alteration or use of cultural heritage resources.

(e) To implement the vision and recommendations put forth in the City’s Cultural Master Plan. (Mod D (y)(ii))

3.4.2.1 GENERAL POLICIES

(a) Development permitted by the land use policies and designations of this Plan should have regard for cultural heritage resources and shall, wherever feasible, incorporate these resources into any development plans.

(b) All new development in older established areas of historic, architectural or landscape value, shall be encouraged to be in keeping with the overall character of these areas.

(c) Development and site alteration on lands adjacent to protected heritage properties and those included in the inventory referred to in Section 3.4.2.2 (c) of this Plan may be permitted where the proposed development and site alteration has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the cultural heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved.

(d) Proposed development and site alteration permitted in accordance with subsection (c) above shall be encouraged to be in keeping with the immediate physical context and streetscape by being generally of the same height, width, massing and orientation as adjacent buildings, being of similar setback, of like or compatible materials, and using similarly proportioned windows, doors and roof shapes in order to maintain a sense of visual continuity and compatible building design.

(e) The City shall encourage measures which enhance public appreciation of interesting buildings, structures, streetscapes, open spaces or landscapes of historic, architectural, archaeological or scenic value.

(f) The City may restore, rehabilitate, enhance and maintain heritage resources owned by the municipality in fulfilment of the cultural heritage goals and policies of this Plan.

(h) The City may require as a condition of approval of development including a consent, minor variance, subdivision or site plan, the issuance of a building permit, change of use or partial demolition of a heritage building or structure, that the proponent enter into
agreements to preserve and/or permit to be designated pursuant to the Ontario Heritage Act, the building or structure through other legal instruments as may be noted in this Plan.

(i) In areas considered for intensification, the City shall encourage the conservation or preservation of any cultural heritage resource which may be affected by such intensification with the use of conservation plans and heritage-related urban design guidelines. (Mod D (aa))

(j) The City may:
   i. consider amendments to the Zoning By-law that will enable the conservation of a heritage resource.
   ii. designate properties to be of cultural or heritage value or interest under the Ontario Heritage Act or its successor.

(k) The City will give particular consideration to all development proposals at strategic locations throughout the City Centre.

(l) The City may require heritage impact assessments for built heritage and cultural heritage landscape resources which may be impacted by development.

(m) The City may inventory cultural heritage resources in the municipality through the designation by by-law and/or listing of individual heritage properties, conservation districts and landscapes, and archaeological sites on a municipal register, which can be considered when making planning decisions.

(o) The City shall ensure conservation of known significant cultural heritage resources prior to any undertaking of municipal public works and municipally owned properties, such as roads and infrastructure projects carried under the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process. The City may require heritage impact assessments and satisfactory measures to mitigate any negative impacts affecting identified significant heritage resources. (Mod D (bb))

3.4.2.2 HERITAGE DESIGNATIONS

(a) The Ontario Heritage Act or any successor legislation will be utilized to conserve, protect and enhance the heritage resources of the City of Barrie which may include the designation of individual properties and/or the designation of a group or groups of properties as Heritage Conservation Districts.

(c) The City may utilize any government programs available to assist in the implementation of heritage conservation policies and may pass by-laws providing for the making of a grant or loan to the owner of a property designated under the Ontario Heritage Act for the purpose of paying for the whole or any part of the cost of alteration of such designated property on such terms and conditions as the City may prescribe.

2.2.2 Hewitt’s Secondary Plan Area

9.4.4.3 Cultural Heritage Conservation

Cultural heritage resources and proposed development and site alteration on lands adjacent to protected heritage properties shall be subject to the policies of Section 3.4 of the Official Plan, Cultural Heritage Conservation. In addition, the assessment and conservation of significant archaeological resources and areas of archaeological potential shall also be subject to the policies of Section 3.4 of the Official Plan.
2.2.3 Town of Innisfil

Objectives:
1. To encourage the maintenance, restoration and enhancement of buildings, structures and areas which are considered of significant architectural or historical value.
2. To identify and preserve significant archaeological resources.
3. To identify and conserve significant cultural heritage landscapes.
4. To ensure that new development is sensitive to heritage resources.
5. To encourage and foster public awareness, participation and involvement in the conservation of cultural heritage resources.

Policies

6.1 A register of built heritage resources and heritage conservation districts that are of cultural heritage value or interest shall be established by the Town. The register will be kept by the Clerk and shall list all property situated in the municipality that has been designated by the municipality or by the Minister and shall contain, with respect to each property: A legal description of the property; the name and address of the owner; and a statement explaining the cultural heritage value or interest of the property and a description of the heritage attributes of the property.

6.2 The Town may also consider the passing of by-laws to establish Heritage Conservation Districts, and shall ensure that the register contains a map or description of the area of each heritage conservation district.

6.3 The register may also include built heritage resources that have not been designated but that the Town Council or local heritage committee believes to be of cultural heritage value or interest.

6.4 A heritage committee shall be appointed to identify the register of built heritage resources, and shall not contain fewer than five members.

6.5 The heritage committee shall identify the register of built heritage resources based on the criteria provided in Sections 6.6 and 6.7 and may also identify significant cultural heritage landscapes.

6.6 Cultural Heritage Resources generally fall into one of two categories: those of historic value and those of architectural value.

a) Cultural Heritage Resources of historic value can be described as follows:
   Those that serve as an example of the Town's past social, cultural, political or physical development; Those that serve as an example of outstanding work by a local or national personality; and those that date from an early or significant period in the Town’s development.

b) Cultural Heritage Resources of architectural value can be described as follows:
   Those that serve as a representative example of style, design or period of building; those that serve as a representative example of a method of construction which was used during a certain time period or rarely used today; those that serve as an important Town landmark; and those that make an important contribution to the area composition or streetscape of which it forms a part.
6.7 Cultural Heritage Resources may also include property or area that is recognized by the Province as being archaeologically significant. By-laws under the Ontario Heritage Act may be passed to designate properties of historical or architectural significance.

6.8 The Town may establish design principles for buildings in proximity to Heritage Conservation Districts or Heritage Conservation buildings.

6.9 As part of any new Secondary Plan study, a heritage consultant shall be retained to identify buildings considered to be significant cultural heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes and add these to the register.

6.10 Development applications on lands adjoining or contiguous to a protected heritage property shall demonstrate that the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved.

6.13 The Town will have regard for known built heritage resources, significant cultural heritage landscapes and known archaeological resources in the undertaking of municipal public works, such as roads and infrastructure projects carried under the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process.

6.14 Town will consult with the appropriate government agency when an unidentified cemetery or unmarked human burial site is identified and affected by development.

2.3 Data Collection

In the course of the cultural heritage assessment, all potentially affected cultural heritage resources 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 historical 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 area. 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 utilised to identify cultural heritage resources that have not been previously identified on federal, provincial, or municipal databases.

Several investigative criteria are utilised during the field review to appropriately identify new cultural heritage resources. These investigative criteria are derived from provincial guidelines, definitions, and
past experience. During the course of the environmental assessment, a built structure or landscape is identified as a cultural heritage resource if it is considered to be 40 years or older, and if the resource satisfies at least one of the following criteria:

**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.
- It demonstrates a high degree of excellence or creative, technical or scientific achievement at a provincial level in a given period.

**Historical/Associative Value:**
- It has a direct association with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to: the City of Barrie; the Town of Innisfil; the Province of Ontario; or Canada.
- It yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of the history of: the City of Barrie; the Town of Innisfil; the Province of Ontario; or Canada.
- It demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to: the City of Barrie; the Town of Innisfil; the Province of Ontario; or Canada.
- It represents or demonstrates a theme or pattern in Ontario’s history.
- It demonstrates an uncommon, rare or unique aspect of Ontario’s cultural heritage.
- It has a strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organization of importance to the province or with an event of importance to the province.

**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.)
- It is of aesthetic, visual or contextual important to the province.

If a resource meets one of these criteria it will be identified as a cultural heritage resource and is subject to further research where appropriate and when feasible. Typically, detailed archival research, permission to enter lands containing heritage resources, and consultation is required to determine the specific heritage significance of the identified cultural heritage resource.

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 the desktop data collection are contained in Sections 3.0, while Sections 4.0, 5.0 and 6.0 contain conclusions and recommendations for further work to be undertaken.

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 undertaking. A review of available primary and secondary source material was undertaken to produce a contextual overview of the study area, including a general description of Euro-Canadian settlement and land use. Historically, the study area is located in the Town of Innisfil, Simcoe County.
3.2 Township Survey and Settlement

3.2.1 Innisfil Township

The area was surveyed in 1820 and the population grew slowly until the first saw mill was erected in the 1830s. The first census of the Township population recorded 742 inhabitants. By 1850, the population had increased to 1,807 and in that year the first municipal council was established (Mika and Mika 1981).

Early settlements include: Painswick, Stroud, and Churchiel (Churchill). The following settlements lie within the study area in the historic Township of Innisfil.

St. Paul’s

The community of St. Paul’s was established at the corner of Penetanguishene Road (Yonge Street) and Mapleview Drive, and was centered around St. Paul’s Anglican Church (established 1851) and a schoolhouse as depicted on the 1879 Illustrated Historical Atlas (Miles and Co. 1879). The small community consisted of a cluster of houses, and would have been along the main path of anyone travelling between Toronto and Georgian Bay along Penetanguishene Road.

3.2.2 City of Barrie

The City of Barrie is located at the head of Kempenfelt Bay on Lake Simcoe and at the junction of a number of major transportation routes, including the Barrie Rail Corridor. Kempenfelt, east of the Bay and now part of the City of Barrie, was an important site during the War of 1812 as it was the starting point of Nine Mile Portage. First established by First Nations prior to the arrival of Europeans, the portage became a strategic military transportation route between Lake Simcoe and Lake Huron. A storehouse was built at this location which also served as a stopping site for traders and settlers.

The town of Barrie was named after Commodore Barrie, commander of British warships at Kingston in the early nineteenth century. The town site was surveyed into town lots in the early 1830s and the first settler to permanently locate in Barrie was a Scottish farmer named Alexander Walker. Other early settlers include David Edgar, Captain Oliver, and John McWatt. The 1830s also saw the establishment of taverns, a general store, a post office, a school house, and a number of churches.

In the 1850s, the Ontario, Simcoe and Huron Railway was constructed through Allandale, which was united with Barrie in 1897. Barrie was incorporated as a town in the early 1850s and as a city more than a century later in 1959 (Mika and Mika 1977: 136-139).

3.2.3 The Ontario, Huron and Simcoe Railway (Northern Railway)

The Toronto, Simcoe, and Lake Huron Union Rail Road Company was incorporated in 1844 and in 1850 was renamed the Ontario, Simcoe, and Huron Union Rail Road Company. The rail line opened on May 16, 1853, and connected Toronto to Aurora (formerly Matchell’s Corners) via a 48 kilometre track (Andreae 1997). The line was expanded with service to Bradford beginning June 13, 1853, and further expanded to Barrie on October 11 1853 (forming the path for the present Barrie rail corridor). The inaugural trip on May 16, 1853 from Toronto to Aurora is commemorated by a plaque at Toronto’s Union Station, as it was the first steam locomotive operated in Ontario (Mika and Mika 1977).
In 1858, the company underwent a third name change becoming the Northern Railway Company of Canada. Subsequently, the Ontario, Simcoe and Huron Railway became known simply as the Northern Railway, until 1888 when the ownership amalgamated with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, at which point the Northern Railway became part of the Grand Trunk Railway. Rail tracks were quickly laid across Ontario, as well as other parts of the country linking settlements and provinces. The population of Canada doubled between 1851 and 1901 but the miles of rail laid increased exponentially from 159 to 18,294 miles (Andreae 1997). The Northern Railway was a major draw factor for businesses in the Counties of York and Simcoe and caused many communities with a station to thrive and those without to dissipate (Town of Newmarket 2012). In 1923, the railway company was again amalgamated, this time with the government-owned CNR.

Commuter service began on the line in 1972, operated by CN as part of the CN Newmarket Subdivision. This commuter service was taken over by VIA Rail in 1978, and then by GO Transit in 1982. GO Transit continues to operate this commuter service to this day.

### 3.3 Physiographic Setting

In general terms, the study area falls within the Peterborough Drumlín Field region of southern Ontario. The Peterborough Drumlín Field extends from Simcoe County east to Hastings County and is generally characterized by rolling till plains overlying limestone bedrock. The region is approximately 4,532 km² in size and contains over 3,000 drumlins in addition to many other drumlinoid hills and surface flutings (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 169). The drumlins are composed of highly calcareous till but there are local differences in composition. Ontonabee loam, Bondhead loam and the Dundonald series are important soils in this region.

Drumlins are oval hills of glacial till with smooth convex contours. The alignment of groups of drumlins indicates directionality of the movement of glacial advance (Chapman and Putnam 1984:235).

### 3.4 Review of Historic Mapping

The 1879 New Topographical Atlas map (Mile and Co. 1879) and the 1881 Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Simcoe (Belden 1881) were reviewed to determine the potential for the presence of cultural heritage resources within the study area from the nineteenth century (Figures 2 and 3). 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.

Historically, the study area is located in the County of Simcoe, in the Township of Innisfil, in the following lots and concessions (from north to south and west to east):

- Concession XIII: part of Lot 19;
- Concession XII: part of Lots 11-20;
- Concession XI: part of Lots 11-20;
- Concession X: part of Lots 11-19;
- Concession IX: part of Lot 11-19;
Details of historic property owners and historic features in the study area are listed in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot #</th>
<th>Con #</th>
<th>Property Owner(s) (1879)</th>
<th>Historical Feature(s) (1879)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Jas. Thompson</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Jos. Huggart</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Watercourse, sawmill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Jas. Booth</td>
<td>Roadway, community of Painswick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Roadway, Railroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>G.E. Warnica</td>
<td>Farmstead, roadway, railroad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Rob't Metcalf</td>
<td>Farmscapes, railroad, watercourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Watercourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Rob't Wilkinson</td>
<td>Farmscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Jno Gibbins</td>
<td>Farmstead, watercourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>F. Quantz (?)</td>
<td>Farmstead, watercourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Jno. Collins</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>P. Wise (?)</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W.J.C.</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Church, school, railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>P. Shephard</td>
<td>Farmstead, watercourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Thos. Smith</td>
<td>Farmstead, watercourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>T. Fagan</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>J. Crispin (Tenant)</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Watercourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Jno. Johnston</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>R. Collins</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Village of Stroud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Stroud P.O., railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Village of Craigvale, railway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Jas. Patterson</td>
<td>Two farmsteads, watercourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 1879 *New Topographical Atlas* (Miles and Co 1878, Figure 2) map demonstrates the study area was located in a rural, agricultural context in the late nineteenth century. The Northern Railway is present in the center of the study area, and is oriented parallel to the east side of Penetanguishene Road, as extant within the study area. The villages of Victoria Stroud and Craigvale are located to the south of Penetanguishene Road, and southeast on a rail crossing, respectively. A schoolhouse and a church are depicted on the east side of Penetanguishene Road, immediately south of modern day Mapleview Road. A second school house is depicted at the northwest corner of modern day Huronia Road and Lockhart Road, immediately outside the study area.

The 1881 *Illustrated Historical Atlas* map (Belden 1881, Figure 3) also demonstrates that the study area was located in a rural, agricultural context in the late nineteenth century, and shows the area in more detail than the 1879 mapping. The Northern Railway is still depicted at the centre of the study area, and is oriented in the same direction as extant in the study area. The church and schoolhouse depicted on Penetanguishene Road south of Mapleview Road are also present in the same location as earlier mapping.
In addition to these structures, a number of farmhouses are also depicted within the study area along Mapleview Drive and Lockhart Road. The community of Allandale is located to the north along Penetanguishene Road and the Northern Railway, outside of the study area.

Figure 2: Study area overlaid on the 1879 *New Topographical Atlas*  
(Miles and Co 1879)
In addition to nineteenth-century mapping, historical mapping and aerial photographs for the twentieth century were examined. This report presents maps from 1928, 1954, and 1986. These do not represent the full range of maps consulted for the purpose of this study but were judged to cover the full range of land uses that occurred in the area during this period.

The 1928 Topographic map depicts the study area as an active agricultural area, with the extant roadways and railway lines in their present alignment and locations (Figure 4). Yonge Street (formerly Penetanguishene Road) is depicted as central to the study area, while Mapview Drive and Lockhart Road are depicted as being important circulation routes for the farmsteads in the area. Watercourses and their associated wooded valleylands are depicted to the immediate east of Huronia Road, and east of Yonge Street. Overall, the study area is shown to retain an agricultural setting well into the twentieth century.

The 1954 Aerial Photograph (Figure 5) continues to depict the study area as a rural agricultural area. Roadways and railways retain their alignment, and the wooded watercourse valleylands are depicted in the same location as in earlier mapping. Minor development appears to have taken place at the intersection of Yonge Street and Mapview Drive, in the location depicted as a church and schoolhouse in the nineteenth-century mapping. Mapview Drive and Lockhart Road continue to be used as the primary circulation routes for vehicles and farming equipment in the area.

The 1986 Topographical Map (Figure 6) depicts few changes from the 1954 aerial photograph, and demonstrates that the study area continued to be located in a rural agricultural setting into the late
twentieth century. There is evidence of limited residential development at the intersection of Maplevie Drive and Yonge Street, demonstrated by the addition of the label ‘St. Paul’s’ in the area. To the north of the study area, the City of Barrie is shown to have undergone considerable growth, and occupies more area than the earlier community of Allandale depicted in late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century mapping.

Figure 4: Study area overlaid on the 1928 Topographical Map
(Department of National Defence 1928)
Figure 5: Study area overlaid on the 1954 Aerial Photograph of Southern Ontario
(Hunting Survey Corporation 1954)

Figure 6: Study area overlaid on the 1986 NTS Map, Barrie Sheet (31 D/05)
(Department of Energy, Mines, and Resources 1986)
4.0 Existing Conditions

In order to make a preliminary identification of existing cultural heritage resources within the study area, the following resources were consulted:

- The City of Barrie’s Inventory of Heritage Properties and list of Heritage Conservation Districts (2013);
- The City of Barrie’s Interactive Map, which shows the location of listed and designated heritage properties;
- The City of Barrie Planning Department was contacted directly to determine any known heritage resources within or adjacent to the study area (email communication 25 May 2016);
- The Town of Innisfil’s Municipal Heritage Register (2010);
- Parks Canada’s Canada’s Historic Places website: available online, the searchable register provides information on historic places recognized for their heritage value at the local, provincial, territorial, and national levels;
- Park’s Canada’s Directory of Federal Heritage Designations, a searchable on-line database that identifies National Historic Sites, National Historic Events, National Historic People, Heritage Railway Stations, Federal Heritage Buildings, and Heritage Lighthouses;
- The inventory of Ontario Heritage Trust easements;
- The Ontario Heritage Trust’s Ontario Heritage Plaque Guide, an online, searchable database of Ontario Heritage Plaques;
- Ontario’s Historical Plaques website; and
- Previously completed heritage assessment of the study area: Cultural Heritage Assessment Report, Annexed Lands, City of Barrie Secondary Plan (Unterman McPhail Associates 2011).

A review of the federal registers, municipal and provincial inventories, and previous published research revealed that there are 20 previously identified features of cultural heritage value within the Hewitt’s Secondary Plan study area (CHR 1-2, 4-21). Based on the results of the background research, one additional cultural heritage resource was also noted – a farmscape at 2114 Lockhart Road (CHR 3).

A field review was undertaken by Lauren Archer, Cultural Heritage Specialist, ASI, on June 3rd 2016 to document the existing conditions of the study area. The field review was preceded by a review of available, current and historic, aerial photographs and maps (including online sources such as Bing and Google maps). These large-scale maps are reviewed for any potential cultural heritage resources which may be extant in the study area. The existing conditions of the study area are described below. Identified cultural heritage resources are discussed in Table 2 and Table 3 and mapped in Figure 15 of this report.

4.1 Hewitt’s Secondary Plan Study Area – Existing Conditions

The subject study area consists of the roadways and property directly adjacent to the road, which would be subject to road improvements as a part of the Hewitt’s Secondary Plan, including part of Big Bay Road between Yonge Street and Side Road 20, Mapleview Road between Huronia Road and Sideroad 20.

---

1 Reviewed 31 May, 2016 (http://www.maps.barrie.ca/resident/WebPages/Disclaimer.aspx?ReturnUrl=%2fresident%2fWebPages%2fMap%2fFundyViewer.aspx%3fselectedTab%3dSearch%26SEARCHNAME%3dADDRESS)
3 Reviewed 12 May, 2016 (http://www.heritagetrust.on.ca/Resources-and-Learning/Online-Plaque-Guide.aspx)
4 Reviewed 12 May, 2016 (www.ontarioplaques.com)
Lockhart Road between Huronia Road and Sideroad 20, and Yonge Street between Mapleview Road and Lockhart Road. Directly adjacent to this area is the St. Paul’s Historic Settlement area, comprising of properties along St. Paul’s Crescent and Yonge Street. This small community consists of a cluster of houses, a church, a former school and a cemetery. The community includes a post WWII residential subdivision on St. Paul’s Crescent and Yonge Street, consisting of small subdivided lots along the roadway.

The area is historically predominantly rural agricultural, and this agricultural use is still reflected in the existing conditions along Big Bay Road, Mapleview Road, Lockhart Road, and Yonge Street which are all rural roadscapes, composed of two lanes of divided vehicular traffic bordered by narrow gravel shoulders and shallow ditches. The roadway is lined with hydro poles, vegetation, with adjacent farmscapes and remnant farmscapes, and active agricultural lands. Several contemporary subdivisions have been built within the study area between Mapleview and Big Bay Road, an indication of growth and intensification in Barrie.
Figure 7: Looking north on Yonge Street, within the historic settlement area of St. Paul's

Figure 8: Carpe Diem farm at 8252 Yonge Street, an active orchard.

Figure 9: North-east view of the Barrie railscape from Mapleview Road within the historic settlement area of St. Paul's.

Figure 10: Big Bay Road looking east.
Figure 11: Lockhart Road looking west.

Figure 12: North-east view of Mapleview Road. Note recent residential development.

Figure 13: Looking north on St. Paul's Crescent, within the historic settlement area of St. Paul's.

Figure 14: Hewitt’s Creek, looking south from Mapleview Road.
Based on the results of the background research and field review, there are 32 cultural heritage resources within the study area, including: nine farmscapes (CHLs 1, 3, 8, 11-16, and 20); ten residences (CHLs 4, 5, 7, 10, BHRs 1-5); four remnant farmscapes (CHLs 9, 17-19), one historic settlement area (CHR 6), one church with cemetery (CHR 2), one former school (CHR 23), one watercourse (CHL 22), four roadscapes (CHL 24-27) and one railscape (CHR 21). CHR 1 and CHR 2 were formerly listed by the Town of Innisfil, however, they were annexed by the City of Barrie in 2008, and were never transferred to the City of Barrie Heritage Register. See Table 3 for a summary of built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes, and Table 3 in Appendix 1 for a detailed description of these identified resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHL 1</td>
<td>793 Mapleview Drive</td>
<td>Formerly listed by the Town of Innisfil</td>
<td>Farmscape including red brick farmhouse, formerly listed by the Town of Innisfil, but not included when the area was annexed by the City of Barrie in 2008 (City of Barrie Planning staff, email communication August 27, 2015).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 2</td>
<td>43 St. Paul's Crescent (3294 St. Paul's Crescent)</td>
<td>Church and Cemetery, Formerly listed by the Town of Innisfil</td>
<td>St. Paul's Anglican Church and cemetery was established in 1851 (date plaque on structure), with the extant church constructed in 1903 (Unterman McPhail Associates 2011). Formerly Listed by the Town of Innisfil, but not included when the area was annexed by the City of Barrie in 2008 (City of Barrie Planning staff, email communication August 27, 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 3</td>
<td>750 Lockhart Road (2114 Lockhart Road)</td>
<td>Identified during desktop data review</td>
<td>Farmstead featuring a one-and-a-half storey frame residence with an intersecting gable roof, active agricultural fields, and established circulation routes. Depicted in 1928 Topographical Map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 4</td>
<td>1039 Big Bay Point Road (1663 Big Bay Point Road)</td>
<td>Identified in previous assessment (Unterman McPhail Associates 2011)</td>
<td>Mid-twentieth century one-storey frame residence with a side gabled roof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 5</td>
<td>694 Mapleview Drive</td>
<td>Identified in previous assessment (Unterman McPhail Associates 2011)</td>
<td>Located within the community of St. Paul's, this residence is an early-twentieth century two storey red brick house with rectangular massing and a hipped roof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 6</td>
<td>Community of St. Paul's</td>
<td>Identified in previous assessment (Unterman McPhail Associates 2011)</td>
<td>Community located at the intersection of Mapleview Road and Yonge Street, including a group of house centered around St. Paul's Anglican Church and a school. The former alignment of Penetanguishene Road/Yonge Street (modern day St. Paul's Crescent) passes through the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 7</td>
<td>929 Yonge Street (8359 Yonge Street)</td>
<td>Identified in previous assessment (Unterman McPhail Associates 2011)</td>
<td>Mid-late nineteenth century one-and-a-half storey dichromatic brick residence featuring a cross gabled roof. Located within the settlement of St. Paul's.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 8</td>
<td>1012 Yonge Street (8252 Yonge Street)</td>
<td>Identified in previous assessment (Unterman McPhail Associates 2011)</td>
<td>Farm complex featuring a two storey red brick residence built in the late nineteenth-century. 'Carpe Diem Farm' grounds also include a gambrel barn, silo, and an active apple orchard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 9</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>Identified in previous</td>
<td>Remnant farmscape featuring agricultural fields, and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Summary of built heritage resources (BHR) and cultural heritage landscapes (CHL) in the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mapleview Drive</td>
<td>assessment (Unterman McPhail Associates 2011)</td>
<td>abandoned silo, and mature treelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 11</td>
<td>3320 20th Sideroad</td>
<td>Identified in previous assessment (Unterman McPhail Associates 2011)</td>
<td>Farmscape features a late nineteenth-century one-and-a-half storey brick farmhouse with a cross gabled roof, a gambrel roofed barn, silo, outbuildings, agricultural fields, mature plantings, and circulation routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 12</td>
<td>1000 Lockhart Road</td>
<td>Identified in previous assessment (Unterman McPhail Associates 2011)</td>
<td>Farmscape featuring a one-and-a-half storey late nineteenth century frame residence, gable roof barn, mature plantings, and agricultural fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 13</td>
<td>1750 Lockhart Road</td>
<td>Identified in previous assessment (Unterman McPhail Associates 2011)</td>
<td>Farmscape features a one-and-a-half storey nineteenth-century residence obscured by vegetation, with a gambrel roof barn and other outbuildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 14</td>
<td>1757 Lockhart Road</td>
<td>Identified in previous assessment (Unterman McPhail Associates 2011)</td>
<td>Farmscape includes a farmhouse, gambrel roof barn, silo, and other outbuildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 15</td>
<td>912 Lockhart Road</td>
<td>Identified in previous assessment (Unterman McPhail Associates 2011)</td>
<td>Farmscape features a one-and-a-half storey nineteenth-century with intersecting gable roof, gable roofed barn, concrete silo, and outbuildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 16</td>
<td>1914 Lockhart Road</td>
<td>Identified in previous assessment (Unterman McPhail Associates 2011)</td>
<td>Farmscape includes a residence obscured by trees, a gable roof barn, outbuildings, and fenced activity and livestock areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 17</td>
<td>620 Lockhart Road</td>
<td>Identified in previous assessment (Unterman McPhail Associates 2011)</td>
<td>Remnant farmscape features agricultural fields and established circulation routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 18</td>
<td>560 Lockhart Road</td>
<td>Identified in previous assessment (Unterman McPhail Associates 2011)</td>
<td>Remnant farmscape features barn ruins, a concrete silo, agricultural fields and established circulation routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 19</td>
<td>460 Lockhart Road</td>
<td>Identified in previous assessment (Unterman McPhail Associates 2011)</td>
<td>Remnant farmscape features barn ruins, a concrete silo, agricultural fields and established circulation routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 20</td>
<td>2647 Lockhart Road</td>
<td>Identified in previous assessment (Unterman McPhail Associates 2011)</td>
<td>Farmscape features a one-and-a-half storey nineteenth-century red brick residence with a cross gable roof, silo, mature plantings, and agricultural fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 21</td>
<td>Barrie Rail Line</td>
<td>Identified in previous assessment (Unterman McPhail Associates 2011)</td>
<td>Rail line established as the Northern Railroad in 1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 22</td>
<td>Hewitt’s Creek</td>
<td>Identified during field review.</td>
<td>The Hewitt’s Creek subwatershed runs through the study area, emptying into Kempenfelt Bay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Summary of built heritage resources (BHR) and cultural heritage landscapes (CHL) in the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHL 23</td>
<td>75 St. Paul's Crescent</td>
<td>Identified in previous assessment (Unterman McPhail Associates 2011)</td>
<td>The property is associated with the St. Paul's Anglican Church, located to the northwest across the street from the cemetery, and with the community of St. Paul's (CHL 6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 24</td>
<td>Big Bay Road</td>
<td>Identified during field review.</td>
<td>Big Bay Road is composed of two lanes of divided vehicular traffic bordered by narrow gravel shoulders and shallow ditches. The roadway is lined with mature trees, vegetation and agricultural fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 25</td>
<td>Lockhart Road</td>
<td>Identified during field review.</td>
<td>Lockhart Road is composed of two lanes of divided vehicular traffic bordered by narrow gravel shoulders and shallow ditches. The roadway is lined with hydro poles, vegetation and agricultural fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 26</td>
<td>Mapview Road</td>
<td>Identified during field review.</td>
<td>Mapview Road is composed of two lanes of divided vehicular traffic bordered by narrow gravel shoulders and shallow ditches. The roadway is lined with hydro poles, mature trees, vegetation and agricultural fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 27</td>
<td>St. Paul's Crescent</td>
<td>Identified during field review.</td>
<td>St. Paul's Crescent, formerly part of Yonge Street (Formerly known as Penetanguishene Road) is composed of two lanes of divided vehicular traffic bordered by narrow gravel shoulders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 1</td>
<td>99 St. Paul's Crescent (3297 St. Paul's Crescent)</td>
<td>Identified in previous assessment (Unterman McPhail Associates 2011)</td>
<td>This former school is associated with the settlement of St. Paul's, and is located within with this historic settlement area (CHL 6). It is located off of St. Paul's Crescent, formerly a part of Yonge Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 2</td>
<td>926 Yonge Street (8362 Yonge Street)</td>
<td>Identified in previous assessment (Unterman McPhail Associates 2011)</td>
<td>Located within the settlement of St. Paul's, and is associated with this historic settlement area (CHL 6). A stone Arts &amp; Crafts Bungalow house with six over one wood windows, and enclosed porch, and red roof with central chimney. Set back from Yonge Street with a mature treed lot and fenced off back yard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 3</td>
<td>920 Yonge Street (8372 Yonge Street)</td>
<td>Identified in previous assessment (Unterman McPhail Associates 2011)</td>
<td>Located within the settlement of St. Paul’s, and is associated with this historic settlement area (CHL 6). A contemporary two storey bungalow house with two large dormers, and a detached carriage house style garage. Set back from Yonge Street with a large paved driveway, a large landscaping stone and a mature treed lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 4</td>
<td>908 Yonge Street (8359 Yonge Street)</td>
<td>Identified in previous assessment (Unterman McPhail Associates 2011)</td>
<td>Located within the settlement of St. Paul’s, and is associated with this historic settlement area (CHL 6). An early 20th century 1 ½ storey side gable bungalow house, centre hall plan, with two large windows and angel stone façade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 5</td>
<td>921 Yonge Street</td>
<td>Identified during field review.</td>
<td>Located within the settlement of St. Paul’s, and is associated with this historic settlement area (CHL 6). An early 20th century 1 ½ storey side gable bungalow house, centre hall plan, with two large windows on the front façade, with two small dormers in the roofline and a front porch.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Screening for Potential Impacts
To assess the potential impacts of the undertaking, identified cultural heritage resources are considered against a range of possible impacts as outlined in the document entitled *Screening for Impacts to Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes* (MTC November 2010) which include:

- Destruction, removal or relocation 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 exposure or visibility of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden (III.3).
- Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context, or a significant relationship (III.4).
- Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas from, within, or to a built or natural heritage 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, etc (III.7)

A number of additional factors are also considered when evaluating potential impacts on identified cultural heritage resources. These are outlined in a document set out by the Ministry of Culture and Communications (now Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport) and the Ministry of the Environment entitled *Guideline for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments* (October 1992) and include:

- Magnitude: the amount of physical alteration or destruction which can be expected;
- Severity: the irreversibility or reversibility of an impact;
- Duration: the length of time an adverse impact persists;
- Frequency: the number of times an impact can be expected;
- Range: the spatial distribution, widespread or site specific, of an adverse impact; and
- Diversity: the number of different kinds of activities to affect a heritage resource.

For the purposes of evaluating potential impacts of development and site alteration, MTC (2010) defines “adjacent” as: “contiguous properties as well as properties that are separated from a heritage property by narrow strip of land used as a public or private road, highway, street, lane, trail, right-of-way, walkway, green space, park, and/or easement or as otherwise defined in the municipal official plan.”

Once alternative alignments or a preferred alternative for the Hewitt’s Secondary Plan road upgrades have been identified, all cultural heritage resources identified within and adjacent to the study area will be evaluated against the above criteria and a summary of impact screening results will be provided. Various works associated with road improvements have the potential to affect cultural heritage resources in a variety of ways, and as such, appropriate mitigation measures for the undertaking need to be considered.

Where any above-ground cultural heritage resources are identified, which may be affected by direct or indirect impacts, appropriate mitigation measures should be developed. This may include completing a heritage impact assessment or documentation report, or employing suitable measures such as landscaping,
buffering or other forms of mitigation, where appropriate. In this regard, provincial guidelines should be consulted for advice and further heritage assessment work should be undertaken as necessary.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS

The results of background historical research and a review of secondary source material, including historical mapping, revealed a study area with a rural land use history dating back to the early nineteenth century. The field review confirmed that this area retains a number of nineteenth- and twentieth-century cultural heritage resources. The following provides a summary of the assessment results:

Key Findings

- A total of 32 cultural heritage resources were identified within and/or adjacent to the Hewitt’s Secondary Plan study area;

- These resources include nine farmlands (CHLs 1, 3, 8, 11-16, and 20); ten residences (CHLs 4, 5, 7, 10, BHRs 1-5); four remnant farmlands (CHLs 9, 17-19), one historic settlement area (CHR 6), one church with cemetery (CHR 2), one former school (CHR 23), one watercourse (CHL 22), four roadscapes (CHL 24-27) and one rail line (CHR 21).

- CHR 1 and CHR 2 were formerly listed by the Town of Innisfil, however, they were annexed by the City of Barrie in 2008, and were never formally transferred to the City of Barrie Heritage Register.

- Identified cultural heritage resources are historically, architecturally, and contextually associated with nineteenth-century and twentieth-century land use patterns in Innisfil.

6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

The background research, data collection, and field review conducted for the study area determined that there are 32 cultural heritage resources are located within or adjacent to the Hewitt’s Secondary Plan study area. Transportation improvements may have a variety of impacts upon cultural heritage resources. As such, the proposed improvements should be planned to avoid impacts to any cultural heritage resources.

Based on the results of the assessment, the following recommendations have been developed:

1. Staging and construction activities should be suitably planned and undertaken to avoid impacts to identified cultural heritage resources;

2. Once a preferred alternative or detail designs of the proposed work are available, this report will be updated with a confirmation of impacts of the undertaking on cultural heritage resources identified within and/or adjacent to the study area and will recommend appropriate mitigation measures. Mitigation measures may include, but are not limited to, completing a heritage impact assessment or documentation report, or employing suitable measures such as landscaping, buffering or other forms of mitigation, where appropriate. In this regard,
provincial guidelines should be consulted for advice and further heritage assessment work should be undertaken as necessary; and,

3. Should future work require an expansion of the study area then a qualified heritage consultant should be contacted in order to confirm the impacts of the proposed work on potential heritage resources.