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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ASI was contracted by Dillon Consulting Limited to conduct a Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment (CHRA) as part of the Ridge Landfill Expansion Environmental Assessment near the community of Blenheim in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent. This project involves the expansion of the existing landfill site to an area of approximately 334 hectares, and use of an approximately 10-kilometre existing haul route using the existing right-of-ways from the landfill along Erieau Road, Drury Line, and Communication Road to the right-of-way of the westbound Highway 401 on-ramp.

The results of the background research and field survey, which included a review of nineteenth and twentieth century mapping, revealed a study area with Indigenous history dating back thousands of years and an agricultural land use history with its origins in nineteenth century survey and settlement. Over the past centuries, generally the study area has been minimally altered and a small number of mid- to late-twentieth century residential structures have been introduced. A fair number of late nineteenth to early twentieth century agricultural complexes and structures have been maintained, and generally, the overall landscape of the area has retained a rural, agricultural character and setting.

Twenty-three cultural heritage resources are located within or adjacent to the study area. The study area was assessed from the existing right-of-ways (ROW) from Communication Road, Drury Line, Middle Line, Erieau Road, Allison Line, and Charing Cross Road. Of the 23 cultural heritage resources, nine are barns/outbuildings (BHR 1, BHR 2, BHR 5, BHR 6, BHR 9, BHR 10, BHR 11, BHR 15, and BHR 16), five are residences (BHR 4, BHR 7, BHR 8, BHR 12, and BHR 14), seven are farmscapes (CHL 1, CHL 2, CHL 3, CHL 4, CHL 5, CHL 6, and CHL 7), and one is a former schoolhouse (institutional), now a residence (BHR 13). The results in this CHRA comprise of all previously identified cultural heritage resources which were identified as part of the 1996 Cultural Resource report for the earlier BFI Ridge Landfill expansion. None of the resources are on the Municipal Heritage Register for the Municipality of Chatham-Kent.

The expansion plan of Ridge Landfill will impact the character and setting of the rural landscape. The expansion area has the potential to directly impact cultural heritage resources. This may include the removal or demolition of some cultural heritage resources which may alter the present rural character associated with the nineteenth century transportation routes, such as Allison Line and Charing Cross Road (see Table 3). There may also be potential for disruption, or indirect impacts, to cultural heritage resources along the existing haul route and adjacent lands to the expansion area by the introduction of physical, visual, audible or atmospheric elements to the existing environment that are not in keeping with the rural character and/or setting (see Table 3).

Based on the results of this assessment and a review of the development plan, the following recommendations have been developed:

1. BHR 14, BHR 15, BHR 16, and CHL 7 are expected to be directly impacted through alteration to the setting in the proposed development plan (Appendix A). A property specific Heritage Impact Assessment is required, which should include an evaluation of the resource based on the criteria set out in Ontario Regulation 9/06. A Cultural Heritage Documentation Report (CHDR) may be a mitigation action of the HIA.
2. Staging and construction activities should be suitably planned and undertaken to avoid impacts to identified cultural heritage resources. Should construction activities occur in close proximity to identified resources, the impacts of vibrations should be determined through an engineering assessment and any resulting mitigation measures should be implemented prior to construction as needed.

3. Should future work require an expansion of the study area or if road improvements along the haul roads become necessary, then a qualified heritage consultant should be contacted in order to confirm the impacts of the proposed work on potential heritage resources.

4. Visual impacts of the landfill expansion to the adjacent cultural heritage resources (BHR 12, BHR 13, CHL 5 and CHL6) should be minimized through the introduction and/or maintenance of berms or other type of vegetative screening.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

ASI was contracted by Dillon Consulting Limited to conduct a Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment (CHRA) as part of the Ridge Landfill Expansion Environmental Assessment near the community of Blenheim in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent. This project involves the expansion of the existing landfill site to an area of approximately 334 hectares, and use of an approximately 10-kilometre existing haul route using the existing right-of-ways from the landfill along Erieau Road, Drury Line, and Communication Road to the right-of-way of the westbound Highway 401 on-ramp (Figure 1).

The purpose of this report is to present a built heritage and cultural landscape inventory of cultural heritage resources, to identify existing conditions of the Ridge Landfill study area, to identify impacts to cultural heritage resources, and to propose appropriate mitigation measures. In addition to built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes, a property’s cultural heritage value and attributes can also be associated with archaeological resources. This CHRA examines only the potential cultural heritage value associated with above-ground resources. ASI was also contracted to conduct the archaeological resource assessment and it will be presented in a separate report. The research for this report was conducted under the senior project management of Annie Veilleux, Manager of the Cultural Heritage Division, ASI.

Figure 1: Location of the study area
Base Map:©OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community
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 resources 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, roadscape 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 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 definitions considered during the course of the assessment:
A provincial heritage property is defined as the following:

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:

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:

…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:

… 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 archaeological 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

2.1.1 The Municipality of Chatham-Kent

The Chatham-Kent Official Plan (Consolidated June 7, 2017) is a tool for the “Protection and
elevation of natural features and cultural heritage features by identifying environmental areas suitable
for protection and enhancement, providing policies supporting heritage conservation and encouraging
stewardship of these important resources” (Section 1.4):

It shall be the objective of Chatham-Kent to:

5.3.1.1 Support and encourage the preservation of the Municipality's rich cultural
heritage resources.

5.3.1.2 Encourage the documentation, display, interpretation and celebration of
the Municipality's cultural heritage.

The Chatham-Kent Official Plan (Section 5.3, Consolidated June 7, 2017) sets out a number of policies
with regard to cultural heritage resources. Policies that are relevant to this study include:

5.3.2.1 The Municipality shall conserve its significant built heritage resources and cultural
heritage landscapes that are of cultural heritage value or interest in the landscape, and may use the
Ontario Heritage Act to do so.

5.3.2.2 Development and/or site alteration shall not be permitted on properties containing
significant built heritage resources and/or cultural heritage landscapes, unless it is demonstrated
though a heritage impact assessment prepared by a qualified professional to the satisfaction of the
Municipality that the significant built heritage resources or cultural heritage landscapes on or
adjacent to the subject property(ies) will be conserved.

5.3.2.9 The Municipality may prepare and maintain a cultural heritage database and/or heritage
management plans for planning purposes, in consultation with the MHC, resulting in inventories
of significant heritage buildings, heritage districts, cultural heritage landscapes, archaeological
sites, and areas of archaeological potential within Chatham-Kent. The Municipality will also
maintain a register of properties, endorsed by Council, containing properties designated under the
Ontario Heritage Act. The register shall also contain a listing of properties worthy of designating
under the Ontario Heritage Act and the Municipality shall endeavour to have these properties
designated. Signage will be erected to indicate that a property is a designated heritage property.

5.3.2.11 The Municipality shall encourage the designation of sites of national significance as
national historic sites.
5.3.2.15 Adaptive re-use of heritage properties shall be promoted, such as the conversion of a historic building to a museum or community meeting space.

5.3.2.16 To ensure that heritage properties remain in their context, the relocation of heritage buildings or structures shall be discouraged.

The Municipality of Chatham-Kent also encourages the conservation of significant cultural heritage landscapes and vegetation, as outlined in section 5.3.2.20: “The preservation of cultural landscapes in the rural areas such as hedgerows, stone fences or tree lines is encouraged.”

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 historical 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 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 (including Ontario Regulations 9/06 and 10/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act), 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 Municipality of Chatham-Kent; 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: Municipality of Chatham-Kent; 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 Municipality of Chatham-Kent; 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 entire province or with a community that is found in more than one part of the province. The association exists for historic, social, or cultural reasons or because of traditional use.
• 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.

## 3.0 BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT

### 3.1 Introduction

This section provides a brief summary of historical 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 physiography, Indigenous and Euro-Canadian land use and settlement.

### 3.2 Physiographic Region

The study area is situated within the St. Clair Clay Plains and the Bothwell Sand Plains physiographic regions of southern Ontario. The St. Clair Clay Plains physiographic region is characterized by extensive low-lying clay plains between Lake St. Clair in Essex and Kent Counties and the St. Clair River in Lambton County, except for a moraine at Ridgetown and Blenheim (Chapman and Putnam 1984:147). Deposits are deep except near Amherstburg, where a dome of limestone comes to the surface. Part of this limestone comes to the surface in Kent County, but the majority of bedrock is black shale. The very flat tract of land east of Lake St. Clair was submerged after the disappearance of Glacial Lake Warren in a correlative of Early Lake Algonquin and received a deeper covering of stratified clay and silt. The study area contains regions of sand and clay plain. Historically, this area supported a swamp forest of elm, black ash, white ash, and silver or red maple (Chapman and Putnam 1984:150).

The Bothwell Sand Plain is the delta of the Thames River in glacial Lake Warren. The region has an approximate elevation of between 183 and 213 metre above sea level and covers an area of approximately 1813 square kilometres. The region consists of relatively thin (approximately one metre) deposits of sand.
over the underlying glaciolacustrine clays of Lake Warren. The topography is generally level except
where gullies have cut through former shorecliffs (Chapman and Putnam 1984:147).

Two major Thames River tributaries are within or adjacent to the study area. The northwestern end of the
study area is adjacent to McGregor’s Creek. This creek discharges into the Thames River (Belden 1880-
1881). In addition, Jeaneattes Creek, another Thames River tributary, ran through the expansion area (see
Figure 7). The Thames watershed drains an area of approximately 5700 square kilometres and is
approximately 273 kilometres in length from its source near Brodhagen to Lake St. Clair. The Thames
River was designated a heritage river by the Canadian Heritage Rivers System in 2000 because of its
importance as a transportation route and critical resource extraction area for Indigenous peoples for over
11,000 years, and since the seventeenth century for Euro-Canadian settlement, warfare, and trade

In addition, there are three channelized drains within the study area: Howard, Duke and Scott Drains.
These drains were likely former tributaries of the Thames River.

3.3 Indigenous Land Use and Settlement

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

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

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

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

The lands between Lake Erie and Lake Huron were highly contested during the contact period of southwestern Ontario. An early Jesuit map entitled Nouvelle France depicts this area as a border zone between peoples of different cultures and languages. The introduction of European trade goods, weapons, missionarines, and diseases served to exacerbate previous tensions between Indigenous groups (Johnston 2004:9). The period between AD 1400 and 1600 in southwestern Ontario is the least understood. Of the few known sites from this period, the majority are located near the Ontario-Michigan border and so much of the archaeological record from this period may have been destroyed by the urban development of this region, e.g., in the greater vicinity of the Cities of Windsor and Detroit. The evidence which does exist, however, indicates a trend towards population aggregation and construction of larger, fortified settlements. Settlement locations are also situated in areas typically less well-suited towards agriculture but quite well suited to alternate resource utilization, and so this pattern of supplementary agriculture seems to continue in this period. The Thames River Valley has documented occupation by Western Basin Tradition culture from approximate AD 1000-1400 (Murphy and Ferris 1990).

The western end of the Lake Erie north shore is understood to have been generally abandoned during the seventeenth century. The region may have been occupied by Central Algonquian populations whom Neutral Nation groups came into conflict with during hunting forays (Murphy and Ferris 1990:260). Between AD 1638 and 1641, the Neutral Nation are reported to have taken captive 1000 individuals of the Fire Nation (Lennox and Fitzgerald 1990:418). Late Western Basin Tradition populations may have been related to the seventeenth century Kickapoo, Miami, Potawatomi, Fox and Sauk Nations (Heidenreich 1990:Figure 15.1).

The north shore Iroquoian populations are understood to have been displaced from southern Ontario by the 1650s and were largely replaced by the New York Iroquois—or Haudenosaunee1. When the Seneca’s established Teyiaigon at the mouth of the Humber, they were in command of the traffic across the peninsula to Lake Simcoe and the Georgian Bay. Later, Mississauga and earliest European presence along the north shore, was therefore also largely defined by the area’s strategic importance for accessing and controlling long-established economic networks. Prior to the arrival of the Seneca, these economic networks would have been used by indigenous groups for thousands of years.

Due, in large part, to increased military pressure from the French upon their homelands south of Lake Ontario, the Haudenosaunee abandoned their north shore frontier settlements by the late 1680s, although they did not relinquish their interest in the resources of the area, as they continued to claim the north shore as part of their traditional hunting territory. The territory was immediately occupied or re-occupied by Anishinaabek groups, including the Mississauga, Ojibwa (or Chippewa) and Odawa, who, in the early seventeenth century, occupied the vast area extending from the east shore of Georgian Bay, and the north

---

1 The Haudenosaunee are also known as the New York Iroquois or Five Nations Iroquois and after 1722 Six Nations Iroquois. They were a confederation of five distinct but related Iroquoian-speaking groups - the Seneca, Onondaga, Cayuga, Oneida, and Mohawk. Each lived in individual territories in what is now known as the Finger Lakes district of Upper New York. In 1722 the Tuscarora joined the confederacy.
shore of Lake Huron, to the northeast shore of Lake Superior and into the upper peninsula of Michigan. Individual bands were politically autonomous and numbered several hundred people. Nevertheless, they shared common cultural traditions and relations with one another and the land. These groups were highly mobile, with a subsistence economy based on hunting, fishing, gathering of wild plants, and garden farming. Their movement southward also brought them into conflict with the Haudenosaunee.

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

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

The eighteenth century saw the ethnogenesis in Ontario of the Métis, when Métis people began to identify as a separate group, rather than as extensions of their typically maternal First Nations and paternal European ancestry (Métis National Council n.d.). Living in both Euro-Canadian and Indigenous societies, the Métis acted as agents and subagents in the fur trade but also as surveyors and interpreters. Métis populations were predominantly located north and west of Lake Superior, however, communities were located throughout Ontario (MNC n.d.; Stone and Chaput 1978:607,608). During the early nineteenth century, many Métis families moved towards locales around southern Lake Huron and Georgian Bay, including Kincardine, Owen Sound, Penetanguishene, and Parry Sound (MNC n.d.). By the mid-twentieth century, Indigenous communities, including the Métis, began to advance their rights within Ontario and across Canada, and in 1982, the Métis were federally recognized as one of the distinct Indigenous peoples in Canada. Recent decisions by the Supreme Court of Canada (Supreme Court of Canada 2003, 2016) have reaffirmed that Métis people have full rights as one of the Indigenous people of Canada under subsection 91(24) of the Constitution Act, 1867.

In 1790, the McKee Treaty was signed between the Crown and the Ottawa, Chippewa, Pottowatomi and Huron Nations of Detroit. This treaty included the lands of the study area (AANDC 2013).

### 3.4 Historical Euro-Canadian Land Use: Township Survey and Settlement

Historically, the study area is located in the Geographic Township of Harwich, County of Kent, and is within or directly adjacent to Lots 18-25, Concession 1, East of Communication Road (ECR), Lots 18-25, Concession I, West of Communication Road (WCR), Lots 18 and 19, Concession I (WCR), Lots 12-19, Concession III (WCR), and Lots 12-19, Concession IV (WCR). In addition, the study area is adjacent to Lot 25, Concessions XII-XVI in the Geographic Township of Raleigh, County of Kent.

#### 3.4.1 The Townships of Harwich and Raleigh

The survey of Harwich Township, located in the middle of Kent County, was initiated in 1797. Eventually three surveys were conducted from three different directions; as a result, the same lot and...
concession numbers appear three times (Mika and Mika 1983:246–248). Settlement in north Harwich began between 1785 and 1800 with clearing of land along the Thames River. Many of the first settlers in Harwich were Loyalists, such as the Rushton, Newcombe, and Pardo families and by 1817 the population of Harwich was only 114. Communication Road (now Highway 40), surveyed in 1797, passed through the “Ten Mile Bush” in the western half of the township. Lots were laid out on either side of Communication Road, originally granted to the Loyalists. The area remained largely unsettled until the mid nineteenth century. Communication Road was largely impassable until it was improved in 1844 to connect Chatham on the Thames River to Shrewsbury on the harbor (Dillon 1996). Rondeau Bay was considered a safe harbor for and an important port for supplies. Dense bush and swamp delayed settlement in the middle portion of the township until the second half of the nineteenth century. “Ten Mile Bush” was gradually cleared in the nineteenth century, as Harwich Township developed an agriculturally-based economy (Dillon 1996).

There were only two clusters of settlement as early as 1850, Charing Cross and Huffman's Corners. Places such as Mull and Fargo developed later close to the railways.

Settlement of Raleigh Township began in 1792 when the first settlers arrived. The primary attraction to this township was agricultural interests, rather than important trade markets. Prior to 1850, there is no record of municipal affairs in the Township. In 1866, there were 1,200 inhabitants. In the 1880s there were a small number of villages in Raleigh Township with Charing Cross considered the most important (Belden 1880-1881).

On January 1, 1998, the Townships of Harwich and Raleigh were amalgamated into the new Municipality of Chatham-Kent (Armstrong 1985).

### 3.4.2 Village of Blenheim

The Village of Blenheim was first settled in 1833-34 when Richard Chute settled south of Ridge Road and west of Communication Road (Belden 1880-1881). Blenheim is situated upon a ridge, a part of the Blenheim Moraine sub-region. In 1837 James W. Little, of Raleigh Township and militia captain from the War of 1812, purchased Chute’s land at the intersection of Ridge Road and Communication Road where he surveyed the Blenheim village plot. Few lots had sold by 1847 until the development of the lumber industry and the construction of a steam sawmill on Rondeau harbour. By 1857 Blenheim’s population had reached 450 and it had become a prosperous agricultural centre. In 1874, Blenheim was incorporated as a village with a population of 1,096, and as a Town in 1885 (Brown 2004). Blenheim grew to be the central settlement in the southern half of Harwich Township (Dillon 1996).

### 3.4.3 Village of Charing Cross

Charing Cross, straddling the Harwich-Raleigh township line, was settled around 1830 by a Mr. Cook from England, originally naming the village Cook’s Corners. A cluster of log buildings was built on a trail, later Charing Cross Road, from Buckhorn (Cedar Spring) to Chatham. The area was generally avoided by settlers who preferred the lakeshore road with higher farm lots draining toward Lake Erie (Armstrong 1985). In the nineteenth century, the village contained a Canada Southern Railway station connecting with a line of stage coaches for Chatham. It also had a steam saw mill, two hotels, church, store, post office, several shops, and a tollgate to enter Middle Line (Belden 1880-1881).
3.4.4 Railway Transportation

Canada Southern Railway (CSR)
Originally founded in 1868 as the Erie & Niagara Extension Railway, the line became the Canada Southern Railway (CSR) in 1869, running along the entire north shore of Lake Erie, from Fort Erie where it connected to Buffalo, to Windsor where it connected to Detroit (Chatham-Kent Metal Detecting Club 2005). Construction of the Canada Southern Railway across Harwich Township began in the early 1870s (Dillon 1996). The railway was leased to the Michigan Central Railroad in 1883 (Chatham-Kent Metal Detecting Club 2005).

Erie and Lake Huron Railway (E&LHR)
The Erie & Lake Huron Railway (E&LHR) linked Lake Huron and Lake Erie, from Shrewsberry to Sarnia, through the communities of Blenheim, Chatham, Dresden, and Wallaceburg. Construction began in 1879 from Lake Erie and was completed in 1886 (Hughes 2000). Initially, operations were handled by the Canada Southern Railway. Its original purpose was the hauling of cordwood, however during the summer months, passenger service was predominant with people accessing lakefront properties, resorts and public beaches (Hughes 2000; Moore Museum 2017). In 1898, the E&LHR was purchased by the Lake Erie & Detroit River Railway and merged into that system, which in turn was purchased in 1903 by the Pere Marquette Railway (PMR), a regional line established in Ontario to compete with other ambitious American lines. The PMR fell into receivership in both 1905 and 1912, and eventually was merged with the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway (C & O) in 1947, later called CSX Transportation. The original line was abandoned in 1974 and all tracks were lifted (Hughes 2000).

Chatham-Wallaceburg-Lake Erie Electric Railway
The Chatham-Wallaceburg-Lake Erie Electric Railway (CWLEER) was an electric passenger line that flourished between 1905 and 1915, with just four electric freight motors. It travelled from Wallaceburg, northwest of Chatham near the St. Clair River, through Chatham and Cedar Springs to Erie Beach. It faced serious competition from automobiles as well as problems in service after being purchased by the Canadian Northern Railway. Despite economic losses, the CWLEER continued carrying passengers, then provided a brief freight-only service until an accident on the Third Street Bridge in Chatham in 1929 that brought an end to the line (Rhodes 2013).

3.5 Review of Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Mapping

The 1831 Patent Plan Map of Harwich Township (Burwell 1831), the 1876 Map of the County of Kent, (Shackleton and McIntosh 1876), and the 1880-1881 Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Essex and Kent (H. Belden & Co. 1880-1881) were reviewed to determine the potential for the presence of historical resources in the study area in the nineteenth century (Figures 2-4).

The illustrated atlas series of maps are useful in that they define the boundaries of land ownership parcels and provide names of landowners (but not settlers per se). One of the earliest maps showing detail within the general study area is the 1831 Patent Plan Map of Harwich Township (Figure 2). Although there are no illustrated features, names of the lot owners are provided. The map highlights areas that are still forested, mostly along the lot lines. It is likely this 1831 patent map had been revised post-1831 since the Erie and Lake Huron Railway which did not open until the late nineteenth century is depicted.

The 1876 Map of the County of Kent shows the names of landowners (Figure 3). The Canada Southern Railway is depicted crossing Communication Road into the settlement area of Charing Cross. There are
no building features shown. In the case of the 1880-1881 *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Essex and Kent*, the locations of notable buildings and farmstead clearings are provided, as well as the settlement area of Charing Cross (Figure 4). The majority of buildings shown are farmhouses. The map also illustrates the location of a schoolhouse in Lot 25, Concession XV, in Raleigh Township, on the south side of Charing Cross Road. The 1880-1881 historical atlas map also shows that the study area intersects eleven open concession roads, now referred to as Horton Line, Communication Road, Cundle Line, Burk Line, Drury Line, Fargo Road, Lagoon Road, Middle Line, Erieau Road, Allison Line, and Charing Cross Road. In addition, the map depicts the Canada Southern Railway (CSR) and the “Huron & Erie Railway” (E&LHR).

In general, the nineteenth-century maps demonstrate the study area consisted of rural agricultural land which was still being cleared into the twentieth century.

It should be noted 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. The following property owners/occupants and associated historical features are illustrated within or adjacent to the study area:

**Table 1: Nineteenth-Century Property Owner(s) and Historical Feature(s) within or adjacent to the study area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Con Lot</th>
<th>Property Owner(s)</th>
<th>Historical Feature(s)</th>
<th>Property Owner(s)</th>
<th>Historical Feature(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harwich Township</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ECR 19</td>
<td>D. Rice</td>
<td>Canada Southern Railway None</td>
<td>Canada Southern Railway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>F. Rice</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>S. W. White</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>John Hood, Tenant farmer, settled 1878</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>J. Brown</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>J. Eagle</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>N. Tompkins</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Estate of the late Robert Smyth, farmer, settled 1844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>T. Smith</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>T. Boyce</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Samuel Johnston, farmer, settled 1879</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 WCR 18</td>
<td>R. A. Tomkins</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>William Blair, farmer, settled 1875</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>P. Huffman</td>
<td>Canada Southern Railway None</td>
<td>Canada Southern Railway, Erie and Lake Huron Railway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>J. W. Condle</td>
<td>Canada Southern Railway None</td>
<td>Canada Southern Railway, Erie and Lake Huron Railway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>D. Boyes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Jane Cundle, Widow of John Cundle, settled 1826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Jane Cundle, Widow of John Cundle, settled 1826</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>T. Mosa</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Erie and Lake Huron Railway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two topographic maps of the study area, dating from 1913 and 1940, illustrate that there had been settlement along the above noted transportation routes (Figures 5 and 6). Watercourses are present running through the study area in an east-westerly direction. One institutional feature is shown on the west side of Charing Cross Road. It is the location of a red brick schoolhouse. Since the nineteenth century, the most notable features are the addition of the Pere Marquette Railway and the Lake Erie Electric Railway. The 1913 topographic map shows “Cedar Springs Station” located on the east side of Charing Cross Road within the study area. In addition, it shows within or adjacent to the study area, most of the lots were cleared for agriculture, with some tree stands. The 1913 map also shows that the majority of the farmhouses are of frame construction with only six brick houses within or adjacent to the study area. Both maps illustrate a number of water crossings present in proximity to the major watercourses. Two water crossings associated with McGregor’s Creek, a tributary of the Thames River, are shown.
located adjacent to the northwest end of the study area, near present day Highway 401. A third water crossing, associated with Jeanette Creek, a tributary of the Thames River, is illustrated just northwest of the expansion area along Charing Cross Road.

The 1974 topographic map shows much of the same configuration as the earlier topographic maps, and indicates the study area was sparsely populated at this time (Figure 7). Generally, this map demonstrates a period of minimal growth with the continuation of agriculture in the study area. Mapping does not indicate that during the course of the nineteenth and early twentieth century’s there was significant expansion in the community of Charing Cross. The main settlement area remains just northeast of the study area.

In summary, a review of mapping reveals that the study area was, throughout the twentieth century, a rural, agricultural landscape.

Figure 2: The study area overlaid on the 1831 (revised) map of the Township of Harwich
Base Map: Patent Plan Map of Harwich Township (Burwell 1831)
Figure 3: The study area overlaid on the 1876 map of the Township of Harwich
Base Map: Map of the County of Kent, (Shackleton and McIntosh 1876)

Figure 4: The study area overlaid on the 1880 map of the Township of Harwich
Base Map: Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Essex and Kent (H. Belden & Co. 1880-1881)
Figure 5: The study area overlaid on 1913 NTS mapping
Base Map: Chatham Sheet 40 J/8 (Department of Militia and Defence 1913)

Figure 6: The study area overlaid on 1940 NTS mapping
Base Map: Chatham Sheet 40 J/8 (Department of National Defence 1940)
Figure 7: The south section of the study area overlaid on 1974 NTS mapping

Base Map: Charing Cross Sheet 40 J/8a & 40 J/1h (Department of Energy, Mines and Resources 1974)
4.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS

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

- The Municipal Heritage Register, which provides an inventory of cultural heritage resources that are designated under Part IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act, as well as those listed properties that are of cultural heritage value or interest to Chatham-Kent (email contact with Greg Houston, Planning Technician, Municipality of Chatham-Kent, 29 May 2017).
- the Canadian Heritage Rivers System inventory available at http://www.chrs.ca/en/main.php (reviewed 29 May 2017);
- the Ontario’s Historical Plaques, available at http://www.ontarioplaques.com/ (reviewed 08 June 2017); and
- 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, available at http://www.historicplaces.ca/en/pages/about-apropos.aspx (reviewed 08 June 2017).

A review of the federal registers and municipal and provincial inventories revealed that there are no previously identified features of cultural heritage interest within and adjacent to the Ridge Landfill Expansion study area.

In addition, a previous Impact Assessment report was consulted identifying cultural resources for the proposed BFI Ridge Landfill Expansion EA project conducted in 1995-1996 by Dillon Consulting Limited (Dillon 1996). In total, 43 built heritage features were identified during the assessment (Dillon 1996). The 1996 Cultural Heritage report was as a guiding reference for this CHRA.

A field review was undertaken by Tara Jenkins, Cultural Heritage Specialist, ASI, on May 29, 2017 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 Tables 4-6 and mapped in Figures 8-11 of this report.

4.1 Ridge Landfill Expansion - Existing Conditions

The existing Ridge Landfill and the proposed expansion area are situated on the western edge of Harwich Township. The Ridge Landfill Expansion study area consists of three main components: the existing haul route, the lands within the proposed Ridge Landfill expansion area, and the lands adjacent to the Ridge Landfill expansion area. The expansion area is an irregularly shaped boundary, which is roughly bounded
by Allison Line, Erieau Road, Charing Cross Road, and the west boundary of the east half of Lot 16 Concession IV (WCR), Harwich Township.

The existing haul route consists of an approximately 10-kilometre corridor using the existing right-of-ways from the Ridge Landfill along Erieau Road, Drury Line, and Communication Road to the right-of-way of the westbound Highway 401 on-ramp. Erieau Road, Drury Line, and Communication Road, all rural roadscapes, are composed of two paved lanes of divided vehicular traffic bordered by narrow gravel shoulders and drainage ditches. The roadways are lined with hydro poles, vegetation, with adjacent farmscapes, rural residential lots, and active agricultural lands. Just northeast of the study area is the rural community of Charing Cross, located at the junction of Middle Line and Charing Cross Road. Highway 401 and McGregor’s Creek are located just north of the study area. The Highway 401 interchange was under construction at the time of this report.

The properties within and adjacent to the expansion area are also rural in character, with the exception of the existing Ridge Landfill site. Allison Line is a gravel road with narrow gravel shoulders and grassed ditches. Charing Cross Road is a paved two lane road bordered by gravel shoulders and wide grassed swaths with drainage ditches within the right-of-way.

The study area is historically predominantly rural agricultural, and this agricultural use is still reflected in the existing conditions today. The study area is characterized by rural residential properties, predominantly agricultural farm complexes with some small residential lots.
Plate 5: Approximate view of the western boundary of the expansion area from Erieau Road, looking southwest.

Plate 6: View of Duke Drain along Erieau Road, looking west.

Plate 7: Looking southwest along Allison Line.

Plate 8: Former rail line at Allison Line and Erieau Road, looking southwest.

Plate 9: Orchard and mature tree line along Gore Road at Allison Line (a part of CHL 5), looking east.

Plate 10: Mature tree line along Allison Line (a part of CHL 5), looking southwest.
4.2 Ridge Landfill Expansion – Identified Cultural Heritage Resources

An impact assessment study for the expansion of the BFI Ridge Landfill and surrounding landscape was conducted in 1995-1996 (Dillon 1996). A Cultural Heritage report was written to document the potential impact of the landfill expansion on below-ground (archaeological) and above-ground (heritage) cultural resources. The assessment of heritage resources was undertaken for three study areas: on-site (lands within the landfill expansion area), off-site (lands within one kilometre), and the waste haul route (lands adjacent to the waste haul route on Highway 40, Drury Line, and Erieau Road).

In total, 43 built heritage features were identified during the assessment (Dillon 1996). Of these, 30 were identified within ASI’s study area. Of these 30, seven are no longer extant and were identified as:

- three residences (20240 Charing Cross Road, Lot 25, Con. XIV, Raleigh Twp., 20063 Charing Cross Road, Lot 14, Con. IV, Harwich Twp., and 19860 Charing Cross Road, Lot 25, Con. XVI, Raleigh Twp.);
- an abandoned farmhouse (Lot 25, Con. XV, Raleigh Twp.);
- two barns (21466 [misidentified in report as 21456] Communication Road, Lot 24, Con. I, Harwich Twp., and Lot 13, Con. IV, Harwich Twp- north side of Allison Line); and
- a farm complex (20111 Erieau Road, Lot 14, Con. III, Harwich Twp.).
Based on the results of the background research and field review, 23 cultural heritage resources are located within and adjacent to the study area, including: fifteen residences (BHRs 1-12 & 14-16), seven farmscapes (CHLs 1-7), and one former institution, now a residence (BHR 13). See Table 2 for a summary of built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes, and Tables 4-6 in Section 7.0 for a detailed description of these identified resources.

| Table 2: Summary of cultural heritage resources (CHRs) within and/or adjacent to the study area |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| **Resource** | **Type** | **Address/Location** | **Recognition/Comments** |
| Haul Route   |          |                      |                           |
| BHR 1        | Barn     | 21505 Communication Road Lot 24, Con. I, Harwich Twp. | Identified in a Previous Assessment (Dillon 1996) |
| BHR 2        | Barn     | Communication Road Lot 23, Con. I, Harwich Twp. | Identified in a Previous Assessment (Dillon 1996) |
| BHR 3        | Residence | 21179 Communication Road Lot 22, Con. I, Harwich Twp. | Identified in a Previous Assessment (Dillon 1996) |
| BHR 4        | Residence | 21037 Communication Road Lot 21, Con. I, Harwich Twp. | Identified in a Previous Assessment (Dillon 1996) |
| BHR 5        | Outbuildings | 20905 Communication Road Lot 21, Con. I, Harwich Twp. | Identified in a Previous Assessment (Dillon 1996) |
| BHR 6        | Barn     | 9284 & 9286 Drury Line Lot 18, Con. I, Harwich Twp. | Identified in a Previous Assessment (Dillon 1996) |
| BHR 7        | Residence | 9262 Drury Line Lot 18, Con. I, Harwich Twp. | Identified in a Previous Assessment (Dillon 1996) |
| BHR 8        | Residence | 9158 Drury Line Lot 18, Con. II, Harwich Twp. | Identified in a Previous Assessment (Dillon 1996) |
| BHR 9        | Barn     | 9163 Drury Line Lot 19, Con. II, Harwich Twp. | Identified in a Previous Assessment (Dillon 1996) |
| BHR 10       | Barn     | 9090 Drury Line Lot 18, Con. II, Harwich Twp. | Identified in a Previous Assessment (Dillon 1996) |
| BHR 11       | Barn     | 8965 Middle Line Lot 18, Con. III, Harwich Twp. | Identified in a Previous Assessment (Dillon 1996) |
| CHL 1        | Farmscape | 21398 & 21402 Communication Road Lot 23 Con. I, Harwich Twp. | Identified in a Previous Assessment (Dillon 1996) |
| CHL 2        | Farmscape | 20723 Communication Road Lot 19, Con. I, Harwich Twp. | Identified in a Previous Assessment (Dillon 1996) |
| CHL 3        | Farmscape | 9289 & 9291 Drury Line Lot 19, Con. I, Harwich Twp. | Identified in a Previous Assessment (Dillon 1996) |
| CHL 4        | Farmscape | 8941 Middle Line Lot 19, Con. III, Harwich Twp. | Identified in a Previous Assessment (Dillon 1996) |

**Adjacent Lands to the Expansion Area**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHR 12</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>20043 Erieau Road Lot 14, Con. III, Harwich Twp.</td>
<td>Identified in a Previous Assessment (Dillon 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 13</td>
<td>Former Institutional/Residence</td>
<td>20098 Charing Cross Road Lot 25, Con. XV, Raleigh Twp.</td>
<td>Identified in a Previous Assessment (Dillon 1996) “School Section No. 4 A.D. 1901”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 5</td>
<td>Farmscape</td>
<td>19881,19867 &amp; 19863 Charing Cross Road Lot 12, Con. IV, Harwich Twp.</td>
<td>Identified in a Previous Assessment (Dillon 1996) “Thompson’s Orchards” “Established 1881”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 6</td>
<td>Farmscape</td>
<td>20375 Charing Cross Road Lot 16, Con. IV, Harwich Twp.</td>
<td>Identified in a Previous Assessment (Dillon 1996)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Summary of cultural heritage resources (CHRs) within and/or adjacent to the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Address/Location</th>
<th>Recognition/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lands Within the Expansion Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 14</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>8779 Allison Line&lt;br&gt;Lot 13, Con. IV, Harwich Twp.</td>
<td>Identified in a Previous Assessment (Dillon 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 15</td>
<td>Barn</td>
<td>20011 Charing Cross Road&lt;br&gt;Lot 13, Con. IV, Harwich Twp.</td>
<td>Identified in a Previous Assessment (Dillon 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 16</td>
<td>Barn</td>
<td>20323 Charing Cross Road&lt;br&gt;Lot 16, Con. IV, Harwich Twp.</td>
<td>Identified in a Previous Assessment (Dillon 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 7</td>
<td>Farmscape</td>
<td>8765 Allison Line&lt;br&gt;Lot 13, Con. IV, Harwich Twp.</td>
<td>Identified in a Previous Assessment (Dillon 1996)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An additional barn, located at 20756 Communication Road, was previously identified (Dillon 1996). While aerial imagery suggests the barn is still extant, confirmation of the existence of the barn was not possible during fieldwork. As the barn is not located directly adjacent to the haul route no impacts are anticipated from the Ridge Landfill Expansion project and it was not included as a Built Heritage Resource in this report.

4.2.1 Thames Canadian Heritage River

The Thames River major tributaries are illustrated on the twentieth century topographical maps (Figures 4-7) in the vicinity of the study area. Even though they have been channelized and diverted, it is important to note that the tributaries influenced settlement in the vicinity of the study area.

The Thames River was formally designated a Canadian Heritage River on August 14, 2000. The Thames River was recognized as a heritage river for its outstanding contributions to the country’s cultural heritage, natural heritage, and recreational opportunities. The broad goal of managing the Thames and a Canadian Heritage river is: “To increase the appreciation, enjoyment and stewardship of the natural, and cultural heritage and recreational opportunities of the Thames River and its watershed through community cooperation and involvement.” As such, it is locally recognized for its contribution to the settlement of Kent County, notably the early river port and ship building centre of Chatham.

As the study area is within the Thames River Watershed, and given the major tributaries that transverse the study area, agriculture flourished in the nineteenth century and created a very prosperous farming landscape in the surrounding Chatham area.

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.”

4.4 Potential Impacts of the Proposed Work to Cultural Heritage Resources

The development plan for the Proposed Expansion Fill Area (Appendix A) and the haul route was reviewed to determine possible impacts to identified heritage resources. The following table (Table 3) considers the impacts of the design on identified cultural heritage resources, based on the Ministry of Tourism and Culture document entitled Screening for Impacts to Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (November 2010).

These three components have been further analyzed for impacts to the cultural heritage in Table 3 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Impacts to Identified Cultural Heritage Resources and Recommended Mitigation Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Haul Route</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 1: 21505 Communication Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 2: Lot 23, Con. 1 (ECR), Harwich Twp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 3: 21179 Communication Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 4: 21037 Communication Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 5: 20905 Communication Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 6: 9284 &amp; 9286 Drury Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 7: 9262 Drury Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 8: 9158 Drury Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BHR 9:</strong> 9163 Drury Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BHR 10:</strong> 9090 Drury Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BHR 11:</strong> 8965 Middle Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHL 1:</strong> 21398 &amp; 21402 Communication Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHL 2:</strong> 20723 Communication Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 3: Impacts to Identified Cultural Heritage Resources and Recommended Mitigation Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHL 3: 9289 &amp; 9291 Drury Line</td>
<td>Based on the proposed haul route, there may be indirect impacts to the property. There may be minimal audible and atmospheric impacts since the house sits in close proximity to Drury Line. The haul route does not require acquisition of this property. Utilizing Drury Line Road as part of the haul route will not result in change to the property’s current character and setting. Therefore, the haul route heritage impacts are considered minimal.</td>
<td>No further work is required. However, if road improvements are necessary, a property specific Heritage Impact Assessment, which should include an evaluation of the resource using the criteria set out in Ontario Regulation 9/06 should be completed, as per Section 5.3 of the Municipality of Chatham-Kent’s Official Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 4: 8941 Middle Line</td>
<td>Based on the proposed development plan, there are no identified impacts. The farm complex (CHL 4) sits back from Middle Line.</td>
<td>No further work is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjacent Lands to the Expansion Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 12: 20043 Erieau Road</td>
<td>Based on the proposed development plan, there may be indirect impacts to the property. The farm complex is situated close to the property line, making the property more vulnerable to vibrations. There may also be minimal audible and atmospheric impacts. However, the expansion does not require acquisition of this property. Since the proposed expansion will occur southwest of this property and Erieau Road it will not result in change to its current character and setting. Overall, the impacts to this property are considered minimal.</td>
<td>No further work is required. However, construction should be planned at a distance as far from the cultural heritage resource as possible. If construction is to occur in close proximity to BHR 12, the impacts of the vibrations should be determined through an engineering assessment and any resulting mitigation measures should be implemented prior to construction. A high berm on the southwest side of Erieau Road has already been constructed. It minimizes the visual impact to this built heritage feature. This berm should be maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 13: 20098 Charing Cross Road</td>
<td>Based on the proposed development plan, there may be indirect impacts to the property. The farm complex is situated close to the property line, making the property more vulnerable to vibrations. There may also be minimal audible and atmospheric impacts. However, the expansion does not require acquisition of this property. The proposed expansion will occur west of this property and Charing Cross Road. It</td>
<td>No further work is required. However, construction should be planned at a distance as far from the cultural heritage resource as possible. If construction is to occur in close proximity to this property properties, the impacts of the vibrations should be investigated through an engineering assessment and any necessary mitigation measures should be implemented prior to construction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 3: Impacts to Identified Cultural Heritage Resources and Recommended Mitigation Strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
<th>Mitigation Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHL 5: 19881, 19867, 19863 Charing Cross Road</td>
<td>Based on the proposed development plan, there may be indirect impacts to the property. The farm complex is situated close to the property line, making the property more vulnerable to vibrations. There may also be minimal audible and atmospheric impacts. However, the expansion does not require acquisition of this property. The proposed expansion will occur west of this property and Charing Cross Road and Allison Line. It will result in limited change to its current character and setting. Overall, the impacts to this property are considered minimal.</td>
<td>No further work is required. However, construction should be planned at a distance as far from the cultural heritage resource as possible. If construction is to occur in close proximity to CHL 5, the impacts of the vibrations should be determined through an engineering assessment and any resulting mitigation measures should be implemented prior to construction. The expansion of the landfill should also try to minimize the visual impact to the farmscape, such as the construction of high berms to obstruct the view of the landfill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 6: 20395 Charing Cross Road</td>
<td>Based on the proposed development plan, there may be indirect impacts to the property. The farm complex is situated close to the property line, making the property more vulnerable to vibrations. There may also be minimal audible and atmospheric impacts. However, the expansion does not require acquisition of this property. The proposed expansion will occur west of this property and Charing Cross Road. It will result in limited change to its current character and setting. Therefore, the impacts to this property are considered minimal.</td>
<td>No further work is required. However, construction should be planned at a distance as far from the cultural heritage resource as possible. If construction is to occur in close proximity to this property properties, the impacts of the vibrations should be investigated through an engineering assessment and any necessary mitigation measures should be implemented prior to construction. The expansion of the landfill should also try to minimize the visual impact to the farmscape, such as the construction of high berms to obstruct the view of the landfill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 14: 8779 Allison Line</td>
<td>Based on the proposed development plan, there will be direct impacts to the property due to the construction of a proposed berm. There is potential that BHR 14 will be displaced (i.e. removed or demolished).</td>
<td>Prior to any change in the environment (i.e. removal or demolition), a Heritage Impact Assessment is required, which should include an evaluation of the resource based on the criteria set out in Ontario Regulation 9/06. A Cultural Heritage Documentation Report (CHDR) may be a mitigation action of the HIA. The CHDR should include photodocumentation of the existing roadscape on Allison Line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td>Impacts</td>
<td>Mitigation Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 15: 20011 Charing Cross Road</td>
<td>Based on the proposed development plan, there may be direct impacts to BHR 15 due to the construction of a proposed watercourse route, located at the edge of the West Landfill expansion area. Although the property has already been acquired by Ridge Landfill, there still is potential that BHR 15 will be displaced (i.e. removed or demolished).</td>
<td>Prior to any change in the environment (i.e. removal or demolition), a Heritage Impact Assessment is required, which should include an evaluation of the resource based on the criteria set out in Ontario Regulation 9/06. A Cultural Heritage Documentation Report (CHDR) may be a mitigation action of the HIA. The CHDR should include photodocumentation of the existing roadscape on Charing Cross Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 16: 20323 Charing Cross Road</td>
<td>Based on the proposed development plan, there will be direct impacts to the property due to the construction of a proposed flood control facility. There is potential that BHR 16 will be displaced (i.e. removed or demolished).</td>
<td>Prior to any change in the environment (i.e. removal or demolition), a Heritage Impact Assessment is required, which should include an evaluation of the resource based on the criteria set out in Ontario Regulation 9/06. A Cultural Heritage Documentation Report (CHDR) may be a mitigation action of the HIA. The CHDR should include photodocumentation of the existing roadscape on Charing Cross Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 7: 8765 Allison Line</td>
<td>Based on the proposed development plan, there will be direct impacts to the property due to the construction of a proposed berm and proposed stormwater pond. There is potential that CHL 7 will be displaced (i.e. removed or demolished).</td>
<td>Prior to any change in the environment (i.e. removal or demolition), a Heritage Impact Assessment is required, which should include an evaluation of the resource based on the criteria set out in Ontario Regulation 9/06. A Cultural Heritage Documentation Report (CHDR) may be a mitigation action of the HIA. The CHDR should include photodocumentation of the existing roadscape on Allison Line.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.0 CONCLUSIONS

The results of background historical research and a review of secondary source material, including historic mapping, revealed a study area with Indigenous history dating back thousands of years, and rural land use history dating back to the nineteenth century. Seven cultural heritage landscapes (CHL) and 16 built heritage resources (BHR) were identified within and/or adjacent to the study area. All the resources were previously identified as part of the 1996 Cultural Resource report for the BFI Ridge Landfill expansion. None of the resources, however, are on the Municipal Register for the Municipality of Chatham-Kent.

5.1 Key Findings

The development plan may have a variety of impacts on cultural heritage resources. The expansion plan of Ridge Landfill will impact the character and setting of the rural landscape. The expansion area has the potential to directly impact cultural heritage resources. This may include the removal or demolition of some cultural heritage resources which may alter the present rural character associated with the nineteenth century transportation routes, such as Allison Line and Charing Cross Road (see Table 3). There may also be potential for disruption, or indirect impacts, to cultural heritage resources along the existing haul route and adjacent lands to the expansion area by the introduction of physical, visual, audible or atmospheric elements to the existing environment that are not in keeping with the rural character and/or setting (see Table 3).

Based on the results of background data collection and the field survey, there are 23 cultural heritage resources located within the Ridge Landfill Expansion Environmental Assessment study area. As such, the proposed improvements should be planned to avoid impacts to any cultural heritage resources.

- A total of 23 cultural heritage resources were identified within and/or adjacent to the study area;
- Seven cultural heritage landscapes (CHL) and 16 built heritage resources (BHR) were identified within and/or adjacent to the study area. Although these resources are not on the Municipal Heritage Register, all were previously identified in a cultural heritage assessment report (Dillon 1996);
- Of the 23 cultural heritage resources, nine are barns/outbuildings (BHR 1, BHR 2, BHR 5, BHR 6, BHR 9, BHR 10, BHR 11, BHR 15, and BHR 16), five are residences (BHR 4, BHR 7, BHR 8, BHR 12, and BHR 14), seven are farmscapes (CHL 1, CHL 2, CHL 3, CHL 4, CHL 5, CHL 6, and CHL 7), and one is a former schoolhouse (institutional), now a residence (BHR 13); and
- Identified cultural heritage resources are historically, architecturally, and contextually associated with land use patterns in the rural area of the Municipality of Chatham-Kent, and more specifically representative of the nineteenth century and early twentieth century rural land use.

All 23 cultural heritage resources identified within the study area were assessed using the existing development plans and the following provides a summary of the preliminary impact assessment completed:
• Direct impacts are anticipated for BHR 14, BHR 15, BHR 16, and CHL 7, and include, but are not limited to, a direct physical impact to the cultural heritage resource (i.e. removal if they are located within the expansion area).

• Indirect impacts were found with BHRs 1-13 and CHLs 1-6, which include, but are not limited to, by the introduction of physical, visual, audible or atmospheric elements that are not keeping with the rural character of the area.

6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed undertaking should not adversely affect cultural heritage resources and intervention should be managed in such a way that its impact is sympathetic with the value of the resources. When the nature of the undertaking is such that adverse impacts are unavoidable, it may be necessary to implement management or mitigation strategies that alleviate the deleterious effects on cultural heritage resources. Mitigation is the process of causing lessening or negating anticipated adverse impacts to cultural heritage resources and may include, but are not limited to, such actions as avoidance, monitoring, protection, relocation, remedial landscaping, documentation of the cultural heritage landscape and/or built heritage resource if to be demolished or relocated, and salvage of building materials.

The background research and field review conducted for the study area determined that 23 cultural heritage resources are located within or adjacent to the study area. The study area was assessed from the existing right-of-ways (ROW) primarily from Communication Road, Drury Line, Middle Line, Erieau Road, Allison Line, and Charing Cross Road. In general, the Ridge Landfill expansion project includes a haul route and expansion of its current facility, including new fill areas, water management, and the construction of berms.

Based on the results of this assessment and a review of the development plan, the following recommendations have been developed:

1. BHR 14, BHR 15, BHR 16, and CHL 7 are expected to be directly impacted through alteration to the setting in the proposed development plan (Appendix A). A property specific Heritage Impact Assessment is required, which should include an evaluation of the resource based on the criteria set out in Ontario Regulation 9/06. A Cultural Heritage Documentation Report (CHDR) may be a mitigation action of the HIA.

2. Staging and construction activities should be suitably planned and undertaken to avoid impacts to identified cultural heritage resources. Should construction activities occur in close proximity to identified resources, the impacts of vibrations should be determined through an engineering assessment and any resulting mitigation measures should be implemented prior to construction as needed.

3. Should future work require an expansion of the study area or if road improvements along the haul roads become necessary, then a qualified heritage consultant should be contacted in order to confirm the impacts of the proposed work on potential heritage resources.

4. Visual impacts of the landfill expansion to the adjacent cultural heritage resources (BHR 12, BHR 13, CHL 5 and CHL6) should be minimized through the introduction and/or maintenance of berms or other type of vegetative screening.
### 7.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE INVENTORY

#### Table 4 Detailed description of built heritage resources (BHR) and cultural heritage landscapes (CHL) adjacent to the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature ID</th>
<th>Address/Location</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BHR 1      | 21505 Communication Road Lot 24, Concession I (ECR), Harwich Twp. | Identified in a previous assessment | Barn | During the roadside assessment the barn could not be viewed from Communication Road since it is fully screened by vegetation. The farmstead is set well back from the road. Comparing the sketch from the data sheet completed in 1996 (Dillon 1996) to the current aerial view, the barn is still extant.  

**Historical:**  
- Property expresses the agricultural settlement patterns of the area.  

**Design:**  
- The property features a complex of two modern homes and outbuildings.  
- The barn is a late nineteenth century rural vernacular barn, clad in vertical board. It was noted in 1996 as in poor condition (Dillon 1996).  

**Context:**  
- The agricultural property contributes to the rural nature of this portion of Communication Road.  
- The property is set far back from Communication Road. | View of driveway from Communication Road, looking northeast  
View from Communication Road, looking north |
### Table 4 Detailed description of built heritage resources (BHR) and cultural heritage landscapes (CHL) adjacent to the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature ID</th>
<th>Address/Location</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHR 2</td>
<td>Communication Road Lot 23, Concession 1 (ECR), Harwich Twp.</td>
<td>Identified in a previous assessment</td>
<td>Barn</td>
<td><strong>Historical:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- Property expresses the agricultural settlement patterns of the area.&lt;br&gt;- The barn is a remnant of a former farmstead.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Design:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- One gable roof frame barn with a concrete foundation. A modern shed addition is on the north side of the barn.&lt;br&gt;- No residence is visible from Communication Road.&lt;br&gt;- Ruins of a shed are visible from Communication Road.&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Context:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- The agricultural property contributes to the rural nature of this portion of Communication Road.&lt;br&gt;- The barn is set back from Communication Road.</td>
<td>View of the barn from Communication Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature ID</td>
<td>Address/Location</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Resource Type</td>
<td>Description/Comments</td>
<td>Photograph(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| BHR 3      | 21179 Communication Road Lot 22, Concession 1 (ECR), Harwich Twp. | Identified in a previous assessment | Residence | Historical:  
- Property supports the agricultural character of the area.  
Design:  
- Late nineteenth century vernacular red brick Four Square style house with a hip roof, front shed dormer, field stone foundation.  
- Chimney has been removed, new metal roof, modern windows (2/2) with flat voussoirs.  
- Decorative circular brick terra cotta patterning between upper windows on the front façade.  
- Portico on south side centre entrance is still extant, the front centre entrance portico has been removed.  
Context:  
- The rural residential property contributes to the rural nature of this portion of Communication Road.  
- This residence sits close to the road, surrounded by agricultural fields. | View of 21179 from Communication Road  
View of 21179, looking north from Communication Road |
### Table 4 Detailed description of built heritage resources (BHR) and cultural heritage landscapes (CHL) adjacent to the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature ID</th>
<th>Address/Location</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BHR 4      | 21037 Communication Road Lot 21, Concession 1 (ECR), Harwich Twp. | Identified in a previous assessment | Residence (Abandoned) | This house is vacant and is in very poor condition.  
  
  **Historical:**  
  - Property expresses the agricultural settlement patterns of the area.  
  
  **Design:**  
  - Late nineteenth century or early twentieth century vernacular red brick Four Square style house with a hip roof, front shed dormer, and a field stone foundation.  
  - Chimney style suggests nineteenth century, new metal roof, modern windows (2/2) with flat voussoirs.  
  - Decorative circular brick terra cotta patterning between upper windows on the front façade.  
  - Portico on south side centre entrance is still extant, the front centre entrance portico has been removed since its documentation in 1996 (Dillon 1996).  
  
  **Context:**  
  - The rural residence contributes to the rural nature of this portion of Communication Road.  
  - This residence sits close to the road.  
  - In 1996, open fields surrounded the house, however, the house is now surrounded by a large modern greenhouse complex. | View of 21037 from Communication Road and the surrounding greenhouse complex, looking north |
### Table 4 Detailed description of built heritage resources (BHR) and cultural heritage landscapes (CHL) adjacent to the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature ID</th>
<th>Address/Location</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BHR 5      | 20905 Communication Road Lot 20, Concession 1 (ECR), Harwich Twp. | Identified in a previous assessment | Outbuildings | Historical:  
- Property expresses the agricultural settlement patterns of the area.  
Design:  
- Late nineteenth century or early twentieth century row of sheds and silo, located to the rear of the modern house.  
Context:  
- The agricultural property contributes to the rural nature of this portion of Communication Road.  
- The property is set back from Communication Road, and is surrounded by open fields. | View of farm complex of 20905 from Communication Road, looking north |
| BHR 6      | 9284 & 9286 Drury Line Lot 18, Concession 1 (WCR), Harwich Twp. | Identified in a previous assessment | Barn | Historical:  
- Property expresses the agricultural settlement patterns of the area.  
Design:  
- A late nineteenth century or early twentieth century gable roof frame barn and silo.  
- Driveway is between two modern residences which leads back to the barn.  
Context:  
- The agricultural property contributes to the rural nature of this portion of Drury Line.  
- The farm complex is set back from Drury Line and is surrounded by open fields. | View of barn from Drury Line, looking southwest |
### Table 4 Detailed description of built heritage resources (BHR) and cultural heritage landscapes (CHL) adjacent to the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature ID</th>
<th>Address/Location</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BHR 7      | 9262 Drury Line Lot 18, Concession 1 (WCR), Harwich Twp. | Identified in a previous assessment | Residence | Historical:  
- Property expresses the agricultural settlement patterns of the area.  
- Sign says owned by Sue and Earl Drury-descendants of the Drury family after which the road was named.  
  
Design:  
- Late nineteenth century or early twentieth century vernacular red brick Four Square style house with a hip roof, front shed dormer sitting on a concrete foundation.  
- Windows are 2/2 with flat brick voussoirs and concrete sills.  
- The chimney has been removed since its documentation in 1996 (Dillon 1996).  
- The large frame barn and silo, documented in 1996, is no longer extant (Dillon 1996).  
- Portico on front façade centre entrance.  
- A one storey modern house has been built on the north side of the driveway.  
  
Context:  
- The agricultural property contributes to the rural nature of this portion of Drury Line.  
- This residence sits close to the road and the property is surrounded by open fields. |
Table 4 Detailed description of built heritage resources (BHR) and cultural heritage landscapes (CHL) adjacent to the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature ID</th>
<th>Address/Location</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BHR 8      | 9158 Drury Line Lot 18, Concession II (WCR), Harwich Twp. | Identified in a previous assessment | Residence | Historical:  
- Property expresses the agricultural settlement patterns of the area.  
Design:  
- A late nineteenth century vernacular frame house, with a T-shaped plan and a rear addition, clad in modern material, with a cross gabled roof. The house is much altered.  
- The window awnings, shown in the 1996 photograph, have been removed (Dillon 1996).  
- No outbuildings remain.  
Context:  
- The rural residential property contributes to the rural nature of this portion of Drury Line.  
- This residence sits close to the road and the property is surrounded by open fields. | View of 9158 from Drury Line from Drury Line, looking east |
### Table 4 Detailed description of built heritage resources (BHR) and cultural heritage landscapes (CHL) adjacent to the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature ID</th>
<th>Address/Location</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BHR 9      | 9163 Drury Line Lot 19, Concession II (WCR), Harwich Twp. | Identified in a previous assessment | Barn | At the time of the field survey, the barn and silo are heavily screened by coniferous hedges.  
  
  **Historical:**  
  - Property expresses the agricultural settlement patterns of the area.  
  
  **Design:**  
  - An early twentieth century barn with vertical board siding and a concrete foundation (possibly parged fieldstone).  
  - Silo is also present.  
  - Modern bungalow is on the property (Dillon 1996).  
  
  **Context:**  
  - The rural residential property contributes to the rural nature of this portion of Drury Line.  
  - This farm complex is set back from the road and is surrounded by open fields. |

*View of 9163 from Drury Line, looking north*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature ID</th>
<th>Address/Location</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BHR 10     | 9090 Drury Line Lot 18, Concession II (WCR), Harwich Twp. | Identified in a previous assessment | Barn          | Previously identified as a farm complex in 1996 (Dillon 1996).  

**Historical:**  
- Property expresses the agricultural settlement patterns of the area.  
- The barn is a remnant of a former farmstead.  

**Design:**  
- The frame barn has a gable roof and vertical board siding.  
- The red brick Gothic Revival farmhouse, documented in 1996 is no longer extant (Dillon 1996).  
- The brick shed, drive shed, and other outbuildings, also documented in 1996, are no longer extant (Dillon 1996).  
- A recently constructed one storey brick motel-like structure has been built on-site, adjacent to the barn.  

**Context:**  
- The agricultural property contributes to the rural nature of this portion of Drury Line.  
- This barn sits very close to the road and the property is surrounded by open fields. |

View of the barn from Drury Line and the modern building, looking northeast
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature ID</th>
<th>Address/Location</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BHR 11    | 8965 Middle Line Lot 18, Concession III (WCR), Harwich Twp. | Identified in a previous assessment | Barn | Historical:  
- Property expresses the agricultural settlement patterns of the area.  

Design:  
- A late nineteenth century rectangular barn with vertical board siding.  
- Since 1996, the second identical barn that was connected to the north of the existing barn is no longer extant (Dillon 1996), as evidenced in the current aerial.  
- A modern farmhouse is on the farm complex.  

Context:  
- The agricultural property contributes to the rural nature of this portion of Middle Line, a mid 19th century gravel road between Blenheim and Charing Cross.  
- This property is set back from the road and the property is surrounded by open fields. | View of the barn from Middle Line, looking north |
### Table 4 Detailed description of built heritage resources (BHR) and cultural heritage landscapes (CHL) adjacent to the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature ID</th>
<th>Address/Location</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CHL 1      | 21398 & 21402 Communication Road Lot 23, Concession I (WCR), Harwich Twp. | Identified in a previous assessment | Farmscape | Historical:  - Property expresses the agricultural settlement patterns of the area.  
  Design:  - Two residences with a single lane entry – 1 late nineteenth century (ca 1870s-1880s), 1 early twentieth century.  - The late 19th century residence is a representative Gothic Revival style building- a 2 storey red brick house with a cross gabled roof on a field stone foundation.  - It has an L-shaped plan, projecting red brick quoins, projecting ear dropped voussoirs, vergeboard in the gables, projecting brick frieze in the gables, and a new metal roof.  - One gable roof frame barn with modern additions is extant on the property, and a silo is also present.  - The early 20th century house is 1 ½ storey with a hip roof and centre chimney.  
  Context:  - The agricultural property contributes to the rural nature of this portion of Communication Road.  - The houses sit close to the road and are surrounded by mature trees. The farm complex is surrounded by agricultural fields. | View of 21402 from Communication Road  View of 21398 from Communication Road |
### Table 4 Detailed description of built heritage resources (BHR) and cultural heritage landscapes (CHL) adjacent to the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature ID</th>
<th>Address/Location</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CHL 2      | 20723 Communication Road Lot 19, Concession I (ECR), Harwich Twp. | Identified in a previous assessment | Farmscape    | **Historical:**  
- Property expresses the agricultural settlement patterns of the area.  
**Design:**  
- Late nineteenth century 1 ½ storey vernacular farm house with a T-shaped plan and cross gabled roof.  
- Two shed style dormers on the south side of the house with an open porch.  
- One frame barn with vertical board siding and a gable roof. The barn is in poor condition.  
**Context:**  
- The agricultural property contributes to the rural nature of this portion of Communication Road.  
- The property set close to Communication Road and is surrounded by open fields. |

View of 20723 from Communication Road
View of the farm complex from Communication Road, looking north
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature ID</th>
<th>Address/Location</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HAUL ROUTE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 3</td>
<td>9289 &amp; 9291 Drury Line Lot 19, Concession 1 (WCR), Harwich Twp.</td>
<td>Identified in a previous assessment</td>
<td>Farmscape</td>
<td>Historical: - Property expresses the agricultural settlement patterns of the area. Design: - Two residences: 1 late nineteenth century residence and 1 early twentieth century with a single lane entry. - The nineteenth century house faces east onto the driveway. - The late nineteenth century vernacular 1 ½ storey red brick house is a 3 bay residence with a front gable in a Gothic Revival style, two end chimneys, and an early rear addition. - Wood decorative detailing on open south-facing rear porch. - The early twentieth century residence is a 1 storey frame house, with a gable style roof, central chimney and a concrete foundation. - Driveway is between the two houses which leads back to the frame barn grouping and silo. Context: - The agricultural property contributes to the rural nature of this portion of Drury Line. - The property is set close to Drury Line and is surrounded by open fields and a creek to the southwest.</td>
<td>View of 9289 residence (late 19th century) from Drury Line&lt;br&gt;View of farm complex from Drury Line, looking west</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature ID</td>
<td>Address/ Location</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Resource Type</td>
<td>Description/Comments</td>
<td>Photograph(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CHL 4      | 8941 Middle Line Lot 19, Concession III (WCR), Harwich Twp. | Identified in a previous assessment | Farmscape | Historical:  
- Property expresses the agricultural settlement patterns of the area.  
Design:  
- A mid to late nineteenth century farmstead.  
- The two storey frame residence with a shallow gable roof and a one storey north side addition is unusual compared to other building stock in the immediate area (Dillon 1996).  
- Windows are modern but openings appear to be original.  
- Some outbuildings and the large gable roof frame barn, documented in 1996, are no longer extant (Dillon 1996).  
- A small gable roof barn is extant and one frame shed.  
Context:  
- The agricultural property contributes to the rural nature of this portion of Middle Line, a mid 19th century gravel road between Blenheim and Charing Cross.  
- This property is set back from the road and the property is surrounded by open fields. | ![View of 8941 from Middle Line, looking northeast](image1) ![View Of 8941 from Drury Line, looking west](image2) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature ID</th>
<th>Address/ Location</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BHR 12     | 20043 Erieau Road- east side Lot 14, Concession III (WCR), Harwich Twp. | Identified in a previous assessment | Residence | At the time of this assessment, the residence is obscured by trees from the Erieau roadside. The setting is well vegetated.  
- Property expresses the agricultural settlement patterns of the area.  
- Design:  
  - A late nineteenth century vernacular farmhouse with modern siding.  
  - Documented when visible in 1996 as a 1 ½ storey house with a T-shaped plan, and some modern alterations (Dillon 1996).  
- Context:  
  - The agricultural property contributes to the rural nature of this portion of Erieau Road.  
  - Although sheltered by vegetation, the house sits close to Erieau Road. The property, on the northeast side of Erieau Road is surrounded by agricultural fields and the southwest side of the road by the existing Ridge Landfill. | View of the farmhouse obscured by trees from Erieau Road, looking north |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature ID</th>
<th>Address/ Location</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHR 13</td>
<td>20098 Charing Cross Road (west side) Lot 25, Concession XV, Raleigh Twp.</td>
<td>Identified in a previous assessment</td>
<td>Former Institutional/ Residence</td>
<td>At the time of the assessment, the former school house was partially screened by vegetation. &lt;br&gt; Historical: &lt;br&gt; - Property is a built reminder of early settlement along Charing Cross Road.  &lt;br&gt; - Signage says “School Section No. 4 A.D. 1901”. &lt;br&gt; - Historical mapping shows that a school house was present at this location as early as 1876 (see Figure 3). It is likely that a former frame school house stood at this location, and in 1901 a more substantial school house was built. &lt;br&gt; Design: &lt;br&gt; - Built in 1901, the school house is an excellent example of a rural one-room school in an impressive ornate style of school architecture. &lt;br&gt; - There is an open bell tower at the east end, 2 projecting gables joined by a shed roof at each end, and a brick chimney on the west end. &lt;br&gt; Context: &lt;br&gt; - The structure is situated directly adjacent to Charing Cross Road, and to the abandoned C&amp;O rail line which is no longer visible on the landscape. &lt;br&gt; - The treed residential property is surrounded by agricultural fields on the northwest side of Charing Cross Road. On the northeast side of Charing Cross Road there is a berm and modern culverts a part of the existing Ridge Landfill.</td>
<td>View of Schoolhouse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5 Detailed description of built heritage resources (BHR) and cultural heritage landscapes (CHL) adjacent to the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature ID</th>
<th>Address/Loc.</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CHL 5      | 19881, 19867 & 19863 Charing Cross Road Lot 12 Concession IV (WCR), Harwich Twp. | Identified in a previous assessment | Farmscape | At the time of this assessment, the residences are obscured by trees from the Charing Cross roadside. The setting is well vegetated.  
**Historical:**  
- Property expresses the agricultural settlement patterns of the area.  
- Signage on the property is “Thompson's Orchards” “Established 1881”.  
**Design:**  
- Documented in 1996 (Dillon 1996) – Two residences; 1 mid to late 19th century Gothic Revival style farmhouse (north side of driveway), and a second house, hidden behind cedars, which is possibly a small 1 storey house (south side of driveway).  
**Context:**  
- The agricultural property contributes to the rural nature of this portion of Charing Cross Road and Allison Line.  
- The farm complex sits close to the road, surrounded by orchards and agricultural fields.  
- Mature tree rows down sides of the property, along Gore Road and Allison Line (see Plates 9 and 10). | View of apple store at the southeast corner at Charing Cross Road and Allison Line  
View of the driveway between houses, leading to the barnyard behind |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature ID</th>
<th>Address/Locaton</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHL 6</td>
<td>20395 Charing Cross Road Lot 16, Concession IV (WCR), Harwich Twp.</td>
<td>Identified in a previous assessment</td>
<td>Farmscape</td>
<td>At the time of this assessment, the residences are obscured by trees from the Charing Cross roadside. The setting is well vegetated. <strong>Historical:</strong> - Property expresses the agricultural settlement patterns of the area. <strong>Design:</strong> - Two residences with a single lane entry – 1 1890s farm house (northern side of driveway), and 1 1860s-1880s farm house (southern side of driveway). - The northern residence is a 1 1/2 storey vernacular frame farmhouse with a gable roof and a rough concrete foundation. It has wood decorative detailing on the open south-facing rear porch. This 19th century house faces east onto driveway. - The southern residence is heavily screened by trees, and is a 1 1/2 storey frame house. - The driveway is between the two houses which leads back to the frame barn grouping. <strong>Context:</strong> - The agricultural property contributes to the rural nature of this portion of Charing Cross Road. - The houses are situated close to Charing Cross Road and surrounded by agricultural fields. Note: The data sheet from 1995, refers to this property incorrectly as 20475 (a carryover from the previous data sheet) (Dillon 1996)</td>
<td>View of the house on the north side of the driveway from Charing Cross Road, looking north View of the driveway from Charing Cross Road, looking northeast View of the house on the south side of the driveway from Charing Cross Road, looking east</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6 Detailed description of built heritage resources (BHR) and cultural heritage landscapes (CHL) within the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature ID</th>
<th>Address / Location</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description / Comments</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BHR 14 | 8779 Allison Line Lot 13, Concession IV (WCR), Harwich Twp. | Identified in a previous assessment | Residence | Historical:  
- Property expresses the agricultural settlement patterns of the area.  

Design:  
- An early twentieth century (1910s-1920s) one storey vernacular house with a hip roof and small dormers on the south and west facades.  

Context:  
- The rural residential property contributes to the rural nature of this portion of Allison Line.  
- This house sits close to Allison Line and is surrounded by open fields. | View of 8779 Allison Line, looking north |
### Table 6 Detailed description of built heritage resources (BHR) and cultural heritage landscapes (CHL) within the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature ID</th>
<th>Address/Location</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHR 15</td>
<td>20011 Charing Cross Road Lot 13, Concession IV (WCR), Harwich Twp.</td>
<td>Identified in a previous assessment</td>
<td>Barn</td>
<td>Previously identified as a farm complex in 1996 (Dillon 1996). At the time of the assessment, the farm complex has been cut off from Charing Cross Road, by a berm associated with the Ridge Landfill. A view of the barn can be seen from Allison Line. <strong>Historical:</strong> - This property, although cut off from the roadscape, is still a built reminder of early agricultural settlement in the area. <strong>Design:</strong> - The 1½ story vernacular L-shaped plan frame farmhouse, built in the 1870s-1880s, is no longer visible from Charing Cross Road. The aerial view shows that the house is no longer extant. - The large gambrel roof barn is visible from Allison Line. <strong>Context:</strong> - This property has no longer retains its connection to the rural agricultural landscape. The barn cannot be viewed from Charing Cross Road.</td>
<td>View from Allison Line of the farm complex cut off from Charing Cross Road, looking west View of former entrance to the farm complex and view of the Ridge Landfill berm, looking north</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6 Detailed description of built heritage resources (BHR) and cultural heritage landscapes (CHL) within the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature ID</th>
<th>Address/Location</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANDS WITHIN THE EXPANSION AREA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| BHR 16     | 20323 Charing Cross Road Lot 16, Concession IV (WCR), Harwich Twp. | Identified in a previous assessment | Barn | Historical:  
- Property expresses the agricultural settlement patterns of the area.  
Design:  
- A large late nineteenth century barn associated with the modern brick bungalow has a L-plan with gable roof. 
- The windmill documented in 1995 is no longer extant (Dillon 1996).  
Context:  
- The agricultural property contributes to the rural nature of this portion of Charing Cross Road. 
- This barn is surrounded by an open agricultural field, except to the east where the barn is adjacent to a berm associated with the Ridge Landfill. | View of the barn from Charing Cross Road, looking northeast |
### Table 6 Detailed description of built heritage resources (BHR) and cultural heritage landscapes (CHL) within the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature ID</th>
<th>Address/Location</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CHL 7      | 8765 Allison Line Lot 13, Concession IV (WCR), Harwich Twp. | Identified in a previous assessment | Farmscape | Historical:  
- Property expresses the agricultural settlement patterns of the area.  
- Design:  
  - A late nineteenth century 1½ storey farm house, with an original one storey addition on the rear.  
  - This red brick house has radiating brick voussoirs with projecting brick quoins.  
  
Context:  
- The agricultural property contributes to the rural nature of this portion of Allison Line.  
- The house sits close to Allison Line and the outbuildings sit back from the road. | View of house, looking north  
View of house, looking west  
View of outbuildings, including the gable roof barn |
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Executive Summary

Dillion Consulting Limited retained Stantec Consulting Ltd. to prepare a Heritage Impact Assessment for the properties at 8765 and 8779 Allison Line, and 20011 and 20323 Charing Cross Road, in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent, Ontario. The four properties were identified as having cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI) in the 2017 Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment for the Ridge Landfill Expansion prepared by ASI. The Ridge Landfill Expansion involves an expansion of the existing landfill site to an area of approximately 334 hectares (825 acres) and use of approximately 10 kilometre existing haul route using the existing rights-of-way from the landfill along Erieau Road, Drury Line, and Communication Road to the right of way of the westbound Highway 401 on-ramp.

The results for the CHRA determined that 8779 Allison Line (Built Heritage Resource (BHR)-14), 20011 Charing Cross Road (BHR-15), 20323 Charing Cross Road (BHR-16), and 8765 Allison Line (Cultural Heritage Landscape (CHL)-7) are expected to be directly impacted by the Ridge Landfill Expansion, and prior to any change in the environment a HIA is required.

The part of the Study Area located at 8779 and 8765 Allison Line contains a farmstead cultural heritage landscape composed of a residence, barn, outbuildings, and the tenant house located at the adjacent 8779 Allison Line. The part of the Study Area located at 20323 Charing Cross Road contains a late 19th to early 20th century Ontario vernacular cross gable barn. The previously identified resources at 20011 Charing Cross Road were found to be dismantled at the time of the site visit.

The HIA evaluated each property against Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 9/06 made under the Ontario Heritage Act and found that the residence and barn at 8765 Allison Line was determined to have CHVI as representative examples of an Ontario vernacular farmhouse and barn. The residence at 8779 Allison Line was determined to have CHVI as a former tenant house that is historically linked as a component of the farmstead at 8765 Allison Line. Together, these two properties form a cultural heritage landscape. The barn at 20323 Charing Cross Road was determined to have CHVI as a representative Ontario vernacular barn.

Following evaluation, an impact assessment was carried out to identify the potential impacts of the proposed undertaking. The impact assessment determined that the proposed undertaking would result in direct and indirect impacts to the residence, barn, and tenant house at the farmstead on 8765 and 8779 Allison Line and the barn at 20323 Charing Cross Road. Based on impacts identified, the following mitigation measures are recommended:

1) Retention in situ is the preferred method to mitigate impacts associated with the proposed undertaking. While it is understood that retention in situ is not a feasible option given site restraints, should a redesign of the site allow for retention it is the preferred approach given the heritage value identified.
2) Should redesign not allow for retention in situ, it is recommended that documentation and salvage be carried out for both 8779 and 8765 Allison Line and 20323 Charing Cross Road.

   a. Documentation activities should consist of heritage recording of identified heritage attributes through photography and include measurements, where available. It was determined that the content of this HIA provides enough information regarding the interiors and documentation should focus on exterior features.

   b. Salvage activities should consist of the identification and recovery of re-useable materials by a reputable salvage company or charity.

   c. The documentation and salvage work should be carried out under the direction of a Cultural Heritage Specialist in good professional standing with the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP).

3) To provide for the retention of historic information, copies of this report should be deposited at a local repository of historic material. Therefore, it is recommended that this report be deposited at the following locations:

   | Municipality of Chatham-Kent Public Library – Chatham Branch | Municipality of Chatham-Kent Municipal Heritage Committee |
   | 120 Queen Street                                             | 315 King Street West, P.O. Box 640                      |
   | Chatham, ON, N7M 2G6                                        | Chatham, Ontario N7M 5K8                                |

The Executive Summary highlights key points from the report only; for complete information and findings the reader should examine the complete report.
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CHRIA Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment
CHVI Cultural Heritage Value or Interest
CP Conservation Plan
km Kilometres
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MTCS Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport
N/A Not applicable
O. Reg. Ontario Regulation
OHA Ontario Heritage Act
Dillon Consulting Limited (Dillon) retained Stantec Consulting Ltd. (Stantec) to prepare a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for the properties at 8765 and 8779 Allison Line and 20011 and 20323 Charing Cross Road, in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent, Ontario (Figure 1). The four properties were identified as having cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI) in the 2017 Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment (CHRA) for the Ridge Landfill Expansion prepared by Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) (ASI 2017). The Ridge Landfill Expansion involves an expansion of the existing landfill site to an area of approximately 334 hectares (825 acres) and use of an approximately 10 kilometre existing haul route using the existing rights-of-way (ROW) from the landfill along Erieau Road, Drury Line, and Communication Road to the ROW of the westbound Highway 401 on-ramp.

The CHRA determined that 8779 Allison Line (Built Heritage Resource (BHR)-14), 20011 Charing Cross Road (BHR-15), 20323 Charing Cross Road (BHR-16), and 8765 Allison Line (Cultural Heritage Landscape (CHL)-7) are expected to be directly impacted by the Ridge Landfill Expansion. Prior to any change in the environment, the CHRA recommended that an HIA be completed.

The Municipality of Chatham-Kent does not presently have a Terms of Reference for preparing HIAs. Therefore, the preparation of this report will be guided by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport’s (MTCS) Info Sheet #5 in Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology Policies of the Ontario Provincial Policy Statement, 2005 (Government of Ontario 2006a) (Info Sheet #5). This document uses Ontario Regulation (O. Reg.) 9/06 for determination of CHVI and also provided guidance on the assessment of impacts based on CHVI resulting from a proposed change.

As per the guidance contained in Info Sheet #5, this report contains the following components:

- Historical research, site analysis, and evaluation
- Identification of the significant and heritage attributes of the cultural heritage resource
- Description of the proposed undertaking or site alteration
- Measurement of development or site alteration impact
- Consideration of alternative, mitigation, and conservation methods
- Implementation and monitoring
- Summary statement and conservation recommendations

The Study Area referred to throughout this HIA includes 8765 and 8779 Allison Line, and 20011 and 20323 Charing Cross Road, in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent (Figure 1 and Figure 2). The property at 8765 Allison Line contains a late 19th century one and a half storey residence, a gable roof barn, and outbuildings. The property at 8779 Allison Line contains an early 20th century one storey residence. Together, these two properties constitute a cultural heritage landscape as a late 19th century farmstead. The property at 20323 Charing Cross Road contained a mid-20th century residence, outbuilding, and late
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19th to early 20th century barn. The residence located at 20323 Charing Cross Road was not found to have CHVI by ASI and it not evaluated in this report. The property at 20011 Charing Cross Road did not contain any built heritage or cultural heritage landscape components. The barn formerly located on the property was dismantled in 2018 after becoming structurally unsound and site and public safety concerns were identified. As a result, this property was not assessed in this HIA although the property remains in the Study Area.

A site assessment of the Study Area was undertaken on February 11, 2019, by Laura Walter and Frank Smith, Cultural Heritage Specialists with Stantec. The weather conditions were overcast and seasonably cold. Historical research was conducted at the London Public Library to verify background information on the properties and their context.

The metric system was adopted in Canada between 1971 and 1984. Given the 19th century construction date of the buildings within the Study Area, measurements would have been prepared according to imperial standards. Converting measurements that are often standardized into metric may obscure patterns and relationships between features. Therefore, when discussing dimensions of historic structures imperial units are used. In all other areas, measuring distance for example, metric units are applied.
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2.0 SITE HISTORY

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The Study Area is located on the north side of Allison Line between Erieau Road and Gore Road, and on the east side of Charing Cross Road between the 16 Line and 14 Line, in the Municipality of Chatham-Kent, Ontario (Figure 2). The Study Area is situated on Part of Lot 13 and 16, Concession 4 West of Communication Road, in the former Township of Harwich, within the former County of Kent, now the Municipality of Chatham-Kent.

The following sections outline the historical development of the Study Area from the time of Euro-Canadian settlement to the present.

2.2 PHYSIOGRAPHY

The Study Area is situated across the St. Clair Clay Plain physiographic region. The St. Clair Clay Plain is an extensive area of clay plains covering 5,880 square kilometres in Essex, Kent, and Lambton counties. The region is fairly flat with little relief, lying between approximately 175 to 215 metres above sea level. The area during the glacial period was covered by Glacial Lake Whittlesey and Lake Warren, which failed to leave deep stratified beds of sediment on the underlying clay (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 147). The region is mostly of underlying limestone, with some areas of black shale. The majority of the region has a history of poor drainage, which required the installation of dredged ditches and tile underdrains to have satisfactory conditions for crop growth and tillage. (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 149). Still seen on the landscape today are deep ditches and several drains.

The climate of the St. Clair Clay Plain is similar to conditions in the northern part of the United States Corn Belt and the region’s location between Lake Erie and Lake St. Clair prolong the growing season. Common crops in the region are soybean, field corn, winter wheat, mixed grains, and canola.

2.3 SURVEY AND SETTLEMENT

The initial Euro-Canadian presence in the Township of Harwich included French-Canadian traders and missionaries who were based out of Fort Detroit in present day neighbouring Essex County. Fort Detroit was built to secure France’s control of the Great Lakes as part of their vast colonial holdings in North America called New France. The French often used Point Aux Pins, now Rondeau Provincial Park and located within the former township, as a camp site while traveling on Lake Erie (Armstrong 1985: 3).

After the conclusion of the Seven Years War in 1763, the Treaty of Paris ceded much of New France to Great Britain. New France was reorganized into the Province of Quebec, and French rights in the colony were secured through the passage of the Quebec Act in 1774. However, the Quebec Act further inflamed tensions with the Thirteen Colonies, who wished to settle lands in the Ohio Valley that were now part of Quebec (Dagenais 2013). These tensions culminated with the signing of the second Treaty of Paris in 1783, which recognized the independence of the Thirteen Colonies as the United States of America.
Frederick Haldimand, Governor of Canada, wished to attract United Empire Loyalists leaving the United States for Canada (Craig 1963: 4-5). In June 1791, the Constitutional Act was given royal assent, and the Province of Quebec was divided into Upper and Lower Canada (Craig 1963: 17). Upper Canada was created to settle United Empire Loyalists. John Graves Simcoe was chosen to be the first Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada (Craig 1963: 20). Simcoe had ambitious plans for Upper Canada and aimed to mold it into “the very image and transcript of that of Great Britain” (Taylor 2007: 9).

Simcoe reorganized Upper Canada into four districts and 19 counties. On July 26, 1792, Simcoe established Kent County and the county was divided into townships, so it could be opened for settlement (Lauriston 1952: 43). The first townships opened for settlement in the county included Raleigh, Dover, Chatham, Howard, Camden, and Harwich where the Study Area is located (Hamil 1951: 18). The Township of Harwich was named after Harwich in Essex, England. The name derives from the Saxon words “hare” and “wick” which means army and strong place, respectively (Gardiner 1899: 326).

The first survey in Harwich Township was undertaken in 1792 by Patrick McNiff. McNiff surveyed the concessions fronting the Thames River (Hamil 1951: 18 and Ontario Genealogical Society 2006). A second survey was completed in 1795 by Abraham Iredell. The township was surveyed using the double front system (Error! Reference source not found.).

Iredell was instructed to lay out a road named Communication Road from Rondeau Bay to Chatham and use it as a baseline for laying out 200 acre lots on each side. Simcoe intended these lots to be settled by Loyalists (Belden 1881: 53). At the end of the road on Rondeau Bay, Simcoe planned that a city named Shrewsbury would serve as a port (Armstrong 1985: 7). Iredell advised a friend that the best land in the township was in the west along the border with the Township of Raleigh, describing it as “handsome land” (Hamil 1951: 27). The Study Area is along the border with the former Township of Raleigh.

The first settlers arrived in Harwich in 1796 and settled close to present-day Chatham along the Thames River. The first recorded settler was Thomas Clark, who lived along the river in present-day Chatham. Most of these settlers were Late Loyalists, and not part of the original groups of Loyalists who arrived in Canada after the American Revolution (Belden 1881: 53). The land in the back concessions of the township was granted to military veterans, colonial officials, and other influential people who often received grants of 1,200 to 3,000 acres. These grants resulted in a large number of absentee owners and
impeded the early development of the township as settlers were not present to clear the land or contribute labour to road construction (Hamil 1951: 28).

2.4 **19TH CENTURY DEVELOPMENT**

The initial wave of Loyalist and Late Loyalist settlers ended after the War of 1812, when British officials began to discourage American immigration and placed restrictions on land grants for Americans (Taylor 2007: 31). In the 1820s, part of Harwich Township came under the administration of Thomas Talbot's settlement scheme. The Talbot Road, one of the best maintained roads in Southwestern Ontario, was extended into Harwich, and settlers under Talbot's direction began to receive lots in the southern part of the township. Overall, settlement in most of the Township of Harwich proceeded slowly (Lauriston 1952: 267-268). Talbot preferred settlers from the British Isles, and therefore many of the settlers to arrive in Harwich after the War of 1812 were of Scottish origin (Lauriston 1952: 270).

By the 1850s, much of the land in the township was settled, and the population of the township in 1851 was 2,627 (Armstrong 1985: 95). From 1850 to about 1875 the lumber industry played an important role in the township, as settlers began to clear the dense forests of the township. Settlers initially used slash and burn clearing methods and exported the ash or used it for soap making (Armstrong 1985: 52). As the 19th century progressed, sawmills were built throughout the township, and industries like cabinet making grew in Harwich. Much of the lumber was also exported to the United States until 1866, when the Reciprocity Agreement between the United States and Canada ended (Armstrong 1985: 53-54). The most important village in Harwich Township was Blenheim, which started as a milling site. The opening of a post office at Blenheim spurred further growth, and it became the main agricultural trading spot in the township. In 1875, Blenheim was incorporated as a village (Belden 1881: 54).

The population of the Township of Harwich in 1881 stood at 6,410, an increase of 436 since 1871 (Armstrong 1985: 95). By the 1880s, the lumber industry in Harwich had declined, and agriculture became the driving economic force. Most farmers practiced mixed farming with a combination of crops, orchards, and pastureland. Some farmers had specialized farms that grew either corn, tobacco, beans, or fruit (Armstrong 1985: 111). In 1885, the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway was chartered (Andreea 1997: 201). The planned route for the railway ran south from Walkerville to Harrow in Essex County. The route then proceeded east to St. Thomas (Lombard 1972: 47). The portion of the railway between Leamington and Ridgetown was completed in 1892 (Lombard 1972: 50). The railway ROW included land within Lot 13, Concession 4 West of Communication Road, one of the lots within the Study Area. The railway was extended to St. Thomas in 1901 and merged with the Pere Marquette Railway in 1903 and was taken over by the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway in 1929 (Elgin County Historical Society 2019).

The Census of 1891 recorded that the township’s farms cultivated 12,226 acres of wheat, 965 acres of barley, 5,786 acres of oats, 496 acres of potatoes, 120 acres of turnips, and 9,131 acres of hay. The township was the largest producer of fall wheat in Kent County, producing 217,781 bushels. The second highest producer of fall wheat was Dover Township, which produced 131,423 bushels (Census of Canada 1891: 50-51).
2.5 **20TH CENTURY DEVELOPMENT**

At the start of the 20th century, the Township of Harwich continued to remain rural and agricultural. Blenheim was the largest community in Harwich and was home to the township’s main feed mills, flour mills, and saw mills (Armstrong 1985: 117-118). During the 1910s, efforts were undertaken to reclaim the swampy lands of the township that bordered Rondeau Bay and Lake Erie, and by 1920 much of the acreage in the southern part of the township became cultivatable (Armstrong 1985: 164-165). The Census of 1921 recorded that the township’s farms cultivated 11,694 acres of wheat, 1,077 acres of barley, 10,329 acres of barley, 164 acres of rye, 8,063 acres of corn, 20 acres of buckwheat, 2,018 acres of beans, and 11 acres of peas (Dominion Bureau of Statistics 1925: 506-507). The population of the township in 1921 was 4,952 (Dominion Bureau of Statistics 1924: 295).

The effects of the Great Depression during the 1930s depressed prices for farm products, bringing hardship to many Harwich farmers. Relief efforts in the township included “welfare gardens,” and the purchasing of a woodlot for township men to clear (Armstrong 1985: 198-199).

In the post-war period, a new influx of immigrants arrived in Harwich Township, primarily from war torn portions of Europe. The population of the township in 1951 was 6,438, which surpassed the previous population peak in of 6,410 in 1881 (Dominion Bureau of Statistics 1953: 6:43). The increases in population led to the construction, in 1971, of a drinking water pipeline from Lake Erie to service the township, replacing well water. Other developments included new residential subdivisions in Blenheim and a 70-acre industrial park created from annexed township lands (Armstrong 1985: 253). In 1971, the population of Harwich Township was 6,905 (Statistics Canada 1972 6:39).

In the 1990s, the provincial government embarked on a program of municipal restructuring. In 1997, Dr. Peter Meyboom, the appointed provincial restructuring commissioner, announced in a binding decision that the separate 22 municipalities of Kent County, including the Township of Harwich, would be merged into a single municipality named Chatham-Kent. The announcement of Kent County’s amalgamation was not well received by local politicians; the mayor of Blenheim stated, “it certainly isn’t what the majority of people wanted” (Ross 1997). The amalgamation of Kent County into the single tier municipality of Chatham-Kent was completed in 1998 (Francis 2012). The population of Chatham-Kent in 2016 was 102,042, a decrease of 2% since 2011 (Statistics Canada 2018).

2.6 **PROPERTY HISTORY**

2.6.1 **Lot 13, Concession 4 West of Communication Road**

Lot 14, Concession 4 West of Communication Road is an irregular sized lot approximately 275 acres in size and was granted by the Crown in a 200-acre east block and 75-acre west block (Ontario Land Registry Access [ONLand] 2019). The standard policy of land granting in Upper Canada between 1791 and 1826 was to grant land in blocks of 200 acres (Craig 1963: 131 and 139).
2.6.1.1 Eastern Division of Lot 13, Concession 4 West of Communication Road

The eastern portion of the lot, encompassing 200 acres, was granted by the Crown in 1818 to George Young. In 1864, George Young willed the 200 acres to Robert W. Young. It is likely that George Young and Robert Young did not settle the lot and held it in speculation. The 1841 and 1851 Census records have no listing for a George or Robert Young in the Township of Harwich. In 1872, Christopher Irving purchased 94 acres in the east half and, in 1874, Samuel Irving purchased 92 acres in the east half (ONLand 2019). Historical mapping from 1876 depicts the eastern 200 acres of the lot divided between the brothers James and Christopher Irving in the west, and Samuel Irving in the east (Figure 3).

The 1881 Census indicates that the Irving brothers did not live on the lot in the Study Area. The census records and historical mapping indicates they resided in the Township of Raleigh on part of Lot 23, Concession 14, Western Boundary from Thames River, approximately two kilometres west of Lot 13, Concession 4 West of Communication Road (Census of Canada 1881 and Shackleton and McIntosh 1876). It is unclear if the Irving brothers used the land in the Study Area as extra agricultural land, rented it to tenants, or held it in speculation.

The Census of 1881 lists Samuel Irving as a 44-year-old farmer born in Scotland. He lived with his brother Christopher, age 25; father John, age 78; and mother Jane, age 75. John Irving was listed as a 40-year-old farmer born in Scotland and was married to Abigail, age 33, born in England. Their children were James, age 3; and David, an infant (Census of Canada 1881a). In 1892, the Irving brothers sold a portion of their land for construction of the Lake Erie and Detroit River Railway, later part of the Pere Marquette Railway (ONLand 2019). The property at 8765 Allison Line is located on the portion of property owned by John and Christopher jointly.

Between 1909 and 1917 the property was deeded to David Irving, who settled on the lot with his family. The Census of 1921 lists David Irving as a 40-year-old Ontario born farmer of Scottish descent. He lived with his wife Eliza, age 45; daughter Edith, age 5; brother James, age 43; and a lodger Gordon Day, age 17 (Census of Canada 1921a). In 1961, David Irving passed away at the age of 81 and is buried with his wife and a son who died in childhood at Evergreen Cemetery in Blenheim (Billion Graves 2015). Shortly before his death, the property was sold to the Drewery family, who owned the property until it was purchased by Ridge (Chatham) Holdings Ltd. and are currently tenants. The property is currently owned by the Ridge (Chatham) Holdings Ltd., which purchased the property sometime after 1992 (ONLand 2019).

2.6.1.2 Western Division of Lot 13, Concession 4 West of Communication Road

The western portion of Lot 13, Concession 4 West of Communication Road, encompassing 75 acres, was granted by the Crown to Elizabeth Traxler in 1838 (ONLand 2019). Elizabeth Traxler was born in 1809 in Kent County to Michael Traxler and Hannah Dolsen. Her mother was the daughter of Isaac Dolsen, a United Empire Loyalist who was one of the first settlers in the nearby Township of Dover (Hamil 1951: 348). Her father, Michael Traxler, was a United Empire Loyalist from Pennsylvania. The children of United Empire Loyalists were entitled to their own grants of land upon reaching maturity and the Library and Archives Canada database on the Land Petitions of Upper Canada from 1763 to 1865 show that Elizabeth Traxler filed a land petition at Chatham in 1836 (Library and Archives Canada 2013).
In 1853, Elizabeth Traxler sold the property to Isiah Traxler who sold it to Abraham Holmes the same year. Homes divided the property into two 37.5-acre parcels and sold the northwest portion to Luke Kelly in 1866 and the southwest portion to Robert Young in 1864 (ONLand 2019). The property at 20011 Charing Cross is within the portion of the lot owned by Kelly (Shackleton and McIntosh 1876). The 1871 Census lists Luke Kelly as a 27-year-old farmer born in Ireland. He lived with his wife Margaret, age 25 and born in Scotland; son John, age 6; son William, age 4; and son Edward, age 2 (Census of Canada 1871).

In 1911, the Kelly property was deeded to Edward Kelly. In 1913, Kelly sold the property to Fred Thompson, who owned the adjoining 37.5 acres on the lot. In 1918, Fred Thompson sold the property to Gertrude Thompson who in turn sold it to Archie Thompson in 1920 (ONLand 2019). The Census of 1921 lists Archie Thompson as a 27-year-old farmer who lived alone (Census of Canada 1921a). Thompson sold part of the lot to Ontario Hydro in 1937 and the rest of the lot to Kenneth Thompson. The Thompson family continued to own the land as late as 1979 when it passed from Kenneth Thompson to Helen Thompson. The property is currently owned by Ridge (Chatham) Holdings Ltd., which purchased the property sometime after 1992 (ONLand 2019).

2.6.2 Lot 16, Concession 4 West of Communication Road

Lot 16, Concession 4 West of Communication Road was granted by the Crown in 1818 to Edward Dulmage in a 200-acre grant. Between 1836 and 1855, Samuel Street and Thomas Street acquired the lot via Sheriff’s deed (ONLand 2019). It is likely Samuel and Thomas held the lot in speculation as they do not appear listed in Kent County in the Census of 1851 or 1861. In 1869, Thomas Street sold the lot to Henry White (ONLand 2019). Henry White is listed as the owner of the lot in the Kent County Gazetteer for 1874-1875, next to relatives Edward White and Joseph White who were located on neighbouring lots (Charlton 1874: 128). In 1876, Henry White divided the lot in half between Joseph White and Thomas Pardo (ONLand 2019). Based on historical mapping, the property located at 20323 Charring Cross was on land owned by Thomas Pardo (Shackleton and McIntosh 1876).

The Census of 1881 lists Thomas Pardo as a 54-year-old farmer born in the United States of French ancestry. He lived with his wife Ann, age 49; son Henry, age 26; son Andrew, age 24; son Milo age 15; and daughter Harriet, age 12 (Census of Canada 1881b). In 1894, the property owned by Thomas Pardo was willed to Anne Pardo and, in 1896, the property owned by White was conveyed to George Holdaway via the Ontario Loan and Debt Company. (ONLand 2019). In 1927, Milo Pardo became the owner of the southern 100 acres. The Census of 1921 lists Milo Pardo as a 55-year-old farmer of American ancestry. He lived with his wife Viola, age 49; daughter Erie, age 25; son Elmer, age 19; and mother Jane, age 89 (Census of Canada 1921b). Milo Pardo sold the property in 1956 to Egbert Miller Russchen (ONLand 2019). The property is currently owned by Ridge (Chatham) Holdings Ltd., which purchased the property sometime after 1986 (ONLand 2019).
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Thomas Pardo was the grandson of John Pardo. John Pardo petitioned for a land grant in Upper Canada between 1790 and 1845 (Library and Archives Canada 2013). Many relatives of John Pardo settled within Kent County. This included an innkeeper on the Talbot Trail and a younger relative of Thomas, who operated a model farm in Raleigh Township (Chatham-Kent 2017). Members of the Pardo family, including the Pardo family members who resided in the Study Area, are buried at the Pardoville Union Cemetery approximately 10 kilometres to the southwest of the Study Area at the corner of Highway 27 and the Talbot Trail (Find a Grave 2019).
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3.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

3.1 8779 ALLISON LINE

3.1.1 Landscape Setting

The property at 8779 Allison Line is located approximately 700 metres southwest of the intersection of Allison Line and Erieau Road. The property is surrounded by agricultural fields. To the north of the agricultural fields is the Ridge Landfill and an abandoned railway ROW (Plate 2. and Plate 3.). Allison Line is a gravel paved road with grass shoulders (Plate 4 and Plate 5). Running along the south of the roadway is a drainage ditch. A line of wooden utility poles runs along the south of Allison Line until it reaches 8779 Allison Line and crosses to the northern edge of the roadway. There are no structures located on Allison Line aside from the neighbouring property at 8765 Allison Line.

Approximately 100 metres east of the house is a mature deciduous tree and clump of shrubs. Stantec staff were informed during the site visit that this area formerly contained a small residence (Plate 6). The property is landscaped with a lawn, shrubs, and small deciduous trees. The backyard contains a modern gable roof outbuilding and modern gambrel outbuilding, playset, and propane tank. Located directly west of the residence is a gravel driveway connected to Allison Line (Plate 9). The residence contains a small garden along the foundation of the south, east, and west façades that is delineated by brick pavers.

Plate 2: Agricultural field adjacent to 8779 Allison Line, looking east  Plate 3: Ridge Landfill viewed from 8779 Allison Line, looking north
Plate 4: Looking east along Allison Line from 8779 Allison Line

Plate 5: Looking west on Allison Line from 8779 Allison Line

Plate 6: Location of former residence, looking west

Plate 7: Lawn and small trees, looking west

Plate 8: Modern outbuildings and propane tank, looking north

Plate 9: Driveway of 8779 Allison Line, looking south
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3.1.3 Residence Exterior

The residence located at 8779 Allison Line is a one and one half storey structure with a medium-pitched hip roof clad in asphalt shingles and containing a brick chimney (Plate 10). The west, south, and east façades of the residence have gable roof dormers. The exterior of the residence is clad in vinyl siding and contains modern 1/1 windows and casement windows on the first storey and modern doors. The occupant of the residence informed Stantec staff that the original horizontal wood siding was underneath the vinyl siding. The three gable dormers contain 1/1 metal windows. The residence has metal eaves with downspouts and an air conditioning unit on the east façade. The front façade of the residence is asymmetrical and faces west towards the neighbouring farmstead on 8765 Allison Line and has concrete steps, a television antenna mounted on a pole, satellite dish, and utility meter. The north façade of the residence contains a shed roof addition (Plate 11 to Plate 14). The foundation of the residence is poured concrete and has boarded up windows. The foundation of the shed roof addition is concrete block.

Plate 10: Details of asphalt shingles, gable dormer and brick chimney, east façade, looking west

Plate 11: South façade of the residence, looking north

Plate 12: East façade of the residence, looking west

Plate 13: North façade of the residence, looking south
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Plate 14: West façade of the residence, looking east

3.1.4 **Residence Interior**

The interior of the residence has been heavily modified and includes a shed roof addition that was built in the 1970s according to the tenant. The residence has a central hallway plan and contains two bedrooms, two bathrooms, a home office, and kitchen. The kitchen and bathrooms are modern. The original elements remaining are lathe and plaster walls in parts of the kitchen, hallway between the bedroom and bathroom, and ceilings that have been popcorned over in the bedroom. The bedrooms and bathrooms retain the original door surrounds and mouldings.

Plate 15: Lath plaster walls in kitchen, looking north
Plate 16: Plaster ceiling with modern popcorn, looking east
3.2 8765 ALLISON LINE

3.2.1 Landscape Setting

The property at 8765 Allison Line is a farmstead located approximately 800 metres southwest of the intersection of Allison Line and Erieau Road. The property is surrounded by agricultural fields. To the north of agricultural fields is an abandoned railway ROW and the Ridge Landfill (Plate 19). Allison Line is a gravel paved road with grass shoulders. Running along the south of the roadway is a drainage ditch and along the north of the roadway are wooden utility poles (Plate 20 and Plate 21). There are no other structures on Allison Line aside from the neighbouring property at 8779 Allison Line.

The property is landscaped with mature birch trees, mature maple trees, a lawn, evergreen shrubs, and foundation plantings (Plate 22 to Plate 24). Adjacent to the east façade of the residence is a poured concrete patio which is partially surrounded by a wooden fence (Plate 25). The property contains a horseshoe shaped gravel driveway. The west part gravel driveway borders the surrounding agricultural fields and the east part of the driveway leads to the barn and outbuildings (Plate 26 and Plate 27). Many of the areas immediately adjacent to the outbuildings, especially the area surrounding the collapsed barn, are in the early stages of ecological succession and reverting to meadow (Plate 28). Small and intermediate birch trees are growing adjacent to many of the outbuildings (Plate 29 and Plate 30).
Plate 19: Looking north towards Ridge Landfill and agricultural fields

Plate 20: Looking west on Allison Line, showing utility poles and drainage ditch

Plate 21: Looking east on Allison Line, showing drainage ditch

Plate 22: Mature birch trees, mature maple tree, and lawn, looking north

Plate 23: Foundation plantings and shrubs, looking north

Plate 24: Mature maple tree in back yard, looking east
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Plate 25: Concrete patio and wooden fence, looking west
Plate 26: Gravel driveway adjacent to residence, looking north

Plate 27: Gravel driveway adjacent to outbuildings, looking east
Plate 28: Areas around outbuildings in the early stages of ecological succession, looking south

Plate 29: Intermediate birch trees and naturalizing vegetation, looking east
Plate 30: Small birch and deciduous tree adjacent to outbuilding, looking south
3.2.2 Residence Exterior

The residence is a one and one half storey structure with an L-shaped plan and cross gable roof. The roof is clad in asphalt shingles. The roof contains a flat roof dormer on the front façade, gable roof dormer on the west façade, brick chimney, metal chimney, and four lightning rods (Plate 31). The exterior of the residence is red brick with a stretcher bond and contains rusticated concrete block decorative quoins. The foundation of the residence is rusticated concrete block (Plate 32).

The front façade (south façade) of the residence contains an enclosed front porch with modern windows and one 2/2 window with wooden surrounds (Plate 33 and Plate 34). The upper storey of the front façade contains two 1/1 modern windows with concrete sills, segmented arch openings, and brick voussoirs. The first storey has a large central modern window with a horizontal sliding lower portion. The front façade contains a basement window with segmented arch opening and brick voussoir.

The east façade contains two 1/1 windows with brick voussoirs, segmented arch window openings, and concrete windowsills. The first storey contains a modern door and screen door which enters into the enclosed porch and a modern door and screen door with a metal awning. The first storey on this façade contains two modern 1/1 windows with segmented arch openings, brick voussoirs, and concrete windowsills. The basement has two modern windows with segmented arch openings and brick voussoirs (Plate 35).

The north façade of the residence contains a shed roof addition, utility connection, aluminum downspout, and television antenna mounted on a metal pole. The brick colour of the shed roof addition is different from the rest of the residence. The second storey includes two modern 1/1 windows with brick voussoirs, concrete windowsills, and segmented arch openings. The first storey contains two smaller modern 1/1 windows with brick voussoirs, concrete windowsills, and segmented arch openings. The basement level contains a modern window and a boarded-up window with brick voussoirs and segmented arch openings (Plate 36).

The west façade of the residence contains a steeply pitched gable dormer with a modern 1/1 window with a brick voussoir, concrete windowsill, and segmented arch opening (Plate 36). The first storey includes three modern 1/1 windows with brick voussoirs, concrete windowsills, and segmented arch openings. The basement level contains three windows with brick voussoirs and segmented arch openings. The west façade also contains two aluminum downspouts, aluminum gutters, and a satellite dish (Plate 38).
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Plate 31: Flat roof dormer and brick chimney, looking north
Plate 32: Brick exterior, quoins, and rusticated concrete block foundation, looking south

Plate 33: South façade, looking north
Plate 34: Wood 2/2 window on south façade, looking east

Plate 35: East façade, looking west
Plate 36: North façade, looking south
3.2.3 **Residence Interior**

The basement of the residence has a concrete floor and brick chimney (Plate 39 and Plate 40). The walls of the basement are poured concrete and concrete block (Plate 40). Within the basement is a kitchen and storage areas formerly used for coal storage and canning (Plate 41). Adjacent to the staircase is the shaft of a former dumbwaiter that has been closed off. The floor boards of the first storey are visible from the basement and the floor beams are machine cut by a circular saw (Plate 43).

The entrance foyer of the residence contains original wainscoting and molding (Plate 44). A small staircase leads from the foyer up to the kitchen. According to the occupant’s family, the kitchen was redone sometime in the 1960s (Plate 45). The kitchen contains wooden cabinets with a natural finish and a 12-inch tile vinyl floor. The door molding and wainscoting are original (Plate 46 and Plate 47). The walls of the kitchen are clad in modern wallpaper. Accessible to the west of the kitchen is the laundry area, which contains a modern washer and dryer. South of the laundry area is a bathroom with modern fixtures and carpeting.

To the south of kitchen, through a wide opening, is the living room. The living room is carpeted and contains original door and window molding (Plate 48 and Plate 49). The ceiling is a drop ceiling and the walls are clad in modern wallpaper. The enclosed front porch is accessible from the living room. The window openings were boarded up when the enclosed front porch was added (Plate 50). To the west of the living room is a carpeted front room where original hardwood flooring has been identified by the occupant’s family. The original doorway to the residence is in the front room and was replaced by shelving when the enclosed porch was added to the residence (Plate 51). Located adjacent to the living room and front room is a bedroom. The bedroom contains original hardwood floors, wood mouldings, and window surrounds (Plate 52).

The second floor of the residence is accessed via a wooden staircase with a carved newel and a circular top (Plate 53 and Plate 54). The second floor contains five rooms: two bedrooms, one open room, a storage room, and a half bathroom. The east bedroom contains original wooden closets and shelving, original doors, original floor and door moldings, modern wallpaper, and is carpeted (Plate 55). The west bedroom has original floor and door molding, original hardwood flooring, modern wallpaper, and the wall...
is clad in wallpaper (Plate 56). The open room contains original door and window molding, a dormered ceiling, original hardwood flooring and modern wallpaper on the south and east walls (Plate 57). The north wall contains no wallpaper. The storage room contains an unfinished wood floor and exposed ceiling rafters. The storage room is accessed through a small half-height door. Visible in the storage room is the original wooden exterior cladding and wooden shingles (Plate 58). Between the storage room and open room is a half bathroom with modern fixtures and a carpeted floor (Plate 59). The second-floor hallway has walls clad in wallpaper, original door and floor molding, and a carpeted floor (Plate 60).

Plate 39: Brick chimney in basement, looking south
Plate 40: Concrete block walls and concrete floor in basement, looking west
Plate 41: Poured concrete and concrete block walls in basement
Plate 42: Kitchen area in basement, looking east
Plate 43: Floor boards and rafters in basement

Plate 44: Entrance foyer, looking south

Plate 45: Kitchen, looking north

Plate 46: Kitchen wainscoting, looking east

Plate 47: Door surrounds in kitchen, looking south

Plate 48: Floor molding in living room, looking south
Plate 49: Door molding in living room, looking west

Plate 50: Boarded window in enclosed porch, looking north

Plate 51: Former entrance converted into shelving, looking east

Plate 52: Hardwood floors and molding in first floor bedroom

Plate 53: Main staircase looking down to first storey

Plate 54: Details of woodwork and newel on staircase, looking north
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Plate 55: North second floor bedroom, looking north

Plate 56: Original woodwork, south second floor bedroom, looking east

Plate 57: Open Room, looking east

Plate 58: Storage room, looking south

Plate 59: Second floor bathroom, looking east

Plate 60: Second floor hallway, looking west
3.2.4 Barn Exterior

The barn at 8765 Allison Line is a timber frame structure with an exterior of vertical planks (Plate 61). The barn has an L-shaped plan and a side gable roof with a hayhood on the south façade and metal cladding (Plate 62). The foundation of the barn is poured concrete (Plate 63). Between 2005 and 2016, based on Google Earth imagery, the north portions of the barn collapsed.

The south façade of the barn provides access to the first level of the barn. A large metal door on a track provides access. The roof on this façade has a hayhood with a metal chain attached to it (Plate 64). The east façade of the barn is partially collapsed, missing portions of its exterior cladding and roof cladding (Plate 65). The standing portion of the barn contains three entrances, two with wooden doors and one with a metal door. The east façade contains three windows, two of which are boarded with plywood and one which is a broken four pane window. Part of the east façade has collapsed (Plate 65 and Plate 66). To the east of the standing portion and collapsed portion of the barn are the ruins of the east to west part of the L-shaped barn. Remaining is much of the concrete foundation, some timber cladding and beams, and the adjacent cattle feeds (Plate 67).

The west façade of the barn provides access to the first level through two large metal doors on tracks and one metal door with a 15-pane glass window on a track. This façade contains four 8-pane glass windows, some of which are broken. The collapsed portion of this façade is clad in metal and has two windows that have been boarded over (Plate 68). The north façade has mostly collapsed; remaining is a window opening on the upper level adjacent to the roofline and a large entrance to the metal clad portion of the barn (Plate 69).

Plate 61: View of barn showing collapsed portion and remaining portion, looking west
Plate 62: Hayhood on south façade, looking north

Plate 63: Poured concrete foundation, looking west

Plate 64: South façade, looking north

Plate 65: East façade, looking west

Plate 66: East façade, showing the three remaining entrances, looking west

Plate 67: Barn ruins, looking north
3.2.5 Barn Interior

The barn interior consists of a main level and loft area (Plate 70). The barn is supported by three posts and beams and additional wooden braces (Plate 71). All the posts in the interior were hand hewn (Plate 72). These posts, beams, and braces are secured in place by mortise and pins (Plate 73). The interior of the main level contains a pulley system for hay storage and the doors have their original hinges (Plate 74). The floor of the main level is concrete. The loft area is accessed by a wooden ladder. Due to structural condition concerns, Stantec staff did not access the loft level or portions of the barn collapsed or partially collapsed (Plate 75).
3.2.6 Outbuildings

The outbuildings present on 8765 Allison Line consist of a bean cooker, the ruins of two concrete silos, a drive shed, workshop, and outbuilding that was constructed sometime after 1952.

The bean cooker is a side gable roof building with a metal clad roof and timber exterior (Plate 76). The interior is accessed via a small gable roof addition and doorway on the south and north façade. The structure has a six-pane window and 1/1 window on the south façade. The north façade has a window opening but no window is present. The area surrounding the bean cooker is surrounded by farm implements and is reverting to meadowlands.

The two concrete silo ruins are located immediately north of the barn and have mostly been demolished. The silos appear to have been constructed of vertical concrete slabs held together with metal rods (Plate 77 and Plate 78).
The drive shed is a side gable roof structure with a metal clad roof with two lightning rods and vertical timber exterior (Plate 79). The interior is accessed via a large wooden door on a track. The exterior has windows which are broken on the west and south façades. The foundation of the drive shed is poured concrete. The interior of the drive shed has a dirt and concrete floor and contains hand hewn wood beams and various farm implements (Plate 80 and Plate 81).

The workshop is a small structure with a front facing gable roof with a metal clad roof and metal chimney (Plate 82). The exterior of the workshop is clad in metal and contains four pane and six pane glass windows. The foundation of the workshop is poured concrete.

The outbuilding is a side gable roof structure with asphalt shingles, three lightning rods, and an exterior clad in wood paneling with faded red paint (Plate 83). The structure has wood frame windows. The foundation of the outbuilding is poured concrete. The outbuilding is accessed by two doors on the east and west façades and a large door on a track on the west façade. The hardware on the doors is original and contains the wording “Willple M&C Co.” The occupants of the farmstead informed Stantec staff that this structure was originally used as a pig barn.

Plate 76: Bean cooker, looking north
Plate 77: East silo, looking south
Plate 78: West silo, looking east
Plate 79: Drive shed, looking west
3.3 20323 CHARING CROSS ROAD

3.3.1 Landscape Setting

The property at 20323 Charing Cross Road contains a mid-20th century residence, barn, and pumphouse and is located approximately 750 metres south of the intersection of Charing Cross Road and 14 Line (Plate 84). The property is surrounded by agricultural fields to the south and west, and the Ridge Landfill to the north and east. Immediately east of the property is an earth berm that divides the property from the landfill. The berm is landscaped with a lawn and pine trees. Charing Cross Road, also signed County Road 10, is a two-lane asphalt paved road with gravel shoulders and a drainage ditch that runs along the east side of the road (Plate 85 and Plate 86). Wooden utility poles run along the west side of the road.

The property is landscaped with small, intermediate, and mature deciduous trees, an intermediate spruce tree, a lawn, shrubs, and foundation plantings (Plate 87). The property contains a gravel driveway which is connected to Charing Cross Road by a small concrete bridge which spans a drainage ditch (Plate 88). Adjacent to the east façade of the barn are the ruins of a concrete silo. Adjacent to the north façade is a...
pumphouse with a gable roof with metal cladding and an exterior clad in vertical timber. The pumphouse has a poured concrete foundation (Plate 89).
3.22 Barn Exterior

The barn at 20323 Charing Cross Road is an L-shaped structure with a side gable roof clad in metal, a timber frame, and a timber exterior (Plate 88). The barn contains a mix of original and replacement hinges and hardware. The roof of the barn contains eight lightning rods. The foundation of the barn is poured concrete (Plate 89). The west façade contains a shed roof addition. The barn contains an open breezeway that divides the stables from the rest of the barn.

The north façade of the barn has large wood sliding doors with wood hinges and modern brackets (Plate 90 and Plate 91). The section contains a two-pane window and a four-pane window. The east façade includes a wood cutout in the gable peak, wood frame window opening which is missing the window, and two metal half glass doors (Plate 92 and Plate 93). The south façade contains a hay hood on the gable peak, fixed wood frame windows, and original hinges on the doors (Plate 94 to Plate 96). The west façade contains wood frame windows a shed roof addition with a metal roof and exterior clad in plywood (Plate 97 and Plate 98). The opening between the stables and main section of the barn has a metal overhang on this façade and a ceiling of hand-hewn beams (Plate 100 and Plate 103).
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Plate 90: North façade, looking south
Plate 91: Entrance doors on north façade, looking south
Plate 92: East façade, looking east
Plate 93: Breezeway, looking east
Plate 94: South façade, looking north
Plate 95: Hayhood
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Plate 96: Original hinge on south façade, looking north
Plate 97: West façade, looking east
Plate 98: Breezeway, looking east
Plate 99: Wood frame window, looking east
Plate 100: Ceiling beams of breezeway, looking east
Plate 101: Ceiling beams in breezeway
3.3.3 Barn Interior

The interior of the barn is divided into three sections. The southernmost section of the barn contains stables while the portion of the barn oriented west to east contains a drive shed and larger storage area with wooden flooring. The interior includes wood stables and stalls as well as original hardware on the stall doors (Plate 102 and Plate 103). The interior of the stables portion of the barn contains hand hewn wood timber beams secured in place by a mortise and pins (Plate 104).

The floor of the stables is concrete. The interior portion of the main section of the barn contains a drive shed section with a gravel floor and hand-hewn wood beams secured by a mortise and pins (Plate 105 and Plate 106). The upstairs of the barn is accessed via a wood staircase in the drive shed section (Plate 107). The upper level would have been used for grain storage. Stantec staff did not access the upper level due to safety concerns (Plate 108 and Plate 109). A wooden door leads to a larger section of the barn with wood flooring. Because of safety concerns, the section with the wooden flooring was not accessed (Plate 110 and Plate 111).
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Plate 102: Stables portion of barn, looking south

Plate 103: Stables portion of barn, looking north

Plate 104: Hand hewn beams in stables portion

Plate 105: Drive shed portion of barn, looking south
Plate 106: Hand hewn beams in drive shed portion of barn, looking east

Plate 107: Staircase to upper level, looking east

Plate 108: Upper level, looking east

Plate 109: Upper Level: looking south

Plate 110: Wooden floor section of barn, looking west

Plate 111: Support beams, looking west
4.0 EVALUATION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST

4.1 ONTARIO REGULATION 9/06

The criteria for determining CHVI is defined by O. Reg. 9/06 (Government of Ontario 2006b). If a property meets one or more of the below criteria it is determined to contain, or represent, a cultural heritage resource. A summary statement of cultural heritage value will be prepared, and a list of heritage attributes which define the CHVI identified. Given the identification of a cultural heritage resource, consideration should be given to the effects of a proposed change on the heritage attributes of that property. The evaluation of each property according to O. Reg. 9/06 is provided in subsequent sections below.

In order to identify CHVI at least one of the following criteria must be met:

1. The property has design value or physical value because it:
   i. is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method
   ii. displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit
   iii. demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement

2. The property has historical value or associative value because it:
   i. has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community
   ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture
   iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community

3. The property has contextual value because it:
   i. is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area
   ii. is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings
   iii. is a landmark

(Government of Ontario 2006b)
4.2 HERITAGE EVALUATION

4.2.1 8765 Allison Line and 8779 Allison Line

The properties at 8765 and 8779 were determined to constitute a cultural heritage landscape as a farmstead based on an understanding of their historical relationship. The farmstead consists of the former tenant house at 8779 Allison Line and the residence and complex of outbuildings at 8765 Allison Line. The agricultural fields surrounding the properties are not part of the cultural heritage landscape as they have been modified over time and are not representative of the historic lot layout or survey patterns.

4.2.1.1 Design/Physical Value

The residence at 8765 Allison Line is a representative Ontario vernacular residence. It was constructed in about 1880. It is a one and one half storey structure with an L-shaped plan, red brick exterior, and a rusticated concrete block foundation. Similar one and one half storey residences with L-shaped plans and brick exteriors were constructed throughout Chatham-Kent and the surrounding areas during the late 19th century making this residence a representative example of a popular vernacular design used frequently in the late 19th century. The vernacular style does not employ a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit nor does it demonstrate a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. Based on the above discussion, the residence at 8765 Allison Line does meet criteria of Section 1(i) of O. Reg 9/06.

The barn at 8765 Allison Line is a representative example of a gable roof barn. It was constructed in about 1900 and is a timber frame structure with a gable roof that is clad in metal. The foundation of the barn is concrete. Gable roof barns with concrete foundations were constructed throughout rural areas of southern Ontario in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The barn does not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit nor does it demonstrate a high degree of technical or scientific achievement given its common design and construction materials. Based on the above discussion, the barn at 8765 Allison Line does meet criteria of Section 1(i) of O. Reg 9/06.

The former tenant house at 8779 Allison Line is not rare, unique, or representative of a style, type, expression, material or construction method. The residence is not a representative example of residences within Chatham-Kent or the surrounding area. Based on the above discussion, the residence at 8779 Allison Line does not meet the criteria of Section 1 of O. Reg 9/06.

4.2.1.2 Historic/Associative Value

The farmstead at 8779 and 8765 Allison Line is historically associated with the Irving family. Like many farmers in Canada, the Irving family immigrated from Scotland and England to Ontario during the mid-19th century. The mid-19th century was a time of peak migration from the British Isles to Canada. Research has not indicated that the Irving family was directly associated with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution significant to the community. The property does not provide evidence of notable or influential aspects of the community’s history, the history of a particular culture, or contribute in a meaningful way to a comparative analysis of similar properties. The property does not yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture. The builder of the farmstead is unknown.
Based on the above discussion, the residence, barn, and tenant house at 8779 and 8765 Allison Line does not meet criteria set out in Section 2 of O. Reg 9/06.

4.2.1.3 Contextual Value

The farmstead at 8779 and 8765 Allison Line is set in an area that is largely rural in character. The properties are surrounded by agricultural fields to the south, west, and east, many of which contain residences and barns. To the north, the farmstead borders the Ridge Landfill and industrial activity can be seen from the property and from Allison Line. There are no other 19th century residences or barns on this section of Allison Line between Erieau Road and Charing Cross Road, however there are others in the immediate vicinity. Therefore, the residence and barn on the property are not important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of the area. The residence and barn are typical late 19th and early 20th century structures set in a landscape of agricultural fields and industrial activity from the adjacent Ridge Landfill. Therefore, the residence and barn are not physically, historically, functionally, or visually linked to its surroundings. The residence, tenant house, and barn are not landmarks and do not stand out as unusually memorable. Based on the above discussion, the residence and barn at 8765 Allison Line does not meet criteria set out in Section 3 of O. Reg 9/06.

The tenant house at 8779 Allison Line is not important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of the area as it is predominantly agricultural in nature. While there are no other early 20th century residences or tenant houses located on Allison Line, there are others in close vicinity. Nonetheless, the former tenant house has contextual value because it was constructed to support agricultural activities occurring at the farmstead. Therefore, it is historically linked to the residence and barn at 8765 Allison Line. The buildings are historically linked through the relationship between the tenant house and farm complex at 8779 Allison Line. This link contributes to the identification of 8765 and 8779 Allison Line as a cultural heritage landscape. Therefore, the tenant house at 8779 Allison Line does meet the criteria set out in Section 3(ii) of O. Reg 9/06.

4.2.1.4 Summary of O. Reg. 9/06 Evaluation

Table 1: Evaluation of 8765 and 8779 Allison Line According to Ontario Regulation 9/06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria of O. Reg. 9.06</th>
<th>Y/N</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The residence and barn are representative examples of rural Ontario vernacular styled structures. The barn is a representative Ontario vernacular gable roof barn constructed during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Numerous examples of similar residences and barns were constructed throughout Chatham-Kent and the surrounding area during the late 19th century. The outbuildings and tenant house are not rare, unique, or representative of a style, type, expression, material or construction method.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Criteria of O. Reg. 9.06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Y/N</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design or Physical Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The residence, barn, outbuildings, and tenant house do not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit. The design, date of construction, and craftsmanship is representative and typical of rural construction practices during the 19th century and early 20th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The barn, residence, tenant house, and outbuildings do not demonstrate building techniques or include features that demonstrate a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical or Associative Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The properties are historically associated with the Irving family. Christopher and Samuel Irving purchased the property in the early 1870s and their descendants farmed the property until 1961. Although the Irving family is historically associated with the farmstead, they were not determined to be associated with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution significant to the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The properties do not provide evidence of notable or influential aspects of the community’s history, the history of a particular culture, or contribute in a meaningful way to a comparative analysis of similar properties. The properties do not yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The architect of the barn, residence, and tenant house is not known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>While the residence and barn are the only remaining 19th century structures on Allison Line, many other examples exist in close proximity. Also, the Ridge Landfill can be readily seen looking north from the farmstead. Therefore, it does not define, maintain, or support the character of an area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The tenant house at 8779 Allison Line is historically linked to 8765 Allison Line through its relationship as a tenant house for the farmstead. Therefore, the residence and tenant house are historically linked to their surroundings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a landmark</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The residence, tenant house, and barn are not landmarks and do not stand out as unusually memorable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2.1.5 Statement of Significance

The farmstead at 8765 and 8779 Allison Line is located in the municipality of Chatham-Kent. The property is bound by Allison Line to the south and agricultural fields to the west, north, and east. The properties constitute a cultural heritage landscape as a farmstead containing a late 19th to early 20th century residence, barn, outbuildings, and tenant house.
The properties demonstrate cultural heritage value or interest as representative examples of a late 19th to early 20th century Ontario vernacular farmstead including a residence, tenant house, and barn. The residence is a one and one half storey structure with a L-shaped plan, red brick exterior, rusticated concrete block quoins and foundation. The barn is a timber frame structure with a gable roof, vertical barnboard siding, and a poured concrete foundation. All the beams, posts, and secondary beams are hand hewn and secured with mortise and pins. To the north of the residence and barn is a former tenant house which contributes to the vernacular nature of the farmstead through its position in the landscape. While the house itself does not have any design or historical value, it is contextually important as it is historical linked to the residence and barn. The tenant house helps speaks to the once prosperous nature of agricultural activities on the property.

4.2.6 Heritage Attributes

- Residence
  - One and one half storey structure
  - Cross gable roof
  - Dormers (flat and gabled)
  - Red brick exterior
  - Segmented arch window openings with brick voussoirs and concrete sills
  - Rusticated concrete block quoins and foundation
- Barn
  - Gable roof
  - Timber frame construction, including hand hewn beams
  - Vertical barnboard siding
- Tenant House
  - Position in the landscape in relation to 8765 Allison Line

4.2.2 20323 Charing Cross Road

4.2.2.1 Design/Physical Value

The barn at 20323 Charing Cross Road is located in the municipality of Chatham-Kent. It is a timber frame structure, constructed in about 1900, with a roof that is clad in metal and has eight lightning rods. The barn uses common materials and construction methods expressed through its hand-hewn wood beams secured with mortise and pins. Gable roof barns using these materials and construction methods were frequently constructed throughout Ontario in the 19th and early 20th centuries. The date of
construction and craftsmanship are representative of typical rural construction practices during the 19th and early 20th century. The barn does not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit. The barn does not demonstrate a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. Nonetheless, it is a representative Ontario vernacular barn with an unusual L-shaped design with breezeway. Based on the above discussion, the barn at 20323 Charing Cross Road does meet criteria of Section 1(i) of O. Reg 9/06.

4.2.2.2 Historic/Associative Value

The property at 20323 Charing Cross Road is historically associated with the Pardo family. Although the Pardo family contained United Empire Loyalists and significant members of the community, historical research does not indicate that Thomas Pardo or Milo Pardo had direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, or organization that was significant to the community. The barn at 20323 Charing Cross Road does not yield or have the potential to yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, nor does it demonstrate the work of an architect or builder. Based on the above discussion, the barn at 20323 Charing Cross Road does not meet the criteria set out in Section 2 of O. Reg 9/06.

4.2.2.3 Contextual Value

Charing Cross Road, within and adjacent to the Study Area, is rural in character. The west side of the road is agricultural in nature, but the east side has been heavily modified by the construction of an earth berm adjacent to the Ridge Landfill. Because of this, the barn at 20323 Charing Cross Road is not important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of the area. The barn is a late 19th or early 20th century structure set in an area that is adjacent to industrial activity associated with the Ridge Landfill. Therefore, the property is not physically, historically, functionally, or visually linked to its surroundings. The barn does not stand out as unusually memorable or an easily discernible landmark. Based on the above discussion, the barn 20323 Charing Cross Road does not meet the criteria set out in Section 3 of O. Reg 9/06.

4.2.2.4 Summary of O. Reg. 9/06 Evaluation

Table 2: Evaluation of 20323 Charing Cross Road According to Ontario Regulation 9/06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria of O. Reg. 9.06</th>
<th>Y/N</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The barn at 20323 Charing Cross Road is a representative example of an Ontario vernacular barn typical to the late 19th or early 20th century. The mid-20th century residence and early 20th century outbuildings on the residence are not representative of any particular style and not composed of rare materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The residence, barn, and outbuilding do not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit. The design, date of construction, and craftsmanship is representative and typical of rural construction practices.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Evaluation of 20323 Charing Cross Road According to Ontario Regulation 9/06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria of O. Reg. 9.06</th>
<th>Y/N</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design or Physical Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The barn, residence, and outbuilding do not demonstrate building techniques or include features that demonstrate a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical or Associative Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The properties are historically associated with the Pardo family. Thomas Pardo purchased the property in 1876 and the Pardo family remained on the property until 1956. Although Thomas and Milo Pardo are historically associated with the farmstead, they were not significant to a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution significant to the development of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The property does not provide evidence of notable or influential aspects of the community's history, the history of a particular culture, or contribute in a meaningful way to a comparative analysis of similar properties. The property does not yield information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The architect of the barn, residence, and outbuilding house is not known.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The surrounding context is agricultural and closely associated with the Ridge Landfill and the prominent earth berm. As such, the property does not define, maintain, or support the character of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The area east and south of the property has been heavily modified by the Ridge Landfill and earth berm and therefore the property is no longer physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a landmark</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The residence, barn, and outbuilding are not landmarks and do not stand out as unusually memorable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.2.5 Statement of Significance

The barn at 20323 Charing Cross Road is located in the municipality of Chatham-Kent. The property is bound to the south and east by the Ridge Landfill, to the north by 20393 Charing Cross Road, and to the west by Charing Cross Road. The property a late 19th to early 20th century barn and outbuilding.

The property demonstrates cultural heritage value or interest through the presence of a representative example of a late 19th to early 20th century Ontario barn. The barn is a cross gable structure with vertical barnboard siding and a poured concrete foundation. The interior contains original features including hand hewn beams and posts secured by mortise and pins. The property also contains a mid-20th century residence and earth berm associated with the Ridge Landfill, neither of which are in keeping with the late 19th to early 20th century character of the barn.
4.2.2.6 Heritage Attributes

- Barn
  - Cross gable roof
  - Timber frame construction, including hand hewn beams secured with mortise and pins
  - Vertical barnboard siding
5.0 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

5.1 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED UNDERTAKING

The Study Area is contained entirely on land owned by Ridge (Chatham) Holdings Ltd. The landfill is undertaking a plan to expand disposal capacity and continue operation past the year 2022. To facilitate the expansion, the entire Study Area is planned to be cleared.

5.2 ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS FRAMEWORK

The assessment of impacts on cultural heritage resources is based on the impacts defined in the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) Infosheet #5 Heritage Impact Assessments and Conservation Plans. Impacts to heritage resources may be direct or indirect.

Direct impacts include:

- **Destruction** of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features
- **Alteration** that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance

Indirect impacts to cultural heritage resources do not result in the direct destruction or alteration of the feature or its heritage attributes, but may indirectly affect the cultural heritage value of a property by causing:

Indirect impacts include:

- **Shadows** created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden.
- **Isolation** of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship.
- **Direct or indirect obstruction** of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features.
- **A change in land use** such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces.
- **Land disturbances** such as a change in grade that alters soil, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource.

(Government of Ontario 2006a)

Indirect impacts resulting from land disturbances apply to archaeological resources, which are beyond the scope of this assessment. No further consideration to archaeological resources is provided in this report and recommendations regarding archaeological potential should be prepared by a licensed professional archaeologist in good standing with the MTCS.
5.3 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

5.3.1 8765 and 8779 Allison Line

Given the proposed clearing of the properties, impacts identified for 8675 and 8779 Allison Line relate largely to the anticipated removal of all structures on the property. Direct impacts were identified as all heritage attributes may be destroyed or altered including the farmstead containing a residence and barn at 8770 Allison Line, as well as the relationship between the farmstead and the tenant house at 8765 Allison Line. Indirect impacts resulting from the proposed undertaking would be the resulting change in land use of the existing property from a farmstead to a landfill. The other categories are not applicable to the proposed undertaking. As the structures on the property are proposed to be removed, shadow impacts, isolation of the resource, or obstruction of views to the property are not applicable as there would be no structures remaining on the property to receive these impacts.

Table 3: Evaluation of Direct Impacts to Residence, Barn, and Tenant House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Impact</th>
<th>Relevance to 8675 and 8779 Allison Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Destruction</strong> of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features.</td>
<td>The proposed undertaking will result in the removal of the residence, barn, and tenant house at 8765 and 8779 Allison Line. All heritage attributes will be directly impacted. Accordingly, mitigation measures must be prepared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alteration</strong> that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance.</td>
<td>The removal of the residence, barn, and tenant house at 8765 and 8779 Allison Line will alter the appearance of the properties and specifically the historical link of the buildings with the properties. Accordingly, mitigation measures must be prepared.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Evaluation of Indirect Impacts to Residence, Barn, and Tenant House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect Impact</th>
<th>Relevance to 8675 and 8779 Allison Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shadows</strong> created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden</td>
<td>The proposed undertaking will not result in shadows that will indirectly impact 8675 and 8779 Allison Line as no natural features were identified as heritage attributes. Accordingly, no impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures are required related to shadows are identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isolation</strong> of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship</td>
<td>The proposed undertaking will not result in the isolation of heritage attributes identified for 8675 and 8779 Allison Line as no attributes will remain following removal. Accordingly, no impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures are required related to isolation are identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indirect Impact | Relevance to 8675 and 8779 Allison Line
--- | ---
**Direct or indirect obstruction** of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features | The proposed undertaking will not result in obstruction of views for 8675 and 8779 Allison Line as no significant views were identified. **Accordingly, no impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures are required related to views are identified.**

**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 | A change in land use is proposed for 8675 and 8779 Allison Line. The proposed plan will see the area transition from agricultural use to a part of the Ridge Landfill. As the position of the tenant house in relation to 8765 Allison Line was identified as a heritage attribute of the farmstead, this represents a change to heritage attributes. **Accordingly, mitigation measures must be prepared.**

**Land disturbances** such as a change in grade that alters soil, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource | Indirect impacts resulting from land disturbances apply to archaeological resources, which are beyond the scope of this assessment. No further consideration to archaeological resources is provided in this report and the recommendations of a Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment should be followed to mitigate impacts related to land disturbances.

### 5.3.2 20323 Charing Cross Road

Given the proposed clearing of the property, impacts identified for 20323 Charing Cross Road relate exclusively to the anticipated removal of the barn on the property. Direct impacts were identified as all heritage attributes may be destroyed or altered. The other categories are not applicable to the proposed undertaking. As the structure on the property are proposed to be removed and all heritage attributes identified relate exclusively to the structure and not the landscape, shadow impacts, isolation of the resource, obstruction of views to the property, change in land use, or land disturbance are not applicable as there would be no structures remaining on the property to receive these impacts.

**Table 5: Evaluation of Direct Impacts to Barn**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct Impact</th>
<th>Relevance to 20323 Charing Cross Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Destruction</strong> of any, or part of any, <strong>significant heritage attributes or features.</strong></td>
<td>The proposed undertaking will result in the removal of the barn at 20323 Charing Cross Road. All heritage attributes will be directly impacted. <strong>Accordingly, mitigation measures must be prepared.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alteration</strong> that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance.</td>
<td>The removal of the barn at 20323 Charing Cross Road will result in alteration to all identified heritage attributes by removing them from their current historical context. <strong>Accordingly, mitigation measures must be prepared.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: Evaluation of Indirect Impacts to Residence, Barn, and Tenant House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indirect Impact</th>
<th>Relevance to 20323 Charing Cross Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shadows</strong> created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden</td>
<td>The proposed undertaking will not result in shadows that will indirectly impact the barn at 20323 Charing Cross Road as no natural features were identified as heritage attributes. Accordingly, no impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures are required related to shadows are identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isolation</strong> of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship</td>
<td>The proposed undertaking will not result in the isolation of heritage attributes identified the for barn at 20323 Charing Cross Road as no attributes will remain following removal. Accordingly, no impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures are required related to isolation are identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct or indirect obstruction</strong> of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features</td>
<td>The proposed undertaking will not result in obstruction of views for 20323 Charing Cross Road as no significant views were identified. Accordingly, no impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures are required related to views are identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A change in land use</strong> such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces</td>
<td>A change in land use is proposed for 20323 Charing Cross Road. The proposed plan will see the area transition from agricultural use to a part of the Ridge Landfill. However, there were no heritage attributes identified in relation to the current land use. Therefore, no impacts are identified in relation to land use. Accordingly, no impacts were identified, and no mitigation measures are required related to land use are identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land disturbances</strong> such as a change in grade that alters soil, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource</td>
<td>Indirect impacts resulting from land disturbances apply to archaeological resources, which are beyond the scope of this assessment. No further consideration to archaeological resources is provided in this report and the recommendations of a Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment should be followed to mitigate impacts related to land disturbances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.0 MITIGATION MEASURES

6.1 INTRODUCTION

According to InfoSheet #5, where an impact to a heritage resource has been identified and avoidance of the impact is considered ineffective or infeasible, other conservation or mitigative measures must be recommended. Methods of minimizing, or mitigating, negative impacts on a cultural heritage resource range extensively, but are often applied in relation to the level of CHVI identified. Mitigation options have been prepared by a wide number of heritage organizations concerned with a variety of built features. From industrial landscapes to residential streetscapes, mitigation options should attempt to balance the loss of CHVI with the appropriate level of consideration for the heritage resource while understanding that mitigation must always be resource specific, reasonable, and feasible.

6.2 RETENTION

Generally, retention in situ is the preferred option when addressing any structure or property where CHVI has been identified, even if limited. The benefits of retaining a structure, or structures, must be balanced with site-specific considerations. Not only must the CHVI be considered, so too must the structural condition of the heritage resource, the site development plan, and the context within which the structure, or structures, would be retained.

In the case of 8675 and 8779 Allison Line and 20323 Charing Cross Road, both properties are proposed to be cleared for use by the landfill. Given the scope of the proposed undertaking, it is understood that site restraints do not allow for retention of any structures. Should the proposed undertaking be redesigned to avoid the residences and barns, consideration of retention in situ would be appropriate. Based on the current site plans, retention in situ was not determined to be a feasible alternative to lessen the impacts identified.

6.3 RELOCATION

Where retention in situ is not feasible or preferred, relocation is often the next option considered to mitigate the loss of a heritage resource. As with retention, relocation of a structure or structures must be balanced with the CHVI identified. Relocation removes the resource from its contextual setting but allows for the preservation of noteworthy heritage attributes, particularly those identified to be of design or physical value. This is a viable option where the CHVI identified merits preservation and the integrity of the structure is determined to be sound.

The barns at 8765 Allison Line and 20323 Charing Cross Road were constructed as purpose built agricultural structures representative of rural construction practices in late 19th and early 20th century Ontario. These barns, although once very common, are increasingly rare but not unique from other barns found in the vicinity. Both barns were used extensively since the time of construction through to the late 20th century but have fallen into disrepair and are no longer used. When an agricultural building no longer
has a use, it often becomes structurally compromised as can be seen at 8765 Allison Line. The current integrity of both barns calls to question their ability to withstand relocation.

As neither barn exhibits heritage attributes beyond the representative materials and design, neither warrant consideration for relocation as a strategy to mitigate the impacts associated with the proposed undertaking. While relocation may be considered as a community led initiative, should a use for the barns be identified, it does not act as an appropriate mitigation strategy for the CHVI of the barns as the current condition of the barns do not allow for accurate recreation.

In the case of the residence at 8765 Allison Line, it is a representative Ontario vernacular structure with a brick exterior and L-shaped plan. Much like the barns, this style of residence was popular throughout Chatham-Kent and the surrounding area during the late 19th century. Also similar to the barns, there remain many examples of this type of residence. What differentiates the residence from the barns is the visual integrity of the structure. While numerous changes have occurred, it has remained relatively intact and may be a candidate for relocation based on the CHVI identified and its ability to withstand relocation. However, relocation of the residence would remove it from its historical context and compromise the CHVI identified in relation to the barn and adjacent tenant house. Furthermore, also considered in relocation as a viable mitigation strategy is whether the residence warrants relocation. In the case of 8765 Allison Line, it contains CHVI as a representative example of a vernacular house; it is not unique, rare, or early. Relocation would result in creation of a new and historically inaccurate context as the residence would not be distinguishable from the surrounding area. Given this, relocation is not appropriate to mitigate the impact associated with the proposed undertaking.

In the case of the residence and former tenant house at 8779 Allison Line, the residence has CHVI because of its contextual value as being historically linked and part of the farmstead at 8765 Allison Line. Relocation of the residence would sever its historical link with the farmstead and remove the identified CHVI. Therefore, relocation is not an appropriate mitigation option for the residence at 8765 Allison Line.

6.4 DOCUMENTATION AND SALVAGE

Detailed documentation and salvage is often the preferred mitigation strategy where retention or relocation is not feasible or warranted. Documentation creates a public record of the resource, or resources, which provides researchers and the general public with a land use history, construction details, and photographic record of the property. Through the selective salvage of identified heritage attributes and other materials, the CHVI of the property can be retained, if in a different context. Documentation and salvage activities acknowledge the heritage attributes in their current context and, where feasible, allows for reuse.

The proposed undertaking considers permanent alterations to 8765 and 8779 Allison Line and 20323 Charing Cross Road. Although documentation and salvage does not eliminate the removal of these structures, it does seek to record the CHVI identified making the buildings available for future study and access by the public. Recording through photography, measured drawings, or LiDAR scanning creates a record of the resources add their positions on the property so that the loss of CHVI can be mitigated.
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Documentation is often an appropriate mitigation strategy where site constraints will not allow for retention, relocation is not considered feasible or warranted, or CHVI identified is relatively common. It is also a preferred option for components of cultural heritage landscapes where it is the relationship of structures that provide value as is the case for 8765 and 8779 Allison Line.

Salvage of heritage attributes presents an opportunity for elements of both the barns and residences to be retained for future use, if in a different context. As opposed to relocating the barns and house for no specified use, directed salvage offers an opportunity to the local community to retain physical pieces of the property. In addition, materials not identified as heritage attributes – interior materials original to construction for example – have the opportunity to be salvaged. Through the selective salvage of identified heritage attributes and other materials, the CHVI of the property can be retained, if in a different context. Documentation and salvage acknowledges the heritage attributes in their current context and, where feasible, allows for reuse.
7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Following evaluation according to O. Reg. 9/06, the properties at 8779 and 8765 Allison Line and 20323 Charing Cross Road were both determined to contain CHVI and are therefore considered cultural heritage resources. Where a proposed undertaking is anticipated to affect a cultural heritage resource, recommendations are required to mitigate the identified impact. Given the proposed undertaking which anticipated clearing of the site, the following recommendations are made:

1) Retention in situ is the preferred method to mitigate impacts associated with the proposed undertaking. While it is understood that retention in situ is not a feasible option given site restraints, should a redesign of the site allow for retention it is the preferred approach given the heritage value identified.

2) Should redesign not allow for retention in situ, it is recommended that documentation and salvage be carried out for both 8779 and 8765 Allison Line and 20323 Charing Cross Road.
   a. Documentation activities should consist of heritage recording of identified heritage attributes through photography and include measurements, where available. It was determined that the content of this HIA provides enough information regarding the interiors and documentation should focus on exterior features.
   b. Salvage activities should consist of the identification and recovery of re-useable materials by a reputable salvage company or charity.
   c. The documentation and salvage work should be carried out under the direction of a Cultural Heritage Specialist in good professional standing with the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP).

3) To provide for the retention of historic information, copies of this report should be deposited at a local repository of historic material. Therefore, it is recommended that this report be deposited at the following locations:

   - Municipality of Chatham-Kent Public Library – Chatham Branch
     120 Queen Street
     Chatham, ON, N7M 2G6
   - Municipality of Chatham-Kent Municipal Heritage Committee
     315 King Street West, P.O. Box 640
     Chatham, Ontario N7M 5K8
8.0 CLOSURE

This report has been prepared for the sole benefit of Dillon, and may not be used by any third party without the express written consent of Stantec Consulting Ltd. Any use which a third party makes of this report is the responsibility of such third party.

We trust this report meets your current requirements. Please do not hesitate to contact us should you require further information or have additional questions about any facet of this report.

Yours truly,

STANTEC CONSULTING LTD.

Meaghan Rivard, MA, CAHP  
Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist  
Phone: 519-645-3350  
Fax: 519-645-6575  
meaghan.rivard@stantec.com

Colin Varley, MA, RPA  
Senior Associate  
Phone: 613-738-6087  
Fax: 613-722-7299  
colin.varley@stantec.com
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