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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Archaeological Services Inc (ASI) was contracted by Delcan Corporation, Niagara, on behalf of the City of Hamilton to conduct a cultural heritage assessment as part of the Parkside Drive Road Improvements Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA). The goal of the project is to address long term transportation requirements, protect for the future requirements, and to provide the facilities in a phased manner consistent with the Hamilton Transportation Master Plan. The study corridor is approximately 4 km long and extends along Parkside Drive from Highway 6 to east of Churchill Avenue (Figure 1).

Parkside Drive road widening may have a variety of impacts upon built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes. Impacts may 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. Three options have been provided for this undertaking; in general, whilst similar, there are distinct elements to each of the plans. Based on the results of background data collection, a field review, and impact assessment of three project alternatives, the following recommendations have been developed:

1. At time of writing there were three alternatives under consideration for the proposed road widenings. These ranged from a right-of-way of 20 metres, one of 23 metres and the largest at 27 metres. Each of these options is broadly similar although, as noted elsewhere, the orientation north and/or south of the extant right-of-way, varies between options.

2. In all instances where cultural heritage resources have been identified road improvement activities should be planned to avoid impacts to those resources. Where any identified, above ground, cultural heritage resources are to be affected by direct or indirect impacts, further research should be undertaken to identify the specific heritage significance of the affected cultural heritage resource and/or appropriate mitigation measures should be adopted once the final work plan has been chosen from these three alternatives. 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.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

Archaeological Services Inc (ASI) was contracted by Delcan Corporation, Niagara, on behalf of the City of Hamilton to conduct a cultural heritage assessment as part of the Parkside Drive Road Improvements Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA). The goal of the project is to address long term transportation requirements, protect for the future requirements, and to provide the facilities in a phased manner consistent with the Hamilton Transportation Master Plan. The study corridor is approximately 4 km long and extends along Parkside Drive from Highway 6 to east¹ of Churchill Avenue (Figure 1).

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

Figure 1: Location of the study corridor, City of Hamilton.

Base Map: NTS Sheet 30 M/05 (Hamilton-Burlington)

¹ Parkside Drive runs on an alignment (roughly) southwest to northeast. For clarity the road will be assumed to run east-west with the area on each side referred to as north and south respectively.
2.0 BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT CONTEXT

2.1 Approach and Methodology

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

For the purposes of this assessment, the term cultural heritage resources was used to describe both cultural landscapes and built heritage features. A cultural landscape is perceived as a collection of individual built heritage features and other related features that together form farm complexes, 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 is charged under Section 2 of the Ontario Heritage Act with the responsibility to determine policies, priorities and programs for the conservation, protection and preservation of the heritage of Ontario and has published two guidelines to assist in assessing cultural heritage resources as part of an environmental assessment: Guideline for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments (1992), and Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments (1981). Accordingly, both guidelines have been utilized in this assessment process.

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

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

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

Within this document, cultural landscapes are defined as the following (Section 1.0):
The use and physical appearance of the land as we see it now is a result of man’s activities over time in modifying pristine landscapes for his own purposes. A cultural landscape is perceived as a collection of individual man-made features into a whole. Urban cultural landscapes are sometimes given special names such as 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 landuses as agriculture, mining, forestry, recreation, and transportation. Like urban cultural landscapes, they too may be perceived at various scales: as a large area of homogeneous character; or as an intermediate sized area of homogeneous character or a collection of settings such as a group of farms; or as a discrete example of specific landscape character such as a single farm, or an individual village or hamlet.

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

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

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

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

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

A provincial heritage property is defined as the following (14):
Provincial heritage property means real property, including buildings and structures on the property, that has cultural heritage value or interest and that is owned by the Crown in right of Ontario or by a prescribed public body; or that is occupied by a ministry or a prescribed public body if the terms of the occupancy agreement are such that the ministry or public body is entitled to make the alterations to the property that may be required under these heritage standards and guidelines.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Part 4.5 of the PPS states that:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 2.2 Data Collection

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

Background historic research, which includes consultation of primary and secondary source research and historic mapping, is undertaken to identify early settlement patterns and broad agents or themes of change in a study corridor. This stage in the data collection process enables the researcher to determine the presence of sensitive heritage areas that correspond to nineteenth and twentieth century settlement and development patterns. To augment data collected during this stage of the research process, federal, provincial, and municipal databases and/or agencies are consulted to obtain information about specific properties that have been previously identified and/or designated as retaining cultural heritage value. Typically, resources identified during these stages of the research process are reflective of particular architectural styles, associated with an important person, place, or event, and contribute to the contextual facets of a particular place, neighbourhood, or intersection.

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

Several investigative criteria are utilized during the field review to appropriately identify new cultural heritage resources. These investigative criteria are derived from provincial guidelines, definitions, and past experience. A built structure or landscape is identified as a cultural heritage resource that should be considered during the course of the environmental assessment. A resource will be considered if it is 40 years or older\(^2\), and if the resource satisfies at least one of the 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

**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 Hamilton; 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 Hamilton; 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 Hamilton, 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

\(^2\) 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.
• 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 period.

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

Cemeteries: land used for the burial of human remains.

Results of data collection are contained in Section 3.0; while Sections 4.0 and 5.0 contain conclusions and recommend mitigation measures with respect to the undertaking.
3.0 BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT

3.1 Introduction

This section provides a brief summary of historic research and a description of identified above ground cultural heritage resources that may be affected by the proposed work within Parkside Drive corridor. 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 Flamborough, County of Wentworth. This area is now part of the City of Hamilton, Ontario.

3.2 Township Survey and Settlement

Although the study corridor falls within the present-day limits of the City of Hamilton—located near the boundary between Hamilton and Burlington—historically it was associated with the former Townships of East and West Flamborough. Thus, the early settlement and development of these townships is important in understanding the area’s cultural heritage resources.

The land within Flamborough Township was acquired by the British from the Mississauga in 1784. The first township survey was undertaken in 1793, and the first legal settlers occupied their land holdings in Flamborough West the same year and in Flamborough East in 1800. Flamborough East was originally known as Geneva Township, due to its location on Burlington Bay which was then called Lake Geneva. These townships were later renamed after a town and a geographical place called Flamborough Head in Yorkshire, England. Flamborough was initially settled by disbanded soldiers, mainly Butler’s Rangers, and other Loyalists following the end of the American Revolutionary War. East Flamborough was to have been reserved for the use of French nobility and royalists who fled from France during the “Reign of Terror” but this plan was never carried into effect. The original township was divided into East and West halves by provincial legislation in 1798. By the 1840s, both townships were noted for their excellent land and good farms (Boulton 1805:79; Smith 1846:59; Armstrong 1985:143; Green 1997:1-3; Rayburn 1997:120).

Nineteenth-century maps were also consulted to determine potential historic-period land use within the study corridor. Highway 5, which was originally known as Governor’s Road and later Dundas Road, was intended to aid settlement in Upper Canada and serve as a military road. Highway 6, formerly Townline Road, divides the former Townships of East and West Flamborough and was largely built to service the needs of the local agricultural economy.

The study corridor passes just north of the former Village of Waterdown. Waterdown is located along Highway 5, on the edge of the Niagara Escarpment. Grindstone Creek served as a major resource for the community and served to attract the first settlers to the area. Alexander McDonnell was given a grant for land in the Waterdown area in 1796 and was the first to own land at the site (Mika and Mika 1983:600). The land was granted to Alexander Brown in 1805 after McDonnell failed to develop his holdings. Brown is credited with building the first mill at the Great Falls and his son later constructed Brown’s Wharf (Mika and Mika 1983:600).

By 1841 numerous houses and inns had been built in the Village of Waterdown and most of the lots were taken. Some of the first settlers include C. Cummings and A Griffin, millers; H. Dunham, blacksmith; J. Graham, tanner; E.C. Griffin, merchant; and Mr. Reid, a baker (Mika and Mika 1983:600). Waterdown
became the centre of East Flamborough Township and a township hall was constructed in 1857. Waterdown was incorporated as a village in 1878 and was dissolved and amalgamated with the Township of East Flamborough in 1974 to form the Township of Flamborough.

3.2.2 Nineteenth-Century Historic Map Review

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 improvements along the Parkside Drive corridor. 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 along the road allowance between Concession 3 Lots 5-13 and Concession 4, Lots 5-123 in the former County of Wentworth. The 1859 and 1875 historic maps both show Parkside Drive and Highway 6 as historically surveyed roads. Numerous property owners and historic features are depicted adjacent to the road way. The Town of Waterdown is also shown on both maps, on Concession 3, Lots 6 and 7. Details of property owners and historic features located in the study corridor are provided in Table 2. It should be noted that not all features of interest were mapped systematically in the Ontario series of historical atlases, given that they were financed by subscription, and subscribers were given preference with regard to the level of detail provided on the maps. Moreover, not every feature of interest would have been within the scope of the atlases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conc. #</th>
<th>Lot #</th>
<th>Property Owners 1859</th>
<th>Property Owners 1875</th>
<th>Historic Features 1859</th>
<th>Historic Features 1875</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Alexander Brown</td>
<td>Alexander Brown</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Alexander Brown</td>
<td>Alexander Brown</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>McMonies</td>
<td>McMonies</td>
<td>Waterdown</td>
<td>Waterdown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jas. McMonies</td>
<td>Jas. McMonies</td>
<td>(town)</td>
<td>(town)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Edmund Fields</td>
<td>Edmund Fields</td>
<td>Waterdown</td>
<td>Waterdown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(town)</td>
<td>(town)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Edmund Fields</td>
<td>Edmund Fields</td>
<td>Farmstead, orchard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Luke Mullick, Thomas Stock</td>
<td>Luke Mullick, Thomas Stock</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>H.R. O'Reilly</td>
<td>Mrs. Howell</td>
<td>Farmstead, orchard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Geo. Rymal</td>
<td>L.A. Cummer</td>
<td>Farmstead, orchard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>John Long</td>
<td>John Long</td>
<td>Farmstead, orchard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Numerous property owners</td>
<td>W. Rose, T. Parkinson, J. Kaler, Geo. Hill,</td>
<td>Farmsteads (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pickman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Property Owners on Nineteenth-Century Maps
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conc. #</th>
<th>Lot #</th>
<th>Property Owners</th>
<th>1859</th>
<th>1875</th>
<th>Historic Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>James McMonies</td>
<td>Mrs. E. Attridge</td>
<td>1859</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>Farmstead, Orchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>William Trudgen, William Steward</td>
<td>William Trudgen, William Steward</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Farmsteads (3) Orchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>William Fletcher, David Rymal</td>
<td>Chas. McMonies, David Rymal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Farmsteads (2), Orchards (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Peter Creen</td>
<td>John Creen</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Farmstead, Orchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Edward Evans</td>
<td>John and Edward Evans</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Farmstead, Orchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Glebe Land</td>
<td>Chas Arnold, Jos. G. Arnold, John Stock</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lewis Rees</td>
<td>James Higginson, Lawley Langton</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Farmstead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>John Cummings</td>
<td>Walter Byckman</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Farmstead, Orchard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>John Baker, Jacob Baker</td>
<td>John Baker, L. Baker</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Farmsteads (2), Orchards (2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A review of the nineteenth-century maps shows that the area is well-settled by the time the 1859 map is drawn (Figure 2). The 1859 Surtees map shows that at least two wards exist within the Town of Waterdown. This suggests that it has been established long enough and has sufficient population that wards have been set up within the town. Both creek systems (including Grindstone Creek) are shown on this map as is the considerable slope to the south of the study corridor. The Atlas map, dated 1875 (Figure 3), shows that the area and the Town of Waterdown have continued to develop. It is of note that many of the same family names appear on the same lots on both maps suggesting established settlement that dates from at least as early as the mid-nineteenth century. By 1931 (Figure 4), the overall settlement patterns remain largely the same as those seen on the nineteenth-century maps and the large orchards seen on the early maps are still in place, suggesting the continuation of agricultural landuse into the twentieth century. The 1931 map also shows the development of several small settlements (in addition to Waterdown and Clappison’s Corners) as well as a well-established network of roads. Other features which are depicted on this map include a power line to the south of the study corridor and the railway at the eastern terminus.
Figure 2: The study corridor overlaid on the 1859 map of the County of Wentworth

*Base Map: Map of the County of Wentworth, Canada West (Surtees 1859)*
Figure 3: The study corridor overlaid on the 1875 map of the Township of East Flamborough

Base Map: *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth* (Page & Smith 1875)
Figure 4: The study corridor overlaid on the 1931 historic topographic map of the City of Hamilton

Base Map: *Hamilton Sheet No. 33 (NTS 1931; Surveyed 1909, Reprinted with corrections 1931)*

### 3.3 Existing Conditions

In order to make a preliminary identification of existing built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes within the study corridor, a number of municipal resources were consulted. The City of Hamilton Register of Property of Cultural and Historical Interest and the City of Hamilton Heritage Inventories, which includes both designated and non-designated properties, were consulted.

A review of the inventories of designated properties revealed that there are no properties which are designated under Part IV or Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* within the vicinity of and in the study corridor. A review of the City of Hamilton Heritage Inventories revealed that are five non-designated properties of heritage interest in the vicinity of the study corridor within the City limits. Two of these properties appear to have been demolished since their entry in the Hamilton Heritage Inventories. There were no properties listed in the ‘Register’.

A field review was undertaken by Mary-Cate Garden, ASI in April 2012 to document the existing conditions of the study corridor. The field review revealed that Parkside Drive between Highway 6 and the creek southwest of the railway crossing (Plate 24) is a well-travelled thoroughfare. Many of the streets
(particularly in the east) which intersect with Parkside Drive are themselves older and/or established
routes. Examples of these include the Hamilton Street/Centre Street crossing (Plate 13) and the
intersection with Main Street (Plate 14) Consisting of two lanes, Parkside Drive runs through landscapes
that range from more rural woodlots and farms (Plates 3 and 4) in the west to established residential areas
in the east (e.g. Plate 6). In some areas the residential land use gives way to commercial use (e.g. Plate
11) or mixed use including recreational use (Plates 7, 8 and 12). The study corridor sits at the height of a
slope which rises up from the south; however, the topography in and adjacent to the study corridor is, in
general, flat. Fields and remnant fields stretch to the north of Parkside Drive and a hydro corridor (Plate
15) crosses Parkside Drive west of Grindstone Creek. Near Grindstone Creek the topography become
more rolling with gentle slopes down into the creek valley (Plate 19). Finally, throughout the study
corridor there are the remains of wood lots (Plate 16)which lie between and behind much of the mid-
twentieth-century housing and tree lines which marked the boundaries of former farm lots (e.g. Plates 4
and 22) Two creeks cross Parkside Drive; one (unnamed) to the east of Duncan Drive (Figure 7) and the
other, a tributary of the Grindstone Creek watershed (Plate 19 and Figure 11). The latter has both road and
pedestrian crossings (Plate 20). There is also evidence of storm water ponds and other water management
features (including the asphalted ditches on the north side of Parkside Drive (Plate 23) while the first runs
under the roadway through a culvert. There were temporary barriers at the time of the field review (Plate
6) This route is most heavily developed in the middle area (i.e., between Braheheid Avenue and Hamilton
Street North/ Centre Street). Indeed, a large mall is located on the south side of Parkside Drive at
Hamilton Street. East of this intersection, the study corridor returns to its more rural character with small
clusters of houses dating, largely, to the first half of the twentieth century (Plate 18). Throughout the
study corridor Parkside Drive retains much of its earlier late nineteenth/ early twentieth-century character.
The two lane roadway is bordered on both sides with a gravel shoulder and shallow ditches (e.g. Plates 1
&2). In the central and east portion of the study corridor in places there are narrow sidewalks (generally
on the more highly developed south side) which are separated from the road by the aforementioned
ditches and grassy verges (Plates 9, 10, 17 and 21). In circa the last twenty-five years this area appears to
have been heavily developed with modern, late twentieth-century housing subdivisions. At the time of the
site visit, work was ongoing at, at least, two locations to the north of Parkside Drive (e.g. Plate 5). In both
instances it was clear that these developments were located on old farm lots. A third property at 111
Parkside Drive contained a planning notice indicating further development of former farmland.

Plates

Plate 1: Western Terminus of Study Corridor
Highway 6 and Parkside Drive. View to west.

Plate 2: View east along Parkside Drive near
Highway 6.
Plate 3: Parkside Drive East of Hollybush Drive. View to east. Note woodlot to left of photo

Plate 4: View west along Parkside Drive (see Plate 3) showing old tree line

Plate 5: Parkside Drive at Hollybush Drive showing development in progress (left) and established subdivision (right)

Plate 6: View west along Parkside Drive west of Braeheid Drive showing curbs and altered roadscape. Creek at left of photo

Plate 7: Intersection of Keewaydin Street and

Plate 8: View northeast at Keewaydin St and Parkside

Archaeological Services Inc.
Parkside Drive. View to west.

Plate 9: View along south side of Parkside Drive east of Keewaydin showing recent housing

Plate 10: View showing evolved streetscape on north side of Parkside Drive with housing from different periods, contrasting with south side (Plate 9). View to west

Plate 11: View west from Hamilton Street/Centre Street along Parkside Drive. Retail mall to left

Plate 12: View east from Hamilton Drive showing south side of Parkside Drive and park
Plate 13: View east along Parkside Drive to Hamilton/Centre Street showing older roadscape and evolved streetscapes.

Plate 14: View south east to intersection of Main Street and Parkside Drive. Note orientation of street crossing.

Plate 15: View northeast across Parkside showing remnant fields and hydro corridor north of residences.

Plate 16: North side of Parkside Drive west of Mill Street showing remnant wood lot.
Plate 17: View east along south side of Parkside Drive from Churchill Ave showing residential lots and plantings.

Plate 18: View west along north side of Parkside Drive showing residential lots and plantings along frontages.

Plate 19: View east towards Grindstone Creek.

Plate 20: Detail of bridge, south side of Parkside Drive at Grindstone Creek.
A total of nine cultural heritage landscapes and three built heritage resources were identified within the study corridor. Table 2 provides a list of identified cultural heritage resources, which includes a photograph and brief description of the resource. Section 6.0 provides location mapping of identified cultural heritage resources.
Table 2: Identified Built Heritage Resources (BHR) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHL) in the Parkside Drive Study Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Inventory Description</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHR 1</td>
<td>This two storey frame house is part of a complex of buildings which appear to date to the second half of the twentieth century. The house which appears to be covered with vinyl siding has a gable roof with a brick chimney located at the west gable end. It appears that this structure may have been altered over time; however, the mass and scaling suggest that this building dates to the last decades of the nineteenth century or early twentieth century. A gable roofed garage located beside the house may be a later addition. The property also includes mature plantings behind and to the east of the house. There is no information about the foundations. All visible windows are modern.</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Photograph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location: 40 Parkside Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feature Type: Residence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition: Identified during field review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Inventory Description</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHR 2</td>
<td>This small one-and-a-half storey red brick house is located on a corner lot at the intersection of Centre Street and Parkside Drive. Fronting on Parkside Drive it is located in close proximity to the road. The house features a gabled hipped roof with a small porch with gable roof and a brick external chimney. Sitting on rusticated cinder block foundations, there is at least one (visible) window opening into the basement. All visible windows appear to be original to the house. There are structures in this location on both the 1879 and the 1931 maps; the earlier structure appears to be located further to the north than the extant residence. Further, the style of the residence would suggest that this property dates to the early twentieth century and would have replaced an older structure.</td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Photograph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location: 273 Parkside Drive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feature Type: Residence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition: Identified during field review</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>
<tr>
<td><strong>BHR 3</strong></td>
<td>This property appears to date to the second half of the twentieth century; however, the orientation of the structure at right angles to the road is unusual. The residence is a ranch-style red brick, single-storey house with integrated garage. A single chimney is located at the south gable end. The rest of the property consists of a manicured lawn and plantings consistent with later twentieth-century landscaping.</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Photograph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location: 349 Parkside Drive</td>
<td>Feature Type: Residence</td>
<td>Recognition: Identified during field review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CHL 1</strong></td>
<td>Located on the northwest corner of Parkside Drive and Highway 6 this property consists of a (former) farm complex made up of a two storey frame house with gable roof and appears also to contain a number of farm buildings located to the rear of the property. All visible windows appear to have been modernised and appear to date to the twentieth century. The property contains large, mature trees marking property lines. Further, there is some evidence of older circulation routes (the easternmost driveway) and fields remain along the west edge of the property. No information about the outbuildings was available at the time of the field review. This farmhouse appears to be in the same location as a structure depicted on the 1879 map. At the time this property is listed against the Baker family.</td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Photograph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location: 11 Parkside Drive</td>
<td>Feature Type: Farm Complex</td>
<td>Recognition: Hamilton’s Heritage Inventory Volume 2</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>CHL 2</td>
<td>This farm complex sits on the southeast corner at the intersection of Parkside Drive and Highway 6. The property consists of large fields with structures located a considerable distance south of Parkside Drive. This complex is made up of a brick residence which appears to be a one-and-a-half storey brick, gable-roofed house. The barn, located a considerable distance from both right of ways, appears to date no later than the early part of the twentieth century. The extant barn appears to be in the same location as one marked on the 1879 Surtees map. At this time the property is owned by John Long. The map shows a large structure located south of an orchard. Location: 586 Highway 6 Feature Type: Farm complex Recognition: Identified during field review</td>
<td><img src="https://example.com/image.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2: Identified Built Heritage Resources (BHR) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHL) in the Parkside Drive Study Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Inventory Description</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHL 3</td>
<td>This portion of Parkside Drive between the intersection at Highway 6 and the private farm road east of 53 Parkside Drive has retained much of its late nineteenth-century/early twentieth-century character. Essential, character-defining elements include the retention of property lines marked by (sometimes) very large deciduous plantings. This along with remnant fence lines, driveways/lanes and with narrow gravel shoulders merging into shallow ditches and grassy verges all contribute to the visual character of this section of roadway. Changes to this streetscape are on the scale of an evolved, rather than replaced landscape.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location: Parkside Drive East of Highway 6  
Feature Type: Historic Roadscape  
Recognition: Identified during field review
Table 2: Identified Built Heritage Resources (BHR) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHL) in the Parkside Drive Study Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Inventory Description</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHL4</td>
<td>This farm complex is located on a thin parcel of land which runs north from Parkside Drive. The residence consists of a two and a half storey brick farmhouse. This structure is partly obscured by the mature trees lining the long driveway. The structure appears to have retained a number of older and/or original features including window openings, possible shutters a porch and gingerbread. This distance of the house from the road makes it difficult to determine the nature of the foundations, whether there is an external chimney or the nature of the windows. This property is noted within Hamilton’s inventory of buildings of historical or architectural interest. A garage is located at the head of the driveway and it appears that there are more modern (i.e., twentieth-century) agricultural structures located to the north and west of the house. A large field under cultivation is located to the west of the house and may be associated with this complex.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location: 25 Parkside Drive  
Feature Type: Farm Complex  
Recognition: Hamilton’s Heritage Inventories *Volume 2*  

### Table 2: Identified Built Heritage Resources (BHR) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHL) in the Parkside Drive Study Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Inventory Description</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHL 5</td>
<td>This remnant farm complex was in the process of development at the time of the field survey. A series of outbuildings are extant on the west half of the lot, set back a considerable distance from the road. These buildings are in a ruinous state but appear to have consisted of a long storage building, a small shed and larger shed or small barn. The long shed appears to be covered with corrugated metal whilst the small shed is a wood-clad frame structure. The small barn building appears to have stone foundations. To the east of these structures an early driveway is bordered by very large, mature deciduous and coniferous trees. There is strong visual evidence of early circulation routes that may date as early as the first half of the twentieth century or perhaps to the very late nineteenth century.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Location:** 125 Parkside Drive
- **Feature Type:** Farm Complex
- **Recognition:** Identified during field review
### Table 2: Identified Built Heritage Resources (BHR) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHL) in the Parkside Drive Study Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Inventory Description</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHL 6</td>
<td>This cluster of small-scale one and one-and-a-half storey residences are typical of post-war settlement along Parkside Drive. Although this streetscape is somewhat interrupted both by ongoing development work and by subsequent building over approximately the last twenty-five years, it nonetheless retains much of its visual character. Houses within this streetscape typically are frame structures now clad with synthetic siding and sitting on a small to medium-sized lot with mature, established plantings. Many of these residences have been modified and enlarged. These alterations and the new-build residences together represent change which is on the scale of an evolved rather than replaced landscape. This streetscape is limited to the north side Parkside Drive.</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Image 1" /> <img src="image2.jpg" alt="Image 2" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location:** 229-239 Parkside Drive  
**Feature Type:** Streetscape  
**Recognition:** Identified during field review
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Inventory Description</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHL 7</td>
<td>This streetscape is made up of a series of single story ranch-style houses that are</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Photograph of CHL 7" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>typical of a mid or third-quarter of the twentieth century. All exhibit modifications</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Photograph of CHL 7" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to the structure—including porches, cladding and additions—but all retain much if not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all of their original character. Each of these residences is somewhat distanced from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the road with a small lawn and mature plantings. Some of these properties include very</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>large, established trees that likely date to earlier occupancy of the property. With</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>one exception these structures are all residences; the easternmost property (285) which</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sits above the road on a small terrace has been partially converted into a small</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>convenience store. Located at the corner of Main Street and Parkside Drive this corner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lot includes two drives and a parking lot.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location: 275-285 Parkside Drive  
Feature Type: Streetscape  
Recognition: Identified during field review
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Inventory Description</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHL 8</td>
<td>Like CHL 6, this cluster of small-scale one and one-and-a-half storey frame houses dates to the postwar period. These structures tend to be of brick construction with a gable roof and are on a slightly larger scale than their counterparts to the east. Location: 293-301 Parkside Drive Feature Type: Streetscape Recognition: Identified during field review</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Photograph" /> <img src="image2" alt="Photograph" /> <img src="image3" alt="Photograph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 9</td>
<td>This cluster of small red-brick bungalows is typified by structures with low hipped roofs and small porches. These houses are largely unaltered and are fronted with a lawn and driveway. Plantings are sparse on these properties and, where present, appear to be associated with older (and larger) farm lots which were subsequently subdivided for residential settlement. Location: 315 and 319 Parkside Drive Feature Type: Cluster Recognition: Identified during field review</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Photograph" /> <img src="image5" alt="Photograph" /> <img src="image6" alt="Photograph" /></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>CHL 10</td>
<td>This small grouping of post-war/mid-twentieth century frame houses wraps around the corner at Parkside Drive and Mill Street. Most of these residences were constructed as one or one and half storey houses with gable roofs; however, most have had been added to over time. Both of these houses are well set back from the road with large lawns and mature trees near the house and at the back of the properties. Both of these houses not only typify settlement in the first half of the twentieth century they show evidence (though the changes to the structures) of the evolution of this residential neighbourhood.</td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location: 316 Parkside Drive and Mill Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feature Type: Cluster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition: Identified during field review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 11</td>
<td>This grouping of small-scale one and one-and-a-half storey structures shows evidence of settlement of this area of Parkside Drive and the settlement of Waterdown during the postwar period. Consisting of small frame structures with gable roofs, these residences sit on large former farm lots which are being used as smaller residential lots. Although there are some mature plantings along the frontages, most of the plantings are located to the rear of the residences.</td>
<td><img src="image_url" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location: 341-345 Parkside Drive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feature Type: Cluster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition: Identified during field review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Identified Built Heritage Resources (BHR) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHL) in the Parkside Drive Study Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Inventory Description</th>
<th>Photograph(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHL 12</td>
<td>Located on the north side of the road, this farm complex was, at the time of the field review, operating as Connon’s plant nursery. This property contains a residence noted in the Hamilton’s Heritage Inventory. The only structure visible from the road appears to be modern (twentieth-century); a second house visible on air photos may be historic structure. This large property is marked by fence by post and rail fence lines and a line of mature plantings along the road. Evidence of storm water managements may be seen along the creek, suggesting that there may have been alterations to an earlier agricultural landscape.</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image 1" /> <img src="image2.png" alt="Image 2" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location: 368 Parkside Drive  
Feature Type: Farm Complex  
Recognition: Hamilton’s Heritage vol. 2  
Identified during field review

3.4 Impact Assessment

The field review confirmed that the study corridor runs through landscapes that, although altered, retain a number of their early features as well strong evidence of evolved streetscapes and settlement which has taken place over the last century. Parkside Drive is an historic thoroughfare as is Highway 6 which forms the western terminus of the study corridor. In addition, the railway line adjacent to the eastern terminus dates between 1909 and 1931. Finally, the eastern edge of the study corridor is coincident with a tributary of Grindstone Creek, part of the provincially-recognised Grindstone Creek headwaters and wetlands complex. At the time of the field review in April 2012, the area in and around the study corridor was under active development with new residential subdivisions underway. The study corridor as a whole represents a landscape which has evolved from rural, agricultural properties to a peri-urban settlements centred around the historic settlements of Waterdown and, further to the south, Clappison’s Corners.
Continual development of former agricultural landscapes has resulted in a means that some portions of the study corridor (notably east of Hollybush Drive) were heavily developed in the latter half of the twentieth century. The identified cultural heritage resources range from the late nineteenth century through to the mid-twentieth century. Even in the latter instances, many of the early lots have retained their early boundaries. The widening of the road will require property adjacent to both the north and south of the current right-of-way.

There appear to be three alternatives for this road-widening project; maps of the proposed work show three options. These each consists of a right-of-way 20 metres; a second proposed right-of-way measuring 23 metres and a third measuring 27 metres (c.f. Figure XX). Together these alternatives are each broadly similar. Each of the identified cultural heritage resources was applied, initially, against the three alternatives in order to identify direct or indirect impacts. These are initial evaluations undertaken to assess and compare impacts across each of the alternatives.

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

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

Fifteen cultural heritage resources were identified within the study corridor; each of these was evaluated against the above criteria. In general, the proposed work and associated construction activities have the potential to impact the properties through encroachment on the frontages of properties. In some instances (including but not limited to CHL 3) mature and established plantings which define older property lines and other landscape features—including wind breaks—will be altered and/or removed through this proposed work.

CHL 3, a section of Parkside Drive which has retained much of its late nineteenth/early twentieth-century character has the potential to be most seriously affected by the proposed work. Alterations including changes in grade (III.7) or potentially destruction (III.1) of some or all of the elements (including plantings) that make up this cultural heritage landscape.
Once the Parkside Drive design alternatives have been fully identified, all the identified cultural heritage resources identified within or adjacent to the study corridor will be evaluated against the above criteria. The widening of Parkside Drive has the potential to impact upon the cultural heritage resources in a variety of ways and, as such, appropriate mitigation measures for this undertaking need to be considered.

Appropriate mitigation measures should be developed wherever any identified, above-ground cultural heritage resources are to be affected by direct or indirect impacts. This may include 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.

## 4.0 CONCLUSIONS

The results of historical research confirmed that the study corridor features historically surveyed thoroughfares, residences and farm complexes that date back as early as the late nineteenth century and into the first half of the twentieth century. The field review confirmed that the study corridor retains elements associated with early residential development, dating predominantly to the first half of the twentieth century but with (remnant) and other cultural heritage landscapes features dating to the last decades of the nineteenth century. In the western section, the remaining farm complexes provide a sense of the rural landscapes that predominated in this area in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Whilst the middle section (east of Hollybush Drive) has been heavily developed, the western and eastern sections retain much of their rural character. West of Hamilton Street /Centre Street the study corridor is a mix of early and late twentieth-century residences with an evolved landscape that provides a picture of ongoing settlement of this area over more than a century. A total of fifteen cultural heritage resources were identified within the study corridor.

- A total of three built heritage resources and twelve heritage landscapes were identified in the study corridor;
- Three properties (CHL 1, CHL 4 and CHL 12) were previously identified by the City of Hamilton;
- Two other properties at 111 Parkside Drive and 63 Parkside Drive were no longer extant;
- There are no cultural heritage resources in the study corridor that are designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act*;
- The identified cultural heritage resources consist of five farm complexes (CHL 1, CHL 2, CHL 4, CHL 5 and CHL 12); three residences (BHR 1- BHR 3 ), three clusters (CHL 9-11), two streetscapes (CHL 6, CHL 7 and CHL 8), one historic roadscape (CHL 3)
- Identified cultural heritage resources are historically, architecturally, and contextually associated with rural and semi-rural land use patterns and urban development dating to the late nineteenth century and early to mid-twentieth centuries.
5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Parkside Drive road widening may have a variety of impacts upon built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes. Impacts may 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. Three options have been provided for this undertaking; in general, whilst similar, there are distinct elements to each of the plans. Based on the results of background data collection, a field review, and impact assessment of three project alternatives, the following recommendations have been developed:

3. At time of writing there were three alternatives under consideration for the proposed road widenings. These ranged from a right-of-way of 20 metres, one of 23 metres and the largest at 27 metres. Each of these options is broadly similar although, as noted elsewhere, the orientation north and/or south of the extant right-of-way, varies between options.

4. In all instances where cultural heritage resources have been identified road improvement activities should be planned to avoid impacts to those resources. Where any identified, above ground, cultural heritage resources are to be affected by direct or indirect impacts, further research should be undertaken to identify the specific heritage significance of the affected cultural heritage resource and/or appropriate mitigation measures should be adopted once the final work plan has been chosen from these three alternatives. 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.
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7.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE MAPPING

Figure 5: Location of Built Heritage Resources (BHR) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHL) in the Study corridor
Figure 6: Location of Built Heritage Resources (BHR) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHL) in the Study corridor
Figure 7: Location of Built Heritage Resources (BHR) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHL) in the Study corridor
Figure 8: Location of Built Heritage Resources (BHR) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHL) in the Study corridor
Figure 9: Location of Built Heritage Resources (BHR) or Cultural Heritage Landscapes were located within this section of the study corridor.
Figure 10: Location of Built Heritage Resources (BHR) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHL) in the Study corridor
Figure 11: Location of Built Heritage Resources (BHR) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHL) in the Study corridor