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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) was contracted by SNC-Lavalin Inc. to conduct a cultural heritage assessment as part of the Hurontario-Main Light Rail Transit (LRT) Preliminary Design and Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) study. The study corridor extends along Hurontario Street in the City of Mississauga from Park Street in Port Credit northerly to Steeles Avenue, and continues north along Main Street South/North to just south of Church Street West in the City of Brampton. In early 2014, Metrolinx joined the City of Brampton and the City of Mississauga as a co-proponent for the TPAP.

The results of background historic research and a review of secondary source material, including historic mapping, revealed a study area with a rural land use history dating back to the early nineteenth century. Over the course of the twentieth century, the Hurontario-Main LRT study corridor has steadily urbanized with primarily a combination of residential, commercial and recreational land uses. A total of 24 built heritage resources and 12 cultural heritage landscapes were identified within the study area.

The Hurontario-Main LRT study corridor may have a variety of impacts upon built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes. Impacts can include: direct impacts that result in the loss of resources through demolition or alteration, or the displacement of resources through relocation; and indirect impacts that result in the disruption of resources by introducing physical, visual, audible or atmospheric elements that are not in keeping with the resources and/or their setting. The following recommendations have been developed to inform development of detailed functional planning and route analysis of the proposed conceptual alignment for the Hurontario-Main LRT study corridor:

1. According to the Design Workbook 3 (DW3) drawings, the proposed Hurontario-Main LRT alignment has been designed to stay within the existing road right-of-way where possible. However, minimal encroachment will impact CHL 1 and identified heritage attributes.

   (i) CHL 1: As a result of the Mineola Road LRT Stop, encroachment will take place along the frontage of the two properties just south of Mineola Road West, on the west side of Hurontario Street. The property limits will be set back between one to three metres to accommodate the projected sidewalk. A few young trees and two brick pillars with concrete caps, located to either side of the north driveway into 1312 Hurontario Street, will be directly impacted by the projected sidewalk. Given that this is part of the Mineola Neighbourhood and thus listed on the Mississauga Cultural Heritage Landscape Inventory, a detailed heritage impact assessment should be conducted to determine the potential heritage value of these resources and to recommend appropriate mitigation options. An HIA should be conducted by a qualified heritage consultant at the earliest stage possible, preferably during preliminary design or otherwise in the early stages of detail design, and should be conducted for the purposes of confirming the specific heritage significance of a heritage resource and associated heritage attributes, and to provide appropriate recommendations. The HIA should follow the municipal HIA Terms of Reference, and consultation with heritage staff at the City of Mississauga. The completed HIA should be presented to the Municipal Heritage Committee and City Staff for comment, and approval, and the recommendations of the HIA implemented. Potential mitigation options are documentation and relocation of the trees and brick pillars further back on to the property.

2. The Britannia Cemetery (CHL 6) in Mississauga and the Cheyne Cemetery (CHL 8) in Brampton are
A Cemetery Investigation to determine the limits of the Britannia Cemetery (CHL 6) was recommended for the Hurontario/Main Street LRT TPAP by Archeoworks (2010). Given the sensitive nature of this cultural heritage resource, the cemetery limits should be flagged based on the results of the Cemetery Investigation and steps taken to ensure that the site and surrounding fence are retained and protected during construction-related activities.

The Cheyne Cemetery (CHL 8) has previously been subject to a cemetery investigation (ASI 1991; 1992) which determined the western limits of the cemetery. Given the sensitive nature of this cultural heritage resource, the cemetery limits should be flagged based on the results of the Cemetery Investigation and steps taken to ensure that the site and surrounding fence are retained and protected during construction-related activities.

Based on a review of the DW3 drawings and the draft Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment for the Hurontario-Main Light Rail Transit (J.E. Coulter Associates Ltd 2013), the heritage resources identified as BHR 14, BHR 15, CHL 6 and CHL 12 may be affected by vibration impacts during the construction phase of the project. To mitigate these impacts, these cultural heritage resources should be monitored during heavy construction activity, whenever such activity occurs in the vicinity of the above identified resources. In addition, pre-construction building condition surveys of structures located in BHR 14, BHR 15, CHL 6 and along Main Street North in CHL 12 should be undertaken to determine if other measures in addition to monitoring is required to conserve these resources.

Indirect impacts to CHL 9 and CHL 12 are expected through disruption and alteration to the setting of these landscapes. As such, these resources should be subject to photographic documentation and compilation of a cultural heritage documentation report by a qualified heritage consultant in advance of construction. This requirement for CHL 9 and CHL 12 was recommended in the report prepared by UMA in 2010, and consequently, is part of the current ASI work plan.

Direct impacts to BHR 21, BHR 22 are expected as both bridges are to be altered through superstructure replacement. As such, a detailed Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) should be conducted for the bridges at the Etobicoke Creek Crossing (north and south crossings) (BHR 21 and BHR 22) to determine the potential heritage value of these resources and to recommend appropriate mitigation options. An HIA should be conducted by a qualified heritage consultant at the earliest stage possible, preferably during preliminary design or otherwise in the early stages of detail design, and should be conducted for the purposes of confirming the cultural heritage value of these resources and if they are eligible for designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, to identify associated heritage attributes, and to provide appropriate recommendations. The HIA should follow the municipal HIA Terms of Reference, and consultation with heritage staff at the City of Brampton. The completed HIA should be presented to the Municipal Heritage Committee and City Staff for comment, and approval, and the recommendations of the HIA implemented.

According to DW3 (received 23 October 2013), direct impacts to commercial buildings fronting on to Main Street North (CHL 12) are not expected to be directly impacted through removal at this time. However, should land takings be required in the future, particularly within the vicinity of the Queen Street northbound LRT stop and thus requiring the removal of any structures within the CHL 12 limits, a resource-specific Heritage Impact Assessment (as described in Recommendation #5) must be initiated as soon as possible. It should be noted that any changes to the current preliminary engineering drawings that result in removal/demolition of a building(s) in CHL 12 is not recommended from a cultural heritage point-of-view.

At present, the use of battery-operated vehicles instead of an Overhead Catenary System within the heritage area between Narwood Drive and the northern terminus of the study corridor has been proposed in the Main Street North corridor in downtown Brampton (CHL 9 and CHL 12). This is fully supported from a cultural heritage point-of-view given that it will decrease visual impacts to the
setting and character of the Main Street Corridor (CHL 9 and 12).

8. Where Metrolinx is responsible for property acquisitions, the *Standards and Guidelines for Provincial Heritage Property* (MTCS, 2010) applies. Should Metrolinx undertake property acquisitions of cultural heritage resources during future design phases, it is recommended that each resource be assessed for provincial heritage significance as per O. Reg. 10/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

9. Should future work require an expansion of the current study corridor and/or the development of other alternatives, a qualified heritage consultant should be contacted in order to confirm impacts of the undertakings on potential cultural heritage resources.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) was contracted by SNC-Lavalin Inc. to conduct a cultural heritage assessment as part of the Hurontario-Main Light Rail Transit (LRT) Preliminary Design and Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) study. The study corridor extends along Hurontario Street in the City of Mississauga from Park Street in Port Credit northerly to Steeles Avenue, and continues north along Main Street South/North to just south of Church Street West in the City of Brampton (Figure 1). In early 2014, Metrolinx joined the City of Brampton and the City of Mississauga as a co-proponent for the TPAP.

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

Figure 1: Location of the study corridor in the City of Mississauga and the City of Brampton.

Base map: Bing Maps©2012
2.0 BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT CONTEXT

2.1 Approach and Methodology

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

Road construction has the potential to affect cultural heritage resources in a variety of ways. Impacts can include: direct impacts that result in the loss of resources through demolition, or the displacement of resources through relocation; and indirect impacts that result in the disruption of resources by introducing physical, visual, audible or atmospheric elements that are not in keeping with the resources and/or their setting. Potential impacts on identified cultural heritage resources were identified based on the proximity of a resource to the proposed undertaking.

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

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

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

The Ministry of Culture, Tourism 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 (1980). Accordingly, both guidelines have been utilized in this assessment process.

The Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments (Ministry of Culture and Recreation 1980:1) states the following:

“When speaking of man-made heritage we are concerned with the works of man and the effects of his activities in the environment rather than with movable human artifacts or those environments that are natural and completely undisturbed by man.”
In addition, environment may be interpreted to include the combination and interrelationships of human artifacts with all other aspects of the physical environment, as well as with the social, economic and cultural conditions that influence the life of the people and communities in Ontario. The *Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments* distinguish between two basic ways of visually experiencing this heritage in the environment, namely as cultural landscapes and as cultural features.

Within this document, cultural landscapes are defined as the following (Ministry of Culture and Recreation 1980:2):

> 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 townscape 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 (Ministry of Culture and Recreation 1980:2):

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Part 4.5 of the PPS states that:

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

Municipal official plans shall provide clear, reasonable and attainable policies to protect provincial interests and direct development to suitable areas.

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

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

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

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

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

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

In addition, significance is also more generally defined. It is assigned a specific meaning according to the subject matter or policy context, such as wetlands or ecologically important areas. With regard to cultural heritage and archaeology resources, resources of significance are those that are valued for the important contribution they make to our understanding of the history of a place, an event, or a people (PPS 2005).

Criteria for determining significance for the resources are recommended by the Province, but municipal approaches that achieve or exceed the same objective may also be used. While some significant resources may already be identified and inventoried by official sources, the significance of others can only be determined after evaluation (PPS, 2005).

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

### 2.2 Data Collection

In the course of the cultural heritage assessment, all potentially affected cultural heritage resources 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, neighbourhood, or intersection.

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

Several investigative criteria are utilized during the field review to appropriately identify new cultural heritage resources. These investigative criteria are derived from provincial guidelines, definitions, and past experience. 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\(^1\), 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

\(^1\) Use of a 40 year old threshold is a guiding principle when conducting a preliminary identification of cultural heritage resources (Ministry of Transportation 2006; Ministry of Transportation 2007; Ontario Realty Corporation 2007). While identification of a resource that is 40 years old or older does not confer outright heritage significance, this threshold provides a means to collect information about resources that may retain heritage value. Similarly, if a resource is slightly younger than 40 years old, this does not preclude the resource from retaining heritage value.
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 Mississauga and the City of Brampton; the Province of Ontario; Canada; or the world heritage list
- It yields, or had the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of: the City of Mississauga and the City of Brampton; the Province of Ontario, Canada; or the world heritage list
- It demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to: the City of Mississauga and the City of Brampton; the Province of Ontario; Canada; or the world heritage list

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

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

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...
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 Hurontario-Main LRT project in the Municipalities of Mississauga and Brampton. A review of available primary and secondary source material was undertaken to produce a contextual overview of the study corridor, including a general description of Euro-Canadian settlement and land-use. Historically, the study corridor is located in the former Townships of Toronto and Chinguacousy in the County of Peel.

3.2 Township Survey and Settlement

3.2.1 Township of Toronto

The Township of Toronto was originally surveyed in 1806 by Mr. Wilmot, Deputy Surveyor. The first settler in this Township, and also the County of Peel, was Colonel Thomas Ingersoll. The whole population of the Township in 1808 consisted of seven families, scattered along Dundas Street. The number of inhabitants gradually increased until the War of 1812, which checked growth considerably. When the war was over, interest in settlement was revived, and the ‘rear’ or northern portion of the Township was surveyed and called the “New Survey”. The greater part of the New Survey was granted to a colony of Irish settlers from New York City who suffered persecution during the war.

Tributaries of the Credit River run through the western portion of the Township, and this proved to be a great source of wealth to its inhabitants. The river was not only a good watering stream, but there were endless mill privileges along the entire length of the river system.

Within the Township of Toronto, several villages of varying sizes had developed by the end of the nineteenth century, including Port Credit, Streetsville, Meadowvale, Churchville, and Malton. A number of crossroad communities also began to grow by the end of the nineteenth century. These included Clarkson, Cooksville, Dixie, Summerville, and Burnhamthorpe (Heritage Mississauga [...]).
3.2.2 City of Mississauga

In 1968, the Township of Toronto was incorporated as the Town of Mississauga. In 1974, Mississauga was incorporated as a City through the amalgamation of the Town of Mississauga and the villages of Port Credit and Streetsville, as well as portions of the Townships of Toronto Gore and Trafalgar. It has since grown to become the sixth largest city in Canada.

3.2.3 Township of Chinguacousy

The former Township of Chinguacousy is said to have been named by Sir Peregrine Maitland after the Mississauga word for the Credit River which signified “young pine.” Other scholars assert that it was named in honour of the Ottawa Chief Shinguacose, which was corrupted to the present spelling of ‘Chinguacousy,’ “under whose leadership Fort Michilimacinae was captured from the Americans in the War of 1812” (Mika 1977:416; Rayburn 1997: 68).

The Township was formally surveyed in 1818, and the first “legal” settlers took up their lands later in that same year. It was recorded that the first landowners in Chinguacousy were composed of settlers from New Brunswick, the United States and also some United Empire Loyalists and their children (Pope 1877:65; Mika 1977:417; Armstrong 1985:142).

Chinguacousy was initially united with the Gore of Toronto Township for political and administrative purposes. In 1821, the population of the united townships numbered just 412. By 1837, the population of the township had reached an estimated 1,921. The numbers grew from 3,721 in 1842 to 7,469 in 1851. Thereafter the figures declined to 6,897 in 1861 and to 6,129 by 1871 (Walton 1837:71; Pope 1877:59).

Chinguacousy was generally regarded as a prime agricultural Township with plenty of water-access. The west part of the Township was served by the Credit River, the centre by Etobicoke Creek, and the east by tributaries and branches of the Humber River and Mimico Creek.

Within the Township of Chinguacousy, several settlements of varying sizes had developed by the end of the nineteenth century. These included including Brampton, Claude, Edmonton, and Fraser’s Corners.

3.2.4 City of Brampton

The settlement of Brampton was established at the crossroads of Queen Street and Main Street in the 1820s. One of the first people to settle here was John Elliot and William Lawson, both dedicated members of the Primitive Methodist movement. In 1834, they named the settlement at Queen Street and Main Street in the Township of Chinguacousy after their English home, Brampton.

Brampton was incorporated as a village in 1853, and by this time had grown to a population of over 500 people. It was a flourishing community, with several churches, a grammar school, a distillery, stores, and industrial establishments, such as John Haggart’s agricultural implements factory. The arrival of the Grant Trunk Railway in 1856 encouraged further development and growth. The success of Brampton was marked by its selection as the County Seat in 1867, and the County Courthouse, Jail and other public buildings were built. In 1873, Brampton was incorporated as a town with John Haggart serving as mayor.

By 1910, the population of the Town of Brampton had reached 4,000. By this time, numerous industries had been established along the railway line, major banks and a Carnegie Library had been built, and the flower industry begun by Edward Dale in the 1860s continues to flourish with Brampton earning the title
of “Flowertown of Canada”.

Over the course of the two world wars and the Great Depression, the economy of Brampton faltered, factories closed, and the flower business declined. The post-war period saw the arrival of the automobile and the residential subdivision. Bramalea, a planned community to accommodate 50,000 people, was known as ‘Canada’s first satellite city’.

Brampton was incorporated as a City in 1974, the same year that the Region of Peel was created. Large subdivision continued to develop, and the population continued to rise to over 450,000 people (City of Brampton […]).

3.2.5 Historic Mapping

The Townships of Chinguacousy and Toronto are both divided by Hurontario Street, which runs north-south through their centres, with concessions numbering east and west from this central thoroughfare. As such, the study corridor extends along the entire road allowance between Concession I East and Concession I West in the Township of Toronto, and continues north into the Township of Chinguacousy, through Lots 1 to 6.

Nineteenth-century mapping reveals that the majority of the study corridor travelled through agricultural lands (Figures 2 & 3). Several key settlements developed within the study corridor at important historic crossroads, such as Cooksville at the intersection of Dundas Street and Hurontario Street, and where water privileges were plentiful, such as Port Credit at the mouth of the Credit River on Lake Ontario.

Many of these communities prospered with the coming of the railway in the second half of the nineteenth century. The historic railways in the general vicinity of the study corridor are shown on historic mapping (see Figures 2 & 3). The Great Western Railway (GWR) was completed through the south part of Toronto Township in 1854-55, just north of the lakeshore. This railway alignment is now owned by the Canadian National Railway (CNR). The Grand Trunk Railway (GTR) was also built in the mid-1850s and passed through the Town of Brampton. It later became part of the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR). The Credit Valley Railway (CVR), later owned by the CPR, was constructed between 1877 and 1879. The rail line linked Toronto to Orangeville by way of Streetsville. The line travelled west from the Township of Etobicoke to the Township of Toronto, passing south of the hamlet of Dixie, crossing Dundas Street east of Cooksville, then crossing Hurontario Street north of Cooksville, and thereafter turned north towards Streetsville. The CVR continued north through the Township of Chinguacousy, just west of Town of Brampton.

A review of topographic mapping from the early twentieth century (Figure 4) shows that the study corridor continued to have a predominantly rural, agricultural landscape. At the north and south ends of the study corridor, the settlements of Brampton and Port Credit continued to thrive. Smaller hamlets at important crossroads also remained intact along the length of Hurontario Street, with farmsteads, woodlots, and orchards located in between settlement centres. Over the course of the first half of the twentieth century, suburban development increased particularly along the lakeshore and in the area between Lake Ontario and Dundas Street in Toronto Township. This development increased with road improvements, such as the paving of Lakeshore Road in 1914 between Toronto and Hamilton, and later the completion of the King’s Highway (later the Queen Elizabeth Way) in 1937 through Toronto Township. Over the course of the second half of the twentieth century, suburban development began to spread along the length of the Hurontario corridor.
Figure 2: Approximate location of the study corridor overlaid on a map of the Township of Toronto, 1877.

Base Map: *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Peel, Ont.*

Archaeological Services Inc.
Figure 3: The approximate location of the study corridor overlaid on a map of Chinguacousy Township, 1877.

Base Map: Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Peel, Ont.
Figure 4: Approximate location of the study corridor, 1909

Base Map: Brampton Sheet - Topographic Map

Archaeological Services Inc.
3.3 Existing Conditions

In order to make a preliminary identification of existing built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes within the study area, a number of sources were consulted. These include the:

- Cultural Heritage Assessment Report – Hurontario/Main Street Study, Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (Unterman McPhail Associates (UMA) 2010);
- City of Mississauga’s Heritage Register;
- City of Mississauga’s Cultural Landscape Inventory (January 2005);
- City of Mississauga’s Cultural Resource Map (Heritage Layer);
- City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Designated under the Ontario Heritage Act: Designated Properties (updated September 2013);
- City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources: ‘Listed’ Heritage Properties (updated September 2013);
- Brampton Maps (Heritage Layer); and
- the Canadian Register of Historic Places.

In addition to available local history books and historic mapping, information relating to the historical, design/architectural and contextual value of each resource was gathered from the relevant municipality, where available. To date, information regarding the heritage resources identified in the City of Mississauga was obtained from property-specific files maintained at the Heritage Planning Services office in June 2012. Additional information regarding heritage properties/sites in the City of Brampton was found on the city’s online Heritage Newsletter, Heritage Designation By-laws, and Listing Candidate Summary Reports as provided by the City of Brampton.

A field review was undertaken by Lindsay Popert, ASI in June 2012 and July 2012 to document the existing conditions of the study area. The Hurontario-Main Street LRT alignment extends from the Port Credit GO Transit Train Station in Mississauga, northerly to the vicinity of the City of Brampton VIA/GO Transit Train Station site. While the Hurontario St.-Main St. thoroughfare through Mississauga and Brampton travels in a southeast – northwest direction, for ease of description, it is hereafter described as having a north – south alignment. Based on the results of the background research and field review, Table 1 lists the built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes that were identified in the study corridor while Section 6 provides feature mapping of these resources.

Field review confirmed that there are only a few remnants of agricultural landscapes left along the study corridor, considered to be the dominant land use along the corridor throughout the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentieth century. The crossroad communities that developed along the length of the corridor in the nineteenth century, including Britannia and Derry, have all but disappeared with a few remnant features left to communicate the history of these places. The following will provide a brief description of the existing conditions of the study corridor.

3.3.1 Description of Study Corridor Existing Conditions

The southern terminus of the study corridor begins at the Port Credit GO Transit Train Station located on the west side of Hurontario Street between the CNR alignment and Park Street West (Plate 1). North of the CNR alignment, and north of Port Credit, is the Mineola neighbourhood (Plates 2 - 3). Residences of various sizes and styles on large parcels began to appear along either side of Hurontario Street in the early part of the twentieth century, between the Middle Road (later the Queen Elizabeth Way) and Port Credit.
Today, this area features the same dwellings surrounded by mature vegetation, with some residential infill. Given the proximity of this area to Port Credit and its location on a major thoroughfare leading to the Queen Elizabeth Way, many of these dwellings have since been converted to commercial use.

Continuing past the Queen Elizabeth Way, the Hurontario Street study corridor expands from a four-lane thoroughfare to a six-lane thoroughfare. It remains at this capacity well into Brampton, near the northern terminus of the study corridor, at which point it narrows to two lanes of traffic.

North of the Queen Elizabeth Way, the study corridor features a combination of mid- to late twentieth-century high density residential developments, shopping plazas, office buildings, gas stations, public services such as fire stations, churches, hospitals, as well as a few public plazas or parks (Plates 4 – 6). This general trend in land use composition continues until Matheson Boulevard. From this point north, the study corridor features a combination of low density office, commercial and industrial related land use (Plate 7). There is also an increase in undeveloped land, some of which may still be in use as agricultural fields. Individual cultural heritage resources, or small clusters of heritage resources, are typically found at intersections where former crossroad communities had once thrived.

From north of Highway 407 until the second Etobicoke Creek crossing, north of Nanwood Drive, the study corridor is characterized by low-to-medium density residential suburban developments, a few shopping plazas and other commercial developments, as well as the Peel Region Court House complex, and a Peel Regional Police station (Plates 8). North of Steeles Avenue, Hurontario Street becomes Main Street South. North of Bartley Bull Parkway, the study corridor is bounded by the Etobicoke Creek and associated recreational pathway (Plate 9). Main Street spans Etobicoke Creek on two occasions: south of Peel Village Parkway; and north of Nanwood Drive. At Nanwood Drive, the width of the Main Street alignment also begins to narrow, at this point returning to a four-lane thoroughfare.

North of Etobicoke Creek, the study corridor is characterized by medium-to-large scale dwellings that are well setback on larger lots with mature vegetation and landscaping (Plate 10). Many of the dwellings were built in the second half of the nineteenth century, although there has been some infill with more recently constructed houses of similar scale and setback. The land use composition changes from residential to high density commercial at Wellington Street, with several notable public buildings including City Hall, the old Peel County Court House complex, as well as several churches, and a large public park (Plate 11). The commercial buildings with typical three-to-four storey scale and small setback from the road alignment, continues north along Main Street towards the CNR Overhead, as well as along Queen Street to the east and west of Main Street (Plate 12). The GO Transit train station is located at the northern terminus of the study corridor.
Plate 1: View of the CNR Overhead, looking south.

Plate 2: Looking north on Hurontario St. from north of Inglewood Drive.

Plate 3: Looking south on Hurontario St., south of the QEW.

Plate 4: Looking north on Hurontario St. from just north of the North Service Rd.

Plate 5: Looking north at intersection of Hurontario St. and Dundas St.

Plate 6: Looking south on Hurontario St. from Eglinton Ave.
Plate 7: Looking north on Hurontario St. towards Ambassador Dr.

Plate 8: Looking north on Hurontario St. towards Steeles Ave.

Plate 9: Looking north on Main St. S., with Etobicoke Creek on the left (west) side.

Plate 10: Looking north on Main St. S. from Harold St.

Plate 11: Looking north on Main St. S. from Wellington St.

Plate 12: Looking south on Main St. N. at Nelson St. W.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Inventory Description</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **BHR 1** | Location: Canadian National Railway at Hurontario Street, Mississauga  
Feature Type: Railway Bridge  
Recognition: Identified during field review & identified in the previous Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment Report (UMA 2010)  
**Historical:**  
- according to the date stamp located on both abutments, the bridge was built in 1963.  
- historic mapping indicates that prior to 1963, it was an at-grade crossing.  
- this railway alignment was established in the mid-nineteenth century.  
**Design:**  
- single-span, concrete rigid frame bridge.  
- features open-concept steel railings and curved soffit.  
**Context:**  
- frames the northern entrance into Port Credit.  
- associated with the Great Western Railway (now Canadian National Railway). | ![South elevation of the bridge (left) and detail of the date marker on the east abutment (right).](image1.jpg)   
Northeast elevation. |
| **BHR 2** | Location: 25 Pinetree Way, Mississauga (formerly 1608 Hurontario Street)  
Feature Type: Residence (now commercial)  
Recognition: Listed – currently being considered for Designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.  
**Historical:**  
- House was built by Mary Fix and Albert Alphonse Fix.  
- Mary Fix became Reeve of Toronto Township in 1955, and Peel County’s first female Warden in 1959.  
- She is noted for her role in encouraging development of the Dixie and Clarkson industrial areas in the 1950s, and for helping to establish a strong library system for the Township (now City of Mississauga) and was a founding member of the Mississauga Heritage Foundation.  
- She died in 1972, and bequeathed her home to the Town of Mississauga (now City of Mississauga).  
**Design:**  
- one-and-a-half storey vernacular residence of frame construction, following a H-plan footprint, clad in half-a-metre long wood shingles (considered an unusual construction practice), with gabled roof and internal brick chimney on the west side.  
- windows feature fifteen-over-fifteen pane arrangement.  
**Context:**  
- located southwest of intersection of Hurontario Street and the Queen Elizabeth Way.  
- context has been altered recently through the reorientation of Pinetree Way around the back of the house, effectively cutting the house off from the rest of its original parcel (which is now known as Mary Fix Park). | ![Northeast elevation (left) and view showing setback of the structure from the road, looking south (right).](image2.jpg)   
South elevation of the bridge (left) and detail of the date marker on the east abutment (right). |
| **BHR 3** | Location: 2350 Hurontario Street, Mississauga  
Feature Type: Church  
Recognition: Identified during field review & identified in the previous Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment Report (UMA 2010)  
**Historical:**  
- St. Catherine of Siena Roman Catholic Church, built between 1956 and 1961, to service the growing population along Hurontario Street and surrounding residential subdivisions.  
- a review of aerial mapping from the mid-twentieth century indicates that this property was previously an orchard.  
**Design:**  
- features a three-bay front façade, which faces east, with large round window flanked by tall, narrow windows.  
- long front-facing gabled roof.  
- exterior finished in stone-facing.  
**Context:**  
- located on the west side of Hurontario Street. | ![Northeast elevation.](image3.jpg)   
South elevation of the bridge (left) and detail of the date marker on the east abutment (right). |
### Table 1: Identified Built Heritage Resources (BHRs) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHLs) in the Study Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Inventory Description</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **BHR 4** | Location: 2364 Hurontario Street, Mississauga  
Feature Type: Residence (now commercial)  
Recognition: Identified during field review & identified in the previous Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment Report (UMA 2010)  
**Historical:**  
- built in the mid-twentieth century (was present on historic topographic mapping by 1954).  
**Design:**  
- one storey brick dwelling with low-pitched hipped roof and an attached garage.  
- features a central entrance flanked by two gabled bay windows.  
- two internally-bracketed chimneys with brick stacks.  
**Context:**  
- located on the west side of Hurontario Street.  
- located at south end of the former Cooksville settlement. | ![East elevation](East elevation) |
| **BHR 5** | Location: 4650 Hurontario Street, Mississauga  
Feature Type: Residence (now used as a restaurant)  
Recognition: Designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (By-law No. 261-85)  
**Historical:**  
- built in about 1850 by Amos and Charles Wilcox, farmers.  
**Design:**  
- the Designation By-law for this structure indicates that it is a fine example of a mid-nineteenth century stone farmhouse, combining Greek and Gothic Revival detailing.  
- of particular note are the dentil course and cornice returns, lancet dormer window, decorative front door, and fieldstone construction made to imitate ashlar.  
**Context:**  
- prominently located at southwest corner of Hurontario Street and Eglinton Avenue West.  
- the house has been incorporated into a modern commercial development, and is currently occupied by a restaurant/pub. | ![Northeast elevation](Northeast elevation) |
| **BHR 6** | Location: 6650 Hurontario Street, Mississauga  
Feature Type: Residence (now commercial)  
Recognition: Designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (By-law No. 504-77)  
**Historical:**  
- land was originally granted by the Crown in 1814.  
- a review of historic mapping shows the house was present in 1877 and at that time, it was owned/occupied by William Oliver.  
- during the second part of the twentieth century, it was owned by the German Canadian Club, and is known as the 'Hansa House'.  
**Design:**  
- a one-and-a-half storey house with gabled roof, rubble foundation, T-shaped plan, and two internal brick chimneys at the gable ends of the main block.  
- decorative elements include the brackets under the eaves on all sides, the return eaves at the gable ends, the cornice which is moulded trim as well as patterned woodwork, and mouldings around the windows and main entrance.  
**Context:**  
- located on the west side of Hurontario Street, and is surrounded by expansive green lawns.  
- a large parking lot and an associated banquet hall/facility is located behind the former residence. | ![Front (east) elevation](Front (east) elevation) |
### Table 1: Identified Built Heritage Resources (BHRs) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHLs) in the Study Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Inventory Description</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BHR 7 | Location: Corner of Elgin Drive and Main Street South, Brampton  
Feature Type: Gate  
Recognition: Listed on the municipal heritage register (Class A)  
Historical:  
- the entrance gates are associated with the 1960s residential subdivision development of Armbro Heights that was built by the Armstrong Brothers (Armbro is an abbreviation for Armstrong Brothers)  
Design:  
- each gate features matching stone materials, tall square pillars with concrete cap, and attached wall which curves or sweeps away from the road.  
- The interior face of each wall (facing the road) contains the name “Armbro Heights” in block letters with a gold background that was originally illuminated.  
- an example of the Modernist movement.  
Context:  
- the structures are an important landmark & gateway feature given their design, material, associated landscaping, and their positions flanking Elgin Drive at the east approach to the Etobicoke Creek bridge crossing.  
(Source: ‘Listing Candidate Summary Report’, City of Brampton, September 2007) | ![South gate, looking west (left) and view of both gates flanking the road, looking west (right).](Bing Maps © 2012 Microsoft) |
| BHR 8 | Location: 0 Main Street South (access off 34 Richmond Drive), Brampton  
Feature Type: Residence  
Recognition: Listed on the municipal heritage register (Class B)  
Historical:  
- a single structure appears on or in close proximity to this property on historic topographic mapping as early as 1909.  
- by the 1930s, there were several structures shown in the vicinity of the original structure and at that time, access to the property was from Kennedy Road to the east, although it is located so closely to Hurontario Street.  
Design:  
- excellent example of an early twentieth century period revival house.  
- Elements inspired by the English Tudor Revival include: half timbering; tall and prominent chimney stacks; steeply pitched gable roof profiles; random coursed stone walls; stone labels over windows; and leaded glass casement and fixed windows.  
Context:  
- the property is located on elevated land to the east of Hurontario Street.  
- contributes to the character and identity of the Main Street South gateway into downtown Brampton.  
- a long, curving laneway linking the house to Main Street South remains extant and was likely an original access.  
(Source: ‘Listing Candidate Summary Report’, City of Brampton, February 2008) | ![View of the property from Main St. S., looking northeast (left) and an aerial view (right).](Bing Maps © 2012 Microsoft) |
| BHR 9 | Location: 200 Main Street South, Brampton  
Feature Type: Residence  
Recognition: Listed on the municipal heritage register (Class - TBD)  
Historical:  
- built circa 1950s.  
- known property owners include: George Johnston (original owner, no dates); Wilbert and Lena West (1965 – 1968); and Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (1968 – present).  
Design:  
- highly representative of the modernist International Style and ‘50s Contempo’ design, as exhibited through: emphasis on horizontal lines; prominent rectangular chimney with side facing out from the front façade; open carport; large floor-to-ceiling glass plate windows; rows of small squared clerestory windows; split-level massing; and large overhanging eaves.  
Context:  
- the property is located on elevated land to the east of Hurontario Street.  
- contributes to the character and identity of the Main Street South gateway into downtown Brampton.  
- it is well concealed from the road and surrounding properties through vegetative screening.  
(Source: ‘Listing Candidate Summary Report’, City of Brampton, April 2009) | ![View of the property from Main St. S. (left) and an aerial view (right).](Bing Maps © 2012 Microsoft) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Inventory Description</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **BHR 10** Location: Archdekin Park, west of Main Street South  
Feature Type: Bridge  
Recognition: Listed on the municipal heritage register (Class - TBD)  
**Historical:**  
- built in circa 1915 over the Etobicoke Creek.  
- bridge was likely built by B. H. Bull who formally owned this property.  
- the park occupies lands that were originally part of the B. H. Bull Jersey Cattle farm, noted as being the largest Jersey cattle farming operation in Canada at one time.  
**Design:**  
- single-span concrete bridge.  
- concrete balustrades and piers.  
- rehabilitated in 2008 by the City of Brampton.  
**Context:**  
- a landmark in a picturesque park setting. | Views of the bridge, looking southwest (left) and east (right). |
| **BHR 11** Location: 8 Wellington Street, Brampton  
Feature Type: Apartment Building  
Recognition: Designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (By-law No. 237-2007)  
**Historical:**  
- the Park Royal apartment building was built in the 1930s.  
- built for Dr. Robert James Hiscox, owner and publisher of the Peel Gazette.  
**Design:**  
- a ‘one-of-a-kind’ example of an Art Deco/Moderne styled apartment building in Brampton.  
- designed by Robert W. Hall, respected architect in the region.  
- built by noted contractor Harry Hergaarden, regarded as one of the most important twentieth-century building contractors in Brampton.  
**Context:**  
- given its rare architectural style, the building serves as a landmark in the community. | Front façade, looking northwest. |
| **BHR 12** Location: 2 Wellington Street (Ken Whillans Square), Brampton  
Feature Type: Cenotaph/Memorial  
Recognition: Listed on the municipal heritage register (Class A)  
**Historical:**  
- first unveiled in 1928 by Lord Willingdon, Governor General of Canada from 1926 to 1931.  
- the memorial honours those who served and died in the First and Second World Wars and the Korean War.  
**Design:**  
- concrete construction.  
- rehabilitated in 2011.  
**Context:**  
- located in an open plaza in front of Brampton City Hall.  
- an important symbol to the community. | View of the Cenotaph, looking northwest. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Inventory Description</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BHR 13</strong>&lt;br&gt;Location: 48 Main Street South, Brampton&lt;br&gt;Feature Type: Church&lt;br&gt;Recognition: Listed on the municipal heritage register (Class A)**</td>
<td><strong>Historical:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- the First Baptist Church was built in 1875-76.&lt;br&gt;- Reverend E. J. Stobo was the first to serve as minister.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Design:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- red brick constructing featuring buff brick decorative treatment, corbelling at the roofline, round arched window openings, and a tall square tower.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Context:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- while set back from Main Street South, the church still figures prominently in the Brampton historic core given its location on a corner lot and architectural detailing.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Front façade, looking east (left) and setback from the road, looking south (right)." /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BHR 14</strong>&lt;br&gt;Location: 44 Main Street South, Brampton&lt;br&gt;Feature Type: Residence&lt;br&gt;Recognition: Designated under Part IV of the <em>Ontario Heritage Act</em> (By-law No. 109-95)**</td>
<td><strong>Historical:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- the Boyle House was built in the nineteenth century and retains association with Robert Boyle, church minister at St. Paul’s from 1855-1860 and 1867-1869.&lt;br&gt;- the Boyle family is noted for their role in the early economic development of Brampton during the nineteenth century through their operation of a bookstore and a pharmacy.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Design:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- rare example of a dwelling influenced by the French Second Empire architectural style.&lt;br&gt;- features a bell-cast mansard roof, front verandah with tall central staircase, eaves with paired brackets, and three dormers on the front façade with Renaissance Revival style pediments.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Context:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- a prominent structure given its architectural detailing, location in the historic core of Brampton, and also its location between two important churches.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="View of structure, looking northeast (left) and looking southeast (right)." /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BHR 15</strong>&lt;br&gt;Location: 30 Main Street South, Brampton&lt;br&gt;Feature Type: Church&lt;br&gt;Recognition: Designated under Part IV of the <em>Ontario Heritage Act</em> (By-law No. 132-85)**</td>
<td><strong>Historical:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- St. Paul’s United Church was built in the 1880s by local builder Jesse Perry, to the designs of Mallory and Sons.&lt;br&gt;- associated with the Brampton congregation of the Primitive Methodist Church, which was established in 1834 by William Lawson and John Elliot.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Design:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- constructed of stone masonry and slate roofing.&lt;br&gt;- follows a cruciform floor plan and features rusticated exterior stone walls, white stone facings, corbelling on the roofline, and slate roof shingles in a scalloped pattern.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Context:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- a prominent structure given its size, quality of materials and craftsmanship, architectural detailing, and location in the historic core of Brampton.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Front façade, looking east (left) and proximity of the structure to the road, looking north (right)." /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Inventory Description</td>
<td>Photograph(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 16</td>
<td>Location: Main Street North, just north of Theatre Lane, Brampton</td>
<td>View of the bridge from the north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature Type: Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition: Identified during field review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- according to the date stamp located on both abutments, the bridge was built in 1964.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- railway alignment was first established in the mid-nineteenth century.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- single-span bridge constructed using steel and concrete.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- frames the northern entrance into the historic commercial core of Brampton.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- associated with the Grand Trunk Railway (now Canadian National Railway).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 17</td>
<td>Location: 140 Main Street North, Brampton</td>
<td>View from the northwest (left) and north elevation (right).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature Type: Residence (now commercial)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition: Listed on the municipal heritage register (Class - TBD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the Lundy House was built in circa 1852, making it one of the earliest homes to be built in Brampton.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- associated with two prominent Brampton citizens: Dr. John Mullin in the late nineteenth century, and Elin E. Copeland in the early twentieth century.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- three-storey brick, Georgian-inspired house with gabled roof, returned eaves, and symmetrical front façade and central entrance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- fenestration was altered recently from original design.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- prominently located on a corner lot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1: Identified Built Heritage Resources (BHRs) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHLs) in the Study Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Inventory Description</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **BHR 18** | **Location:** 19, 27, 31 Church Street West, Brampton  
**Feature Type:** Railway Station  
**Recognition:** Designated under the *Heritage Railway Stations Protection Act* in 1993 |
| **Historical:** |
| - the former Canadian National Railway station was built in 1907 and is now used as a VIA Rail/Go Transit Station.  
- the station reflects the prosperity and wealth of the Grand Trunk Railway, as well as the City of Brampton, at the turn of the century. |
| **Design:** |
| - one-and-a-half storey brick railway station resting on rock-faced granite foundations.  
- architectural design/detailing combines the Romanesque Revival style with the Arts and Crafts Movement, featuring: wide-arched openings; complex roof line; wide, overhanging eaves with decorative brackets; contrasting materials; variety of window openings/shapes; the large, central square entrance tower with corbelled arcading; textural masonry; and round towers with conical roofs. |
| **Context:** |
| - landmark building in Brampton’s historic downtown area. |
| *Note:* The Georgetown Corridor Planning Study (McCormick Rankin Corporation 2002:28) indicated that a proposed platform and third mainline will encroach into the building. A preliminary review of the site concluded that it would be feasible to relocate the building back from the rail corridor in order to avoid the proposed undertaking and related construction activities. Any changes to the building will be subject to review by the Historic Sites and Monuments Board and will require approval of the National Transportation Agency. |
| **BHR 19** | **Location:** 34 Church Street West, Brampton  
**Feature Type:** Residence (now commercial)  
**Recognition:** Designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (By-law No. 30-84) |
| **Historical:** |
| - this structure was built in 1853 to the designs of internationally known architect William Hay.  
- it was built for prominent Brampton businessman and politician George Wright.  
- subsequent owners and prominent Brampton figures include: John Thistle; George Williams; J. W. Hewetson; and the Honourable William Grenville Davis. |
| **Design:** |
| - considered to be a rare example of High Gothic Revival architecture in Brampton.  
- suffered from a fire, which resulted in the removal of the rear wing.  
- original brick exterior has been covered with siding. |
| **Context:** |
| - helped shape and define the character of the surrounding neighbourhood. |

North elevation (left) and view of south elevation, looking west (right).  
Southeast elevation, view from Church St. (left) and view along Church St., looking west (right).
### Table 1: Identified Built Heritage Resources (BHRs) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHLs) in the Study Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Inventory Description</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BHR 20</strong></td>
<td>Location: 122 – 130 Main Street North, Brampton&lt;br&gt;Feature Type: Commercial&lt;br&gt;Recognition: Listed on the municipal heritage register (Class - B)&lt;br&gt;HISTORICAL:&lt;br&gt; - formerly the Farr Garage Building, likely built in the mid-twentieth century.&lt;br&gt; - front building has now been converted into stores.&lt;br&gt;DESIGN:&lt;br&gt; - main structure features a rectangular footprint with a ‘concave’ front façade, and a rear building extension also with a rectangular footprint.&lt;br&gt; - building is a concrete structure with flat roof, simple roofline, and the front façade features rectangular storefront windows alternating with semi-circular window/door openings.&lt;br&gt;CONTEXT:&lt;br&gt; - forms part of the commercial streetscape of Brampton’s historic commercial core, which continues on the north side of the railway tracks.</td>
<td>![Aerial view of south and east elevations](Bing Maps © 2012 Microsoft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BHR 21</strong></td>
<td>Location: Etobicoke Creek Crossing (north) at Main Street&lt;br&gt;Feature Type: Bridge&lt;br&gt;Recognition: Identified during field review&lt;br&gt;HISTORICAL:&lt;br&gt; - associated with the Main Street alignment, a historical thoroughfare into downtown Brampton.&lt;br&gt; - associated with former bridges built to span this crossing point.&lt;br&gt;DESIGN:&lt;br&gt; - three-span concrete I-girder bridge that was built in 1964.&lt;br&gt; - the bridge underwent rehabilitation work in 2001 and 2012.&lt;br&gt;CONTEXT:&lt;br&gt; - forms part of a series of bridges built to span Etobicoke Creek.</td>
<td>![Oblique view of the east elevation of the Main Street Bridge over Etobicoke Creek (north)](Source: Bing Maps 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BHR 22</strong></td>
<td>Location: Etobicoke Creek Crossing (south) at Main Street&lt;br&gt;Feature Type: Bridge&lt;br&gt;Recognition: Identified during field review&lt;br&gt;HISTORICAL:&lt;br&gt; - associated with the Main Street alignment, a historical thoroughfare into downtown Brampton.&lt;br&gt; - associated with former bridges built to span this crossing point.&lt;br&gt;DESIGN:&lt;br&gt; - built in 1967, rehabilitated in 1977 and 2002.&lt;br&gt;CONTEXT:&lt;br&gt; - forms part of a series of bridges built to span Etobicoke Creek.</td>
<td>![Aerial view of the Main Street Bridge over Etobicoke Creek (north)](Source: Bing Maps 2013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1: Identified Built Heritage Resources (BHRs) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHLs) in the Study Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Inventory Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BHR 23   | **Location:** Canadian Pacific Rail Crossing, Cooksville  
**Feature Type:** Bridge  
**Recognition:** Identified during field review  
**Historical:** associated with the Hurontario Street alignment, a historical thoroughfare through Cooksville  
**Design:** originally built in 1925, widened in 1964, and rehabilitated in 1997  
**Context:** forms part of a series of bridges built to span Etobicoke Creek. |
|          | ![South elevation of the bridge.](image1)                                              |
| BHR 24   | **Location:** Queen Elizabeth Way (QEW) Crossing  
**Feature Type:** Bridge  
**Recognition:** Identified during field review  
**Historical:** Canada’s first cloverleaf interchange in 1937. The interchange was reconstructed in 1962.  
**Associated with:** the QEW and Hurontario Street.  
**Design:** built in 1961, rehabilitated in 2007  
**Context:** forms part of a series of bridges built to span the Hurontario Street corridor. |
|          | ![North elevation of the bridge.](image2)                                              |
### Table 1: Identified Built Heritage Resources (BHRs) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHLs) in the Study Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Inventory Description</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHL 1</td>
<td>Location: Mineola Neighbourhood, Mississauga (includes the west side of Hurontario Street, from the CN Railway to just south of the QEW) Feature Type: Residential Neighbourhood Recognition: Listed on the Mississauga Cultural Heritage Landscape Inventory (L-RES-6)</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="View of the west side of Hurontario St, looking north from Mineola Rd (left) and looking south along part of the Hurontario Streetscape, from south of Indian Valley Trail (right)." /> <img src="image2" alt="Photos showing range in housing styles and scale along west side of Hurontario St." /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historical:</td>
<td>(a historic road along the banks of the Credit River) and Hurontario Street, followed by Mineola Road and Indian Valley Trail in the 1930s – 1940s, with considerable development occurring in the 1950s. illustrates an important phase in Port Credit's social and physical development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design:</td>
<td>the residential properties located in the Mineola residential neighbourhood are noted for their aesthetic/visual qualities and consistent scale. the area features larger property parcels, a variety of housing styles, meandering network of roads, and most importantly, the roads and houses were built on the original topography (rather than on re-graded land). roads lack curbs and sidewalks, creating a soft transition from road to front yards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context:</td>
<td>the landscape is noted in particular for its scenic/visual qualities and blend of natural environment with manicured landscapes. mature vegetation. located north of the historic core of Port Credit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Identified Built Heritage Resources (BHRs) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHLs) in the Study Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Inventory Description</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CHL 2  | Location: East side of Hurontario Street, between Mineola Road and the QEW, Mississauga
Feature Type: Streetscape
Recognition: Identified during field review & identified in the previous Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment Report (UMA 2010)
Includes one property that is Listed on the municipal heritage register: 1395 Hurontario Street, built circa.1935.
Historical:
- a review of early-twentieth-century mapping reveals that there were four residences along this part of Hurontario Street by 1909/1915, and the number of residences doubled by 1922. Mapping also shows that there was a mixture of brick and frame residences.
- illustrates an important phase in Port Credit’s social and physical development.
Design:
- residences of various massing, scale and architectural styles situated on large lots that front on to Hurontario Street.
Context:
- original topography and mature vegetation has been maintained, with properties often combining the preserved natural environment with manicured/landscaped surroundings.
- most residences are well set back from the road right-of-way, and a large number have been converted into commercial or office use.
- mature vegetation.
- located north of the historic core of Port Credit. |
|         | Southwest elevation of listed property at 1395 Hurontario St (left) and looking north along streetscape (right). |
|         | Views showing typical examples of a small setback (left) and large setback (right) from the road. |
| CHL 3  | Location: West side of Hurontario Street, Mississauga (2134, 2130, 2124, and 2114 Hurontario Street)
Feature Type: Streetscape *This CHL has been altered through removal of the three dwellings in 2012.
Recognition: Identified during field review & identified in the previous Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment Report (UMA 2010)
Historical:
- early- to mid-twentieth-century residences built along the west side of Hurontario Street, between the historic settlement centres of Port Credit and Cooksville.
Design:
- generally one, to one-and-a-half story scale, simple rectangular footprint, frame construction, siding exterior, internal chimneys, and gable roof.
- 2124 Hurontario Street likely dates to the early part of the twentieth century given its Craftsman bungalow design.
Context:
- part of the streetscape is slated for redevelopment.
- 2124 Hurontario Street is in close proximity to the current road right-of-way, while the other residences are further set back. |
|         | View of 2130 and 2134 Hurontario St. in July 2012 (left) and view of now vacant property in Sept 2013 (right) |
### Table 1: Identified Built Heritage Resources (BHRs) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHLs) in the Study Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Inventory Description</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHL 4</strong></td>
<td>Location: Mississauga City Hall complex including the Central Library and Living Arts Centre</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="South elevation of City Hall (left) and view of the Public Library, looking south along Living Arts Dr (right)." /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature Type: Institutional</td>
<td>Recognition: Listed on the Mississauga Cultural Heritage Landscape Inventory (L-INS-1 &amp; F-INS-1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical:</td>
<td>Mississauga City Hall represents an important phase of development in the history of Mississauga and is a testament to the success of the long-serving Mayor Hazel McCallion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- completed in 1987.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design:</td>
<td>City Hall is part of a larger ‘civic campus’ which includes the main Public Library, and the Performing Arts Centre (L-INS-1).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the City Hall Clock Tower (F-INS-1) is a prominent feature in the city core and serves as a civic landmark, being visible from various directions and from considerable distances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- following an international design competition, the design for City Hall by UK architect Ed Jones, and Michael Kirkland and Project Planning of Toronto, was chosen as the preferred design.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- City Hall is considered to be an internationally-recognized example of Post-Modern architecture.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context:</td>
<td>located next to the Square One shopping centre, roughly in the geographical centre of the City of Mississauga.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **CHL 5** | Location: 5576, 5520, 5490 Hurontario Street | ![Views from Hurontario St. towards the Britannia Schoolhouse (left) and the William Chisholm House and frame barn (right).](image) |
| Feature Type: Remnant Agricultural Landscape | Recognition: Listed on the Mississauga Cultural Heritage Landscape Inventory (L-AG-3) | |
| Historical: | the property features four historical buildings: the one-room Britannia Schoolhouse built in 1864, which operated until 1959; a David Chisholm House built between 1825 and 1832; a frame barn; and the Britannia Farmhouse, a Victorian style residence built c.1850, on land that was entrusted to the Peel Board of Education since 1833. | |
| Design: | the Britannia Schoolhouse is a typical example of a mid-nineteenth century educational building, built in the Gothic Revival style. | |
| - the William Chisholm House is an example of the Georgian Revival style and was moved to this site in 1990 from its original location one mile north on Hurontario Street. | | |
| - the Britannia Farmhouse is a Victorian style cottage with gable roof, front gable dormer and decorative bargeboard; it was restored in 1990. | | |
| Context: | located as being one of the last intact agricultural landscapes in Mississauga. | |
| - large property, with built features and landscape features set well back from the road, with the exception of the schoolhouse. | | |

| **CHL 6** | Location: 5961 Hurontario Street | ![Northwest elevation (left) and view showing small setback from Hurontario St., looking north (right).](image) |
| Feature Type: Church & Cemetery | Recognition: Designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (By-law No. 1004-81) | |
| Historical: | the Britannia Church and Cemetery were established in circa 1843. | |
| Design: | the church was extensively renovated in 1864, and has not been significantly altered since then. | |
| - follows the High Victorian Gothic architectural style as expressed through the use of dichromatic brickwork, non-structural buttresses, stone trim, distinct chancel, and lancet windows. | | |
| - intact interior features, according to the designation by-law, include the gallery, ceiling medallion and windows. | | |
| Context: | the church, headstones, and associated iron fence/gates are in close proximity to the current road right-of-way. | |
| - an isolated landmark, the church and cemetery are all that remains of the former hamlet of Britannia (originally “Gardner’s”), which developed in the nineteenth century at the corner of Hurontario Street and Britannia Road West. | | |
Table 1: Identified Built Heritage Resources (BHRs) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHLs) in the Study Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Inventory Description</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHL 7</strong>&lt;br&gt;Location: North side of Derry Road West, west of Hurontario Street, Mississauga&lt;br&gt;Feature Type: Cemetery&lt;br&gt;Recognition: Designated under Part IV of the <em>Ontario Heritage Act</em> (By-law No. 089-2007)&lt;br&gt;<strong>Historical:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- According to a plaque located at the cemetery grounds, the Derry West Anglican Cemetery and former Anglican church were established at this site in about 1827 on land granted to Joseph Carter in 1822.&lt;br&gt;- the first church (c.1827 – 1843) was a small log church.&lt;br&gt;- the second church (1843 - 1867) was a mud brick church, it was destroyed by fire in 1867 and never replaced.&lt;br&gt;- the cemetery closed in 1936, and for many years was left unmanaged.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Design:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- situated on a roughly rectangular parcel of land, the headstones are generally set back from the road and are orientated in a north-south direction.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Context:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- the cemetery is an isolated landmark, and all that remains of the former hamlet of Derry West which developed in the nineteenth century around the intersection of Hurontario Street and Derry Road West.</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Looking north from Derry Rd. W. (left) and looking across the cemetery towards the Derry Rd W/Hurontario St. intersection (right)." />.&lt;br&gt;View of the cemetery, looking northeast (left) and proximity to the road (right).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHL 8</strong>&lt;br&gt;Location: East side of Hurontario Street, south of County Court Boulevard, Brampton&lt;br&gt;Feature Type: Cemetery&lt;br&gt;Recognition: Listed on the municipal heritage register (Class A) (Pending Heritage Designation)&lt;br&gt;<strong>Historical:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- the Cheyne Pioneer Cemetery was established in the mid-nineteenth century and was associated with the former Cheyne Wesleyan Methodist Church, known as the Cheyne Chapel.&lt;br&gt;- established by the Cheyne and Graham families, who were part of a group of Irish families who left the United States of America following the War of 1812.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Design:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- bounded by a decorative metal fence.&lt;br&gt;- remaining grave markers are generally facing towards Hurontario Street.&lt;br&gt;<strong>Context:</strong>&lt;br&gt;- bounded by Hurontario Street to the west, and modern commercial/residential developments to the north, east and south.&lt;br&gt;- the current grade of Hurontario Street is much higher than the cemetery/original topography.&lt;br&gt;- features a large tree and historical plaque at the centre.</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="View of the cemetery, looking northeast (left) and proximity to the road (right)." />.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Identified Built Heritage Resources (BHRs) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHLs) in the Study Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Inventory Description</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHL 9</td>
<td>Location: Main Street South, from Gage Park south to the Etobicoke Creek, Brampton</td>
<td>Proximity of road to sidewalk, light standards, and trees on the west side of Main St. S. at the south end (left) and north end (right).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feature Type: Streetscape</td>
<td>Typical example of a retaining wall along the corridor (left) and remains of the former Etobicoke Creek wall (right).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition: The Main Street South corridor is currently in the process of being designated as a ‘Heritage Conservation District’ under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act. Many adjacent properties are currently either listed on the Register or designated under the Ontario Heritage Act.</td>
<td>Examples of houses along corridor that are either well set back from the road (left) or in closer proximity to the road (right).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act: - 133, 77 and 67 Main Street South.</td>
<td>Limits of the proposed HCD boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listed Properties: - 144, 127, 119, 118, 114, 108, 93, 86, 84, 83, 79, 76, 75, 73, 63, 59, 58, 56, and 52 Main Street South.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The neighbourhood is currently in the process of Heritage Conservation District (HCD) designation under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act. The proposed boundary of the district includes all properties that currently and historically front onto Main Street South, between Wellington Street and the intersection of the Etobicoke Creek and Main Street. City staff is currently working with a consulting group to finalize the HCD Plan and Guidelines.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Historical: - well established neighbourhood dating to the mid-nineteenth century. - many prominent members of the Brampton community, notable for their contributions to the early development and prosperity of Brampton, built the houses and/or occupied the properties along this corridor. - most properties remain in residential use, although at least one property has been converted to commercial (Funeral Home at 52 Main St. S.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design: - features a mixture of mid- to late- nineteenth-century residences, early twentieth-century residences, and some more recent infill from the 1960s/70s and recent decades. - the residences are situated on a flat landscape, on parcels of various sizes and shapes, and have a varied setback. Properties are generally landscaped, with a combination of formal landscaping and maintenance of natural/mature vegetation. This creates a visually interesting and aesthetically pleasing streetscape that is dominated by mature trees with large canopies that extend over the sidewalk and road in some areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Context: - serves as a gateway to the Brampton historic core. - features sidewalks of standard size that are either immediately adjacent to the road, or separated by a small grass median/partition. - mature trees were inventoried along the property limits, adjacent to the sidewalks, on both sides of the road. - remnants of the Etobicoke Creek, which was buried in the 1960s, are visible towards the north end of the corridor on the east side (58 Main Street South) and include a small dip in the landscape and the tops of concrete walls which formerly marked the western limits of the creek. - modern additions to the streetscape, such as the retaining walls along portions of the corridor (particularly on the west side, towards the north end), and the street lighting, have been designed in a sympathetic manner.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Inventory Description</td>
<td>Photograph(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CHL 10  | **Location:** West side of Main Street South, south of Wellington Street, Brampton  
**Feature Type:** Park  
**Recognition:** Listed on the municipal heritage register (Class A)  
**Historical:**  
- In 1903, Gage Park became Brampton’s first municipal park.  
- The land was formerly part of the “Alderlea” Mansion front lawn/gardens owned by Kenneth Chisholm, and part of the Elliot Estate which stood to the south of the park, and which was granted by Sir William J. Gage, owner of Gage Publishing.  
**Design:**  
- The park features a meandering pathway, gazebo, mature trees, gardens, wading pool, children’s play area, and skating trail.  
**Context:**  
- Serves as an important transition space, given that the properties to the north of the park are largely commercial and/or denser residential, while the properties to the south are predominantly large residences on large land parcels. | ![View of park from the southeast corner (left) and view of the park along west side of Main St. S., looking north (right).](image) |
| CHL 11  | **Location:** South side of Wellington Street East, east of Main Street South, Brampton  
**Feature Type:** Institutional  
**Recognition:** Designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (By-law No. 38-87); Ontario Heritage Trust Conservation Easement (on the former Peel County Court House)  
**Historical/Design:**  
- 1 – 3 Wellington Street East: Peel County Court House, built 1867 to the designs of Toronto Architect, William Kauffmann. The buff brick courthouse combines elements of the Classical, Italianate, Picturesque, and Gothic architectural styles. It continued to be used as office space once the new County Courthouse was built in 1967, south of Steeles Avenue.  
- 5 Wellington Street East: The former Peel County Registry Building. Built in 1958-1959, it exhibits International Style architecture. The building reflects the work of the prominent Toronto architectural firm of Rounthwaite and Fairfield. It was constructed as the fourth Peel County Registry Building, replacing the 1890 masonry Registry Office located between the County Courthouse and Jail. In 2012, the interior of the building was retrofitted as an art gallery.  
- 7 Wellington Street East: Peel County Land Registry Office, built in 1890 to the designs of J. Tully. The buff brick structure with limestone foundations was influenced by the Late Victorian architectural style. It replaced an earlier land registry office that had been located on Queen Street. It became the Peel County Art Gallery/Museum in 1968.  
- 9 Wellington Street East: Old Brampton Jail, built in 1867 to the designs of William Kauffmann in the Georgian architectural style. The jail was closed in 1977, and it became the home of the Peel Museum and Archives in 1986.  
**Context:**  
- These are prominent structures along the Main St. S. and Wellington St. E. streetscapes, and are important historical landmarks that are closely tied to early development and progress of Brampton. | ![West elevation of the Court House (left) and north elevations of the Jail and Land Registry Office (right).](image) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Inventory Description</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHL 12</td>
<td>Location: Queen Street (Mill Street North to Chapel Street) and Main Street (from just south of the GO/VIA line to John Street), Brampton</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Looking west along Queen St. E. towards Main St. (left) and looking east from Main St. (right)." /> <img src="image2" alt="Looking north along Main St. N. (left) and north along Main St. N towards the railway overhead (right)." /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature Type: Streetscape</td>
<td>Recognition: Identified during field review &amp; identified in the previous Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment Report (UMA 2020)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical:</td>
<td>- the Brampton commercial core developed along Main Street and Queen Street in the nineteenth century. - many businesses are associated with prominent Brampton citizens and tied directly to the early prosperity and economic development of Brampton.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design:</td>
<td>- buildings along both sides of the street tend to be of similar setback and scale, generally two to three floors in height, with various exterior materials, roof types, window treatments, shop windows, signage, and entryways. - some buildings have been rehabilitated with modern materials. - modern commercial infill is of the same scale and setback. - some buildings do stand out along the streetscape, notably the Dominion Building at 8 Queen Street East.</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Looking north along Main St. S, from Wellington St. (left) and from John St. (right)." /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context:</td>
<td>- the streetscape features sympathetic street lighting, trees, wide sidewalks, some street furniture. - large open pedestrian square at the northeast corner of Queen Street and Main Street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act:</td>
<td>- 15, 19 &amp; 25 Main Street North. - 8 Queen Street East.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed Properties:</td>
<td>- 8, 15, 17, 19, 23, 16, 18, 20, 24 Main Street South. - 31, 33, 41, 42, 45, 46, 48, 52, 70, 72, 73, 74, 75, 82 Main Street North. o includes the Heritage Theatre Block: Capitol Theatre Block (82 Main St N) and Robinson Block (70-74 Main St N) - 12 &amp; 14, 16, 23 - 27, 29 – 39, 41 and 51 Queen Street East. - 8 – 28, 69, 75, 79, 81, 85 – 87, 89, 93 and 102 Queen Street West. - 4 Elizabeth Street (at Queen Street West). - 63-71 Main Street North (Haggert Block)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Impact Assessment

3.4.1 Introduction

This section provides an assessment of potential adverse effects associated with the proposed undertaking on identified cultural heritage resources. The proposed undertaking has the potential to affect cultural heritage resources in a variety of ways: resources may experience displacement (i.e., removal), if they are located within the project footprint; they may also be indirectly impacted through disruption by the introduction of physical, visual, audible, or atmospheric elements that are not in keeping with their character and/or setting. As such, appropriate mitigation measures for the undertaking need to be considered. Where any identified, above ground, cultural heritage resources may be affected by direct or indirect impacts, appropriate mitigation measures should be developed. This may include completing a heritage impact assessment or documentation report, or employing suitable measures such as landscaping, buffering, or other forms of mitigation, where appropriate. In this regard, provincial guidelines should be consulted for advice and further heritage assessment work should be undertaken as necessary.

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

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

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.
The preliminary engineering drawings provided in Design Workbook 3 (DW3) [Received 23 October 2013] for the undertaking is illustrated on the cultural heritage resource location mapping (Section 6.0). The cultural heritage resources identified within and adjacent to the study corridor were evaluated against the above criteria and Table 2 provides a summary of impact assessment results.

### 3.4.2 Analysis of Impacts of Design Workbook 3 on Cultural Heritage Resources

The proposed conceptual alignment for the undertaking has been developed to utilize the existing road right-of-way where possible. As a result, removal of built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes and/or demolition of heritage structures due to property acquisitions and/or significant widening of the existing right-of-way have been minimized. Further, encroachments on to identified cultural heritage resources have also been minimized. The results of the impact assessment and recommendations to mitigate identified impacts are contained in Table 2.

While encroachments and physical alterations to cultural heritage resources have been minimized, it will significantly alter the visual experience and composition of cultural heritage landscape areas in the City of Mississauga and the City of Brampton through the introduction of light rail infrastructure, including overhead wires (with the exception of the heritage area in downtown Brampton, north of Nanwood Drive) and station platforms.

Additionally, numerous cultural heritage resources are set in very close proximity to the road right-of-way and date to the nineteenth century. As a result, there is the potential for construction and operational related activities to impact structural features through vibration impacts if appropriate setbacks are not developed in combination with building stabilization measures where appropriate and where warranted. The report *Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment for the Hurontario-Main Light Rail Transit* prepared by J. E. Coulter Associates Ltd. (October 2013) was reviewed to determine which identified heritage properties are at greater risk to vibration impacts. For standard construction along the corridor, heritage properties closer than 100m to the LRT alignment will be assessed and where construction vibration could be high, further analysis and monitoring of the heritage sites will be recommended.

Recommendations to avoid or mitigate these impacts are presented in Table 2 and Section 5.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Hurontario-Main LRT - Impacts to Identified Cultural Heritage Resources and Associated Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feature</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 1: Railway Bridge CNR at Hurontario St., Miss. (Field Review/UMA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 2: Residence 25 Pinetree Way, Miss. (Listed; Intention to Designate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 3: Church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Hurontario-Main LRT - Impacts to Identified Cultural Heritage Resources and Associated Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Impact(s)</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2350 Hurontario St., Miss. (Field Review/UMA)</td>
<td>The LRT line is located in the middle of Hurontario Street. Based on available information, the subject resource is not expected to be negatively impacted by the proposed undertaking.</td>
<td>No further work is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 4: Former Residence 2364 Hurontario St., Miss. (Field Review/UMA)</td>
<td>In this portion of the study corridor, the LRT line is located in the middle of Hurontario Street. Based on available information, the subject resource is not expected to be negatively impacted by the proposed undertaking.</td>
<td>No further work is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 5: Former Residence 4650 Hurontario St., Miss. (Designated)</td>
<td>In this portion of the study corridor, the LRT line is located in the middle of Hurontario Street. Based on available information, the subject resource is not expected to be negatively impacted by the proposed undertaking.</td>
<td>No further work is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 6: Former Residence 6650 Hurontario St. Miss. (Designated)</td>
<td>In this portion of the study corridor, the LRT line is located in the middle of Hurontario Street. Based on available information, the subject resource is not expected to be negatively impacted by the proposed undertaking.</td>
<td>No further work is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 7: Gates Elgin Dr. and Main St. S., Brampton (Listed)</td>
<td>In this portion of the study corridor, the LRT line is located in the middle of Hurontario Street. Based on available information, the subject resource is not expected to be negatively impacted by the proposed undertaking.</td>
<td>No further work is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 8: Residence 0 Main St. S., Brampton (Listed)</td>
<td>In this portion of the study corridor, the LRT line is located in the middle of Hurontario Street. Based on available information, the subject resource is not expected to be negatively impacted by the proposed undertaking.</td>
<td>No further work is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 9: Residence 200 Main St. S., Brampton (Listed)</td>
<td>In this portion of the study corridor, the LRT line is located in the middle of Hurontario Street. Based on available information, the subject resource is not expected to be negatively impacted by the proposed undertaking.</td>
<td>No further work is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 10: Bridge</td>
<td>In this portion of the study corridor, the LRT line is located in the middle of Hurontario Street. Based on available information, the subject resource is not expected to be negatively impacted by the proposed undertaking.</td>
<td>No further work is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 2: Hurontario-Main LRT - Impacts to Identified Cultural Heritage Resources and Associated Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Impact(s)</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archdekin Park, Brampton (Listed)</td>
<td>Line is located in the middle of Hurontario Street. Based on available information, the subject resource is not expected to be negatively impacted by the proposed undertaking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 11: Apartment Building 8 Wellington St., Brampton (Designated)</td>
<td>This resource is well outside of the study corridor, and as such, will not be impacted by the proposed undertaking.</td>
<td>No further work is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 12: Cenotaph/Memorial 2 Wellington St., Brampton (Listed)</td>
<td>In this portion of the study corridor, the LRT line is located in the middle of Main Street. Based on available information, the subject resource is not expected to be negatively impacted by the proposed undertaking.</td>
<td>No further work is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 13: Church 48 Main St. S., Brampton (Listed)</td>
<td>The LRT line becomes two separate tracks through this area, with northbound tracks on the east side of the road, and southbound tracks on the west side of the road. A stop is located on the west side of Main Street, across from the subject resource. Given the setback of the church from the road, there are no expected impacts resulting from potential vibration and construction activities.</td>
<td>No further work is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 14: Residence 44 Main St. S., Brampton (Designated)</td>
<td>The LRT line becomes two separate tracks through this area, with northbound tracks on the east side of the road, and southbound tracks on the west side of the road. A stop is located on the west side of Main Street, across from the subject resource. Given the proximity of the tracks and LRT stop to the subject resource, there is increased potential for premature structural deterioration through adverse vibration effects and or other construction-related operations.</td>
<td>(i) Potential vibration impacts during the construction phase of this project requiring pre-construction building condition surveys and monitoring activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 15: Church 30 Main St. S., Brampton (Designated)</td>
<td>The LRT line becomes two separate tracks through this area, with northbound tracks on the east side of the road, and southbound tracks on the west side of the road. A stop is located on the west side of Main Street, across from the subject resource. Given the proximity of the tracks and LRT stop to the subject resource, there is increased potential for premature structural deterioration through adverse vibration effects and or other construction-related operations.</td>
<td>(i) Potential vibration impacts during the construction phase of this project requiring pre-construction building condition surveys and monitoring activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Hurontario-Main LRT - Impacts to Identified Cultural Heritage Resources and Associated Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Impact(s)</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHR 16: Bridge Main St. N &amp; CNR, Brampton (Identified during field Review)</td>
<td>Based on available information, the subject resource is not expected to be negatively impacted by the proposed undertaking.</td>
<td>No further work is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 17: Residence 140 Main St. N., Brampton (Listed)</td>
<td>This resource is well outside of the study corridor, and as such, will not be impacted by the proposed undertaking.</td>
<td>No further work is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 18: Railway Station 27 Church St. W., Brampton (Designated)</td>
<td>Based on available information, the subject resource is not expected to be negatively impacted by the proposed undertaking.</td>
<td>No further work is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 19: Residence 34 Church St. W., Brampton (Designated)</td>
<td>This resource is well outside of the study corridor, and as such, will not be impacted by the proposed undertaking.</td>
<td>No further work is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 20: Commercial 122-130 Main St. N., Brampton (Listed)</td>
<td>Based on available information, the subject resource is not expected to be negatively impacted by the proposed undertaking.</td>
<td>No further work is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 21: Bridge Etobicoke Creek Crossing (north) (Identified during field Review)</td>
<td>This resource is expected to be altered through superstructure replacement.</td>
<td>A heritage impact assessment should be undertaken to determine the potential heritage value of this resource and to recommend appropriate mitigation options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 22: Bridge Etobicoke Creek Crossing (south) (Identified during field Review)</td>
<td>This resource is expected to be altered through superstructure replacement</td>
<td>A heritage impact assessment should be undertaken to determine the potential heritage value of this resource and to recommend appropriate mitigation options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 23: Bridge Canadian Pacific Rail Crossing (Identified during field Review)</td>
<td>Based on available information, the subject resource is not expected to be negatively impacted by the proposed undertaking.</td>
<td>No further work is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 24: Bridge Queen Elizabeth Way Crossing (Identified during field Review)</td>
<td>Based on available information, the subject resource is not expected to be negatively impacted by the proposed undertaking.</td>
<td>No further work is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 1: Residential Neighbourhood,</td>
<td>As a result of the Mineola Road LRT Stop, minimal encroachment will take place along</td>
<td>Given that this is part of the Mineola Neighbourhood and thus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that this is part of the Mineola Neighbourhood and thus...
Table 2: Hurontario-Main LRT - Impacts to Identified Cultural Heritage Resources and Associated Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Impact(s)</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mississauga (Listed)</td>
<td>the frontage of the two properties just south of Mineola Road West, on the west side of Hurontario Street. The property line will be set back between one and three metres to accommodate the projected sidewalk. A few young trees and two brick pillars with concrete caps, located to either side of the north driveway into 1312 Hurontario Street, will be directly impacted by the projected sidewalk.</td>
<td>listed on the Mississauga Cultural Heritage Landscape Inventory, a detailed heritage impact assessment should be conducted to determine the potential heritage value of these resources and to recommend appropriate mitigation options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 2: Streetscape, Mississauga (Field Review/UMA)</td>
<td>As a result of the Mineola Road LRT Stop, minimal encroachment will take place along the frontage of the four properties just north of Mineola Road East, on the east side of Hurontario Street. The property line will be set back between one and four metres to accommodate the projected sidewalk. Given that the heritage attributes identified during field review will not be impacted as a result of this alteration, there are no further concerns.</td>
<td>No further work is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 3: Streetscape, Mississauga (Field Review/UMA)</td>
<td>In this portion of the study corridor, the LRT line is located in the middle of Hurontario Street. Based on available information, the subject resource is not expected to be negatively impacted by the proposed undertaking.</td>
<td>No further work is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 4: Institutional Mississauga (Listed)</td>
<td>Based on available information, the subject resource is not expected to be negatively impacted by the proposed undertaking.</td>
<td>No further work is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 5: Remnant Agricultural Landscape, Mississauga (Listed)</td>
<td>In this portion of the study corridor, the LRT line is located in the middle of Hurontario Street. Based on available information, the subject resource is not expected to be negatively impacted by the proposed undertaking.</td>
<td>No further work is required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CHL 6: Church and Cemetery Mississauga (Designated) | While the LRT tracks are located in the middle of Hurontario Street, given its age and the proximity of the church to the road there is increased potential for premature structural deterioration through adverse vibration effects and or other construction-related operations. | (i) Potential vibration impacts during the construction phase of this project requiring pre-construction building condition surveys and monitoring activities.  
(ii) Further, given the sensitive nature of this heritage resource, the cemetery limits should be flagged and steps taken to ensure that the site
### Table 2: Hurontario-Main LRT - Impacts to Identified Cultural Heritage Resources and Associated Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Impact(s)</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHL 7: Cemetery Mississauga (Designated)</td>
<td>This resource is outside of the study corridor, and as such, will not be impacted by the proposed undertaking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CHL 8: Cemetery Brampton (Listed) | In this portion of the study corridor, the LRT line is located in the middle of Hurontario Street. Based on available information, the subject resource is not expected to be negatively impacted by the proposed undertaking.  
It should be noted that the Cheyne Cemetery has been subject to a cemetery investigation (ASI 1991; 1992) which determine the western limits of the cemetery. |
| CHL 9: Streetscape Brampton (Listed) | This streetscape is characterized by a dense concentration of nineteenth and early twentieth-century residential heritage resources to either side of the road, mature tree canopy, and other character-defining attributes.  
(i) While the LRT line is restricted to the centre of the roadway, the tracks, LRT stop and related construction activities will result in significant disruption and alteration to the setting of this resource.  
(ii) Minimal encroachment will take place at the east side of the southern end of the Main Street South corridor, at 144 Main Street South. A portion of the property line will be set back approximately one metre to accommodate the projected sidewalk. However, the encroachment will not result in the removal of identified heritage attributes (mature vegetation, built landscape features) and therefore this encroachment is of no further concern. |
| CHL 10: Park Brampton (Listed) | In this portion of the study corridor, the LRT line is located in the middle of Main Street. Based on available information, the subject |

and surrounding fence are retained and protected during construction-related activities.  
No further work is required.  
(i) Given the sensitive nature of this heritage resource, the cemetery limits should be flagged and steps taken to ensure that the site and surrounding fence are retained and protected during construction-related activities.  
(i) Prior to alteration of the streetscape, the subject resource should be subject to photographic documentation and compilation of a cultural heritage resource documentation report.  
No further work is required.
Table 2: Hurontario-Main LRT - Impacts to Identified Cultural Heritage Resources and Associated Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Impact(s)</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>resource is not expected to be negatively impacted by the proposed undertaking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 11: Institutional Brampton (Designated)</td>
<td>In this portion of the study corridor, the LRT line is located in the middle of Main Street. Based on available information, the subject resource is not expected to be negatively impacted by the proposed undertaking.</td>
<td>No further work is required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 12: Streetscape Brampton (Field Review/UMA)</td>
<td>This streetscape is characterized by a dense concentration of nineteenth and early twentieth-century commercial heritage resources that front on to Main Street North and South. The LRT line becomes two separate tracks through this area, with northbound tracks on the east side of the road, and southbound tracks on the west side of the road. An LRT stop is located on the west side of Main Street just north of Wellington Street and on the east side of Main Street, north of Queen Street. The tracks and related construction activities will result in significant impacts, including disruption and alteration to the setting in this area. Specifically, construction of an LRT stop on the east side of Main Street North to the north of Queen Street will significantly alter the streetscape on the east side of Main Street North between Queen Street and Market Square Boulevard. Given the proximity of the tracks and LRT stop to buildings on either side of the road, there is increased potential for premature structural deterioration through adverse vibration effects and or other construction-related operations.</td>
<td>(i) Potential vibration impacts during the construction phase of this project requiring pre-construction building condition surveys and monitoring activities. (ii) Prior to alteration of the streetscape, through encroachment and the introduction of the LRT line, the subject resource should be subject to photographic documentation and compilation of a cultural heritage resource documentation report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.0 CONCLUSIONS

The results of background historic research and a review of secondary source material, including historic mapping, revealed a study area with a rural land use history dating back to the early nineteenth century. Over the course of the twentieth century, the Hurontario-Main LRT study corridor has steadily urbanized with primarily a combination of residential, commercial and recreational land uses. A total of 24 built
heritage resources and 12 cultural heritage landscapes were identified within the study area. The following provides a summary of field review and data collection findings:

- A total of eight cultural heritage resources identified in the study area were previously identified by the City of Mississauga:
  - one is being considered for heritage designation (BHR 2);
  - six are designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (BHR 5; BHR 6; CHL 6; and CHL 7); and
  - three are listed on Mississauga’s *Cultural Heritage Landscape Inventory* (CHL 1; CHL 4; CHL 5).

- A total of twenty cultural heritage resources identified in the study area were previously identified by the City of Brampton:
  - twelve are listed on the municipal heritage register (BHR 7 – BHR 10; BHR 12; BHR 13; BHR 17; BHR 20; CHL 8; CHL 9 [in addition to the corridor itself, nineteen properties are individually listed within the CHL limits]; CHL 10; and CHL 12 [forty-two properties are individually listed within the CHL limits]);
  - one is proposed to be designated under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* as a Heritage Conservation District (CHL 9);
  - seven are designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (BHR 11; BHR 14; BHR 15; BHR 19; CHL 9 [three individual properties located within the CHL]; CHL 11; and CHL 12 [five individual properties located within the CHL]); and
  - one is designated under the *Heritage Railway Stations Protect Act* (BHR 18).

- Ten additional resources were identified during field review and from previous reports (BHR 1; BHR 3; BHR 4; BHR 16; BHR 21 – 24; and CHL 2 – CHL 3).

- Of the total twenty-four identified built heritage resources:
  - nine are (or were originally) residences (BHR 2; BHR 4; BHR 5; BHR 6; BHR 8; BHR 9; BHR 14; BHR 17; and BHR 19);
  - one is commercial (BHR 20);
  - seven are bridges (BHR 1; BHR 6, BHR 10, BHR 21 – BHR 24);
  - one is a railway station (BHR 18);
  - one is an apartment buildings (BHR 11);
  - one is a cenotaph/memorial (BHR 12);
  - three are churches (BHR 3; BHR 13; BHR 15); and
  - one is a gate (BHR 7).

- Of the total twelve identified cultural heritage landscapes:
  - two are institutional buildings/sites (CHL 4; CHL 11);
  - three are church and/or cemetery properties (CHL 6; CHL 7; CHL 8);
  - five are streetscapes (CHL 1; CHL 2; CHL 3; CHL 9; CHL 12);
  - one is a park (CHL 10); and
  - one is a remnant agricultural landscape (CHL 5).

- There are no built heritage resources or cultural heritage landscapes located within or adjacent to the proposed MSF Site #14.
An impact assessment was conducted within the context of preliminary engineering drawings DW3 (October 23 2013) for the proposed alignment. The following is a summary of impacts to identified cultural heritage resources in the Hurontario-Main LRT study corridor based on a review of DW3 drawings:

- The following 20 built heritage resources and 6 cultural heritage landscapes are not expected to be impacted by the proposed undertaking:
  - BHR 1 – BHR 13; BHR 16 – BHR 20; and BHR 23 – BHR 24.
  - CHL 3 – CHL 5; CHL 7 – CHL 8; and CHL 11.

- The following resource will experience minimal encroachment resulting in removal of identified heritage attributes as a result of the proposed alignment:
  - CHL 1.

- Based on a review of DW3 drawings and the draft Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment for the Hurontario-Main Light Rail Transit (J.E. Coulter Associates Ltd 2013), the following resources have the increased potential for premature deterioration through adverse vibration effects and other construction-related operations:
  - BHR 14, BHR 15, CHL 6 and CHL 12.

- The following resources will be significantly disrupted and their settings altered as a result of the proposed LRT tracks and related construction activities:
  - CHL 9 and CHL 12.

- The following resources will be directly impacted through alteration or removal as a result of the proposed LRT tracks and related construction activities:
  - BHR 21 and BHR 22.

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

To date, the following work plan components have been completed:

- Review of the previously completed Cultural Heritage Assessment Report – Hurontario/Main Street Study, Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (UMA 2010) to identify and address any gaps in data collection;
- Updating of cultural heritage resource inventory data compiled as part of the 2010 study;
- Analysis of the preferred route for the Hurontario-Main LRT study corridor including review of the overall alignment, potential property acquisitions, and proposed stop/platforms location; and
Assessment of potential impacts of the proposed conceptual alignment on identified cultural heritage resources and development of conservation and/or mitigation measures where appropriate.

Based on the results of these work plan tasks, the following recommendations have been developed to inform development of detailed functional planning and route analysis of the proposed conceptual alignment for the Hurontario-Main LRT study corridor:

1. According to the DW3 drawings, the proposed LRT alignment has been designed to stay within the existing road right-of-way where possible. However, minimal encroachment will impact CHL 1 and identified heritage attributes.

   (i) **CHL 1**: As a result of the Mineola Road LRT Stop, encroachment will take place along the frontage of the two properties just south of Mineola Road West, on the west side of Hurontario Street. The property limits will be set back between one to three metres to accommodate the projected sidewalk. A few young trees and two brick pillars with concrete caps, located to either side of the north driveway into 1312 Hurontario Street, will be directly impacted by the projected sidewalk. Given that this is part of the Mineola Neighbourhood and thus listed on the Mississauga Cultural Heritage Landscape Inventory, a detailed heritage impact assessment should be conducted to determine the potential heritage value of these resources and to recommend appropriate mitigation options. An HIA should be conducted by a qualified heritage consultant at the earliest stage possible, preferably during preliminary design or otherwise in the early stages of detail design, and should be conducted for the purposes of confirming the specific heritage significance of a heritage resource and associated heritage attributes, and to provide appropriate recommendations. The HIA should follow the municipal HIA Terms of Reference, and consultation with heritage staff at the City of Mississauga. The completed HIA should be presented to the Municipal Heritage Committee and City Staff for comment, and approval, and the recommendations of the HIA implemented. Potential mitigation options are documentation and relocation of the trees and brick pillars further back on to the property.

2. The Britannia Cemetery (**CHL 6**) in Mississauga and the Cheyne Cemetery (**CHL 8**) in Brampton are located on the east side of Hurontario Street.

   (i) A Cemetery Investigation to determine the limits of the Britannia Cemetery (**CHL 6**) was recommended for the Hurontario/Main Street LRT TPAP by Archeoworks (2010). Given the sensitive nature of this cultural heritage resource, the cemetery limits should be flagged based on the results of the Cemetery Investigation and steps taken to ensure that the site and surrounding fence are retained and protected during construction-related activities.

   (ii) The Cheyne Cemetery (**CHL 8**) has previously been subject to a cemetery investigation (ASI 1991; 1992) which determined the western limits of the cemetery. Given the sensitive nature of this cultural heritage resource, the cemetery limits should be flagged based on the results of the Cemetery Investigation and steps taken to ensure that the site and surrounding fence are retained and protected during construction-related activities.

3. Based on a review of the DW3 drawings and the draft Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment for the Hurontario-Main Light Rail Transit (J.E. Coulter Associates Ltd 2013), the heritage resources identified as **BHR 14, BHR 15, CHL 6 and CHL 12** may be affected by vibration...
impacts during the construction phase of the project. To mitigate these impacts, these cultural heritage resources should be monitored during heavy construction activity, whenever such activity occurs in the vicinity of the above identified resources. In addition, pre-construction building condition surveys of structures located in BHR 14, BHR 15, CHL 6 and along Main Street North in CHL 12 should be undertaken to determine if other measures in addition to monitoring is required to conserve these resources.

4. Indirect impacts to CHL 9 and CHL 12 are expected through disruption and alteration to the setting of these landscapes. As such, these resources should be subject to photographic documentation and compilation of a cultural heritage documentation report by a qualified heritage consultant in advance of construction. This requirement for CHL 9 and CHL 12 was recommended in the report prepared by UMA in 2010, and consequently, is part of the current ASI work plan.

5. Direct impacts to BHR 21, BHR 22 are expected as both bridges are to be altered through superstructure replacement. As such, a detailed Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) should be conducted for the bridges at the Etobicoke Creek Crossing (north and south crossings) (BHR 21 and BHR 22) to determine the potential heritage value of these resources and to recommend appropriate mitigation options. An HIA should be conducted by a qualified heritage consultant at the earliest stage possible, preferably during preliminary design or otherwise in the early stages of detail design, and should be conducted for the purposes of confirming the cultural heritage value of these resources and if they are eligible for designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, to identify associated heritage attributes, and to provide appropriate recommendations. The HIA should follow the municipal HIA Terms of Reference, and consultation with heritage staff at the City of Brampton. The completed HIA should be presented to the Municipal Heritage Committee and City Staff for comment, approval, and the recommendations of the HIA implemented.

6. According to DW3 (received 23 October 2013), direct impacts to commercial buildings fronting on to Main Street North (CHL 12) are not expected to be directly impacted through removal at this time. However, should land takings be required in the future, particularly within the vicinity of the Queen Street northbound LRT stop and thus requiring the removal of any structures within the CHL 12 limits, a resource-specific Heritage Impact Assessment (as described in Recommendation #5) must be initiated as soon as possible. It should be noted that any changes to the current preliminary engineering drawings that result in removal/demolition of a building(s) in CHL 12 is not recommended from a cultural heritage point-of-view.

7. At present, the use of battery-operated vehicles instead of an Overhead Catenary System within the heritage area between Narwood Drive and the northern terminus of the study corridor has been proposed in the Main Street North corridor in downtown Brampton (CHL 9 and CHL 12). This is fully supported from a cultural heritage point-of-view given that it will decrease visual impacts to the setting and character of the Main Street Corridor (CHL 9 and 12).

8. Where Metrolinx is responsible for property acquisitions, the Standards and Guidelines for Provincial Heritage Property (MTCS 2010) apply. Should Metrolinx undertake property acquisitions of cultural heritage resources during future design phases, it is recommended that each resource be assessed for provincial heritage significance as per O. Reg. 10/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act.
9. Should future work require an expansion of the current study corridor and/or the development of other alternatives, a qualified heritage consultant should be contacted in order to confirm impacts of the undertakings on potential cultural heritage resources.
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