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1.0 INTRODUCTION

ASI was contracted by IBI Group to conduct a Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment (CHRA) as part of the Grand River Transit (GRT) Northfield Drive Facility Class Environmental Assessment (EA). The GRT Northfield Drive Facility project includes the Environmental Assessment and Preliminary Design of a new bus storage and maintenance facility, and is located southwest of the intersection of Country Squire Road and Northfield Drive East in the City of Waterloo (Figure 1).

The purpose of this report is to present a built heritage and cultural landscape inventory of cultural heritage resources, identify existing conditions of the GRT Northfield Drive Facility project study area, identify impacts to cultural heritage resources, and propose appropriate mitigation measures. The research carried out for this CHRA 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 and contributors, Creative Commons-Share Alike License (CC-BY-SA)

2.0 BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT CONTEXT

2.1 Legislation and Policy Context

This cultural heritage assessment considers cultural heritage resources in the context of improvements to specified areas, pursuant to the Environmental Assessment Act (1990). 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, roadscapes and nucleated settlements. Built heritage resources are typically individual buildings or structures that may be associated with a variety of human activities, such as historical settlement and patterns of architectural development.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A cultural feature is defined as the following (Section 1.0):

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A built heritage resource is defined as the following (13):

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

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

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

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

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

Part 4.7 of the PPS states that:

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

Official plans shall identify provincial interests and set out appropriate land use designations and policies. To determine the significance of some natural heritage features and other resources, evaluation may be required.
Official plans should also coordinate cross-boundary matters to complement the actions of other planning authorities and promote mutually beneficial solutions. Official plans shall provide clear, reasonable and attainable policies to protect provincial interests and direct development to suitable areas.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.2 Municipal Policies

The City of Waterloo’s Official Plan (Section 4.7, 2014 consolidation) sets out a number of policies with regard to cultural heritage resources. Policies that are relevant to this study are included below:
4.7 CULTURAL HERITAGE POLICIES

Conservation of cultural heritage resources is an integral part of this Plan, recognizing that such resources contribute to Waterloo’s identity, economic potential and quality of life. This Plan anticipates growth through intensification while recognizing the importance of conserving Waterloo’s cultural heritage resources in a way that allows culturally significant buildings, structures and landscapes to be experienced and appreciated by existing and future generations.

4.7.1 General Policies

(9) The City will, and the Regional Municipality of Waterloo is encouraged to, give consideration to the impact of modifications to Regional or City arterial and major collector roads and other road improvements in general, including re-alignment and road widening, on cultural heritage resources. Conservation of cultural heritage resources, especially in relation to the character of streetscapes and major crossroads or intersections, shall be encouraged.

(10) Consideration shall be given to the effects of public works and development on cultural heritage resources prior to the approval of public works and development applications. Mitigation of any negative impacts shall be integrated into the design of such projects, where appropriate, in order to complement the character, scale, access to, and appearance of the heritage resource.

4.7.3 Heritage Impact Assessment

(1) A Heritage Impact Assessment, prepared by a qualified heritage conservation professional, shall be required for all proposed development applications, or site alteration permit applications that includes or is adjacent to a protected heritage property. A Heritage Impact Assessment, prepared by a qualified heritage conservation professional, shall also be required for all proposed development applications, or site alteration permit applications that includes a listed, non-designated property.

(a) Where a Heritage Impact Assessment is required as part of a development application or site alteration permit application, the terms of reference for the Heritage Impact Assessment will be determined in consultation with the City.

4.7.4 Built Heritage Resources

(1) Pursuant to the Ontario Heritage Act, Council may pass by-laws to designate a Built Heritage Resource. The designating by-law shall identify the extent of the property, contain procedures and timelines for alterations to and demolition of existing buildings and/or structures as well as the erection of new buildings and/or structures.

(2) Built Heritage Resources and their heritage attributes and features shall be conserved. Where Built Heritage Resources cannot reasonably be retained, consideration is to be given to the following in order of priority:

(a) on-site retention through adaptive re-use for built heritage that cannot be conserved intact;
(b) relocation to another site within the same development;
(c) relocation to a sympathetic site within the City;
(d) rescue and reuse of components; and,
4.7.5 Cultural Heritage Landscapes

(1) The City will identify and document any cultural heritage landscapes in accordance with the Regional Implementation Guideline for Cultural Heritage Landscape Conservation.
(2) The City will designate cultural heritage landscapes in this Plan.
(3) The City shall require the conservation of cultural heritage landscapes that are characteristic of the City or Region through the review of applications for development and/or site alteration.

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 historic research, which includes consultation of primary and secondary source research and historic mapping, is undertaken to identify early settlement patterns and broad agents or themes of change in a study 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, neighborhood, or intersection.

A field review is then undertaken to confirm the location and condition of previously identified cultural heritage resources. The field review is also utilised to identify cultural heritage resources that have not been previously identified on federal, provincial, or municipal databases.

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

Design/Physical Value:
- It is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method.
- It displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.
- It demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
- The site and/or structure retains original stylistic features and has not been irreversibly altered so as to destroy its integrity.
- It demonstrates a high degree of excellence or creative, technical or scientific achievement at a provincial level in a given period.
Historical/Associative Value:
- It has a direct association with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to: the City of Waterloo; 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: the City of Waterloo; the Province of Ontario; or Canada.
- It demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to: the City of Waterloo; 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.

Results of the desktop data collection and field review are contained in Sections 3.0, while Sections 4.0 and 5.0 contain conclusions and recommendations with respect to potential impacts of the undertaking on identified cultural heritage resources.

3.0 BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT

3.1 Introduction

This section provides a brief summary of historic research and a description of identified above ground cultural heritage resources that may be affected by the proposed undertaking. A review of available primary and secondary source material was undertaken to produce a contextual overview of the study area, including a general description of Euro-Canadian settlement and land use. Historically, the study area is located in the former Township Waterloo, Waterloo County in the following lots and concessions:

*Township of Waterloo*
  - Lot 63, German Company Tract

3.2 Township Survey and Settlement

3.2.1 Waterloo Township

The historic Township of Waterloo was originally known as Block Two of the Grand River land grant, which was deeded to the Six Nations Iroquois by the British in 1784 for their loyalty to the Crown in the American War of Independence. In 1796, Block Two, a 38,045 ha tract, was acquired by Richard Beasley from Joseph Brant on behalf of the Six Nations. He subdivided and sold the land, with approximately 24,281 ha of land going to the German Company of Pennsylvania, in November 1803 (Janusas 1988: 2). Company members included Samuel and John Bricker; and Daniel, Jacob, and John Erb. The German Company of Pennsylvania had the lands surveyed by Augustus Jones to be subdivided into 128 farm lots of approximately 181 ha each and 32 farm lots of approximately 34 ha each (Janusas 1988: 96).
When Block Two was incorporated into the District of Gore (County of Halton) in 1816, it was named Waterloo Township, in honour of the battle that ended the Napoleonic Wars in Europe. It remained part of Halton County in the District of Gore until 1842 and then became part of the District of Wellington. The County of Waterloo was created in 1852 (Janusas 1988: 2).

The first immigrants to settle in Waterloo Township were almost exclusively German Mennonites from Pennsylvania, who had originally emigrated from Switzerland, Germany, and France. Most of these settlers were farmers but many were tradesmen or millers. Later settlers were generally of Scottish, English, Irish, and continental German heritage. When the railway was laid through Waterloo Township in the mid-nineteenth century, it became the leading industrial center of Waterloo County (Janusas 1988: 10-12).

Abraham Erb purchased approximately 181 ha of land in 1805 and became the first settler in the Township of Waterloo. He transferred a portion of his land and ownership of two mills to Jacob Snider in 1829. Snider’s son inherited approximately 129 ha which he sold to John Hoffman and Isaac Weber, who sectioned and sold the lands in 1854, at which point the population of Waterloo began to expand (Janusas 1988: 102).

In the mid-1850s, the defining development of Waterloo Township and Waterloo County was the construction of the railway. The first railway line built into the township was a main line of the Grand Trunk Railway from Toronto, laid through in 1856. A number of other railway lines were soon laid across the township including: a Grand Trunk branch between Preston and Berlin in 1857; a Great Western line between Galt, Preston, and Guelph in 1857; a Grand Trunk branch between Waterloo, Berlin, and Galt in 1882; and a Grand Trunk Branch between Waterloo and Elmira in 1891 (Mika and Mika 1983).

### 3.3 Review of Historic Mapping

The 1861 Tremaine’s Map of the County of Waterloo and the 1879 Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Waterloo were reviewed to determine the potential for the presence of cultural heritage resources within the study area from the nineteenth century (Figures 2-3). It should be noted, however, that not all features of interest were mapped systematically in the Ontario series of historical atlases, given that they were financed by subscription, and subscribers were given preference with regard to the level of detail provided on the maps. Moreover, not every feature of interest would have been within the scope of the atlases.

Historically, the study area is located in the former County of Waterloo, in the Township of Waterloo. Details of historic property owners and historic features in the study area are listed in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot #</th>
<th>Con #</th>
<th>Property Owner(s) (1861)</th>
<th>Property Owner(s) (1879)</th>
<th>Historical Features (1861)</th>
<th>Historical Feature(s) (1879)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>German Company Tract</td>
<td>Christ. B. Snyder</td>
<td>John Snyder</td>
<td>Farmhouse, Roadways</td>
<td>Farmhouse, Roadways</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 1861 Tremaine’s Map of the County of Waterloo demonstrates that Northfield Drive East and Country Squire Road/ University Avenue East are both historically surveyed roads, depicted in their...
present alignments within the study area (Figure 2). Northfield Drive East is oriented northeast-southwest, and is depicted as a major travel route leading to the Village of Waterloo and the Town of Berlin (modern-day City of Kitchener). Country Squire Road/University Avenue East is oriented northeast-southwest, is depicted as the boundary between the Township of Waterloo and the Township of Woolwich to the northwest, and intersects with Northfield Drive East within Lot 63. A structure is clearly visible in the northwest section of Lot 63 outside of the study area, south of Country Squire Road/University Avenue East. Lot 63 in general, and the study area in particular, is located in a rural agricultural setting with the Grand River located nearby to the east along its present alignment.

The 1879 Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Waterloo demonstrates that the study area changed little since the 1861 Tremaine map (Figure 3). Northfield Drive East and Country Squire Road/University Avenue East are both depicted along their present alignment, as is the Grand River to the east. The residence in the northwest section of Lot 63 is still depicted, as are the nearby villages of Lexington and Waterloo to the south. The Illustrated Historical Atlas demonstrates that the area retained a rural agricultural character into the late-nineteenth century.

In addition to nineteenth-century mapping, historical mapping and aerial photographs for the twentieth century were examined. This report presents maps from 1936, 1963, and 1994. These do not represent the full range of maps consulted for the purpose of this study but were judged to cover the full range of land uses that occurred in the area during this period.

The 1936 topographical map shows that no development took place within the study area during the early-twentieth century, and that the area retained its agricultural character (Figure 4). Northfield Drive East and Country Squire Road/University Avenue East are both clearly visible, as is the Snider homestead depicted on the nineteenth-century maps. Outside the study area to the southwest, a circulation route connecting Country Squire Road/University Avenue East to Northfield Drive East that contains a second farm complex is present. The majority of the study area is shown to have remained under active agricultural cultivation into the early-twentieth century. New farmsteads are also depicted to the northeast and to the southeast of the study area, east of Northfield Drive East.

The 1963 aerial demonstrates that the study area maintained a rural character well into the mid-late-twentieth century (Figure 5). Northfield Drive East and Country Squire Road/University Avenue East are both clearly visible, as is the Snider homestead depicted on the nineteenth-century maps. The second potential farm complex and roadway connecting Country Squire Road/University Avenue East and Northfield Drive is also visible, however the resolution of this photograph is lower than the previous examples, and so no specifics details on the structures can be provided.

The 1994 topographic map shows that the area adjacent to the study area underwent considerable development in the late twentieth century (Figure 6). Northfield Drive East and Country Squire Road/University Avenue East are still visible, and the City of Waterloo is depicted as having expanded to the south side of Northfield Drive East. The area immediately to the southwest of the study area is depicted to have undergone significant industrial growth, and many new structures and roadways are present. The study area in particular is depicted with two buildings, including the large rectangular structure that is extant on the site. A communications tower is also depicted in the center of the study area.
Figure 2: The study area overlaid on the 1861 Tremaine’s Map of the County of Waterloo
Base Map: *Tremaine’s Map of the County of Waterloo, Canada West* (Tremaine 1861)

Figure 3: The study area overlaid on the 1879 Historical Atlas of the County of Waterloo
Base Map: *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County Of Waterloo* (Miles and Co. 1879)
Figure 4: The study area overlaid on the 1936 topographic map of Kitchener
Base Map: National Topographic System, Conestogo Sheet 40 P/10 (Department of National Defence 1936)

Figure 5: The study area overlaid on the 1963 aerial photograph of Waterloo
Base Map: Aerial Photograph of the City of Waterloo, Plate IM14 (University of Waterloo Map Library, 1963)
Figure 6: The study area overlaid on the 1994 NTS map of Waterloo

Base Map: NTS Sheet 40 P 10 Conestogo (Department of Energy, Mines and Resources 1994)
3.4 Existing Conditions

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

- The City of Waterloo Municipal Heritage Register which provides an inventory of cultural heritage resources that are designated under Parts IV and V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* and an inventory of listed properties that are of cultural heritage value or interest to the city;\(^1\)
- The Ontario Heritage Trust was contacted to request a search of potential properties designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act* within the study area;\(^2\)
- 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;\(^3\)
- the Federal Heritage Buildings Review Office (FHBRO) [these properties are recognized under the Treasury Board Policy on the Management of Real Property (TBPMRP)]\(^4\); and,
- The City of Waterloo was contacted directly to gather any information on cultural heritage resources within the study area (email communication 24 August 2015). It was confirmed that the study area did not have any previously identified heritage value.

Based on the review of available data, there are no previously identified resources within and/or adjacent to the study area.

A field review was undertaken by John Sleath of ASI on 27 August, 2015, 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 were 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. Plate locations and directions are mapped on Figure 7

3.4.1 GRT Northfield Drive Facility Study Area– Geography and Physiography

The study area is situated within the Oxford Till Plain physiographic region of southern Ontario in a former spillway (Chapman and Putnam 1984). The Oxford Till Plain is located in the centre of southwestern Ontario and covers an area of approximately 155,400 hectares primarily located within Oxford County. The plain is at an approximate elevation of between 305 and 365 metres above sea level. The region consists of a drumlinized till plain formed when glacial advance overrode a pre-existing moraine from a northwesterly direction. The dominant parent material is Middle Devonian limestone creating a calcareous till. Soils within the study area consist of: Caledon sandy loam with Camilla sandy loam and St. Jacobs loam; and, Tuscola loam with Colwood loam and Brant loam (Dept. of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada 1996). The region is marked for being generally good for agriculture and soils in the region are primarily developed beneath a maple-beech forest (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 143-144).

---

\(^1\) Reviewed 24 August 2015


\(^3\) Reviewed 24 August 2015 (http://www.historicplaces.ca/en/pages/about-apropos.aspx)

The study area is located adjacent to the Grand River. The Grand River drains an area of approximately 673,397 ha. Its main stream begins northeast of Dundalk at 526 m above sea level and flows for approximately 290 km to Lake Erie at Port Maitland (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 95). The Grand River was an important transportation route and a critical resource extraction area for generations of aboriginal people. Historically, the Grand River has been utilized as a navigable water-way, as a power source (such power sites served as settlement nuclei) and above Brantford as a course for driving logs (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 98). It is also the focus of the Haldimand Tract; Joseph Brant was awarded 30 miles (48 km) on either side of the river (Johnston 1964: 35-38; Lytwyn 2005).

3.4.2 GRT Northfield Drive Facility Study Area– Existing Conditions

The study area is composed of an area south and west of the intersection of Northfield Drive East and Country Squire Road/University Avenue East in the City of Waterloo. The study area consists of an industrial complex with active farmland to the north of Country Squire Road/University Avenue East, and mixed industrial/commercial buildings to the south of Northfield Drive East. Country Squire Road/University Avenue East is oriented east-northeast to south-southwest, but for the sake of clarity in this report it will be described as having an east-west orientation. Northfield Drive East is oriented in a southwest-northeast direction within the study area.

The south portion of the study area begins northwest of the T-intersection of Northfield Drive East and Toman Drive. Northfield Drive East consists of three lanes of paved, undivided traffic in this section, with one lane each direction and a left-turn lane into 300 Northfield Avenue for northeast bound traffic. Immediately northeast of this entrance, a left-turn lane is provided for southwest bound traffic to turn onto Toman Drive. Northfield Drive East generally lacks curbs within the study area, and features narrow gravel shoulders on both sides (Plate 1). The roadway is separated from the study area at 300 Northfield Drive East by a landscaped grass boulevard with trees (Plate 2). The study area in the southern portion consists of the industrial facility at 300 Northfield Drive East, which includes a large industrial building, parking lots, and exterior work yards (Plates 3-4). The main building is approximately 75 metres long by 45 metres wide and features a rectangular plan and a flat roof, with a triangular addition measuring approximately 45 by 35 metres on the south elevation. The main parking lot measures approximately 100 metres by 35 metres and is located to the east of the main building, adjacent to a grass boulevard and Northfield Drive East (Plate 3).

North of this parking lot, located at 350 Northfield Drive East, the study area is composed of undeveloped, unmaintained grasslands. The vegetation is overgrown, and consists of various grasses, weeds, shrubs, and small trees (Plate 5). This vegetation covers the entire northeastern portion of the study area, which encompasses all of 350 Northfield Drive East. Northfield Drive East consists of four lanes of traffic approaching the northeastern portion of the study area at the intersection with Country Squire Road/University Avenue East, with one lane for southwest-bound traffic, and three for northwest-bound traffic, including a left and right turn lane. There is a concrete median dividing the southwest and northeast-bound traffic right at the southern portion of the intersection, which is supporting a traffic light (Plate 6).

The northern portion of the study area west of Northfield Drive East consists of the same unmaintained, overgrown grasses as found elsewhere, and is bound by Country Squire Road/University Avenue East to the north (Plate 7). In this portion of the study area, Country Squire Road/University Avenue East consists of two lanes of undivided traffic featuring gravel shoulders, with the addition of a left-turn lane.
for eastbound traffic to turn onto Northfield Drive East immediately west of the intersection (Plate 8). To the north of the study area, the landscape consists of active agricultural lands.

Further west along Country Squire Road/University Avenue East, the industrial facility at 300 Northfield Drive occupies the northwest portion of the study area (Plate 4). This section, visible from Country Squire Road/University Avenue East, consists of a large gravel work yard bound by barbed wire fencing to the north, west, and east, and is separated from Country Squire Road/University Avenue East by a grass and treed boulevard (Plate 9). The northwest portion of the study area terminates with a driveway leading into the industrial facility at 300 Northfield Drive East.

Plate 1: Northfield Drive East on the southeast side of the study area, facing northeast.
Plate 2: The study area with Northfield Drive East on the left, looking southwest
Plate 3: The parking area at 300 Northfield Drive East, with the industrial facility to the right, looking southwest
Plate 4: The industrial facility at 300 Northfield Drive East with structure in the background, and gravel work yard in the foreground, facing east.
Plate 5: The overgrown grasses at 350 Northfield Drive East, looking northeast.

Plate 6: The study area with overgrown grasses to the left, and the intersection with Country Squire Road/University Avenue East in the background, looking northeast.

Plate 7: The study area with overgrown grasses at right, and Country Squire Road/University Avenue to the left, looking northeast.

Plate 8: The northeast portion of the study area with Country Squire Road/University Avenue East to the right, and overgrown grasses to the left, looking west.

Plate 9: Country Squire Road/University Avenue East in the northwest portion of the study area, looking northeast.
3.4.3 GRT Northfield Drive Facility– Identified Cultural Heritage Resources

Based on the results of the background research and field review, no cultural heritage resources were identified within and/or adjacent to the GRT Northfield Drive Facility study area.

3.5 Screening for Potential Impacts

The proposed undertaking within the GRT Northfield Drive study area will have no impact on any cultural heritage resources.

4.0 CONCLUSIONS

The results of background historic research and a review of secondary source material, including historic mapping, revealed that the study area was originally located within a rural agricultural landscape dating back to the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth century, with major roadways connecting various settlements located in the vicinity of study area. The area was subject to considerable industrial and commercial development in the mid and late twenty-first century, removing the area to the south and east of the study area from its former agricultural context. Northfield Drive East, though noted in the earliest mapping of the area, and an important circulation route from the Town of Waterloo to the rural farmlands nearby, has been removed from this context due to significant industrial and commercial development adjacent to the study area, as well as through extensive improvements to the roadway itself. The portion of Country Squire Road/University Avenue East adjacent to the study retains its historical functions as an agricultural circulation route due to the presence of active farms on the northwest side, and still serves as the municipal boundary between the City of Waterloo and Woolwich Township. However, extensive modifications and re-alignment to both the east and west of the study area have isolated the majority of the roadscape from its historical context. As a result, it retains little heritage value. The field review confirmed that this area does not retain any cultural heritage resources. The following provides a summary of the assessment results:

**Key Findings**

- There are no previously identified, listed and/or designated cultural heritage resources within or adjacent to the study area.
5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

The background research, data collection, and field review conducted for the study area determined that no cultural heritage resources are located within or adjacent to the GRT Northfield Drive Facility study area. Based on the results of the assessment, the following recommendations have been developed:

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

Figure 7: Study Area and Plate Locations