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Executive Summary

ASI was retained by the City of Hamilton to complete a Cultural Heritage Review to support the development of the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan. The Urban Hamilton Official Plan (U.H.O.P.) identifies the Waterdown Village core area and the surrounding lands as a Community Node within the City’s urban structure. Policy E.2.3.3.11 states that a detailed Secondary Plan shall be undertaken to provide greater direction on the mix of uses, heights, built form, and design within the Node. Key issues which will be addressed as part of the Secondary Plan process include managing redevelopment pressures, protecting the cultural heritage resources and historic character of the downtown, integrating old Waterdown with newer developing areas, maintaining the viability of the historic commercial downtown area, and addressing traffic and access challenges. The Secondary Plan’s supporting studies include urban design guidelines to provide direction on the design of infill and redevelopment, a Transportation Management Plan to address existing and future transportation needs, and this Cultural Heritage Review to address the conservation and protection of cultural heritage resources. The Waterdown Village Built Heritage Inventory has been conducted concurrently and also supports the Secondary Plan.

The study area extends west to east along Dundas Street, from the lands across from Redcliff Court to First Street, and north to south from Nisbet Boulevard to the southerly end of Main Street South. The study area contains approximately 691 properties. The area has Neighbourhoods, Open Space and Mixed Use – Medium Density land uses and includes the Mill Street Heritage Conservation District (H.C.D.). The area is the traditional territory and treaty territory of the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation and is in the traditional territory of the Haudenosaunee peoples, represented by the Haudenosaunee Confederacy Chiefs Council (H.C.C.C.) and Six Nations Elected Council. The Village of Waterdown was historically centred around mills constructed along Grindstone Creek.

The Cultural Heritage Review has been conducted in two stages. The first stage addressed identified potential cultural heritage landscapes within the original Secondary Plan study area boundary. The second stage reviewed an expanded Secondary Plan study area to address additional identified potential cultural heritage landscapes. The potential cultural heritage landscapes were identified as part of the Waterdown Village Built Heritage Inventory conducted by the City of Hamilton, which reviewed the potential built heritage resources in the area concurrently with the Secondary Plan work, as well as through community consultation. As part of the Cultural Heritage Review, site visits were conducted of the area on several occasions to understand the characteristics of the area, identify additional potential cultural heritage landscapes, and evaluate identified potential cultural heritage landscapes.
Background research was conducted for each of the potential cultural heritage landscapes and assessed within the framework of the historic context statement written by the City of Hamilton to support the evaluation of built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes. The built heritage evaluations completed as part of the Waterdown Village Built Heritage Inventory were also reviewed. The cultural heritage landscapes were evaluated using Ontario Regulation 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* and City of Hamilton Council-adopted cultural heritage landscape evaluation criteria. The evaluation found that six of the ten cultural heritage landscapes evaluated met the criteria and are significant landscapes worthy of protection, these include: Dundas Street, Main Street, the Waterdown Heights Subdivision, the Waterdown Union Cemetery, Sealey Park, and Memorial Park.

Heritage policies and recommendations have been developed to inform the Secondary Plan and the Urban Design Guidelines to ensure that built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes in the Village of Waterdown are conserved. Recommendations for both regulatory and non-regulatory approaches have been included in Section 6.0. Additional recommendations for future work have been made to research and evaluate the Grindstone Creek valley and the former Village of Waterdown.
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1.0 Introduction

A.S.I. was retained by the City of Hamilton to complete a Cultural Heritage Review to support the development of the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan. The Urban Hamilton Official Plan (U.H.O.P.) identifies the Waterdown Village core area and the surrounding lands as a Community Node within the City’s urban structure. Policy E.2.3.3.11 states that a detailed Secondary Plan shall be undertaken to provide greater direction on the mix of uses, heights, built form, and design within the Node. The key issues which will be addressed as part of the Secondary Plan process include managing redevelopment pressures, protecting cultural heritage resources and the historical character of the downtown, integrating old Waterdown with newer developing areas, maintaining the viability of the historic commercial downtown area, and addressing traffic and access challenges. The Secondary Plan supporting studies will include urban design guidelines to provide direction on the design of infill and redevelopment, a Transportation Management Plan to address existing and future transportation needs, the Waterdown Village Built Heritage Inventory to identify and protect properties of cultural heritage value or interest, and this Cultural Heritage Review (Review hereafter) to address the conservation and protection of cultural heritage resources. The Review will provide direction for addressing heritage in policy and in urban design guidelines associated with the Secondary Plan. The scope of work for this Review is to:

1. Conduct a site visit of the area to understand area characteristics.
2. Review background research, historic context statement, and preliminary building heritage evaluations for the Secondary Plan area (completed by the City of Hamilton as part of the Waterdown Village Built Heritage Inventory project prior to commencement of consultant’s Review).
3. Identify potential new cultural heritage landscapes (C.H.L.s) and review existing cultural heritage landscapes in the study area.
5. Provide heritage policy and heritage mapping recommendations for inclusion within the Secondary Plan.
6. Review and provide recommendations for the Waterdown Community Node Urban Design Guidelines to ensure that new development is complementary to and respectful of cultural heritage resources.

1.1 Study Area

The study area extends west to east along Dundas Street, from the lands across from Redcliff Court to First Street, and north to south from Nisbet Boulevard to the southerly end of Main Street South. The study area contains approximately 691 properties. The area has
Neighbourhoods, Open Space and Mixed Use – Medium Density land uses and includes the Mill Street Heritage Conservation District (H.C.D.). The area is the traditional territory and treaty territory of the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation and is in the traditional territory of the Haudenosaunee peoples, represented by the Haudenosaunee Confederacy Chiefs Council (H.C.C.C.) and Six Nations Elected Council. The Village of Waterdown was historically centered around millings along Grindstone Creek.

Figure 1: Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan study area.
Figure 2: Aerial photograph showing the Study Area (Google).
2.0 Built Heritage Resource and Cultural Heritage Landscape Assessment Context

The analysis throughout the study process addresses cultural heritage resources under various pieces of legislation and their supporting guidelines. This Review considers cultural heritage resources in the context of the creation of policy for integration into the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan.

2.1 Planning Act and Provincial Policy Statement

The Planning Act (1990) and related Provincial Policy Statement (P.P.S. 2020) make a number of provisions relating to heritage conservation (Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing 1990; Government of Ontario 2020a). One of the general purposes of the Planning Act is to integrate matters of provincial interest in provincial and municipal planning decisions. 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.(i) the conservation of features of significant architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological or scientific interest

The P.P.S. indicates in Section 4.0 - Implementation/Interpretation, that:

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

Official plans shall identify provincial interests and set out appropriate land use designations and policies. To determine the significance of some natural heritage features and other resources, evaluation may be required.

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

Those policies of particular relevance for the conservation of cultural heritage are contained in Section 2.0, Wise Use and Management of Resources, in which the preamble states that “Ontario's long-term prosperity, environmental health, and social well-being depend on conserving biodiversity, protecting the health of the Great Lakes, and protecting natural heritage, water, agricultural, mineral and cultural heritage and archaeological resources for their economic, environmental and social benefits” (Government of Ontario 2020a:22).
Accordingly, in subsection 2.6, *Cultural Heritage and Archaeology* makes the following provisions relevant to this assessment:

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

2.6.3 Planning authorities shall not permit development and site alteration on adjacent lands to protected heritage property except where the proposed development and site alteration has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved.

Italicized terms in the foregoing policy statements are defined in Section 6.0 Definitions of the *P.P.S.* and have been considered as part of the present assessment.

This provides the context not only for discrete planning activities detailed in the *Planning Act* but also for the foundation of policy statements issued under Section 3 of the *Planning Act*.

### 2.2 Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe

The 2020 *Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe* (*Growth Plan*) identifies several policies relating to the conservation of cultural heritage resources within the Province. Section 1.1 of the *Growth Plan* speaks to the challenges faced by increased growth in the Greater Golden Horseshoe (G.G.H.), and that “unmanaged growth can degrade the region’s air quality; water resources; natural heritage resources, such as rivers, lakes, woodlands, and wetlands; and cultural heritage resources.”

Section 1 describes how the *Growth Plan* addresses all matters affecting land use planning and growth, including cultural heritage resources. The plan states that unmanaged growth can degrade important elements that contribute to healthy communities, including cultural heritage resources, and that cultural heritage resources and open spaces are important in providing people with a sense of place of their communities.

Section 2.2.1 of the *Growth Plan* identifies policies for managing growth, and states that most new growth must be directed to settlement areas where there is existing or planned municipal water and wastewater systems and where the achievement of complete communities can be realized.

Section 4 of the *Growth Plan* speaks to the protection of valuable resources, including cultural heritage resources, in Section 4.1:

The G.G.H. contains a broad array of important hydrologic and natural heritage features and areas, a vibrant and diverse agricultural land base, irreplaceable cultural heritage resources, and valuable renewable and non-renewable resources. These lands, features and resources are essential for the
long-term quality of life, economic prosperity, environmental health, and ecological integrity of the region. They collectively provide essential ecosystem services, including water storage and filtration, cleaner air and habitats, and support pollinators, carbon storage, adaptation and resilience to climate change.

Through their historic relationship with the lands and resources in this region, Indigenous communities have gained traditional knowledge that is of value to the planning decisions being made today. A balanced approach to the wise use and management of all resources, including those related to water, natural heritage, agriculture, cultural heritage, and mineral aggregates, will be implemented in the G.G.H.

The G.G.H. also contains important cultural heritage resources that contribute to a sense of identity, support a vibrant tourism industry, and attract investment based on cultural amenities. Accommodating growth can put pressure on these resources through development and site alteration. It is necessary to plan in a way that protects and maximizes the benefits of these resources that make our communities unique and attractive places to live.

Section 4.2.7 of the Growth Plan provides specific policy guidance relating to cultural heritage resources:

1. Cultural heritage resources will be conserved in order to foster a sense of place and benefit communities, particularly in strategic growth areas.

2. Municipalities will work with stakeholders, as well as First Nations and Métis communities, in developing and implementing official plan policies and strategies for the identification, wise use and management of cultural heritage resources.

3. Municipalities are encouraged to prepare archaeological management plans and municipal cultural plans and consider them in their decision-making (Government of Ontario 2020b).

2.3 Ontario Heritage Act

The Ontario Heritage Act (O.H.A) (Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport 2017; now administered by the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries) gives the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (M.H.S.T.C.I.) the responsibility for the conservation, protection, and preservation of Ontario’s cultural heritage resources. The M.H.S.T.C.I. is charged under Section 2.0 of the O.H.A. with the responsibility to determine policies, priorities, and programs for the conservation, protection, and preservation of the
heritage of Ontario. The O.H.A. sets out criteria for determining cultural heritage value under Ontario Regulation 9/06:

1. (1) The criteria set out in subsection (2) are prescribed for the purposes of clause 29 (1) (a) of the Act. O. Reg. 9/06, s. 1 (1).

(2) A property may be designated under section 29 of the Act if it meets one or more of the following criteria for determining whether it is of cultural heritage value or interest:

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

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

3. The property has contextual value because it,
   i. is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area,
   ii. is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or
   iii. is a landmark. O. Reg. 9/06, s. 1 (2) (M. H. S. T. C. I. 1990)

The O.H.A. also sets out the criteria for determining and process for designating H.C.D.s. Section 40.2, provides the scope of study involved in assessing a potential H.C.D.:

40 (2) A study under subsection (19) shall,
   (a) examine the character and appearance of the area that is the subject of the study, including buildings, structures and other property features of the area that should be preserved as a heritage conservation district;
   (b) examine and make recommendations as to the geographic boundaries of the area to be designated;
   (c) consider and make recommendations as to the objectives of the designation and the content of the heritage conservation district plan required under section 41.1;
(d) make recommendations as to any changes that will be required to the municipalities official plan and to any municipal by-laws including any zoning bylaws.

The O.H.A., under section 27, also requires the clerk of every municipality to keep a publicly accessible register of properties that are of cultural heritage value or interest situated within the municipality. The municipal register of heritage properties must list all properties within the municipality that are designated under Part IV (individually listed properties) and Part V (H.C.D.s) of the O.H.A. Subsection 27 (1.2) also allows a municipality to include properties of cultural heritage value or interest that have not been designated in its municipal register, stating:

27 (1.2) In addition to the property listed in the register under subsection (1.1), the register may include property that has not been designated under this Part but that the council of the municipality believes to be of cultural heritage value or interest and shall contain, with respect to such property, a description of the property that is sufficient to readily ascertain the property. (M. H. S. T. C. I. 1990)

Including non-designated properties in the municipal register identifies properties that have cultural heritage value or interest to the community and provides interim protection from demolition, and is therefore an important tool in planning for the conservation of heritage properties (M. H. S. T. C. I. 2017).

**City of Hamilton Built Heritage Inventory**

The City of Hamilton’s Built Heritage Inventory Strategy is a process for updating the listings on the City’s Inventory of Heritage Buildings to proactively identify properties of cultural heritage value or interest worthy of listing on the Municipal Heritage Register, as well as candidates for designation under the O.H.A. The process includes research, updated field surveys and preparing an Historic Context Statement, which outlines the historical evolution of the study area and identifies its key eras and attributes. The Historic Context Statement is used to inform the evaluation and classification of individual properties by determining their contribution to the historic context of the area (City of Hamilton 2014b). The Built Heritage Inventory work has been conducted in phases, including the Downtown Hamilton Built Heritage Inventory completed in 2014 and the Durand Neighbourhood Built Heritage Inventory completed in 2017. The Waterdown Village Built Heritage Inventory is being conducted in parallel to the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan process to help inform and guide future policy.

**2.4 Urban Hamilton Official Plan**

The City of Hamilton’s *Urban Hamilton Official Plan* (2013) (*U.H.O.P.*) provides policy direction for cultural heritage resources within the urban areas of the City, including the Waterdown Secondary Plan study area. Sections, objectives, and policies within the *U.H.O.P.* that are relevant to this Review for the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan are included in
Chapter B (Communities), Chapter C (City Wide Systems and Designations), and Chapter F (Implementation). Summaries of the relevant policies within these chapters are included below. Sections and policies regarding Built Heritage Resources (Subsection 3.4.5 of Chapter B), Cultural Heritage Landscapes (Subsection 3.4.6 of Chapter B) and Heritage Roads (Subsection 3.4.6.6 of Chapter B and Subsection 4.5.3 of Chapter C) are also summarized.

Chapter B of the U.H.O.P. “endeavours to support and build on the strengths of individual communities” to create a collectively strong City of Hamilton. As “the quality of daily life is influenced by the quality of our built, natural, social and cultural environments and supported by the strength of the economy and the creativity of citizens,” this chapter provides policies for the wise management and conservation of cultural heritage resources for the benefit of the community. Section 3.4 of this chapter provides specific cultural heritage resources policies, including the development of Cultural Heritage Conservation Plan Statements (Policy 3.4.2.11) and Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments (Policy 3.4.2.12).

“Cultural heritage resources may include tangible features, structures, sites, or landscapes that, either individually or part of a whole, are of historical, architectural, archaeological, or scenic value. Cultural heritage resources represent intangible heritage, such as customs, ways-of-life, values, and activities. The resources may represent local, regional, provincial, or national heritage interests and values.” (Policy 3.4)

Chapter B also contains general cultural heritage policies for downtown areas, including downtown Waterdown, as it pertains to the conservation of individual cultural heritage properties and areas of heritage value (Policies 3.4.3.1; 3.4.3.2 and 3.4.3.5), as well as new development or redevelopment (Policies 3.4.3.3 and 3.4.3.4). There are also policies for the protection and intensification of established historical neighbourhoods (Policies 3.4.3.6 and 3.4.3.7) and the intensification and adaptive reuse of commercial and industrial heritage properties (Policies 3.4.3.8 and 3.4.3.9).

Chapter C of the U.H.O.P. outlines policies related to city wide systems and designations. Within this chapter is a section that provides policy as it relates to special character roads (Subsection 4.5.3). A summary of this policy, and other policies in the Official Plan that relate to heritage roads, is included below.

Chapter F of the U.H.O.P. explains that “the success of the Official Plan can only be achieved through effective implementation.” Citing various municipal and provincial acts and regulations, as well as other mechanisms, this chapter provides “a series of tools to fulfill the City’s goals and objectives of this Plan.” Section F.1 outlines the Planning Act implementation tools, such as Secondary Plans and Neighbourhood Plans (Section 1.2) and Special Policy Areas, Area Specific Policy Areas, Site Specific Policy Areas (Section 1.3). Supporting Plans (Section 3.1) that can be used as mechanisms to implement goals and objectives of the U.H.O.P. are also included in Chapter F. Those listed are: Cultural Heritage Management Plans (Subsection 3.1.2); Cultural Heritage Conservation Plan Statements (Subsection 3.1.4); Cultural Heritage Impact
Assessments (Subsection 3.2.3); and Urban Design and Architectural Guidelines and Architectural Control (Subsection 3.2.5).

**Built Heritage Resources Policies**

The *U.H.O.P.* provides policies guiding the management and conservation of built heritage resources within the City. The requirements for preparing and maintaining an inventory of built heritage resources and a Register of Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (known as the Municipal Heritage Register), is outlined (Chapter B, Policy 3.4.5.1). The *U.H.O.P.* emphasizes the goal of the City to “encourage the retention and conservation of significant built heritage resources in their original locations. [...] There shall be a presumption in favour of retaining the built heritage resource in its original location.” Policies that relate to the retention, alteration, relocation, and documentation of built heritage resources that may be impacted by development are also provided (Chapter B, Policies 3.4.5.2; 3.4.5.3; 3.4.5.4; and 3.4.5.5).

**Cultural Heritage Landscape Policies**

The *U.H.O.P.* defines a cultural heritage landscape as “a defined geographical area characterized by human settlement activities that have resulted in changes and modification to the environment, which is now considered to be of heritage value of interest. Cultural heritage landscapes may include distinctive rural roads, urban streetscapes and commercial main streets, rural landscapes including villages and hamlets, designed landscapes such as parks, cemeteries and gardens, nineteenth and twentieth century urban residential neighbourhoods, as well as commercial areas and industrial complexes.”¹ This definition (Chapter B, Policy 3.4.6.1) as well as policies and legislation relating to the preparation and maintenance of an inventory of cultural heritage landscapes (Chapter B, Policy 3.4.6.2) is included in the *U.H.O.P.*

**Heritage Roads Policies**

The *U.H.O.P.* also identifies the responsibility of the City to “identify, conserve, and manage heritage roads and associated features.” This policy is included in Chapter B within Section 3.4 - Cultural Heritage Resources Policies (Policy 3.4.6.6) and is further guided by Subsection 4.5.3 – Special Character Roads, within Chapter C. Attributes of a heritage road are defined (Chapter C, Policy 4.5.3.1), as well as the protective measures that should be enacted to conserve heritage attributes in the event of any road maintenance undertakings (Chapter C, Policies 4.5.3.3 and 4.5.3.4). Additionally, the legislative mechanism to be used by the City to protect and conserve heritage roadways is provided (Chapter C, Policy 4.5.3.2). Examples of heritage roads identified in the *U.H.O.P.* include Wilson Street East and Sulphur Springs Road in the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan (Shown in UHOP, Vol 2, Chapter B, Appendix A).

¹ This definition differs from the Provincial Policy Statement definition due to updates to the Provincial Policy Statement which came into effect in 2020.
Cultural Heritage Conservation Plan Statements

The *U.H.O.P.* sets out the requirements for Cultural Heritage Conservation Plan Statements which may be included in secondary plan studies and policies, neighbourhood plans or other planning initiatives (Chapter F, Policy 3.1.4.2). Cultural Heritage Conservation Plan Statements are required to include (Chapter F, Policy 3.1.4.1):

a) a description of the historical development of the area;

b) a description of the cultural heritage resources and their significance;

c) conservation priorities for identified cultural heritage resources;

d) redevelopment potential;

e) consideration of open space, public access and community connectivity;

f) the provision of interpretive devices, such as plaques and displays;

g) the creation of guidelines for the conservation and enhancement of cultural heritage resources; and,

h) the creation of guidelines for contextual enhancements, such as streetscaping and alterations and/or additions to adjacent properties.

2.5 Waterdown Specific Policies and Plans

City of Hamilton Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan

As stated in the *U.H.O.P.*, secondary plans are used to provide detailed and community specific guidance to growth and change in smaller geographic areas of the City. Secondary plans identify more detailed land uses, densities, design requirements, and infrastructure requirements and other implementing actions appropriate for the community. These plans are not intended to repeat the policies in Volume 1, but to supplement Volume 1 policy directions and land use designations. Once secondary plans are completed, they are adopted as amendments to the Official Plan. Volume 2 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan contains the secondary plans (City of Hamilton 2018c).

The City of Hamilton has identified the development of a Secondary Plan for the Waterdown Community Node as a priority. The current Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan Study which began in 2018 and is scheduled to conclude in 2021 is being undertaken to respond to the significant population growth which has occurred around the area to date and the
redevelopment pressures in the core. The Secondary Plan will set forth a clear vision for the evolution of the area and is also considering transportation systems and protection of heritage characteristics. The Secondary Plan will be adopted and approved by City Council. As identified in the City’s U.H.O.P., the Waterdown Community Node consists of the central portion of Waterdown. Community Nodes are defined as areas which are a focal point for the surrounding community which have an important concentration of services, shops, residential uses and other facilities.

Urban design guidelines may also be created with Secondary Plans and are meant to:

- Illustrate the design intent of the Secondary Plan
- Design a thriving community that is vibrant and pedestrian friendly
- Represent a built form and public realm that is compatible with the existing scale, character and unique traits of the community
- Address other design elements related to buildings, sites, streetscapes and public spaces (City of Hamilton 2014c)

The intent of Secondary Plan urban design guidelines is to address these key components:

- Describe the existing context and planned land uses shown in the Secondary Plan
- Describe the structuring elements within the community, including roads, trails, parks and open spaces
- Define the appropriate built form and typologies for each land use
- Provide recommendations and design guidance for architectural and landscape architectural design
- Communicate best practices with respect to urban design, sustainability, revitalization, vibrancy, mobility and walkability
- Provide detailed design guidelines for site design, building design, public realm and streetscapes (City of Hamilton 2014c)

The City of Hamilton has established urban design guidelines for several other Secondary Plans, including:

- Airport Employment Growth District
- Ancaster Community Node
- Binbrook Village Community Core
- Dundas Downtown
- Fruitland-Winona
- Strathcona

As part of the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan, urban design guidelines will also be completed along with this Review and a Transportation Management Plan.
**Waterdown Village Built Heritage Inventory**

A review of the built heritage resources within the historic boundaries of the Village of Waterdown is currently in process by City of Hamilton staff and is being undertaken to inform the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan. The review is gathering updated information and evaluating each property in the study area to determine its heritage value or interest. The results of the Waterdown Built Heritage Inventory review will result in Register listing and designation recommendations to Council, and will feed into the recommendations of this Review (City of Hamilton 2014b).

**Mill Street Heritage Conservation District**

The study area for this Review encompasses the Mill Street H.C.D. The Mill Street H.C.D. was designated under Part V of the O.H.A. in 1996 and includes 116 properties, which are residential, commercial and institutional (Waterdown Mill Street HCD Committee n.d.). The boundary runs along Mill Street North between Elgin Street and Union Street in Waterdown. Although the Mill Street H.C.D. is considered a cultural heritage landscape, this H.C.D. will not be subject to further review as part of this study as it is well understood and appropriately protected through the H.C.D. Plan. The H.C.D. provides: conservation principles, goals and objectives; guidelines for alterations, additions and new construction; and landscape conservation guidelines.

The heritage attributes of the existing Mill Street Heritage Conservation District (By-Law 96-34-H) include the residential, institutional, and commercial buildings that developed around the valley to support the founding industrial activities which took place in the Grindstone Creek Valley. The intersection of Mill and Dundas Streets are noted for their commercial uses which began in the 1830s and 1840s and which continued into the mid-twentieth century. North of Dundas Street, Mill Street is noted for its many community buildings including the Presbyterian Church, the Township Hall, Grace Anglican Church, a cemetery, and a school. Buildings throughout the District predominantly reflect vernacular construction methods with a variety of stylistic embellishments. The area’s landscape characteristics relate to the topography of the river valley and the range of building types and ages with a variety of setbacks, demonstrate the evolution of the area over a long period of time. The boundary of the existing District is described as containing a “considerable wealth of heritage buildings and streetscapes and with further detailed study several other areas within Waterdown would also probably qualify for heritage conservation district designation.” (Unterman McPhail Cuming Associates:1996, 6-4).

**2.6 Other Municipal Policies and Guidelines**

*Urban Hamilton Woodland Conservation By-law and Urban Forest Strategy*

Natural elements and vegetation are recognized as potential features of cultural heritage landscapes in the P.P.S. and Parks Canada *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada*. As such, tree cover and mature trees may be identified as having
cultural heritage value or as heritage attributes. Accordingly, the following section addresses the City’s current framework for managing trees and woodlands.

The Urban Hamilton Woodland Conservation By-law No. 14-212 was enacted “to promote the conservation and sustainable use of woodlands on private property within the urban boundary of the City of Hamilton.” (City of Hamilton 2014a). The by-law specifically protects trees in a woodland equal to or greater than 0.2 hectares located within the urban boundary of the City. Generally, the injury or destruction of a tree in a woodland is not allowed without a permit, with some exceptions.

There is no tree-cutting by-law in place within the Waterdown Area, however an Urban Forest Strategy (U.F.S.) project was initiated by the City of Hamilton beginning in January 2018 and is expected to be completed in 2021 (City of Hamilton 2018b). Draft goals were presented to the public in June 2019. Numerous strategies were identified for protecting, maintaining, and enhancing the long-term health of Hamilton’s urban forest. Some of these strategies could be applied to the Waterdown area.

Park Improvements

The City of Hamilton is responsible for the care and maintenance of city-owned and publicly accessible parks. Many of Hamilton’s parks are managed through master plans which provide guidance for uses and amenities within the park. Master plans have currently been established or are in progress for Central Park, Churchill Park, Confederation Beach Park, Gage Park, Gore Park, and The Hamilton Amateur Athletics Association Grounds. There are no master plans in place for parks in the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan study area. The City of Hamilton Park and Open Space Development Guide provides for the requirement to obtain approval for work on historical buildings and landscapes.

2.7 City of Hamilton Heritage Related Initiatives

City of Hamilton Cultural Policy Plan

The City of Hamilton has established a cultural policy plan titled “Transforming Hamilton through Culture: The Cultural Plan 2013”. The plan identifies eight goals:

1. Culture as an Economic Engine
2. Downtown Renewal
3. Quality of Life Quality of Place
4. Build Tourism
5. Neighbourhood Revitalization
6. Build Community Identity, Pride and Image
7. Encourage Welcoming Communities
8. Creativity for All
The eight goals expand into twelve recommendations and further 78 actions. Goal 3 Quality of Life Quality of Place relates to cultural heritage resources through the recommendation, “Celebrate and preserve Hamilton’s cultural assets” and the related actions listed below:

7.2 Use an integrated approach in policy development and work planning to identify, conserve, protect and enhance heritage buildings, sites, streetscapes, districts, natural cultural landscapes and environmental strategies.

7.4 Encourage and facilitate adaptive reuse of Hamilton’s built heritage assets.

7.6 Require the consideration of cultural, heritage and aesthetic elements in urban design strategies and other related documents.

7.9 Develop a planning guideline to identify and prioritize significant cultural and heritage areas or districts for recognition, preservation, enhancement and promotion.

7.10 Identify and approve additional Heritage Conservation Districts.

7.11 Promote heritage designation of existing identified significant properties and promote the designation of additional buildings.

7.12 Update, maintain and provide public access to the Built Heritage Inventory.

7.13 Update, maintain and provide public access to the Cultural Heritage Landscape Inventory. (City of Hamilton 2013a)

**Heritage Interpretation**

The City of Hamilton has a Plaques and Markers Program administered by the Tourism and Culture Division. This heritage interpretation program provides textual information and photographs in public places. The program currently includes three plaque types: Commemorative, Heritage Recognition and Designated Property. Parties interested in a plaque may apply for review and approval by the Plaques and Markers Adjudication Committee (City of Hamilton 2018a). There is also funding available for three Commemorative plaques annually which are thematically related. For example, the 2019 theme was On the Waterfront: Stories from Cootes Paradise to Stoney Creek.

**Business Improvement Areas**

The City of Hamilton has several Business Improvement Areas (B.I.A.) one of which is in Waterdown and is focused on the downtown core defined as Dundas, Hamilton, Mill and Main Streets. The B.I.A. was created in 1985 with the purpose of making improvements to the local business district through projects ranging from street beautification to events and marketing initiatives. Project are funded through a levy on businesses within the BIA area. The Waterdown
B.I.A. has expressed a commitment to maintaining the “quaintness and charm of the original village” and “preservation of our heritage buildings” (Simons 2017).

**Flamborough Archives and Heritage Society**

The Flamborough Archives and Heritage Society is located at the Waterdown Branch of the Hamilton Public Library. Their mandate is to collect and preserve archival material relating to the history, people, buildings and communities within the area of Flamborough (Anon 2018). The organization hosts monthly meetings on a variety of historical topics, maintains a blog and hosts walking tours.

3.0 Existing Cultural Heritage Landscape Context

3.1 International Context

The term cultural heritage landscape (C.H.L.) initially evolved out of investigations centered on cultural geography and was officially coined in 1926 to describe any place modified by humankind. By the mid-twentieth century, the concept and its comprehensive approach to the investigation of resources emerged at the international level when the United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (U.N.E.S.C.O.) adopted a ‘Recommendation Concerning the Safeguarding of the Beauty and Character of Landscapes and Sites’. This recommendation called for the “preservation and, where possible, the restoration of the aspect of natural, rural, and urban landscapes and sites, whether natural or man-made, which have a cultural or aesthetic interest or form typical natural surroundings”.

By 1975, the General Assembly of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (I.C.O.M.O.S.), the international professional membership N.G.O. that acts as the custodian of conservation doctrine, further recognized the importance of cultural heritage landscapes as an integral unit of analysis by passing Resolutions on the Conservation of Smaller Historic Towns. During the 1980s, additional declarations and charters issued by I.C.O.M.O.S. emerged, with special attention placed on defining cultural heritage landscapes.

In 1992, the World Heritage Convention was amended to include the concept of cultural heritage landscapes, resulting in the first legal instrument able to recognize and protect cultural heritage landscapes. Article 1 of the World Heritage Convention now acknowledges that cultural heritage landscapes represent the ‘combined works of nature and man’. The World Heritage Convention further developed this concept by identifying three categories of cultural heritage landscapes. The three cultural heritage landscape categories identified by U.N.E.S.C.O. include:

1. **“Clearly defined landscape designed and created intentionally by man”**: These embrace garden and parkland landscapes constructed for aesthetic reasons which are often (but not always) associated with religious or other monumental buildings and ensembles.
2. **Organically evolved landscapes**: This results from an initial social, economic, administrative, and/or religious imperative and has developed its present form by association with and in response to its natural environment. Such landscapes reflect that process of evolution in their form and component features. These landscapes fall into two sub-categories:

   a. **Relict (Fossil) Landscape**: one in which an evolutionary process came to an end at some time in the past, either abruptly or over a period. Its significant distinguishing features are, however, still visible in material form.

   b. **Continuing Landscape**: one which retains an active social role in contemporary society closely associated with the traditional way of life, and in which the evolutionary process is still in progress. At the same time, it exhibits significant material evidence of its evolution over time.

3. **Associative cultural landscape**: The inclusion of such landscapes on the World Heritage List is justifiable by virtue of the powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations of the natural element rather than material cultural evidence, which may be insignificant or even absent.

3.2 **Federal Context**

The Parks Canada *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada* defines a cultural landscape as “any geographical area that has been modified, influenced, or given special cultural meaning by people and identifies the following categories of cultural landscapes, in line with the categories identified by U.N.E.S.C.O.: 1) designed cultural landscapes; 2) organically evolved landscapes, including both relict and continuing landscapes; and 3) associative landscapes” (Parks Canada 2010:49).

3.3 **Provincial Context**

The Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (M.H.S.T.C.I.) provides non-legislative resources for communities to assist with the conservation of cultural heritage resources, including the *Ontario Heritage Tool Kit* (2006). The *Ontario Heritage Tool Kit* indicates that cultural heritage resources should be identified, listed, researched, evaluated, and protected, yet it is up to municipalities to use the most effective and appropriate tools available at each step of this process to ensure the ongoing conservation of cultural heritage landscapes within each municipality. The *Ontario Heritage Tool Kit* identifies municipal criteria in Ontario Regulation 9/06 as laid out in the *O.H.A.*, a test against which properties must be assessed and the criteria for determining property of cultural heritage value or interest in a municipality. Criteria include design value or physical value, historical value or associative value,
and contextual value. The three categories of cultural heritage landscapes recognized by U.N.E.S.C.O. are also identified (M. H. S. T. C. I. 2006a).

As the lead heritage agency of the Province of Ontario, the Ontario Heritage Trust (O.H.T.) includes background on cultural heritage landscapes as part of its toolkit. “Cultural Heritage Landscapes: An Introduction” (2012) identifies the three categories of cultural heritage landscapes identified by U.N.E.S.C.O.: designed, evolved and associative. The O.H.T. defines cultural heritage landscape as “a property or defined geographic area of cultural heritage significance that has been modified by human activities and is valued by a community.” (Ontario Heritage Trust 2012)

3.4 Municipal Context: City of Hamilton Cultural Heritage Landscape Framework for Identification and Evaluation

In 2008, the City of Hamilton adopted a framework for determining the cultural heritage value or interest of property for the purposes of designation under Part IV of the O.H.A., including specific criteria for evaluating cultural heritage landscapes. The City’s criteria are consistent with Ontario Regulation 9/06 and can be applied to a broad range of landscapes in a consistent and systematic manner. These criteria have been included as Appendix A.

4.0 Methodology

The Waterdown Community Node Review includes the review of previously identified built heritage resources (i.e., included on the City of Hamilton Built Heritage Inventory) (Figure 3) and potential cultural heritage landscapes previously identified by the City of Hamilton (Figure 4). The Review also includes the identification and evaluation of other potential built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes. The review of built heritage resources is being undertaken by the City of Hamilton, the results of which will be referenced within this report. The review of existing and potential cultural heritage landscapes is being undertaken by A.S.I. Previously identified potential cultural heritage landscapes within the study area are:

- Village of Waterdown
- Mill Street H.C.D.
- Dundas Street
- Main Street
- Waterdown Memorial Park
- Former Glenlea (Glenlee) Farm
- Waterdown Heights Subdivision
- Nelson Street and Mill Site
- Union Cemetery
- Vinegar Hill
- Board Street
It was determined that the Village of Waterdown and the Mill Street H.C.D. would not be further reviewed as part of this Review as per direction received from the City's project team. The Village of Waterdown was not reviewed as it extends beyond the Secondary Plan study area. The Mill Street H.C.D. is already understood and appropriately protected under the H.C.D. Plan policies. Through the Secondary Plan public consultation, Sealey Park was identified by the community as an additional potential cultural heritage landscape.

To complete the review and evaluations of potential cultural heritage landscapes, background historical research, which includes consultation of primary and secondary research sources and historical mapping, is first 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. Typically, resources identified during these stages of the research process are reflective of architectural styles, associated with an important person, place, or event, and contribute to the contextual facets of a 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 experience. A landscape is identified as a cultural heritage resource if the resource meets the criteria for determining cultural heritage value under Ontario Regulation 9/06 of the *O.H.A.* and meets the City of Hamilton’s framework for determining cultural heritage value or interest of a property which includes specific criteria for evaluating cultural heritage landscapes.

---

2 The Village of Waterdown was subsequently reviewed through a separate memorandum prior to finalization of this report to support recommendations included in Section 7.3 of this Cultural Heritage Review.
Figure 3: Built heritage resources currently included on the City of Hamilton Built Heritage Inventory and the City of Hamilton Municipal Heritage Register.
Figure 4: Previously identified potential cultural heritage landscapes within the study area.
4.1 Historical Context

Following a review of primary and secondary sources and historical mapping it was determined that the background history of land use in Waterdown written for the Waterdown Heritage Conservation District Study (1996) by Unterman McPhail Cuming Associates and Wendy Shearer Landscape Architect Limited provides a thorough basis for this Review (Appendix B). This history provides an excellent outline of the early historical development of Waterdown and traces its development from its initial settlement by Euro-Canadians to the subsequent transformation of the rural landscape of East Flamborough Township into the Village of Waterdown in the 1920s. An online Story Map produced by the City of Hamilton in support of the Waterdown Village Built Heritage Inventory provides a timeline of Waterdown which supplements and expands this history and includes inhabitation as early as 7,500 B.C.E. by the Chonnonton Nation to the present. The Story Map includes a narrative description of the area’s history, including key dates and events illustrated by primary source material and interactive maps. These two documents form the basis of the historical context for this Review. Additionally, individual potential cultural heritage landscapes were subject to detailed research and mapping review to provide the basis for evaluation (Appendix C).

4.2 Field Review

A field review was undertaken by Laura Loney, (Former) Cultural Heritage Specialist and Laura Wickett, Cultural Heritage Analyst both of A.S.I. on 29 July 2019. Following an expansion of the study area, a second field review was undertaken by Kristina Martens, Cultural Heritage Specialist of A.S.I. on 12 May 2020 to review new and community identified areas. Field review was limited to publicly accessible areas (i.e., roadways, intersections, non-private lands). As such there is the possibility that additional cultural heritage landscapes may be identified in future.

The individual, previously identified, potential cultural heritage landscapes and community identified cultural heritage landscapes within the study area were reviewed through visual inspection and photographic documentation. The study area was also reviewed to understand the context of built heritage resources and to determine if there were any additional potential cultural heritage landscapes which merited detailed research and evaluation. Additional photographic documentation was collected on 1 August 2019 by Victoria Mance and Laurie Brady, (Former) Survey Technicians, A.S.I., of specific locations to supplement the initial 2019 field review. The field review confirmed the location, boundaries and identified features that expressed each sites’ cultural heritage value.

---

3 The Story Map is available online at: https://spatialsolutions.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapJournal/index.html?appid=cd15231b16174288b88c82c26aa7158c.
4.3 Evaluation Methodology

*Cultural Heritage Landscape Identification and Evaluation Methodology*

Based on the best practice review undertaken as part of this study and a review of the City of Hamilton’s existing municipal framework and provincial and federal policy frameworks, the study team identified the 2014\(^4\) *P.P.S.* definition of a cultural heritage landscape as its working definition for the identification and evaluation of Significant Cultural Heritage Landscapes. Cultural heritage landscape is defined in the *P.P.S.*:

> Means a defined geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community including an Aboriginal community (Government of Ontario 2014).

The project uses the City of Hamilton Framework for Evaluating the Cultural Heritage Value or Interest of Property for Designation under Part IV of the *O.H.A.*\(^5\). Criteria used for evaluation are outlined in detail in Appendix A.

A landscape that has been evaluated and found to have cultural heritage value or interest, is a *significant cultural heritage landscape*. Landscapes which did not meet the criteria at this time may be determined to be of cultural heritage value or interest in the future. Significant C.H.L.s are recommended for classification as Cultural Heritage Landscapes within the City of Hamilton and/or protection under the *O.H.A.* or through other appropriate mechanisms or application of tools identified in Section 6 of this report.

4.4 Potential Cultural Heritage Landscapes

Based on the results of the historical context research and field review, the nine previously identified potential cultural heritage landscapes were determined to merit additional background research and evaluation. It was determined that Sealey Park, a potential cultural heritage landscape identified through public engagement, would also receive additional background research and evaluation. The previously identified and potential cultural heritage landscapes are presented in a series of information sheets summarizing the results of the background research, site analysis, and field review (see Appendix C). The information sheets are organized to include:

\(^4\) During this Review, an updated *P.P.S.* came into force, effective 1 May 2020. The consultant team confirms that both the 2014 and 2020 *P.P.S.* consistently define ‘cultural heritage landscape’, and therefore methodological definitions did not require refinement following the introduction of the 2020 *P.P.S.*

\(^5\) Note the City’s evaluation framework is intended to apply to the evaluation of candidate properties for Part IV designation under the Ontario Heritage Act however the City does not have any specific process for evaluating H.C.D.s. In lieu of a specific framework for evaluation H.C.D.s the framework for individual properties has been employed.
5.0 Identified Cultural Heritage Resources within the Waterdown Community Node

5.1 Built Heritage Resources

City of Hamilton staff have refined the identified Built Heritage Resources within the Waterdown Community Node through the Waterdown Village Built Heritage Inventory process, making recommendations for candidates for inclusion on the Heritage Register either as Non-Designated properties or Designated properties under Part IV of the O.H.A. (Figure 5).^6

^6 Note: Municipal Heritage Register Listings and designation property identifications are not final. Listings and designations reflect proposed recommendations from the Waterdown Village Built Heritage Inventory.
5.2 Cultural Heritage Landscapes

Background research and evaluations prepared as part of this study concluded that six of the ten previously identified and potential cultural heritage landscapes are significant cultural heritage landscapes. The significant cultural heritage landscapes are Dundas Street, Main Street, Waterdown Heights Subdivision, Waterdown Union Cemetery, Sealey Park, and Waterdown Memorial Park (Figure 6). A brief description of each significant cultural heritage landscape is included below. Each of the evaluated areas are described in greater detail in the individual cultural heritage landscape information sheets provided in Appendix C.

Dundas Street

Dundas Street is a significant cultural heritage landscape due to its cultural heritage value, community value, and historical integrity. Dundas Street is an evolved mixed-use transportation corridor dating to the eighteenth century and which has retained nineteenth and early-twentieth-century historic commercial, residential, and public properties along the right-of-
way. A Statement of Significance and identified cultural heritage attributes apply to the portion of Dundas Street East within the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan Study Area between the west property boundary of the property at 289 Dundas Street on the north side and the west property boundary of 290 Dundas Street along the south side to the eastern edge of First Street.

**Main Street**

Main Street is an evolved mid-nineteenth and twentieth-century streetscape with historical, commercial, public, and residential uses that are extant. A Statement of Significance and identified cultural heritage attributes apply to the portion of Main Street within the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan Study Area between the northern terminus of Main Street at Parkside Drive and the south boundary near the Waterdown Pumping Station.

**Waterdown Heights Subdivision**

Waterdown Heights Subdivision is a residential subdivision in the northeast corner of the Village of Waterdown. The area is bounded by Parkside Drive to the north, the concession line to the east, Elgin Street to the south, and Victoria Street to the west. The area has cultural heritage value as the earliest post-Second World War subdivision established during a period when the Village of Waterdown’s population doubled in size. The naming of Churchill Avenue and the housing designs are reflective of the period.

**Waterdown Union Cemetery**

Waterdown Union Cemetery is an active cemetery in Waterdown, located at 9 Margaret Street, north of Dundas Street East along the east bank of the Grindstone Creek. Waterdown Union Cemetery is of cultural heritage value as the earliest cemetery established in the Village of Waterdown with the first burial taking place in 1830. A dozen other burials took place in the 1830s and the cemetery has been active throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and into the twenty-first century with approximately 1010 burials. The property has cultural heritage value or interest for physical reasons, historical associations, and context.

**Sealey Park**

Sealey Park is a community park established in 1931 with a long history of use as the site of the Waterdown Grammar and Common School and the drill shed, both of which date to the mid-nineteenth century. Sealey Park is comprised of 105 and 115 Main Street South and is located on the east side of Main Street South, bounded by School Street to the south, the bank of the Grindstone Creek to the east and residential properties to the north. Sealey Park has cultural heritage value for its associations with the Waterdown Grammar and Common School, the drill shed, the Sealey family, and as a place of community recreation.
Waterdown Memorial Park

Waterdown Memorial Park is a publicly owned community park established between 1946 and 1947 with a history of use for industrial resource extraction. The park is located at 200 Hamilton Street North in Waterdown, generally bounded by Hamilton Street to the west, Parkside Drive to the north, Main Street to the east and the rear lot lines of the properties on the north side of John Street West. Waterdown Memorial Park is valued as a memorial to Second World War veterans and as parkland to provide a place for community recreation and events.
Figure 6: Identified Cultural Heritage Landscapes.
6.0 Regulatory and Non-Regulatory Approaches

Baseline standards for good conservation of cultural heritage resources are set out by the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (M.H.S.T.C.I.) through the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit which provides interpretation for the integration of the P.P.S. into the land use planning process (M. H. S. T. C. I. 2006b). While this document was published in response to the 2005 P.P.S., much of it remains applicable to the interpretation of the 2020 P.P.S. The specific principles identified that reflect good conservation practice include:

1. **Respect for Documentary Evidence.** Do not base restoration on conjecture. Conservation work should be based on historic documentation, such as historic photographs, drawings and physical evidence.

2. **Respect for the Original Location.** Do not move buildings unless there is no other means to save them. Site is an integral component of a building. Any change in site diminishes heritage value considerably.

3. **Respect for Historic Material.** Repair or conserve rather than replace building materials and finishes, except where absolutely necessary. Minimal intervention maintains the historical content of the resource.

4. **Respect for Original Fabric.** Repair with like materials, to return the resource to its prior condition without altering its integrity.

5. **Respect for the Building’s History.** Do not restore to one period at the expense of another. Do not destroy later additions to a house solely to restore it to a single time period.

6. **Reversibility.** Alterations should be able to be returned to original conditions. This conserves earlier building design and technique. For instance, when a new door opening is put in a stone wall, the original stones are numbered, removed and stored, allowing for future restoration.

7. **Legibility.** New work should be distinguishable from old. Buildings should be recognized as products of their own time, and new additions should not blur the distinction between old and new.

8. **Maintenance.** With continuous care, future restoration will not be necessary. With regular upkeep, major conservation projects and their high costs can be avoided.

These conservation principles are also consistent with the policy language in the City’s *U.H.O.P.* There are a range of potential protection tools and approaches that municipal jurisdictions may adopt and/or enable for the long-term conservation of built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes, some of which can apply to multiple properties or groupings of cultural
heritage resources. These range from tools enabled under the O.H.A. and Planning Act, to the creation of municipal by-laws, in addition to non-regulatory approaches such as implementation of strategies designed to increase community awareness and stewardship for cultural heritage landscapes or the creation of financial incentives. Some approaches are more appropriate for individual properties while others are better suited to groups of properties such as cultural heritage landscapes, and in some cases the application of multiple strategies may be preferred (Table 1).

A list of regulatory and non-regulatory tools is outlined below:

- Inclusion of Individual Properties on the City’s Municipal Heritage Register as Non-Designated
- Designation of an individual property under the O.H.A. (Part IV)
- Heritage Conservation District Designation under the O.H.A. (Part V)
- Cultural Heritage Landscape Identification in the Official Plan or Secondary Plan
- Cultural Heritage Conservation Plan Statements in the Official Plan or Secondary Plan
- Identification of Heritage Roads and Special Character Roads in the Official Plan or Secondary Plan
- Designation of Heritage Roads under the O.H.A.
- Area and Site Specific Policy Areas
- Urban Design Guidelines
- Protected Views and View Corridors
- Private and Street Tree Protection By-Laws
- Zoning By-Laws
- Site Plan Control
- Holding By-law provisions
- Interpretation and Commemoration Strategy
- Marketing and Promotions Strategy

Table 1: Applicability to Individual or Groups of Properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Individual Properties</th>
<th>Groups of Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of Individual Properties on the City’s Municipal Heritage Register as Non-Designated</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation of an individual property under the O.H.A. (Part IV)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Conservation District Designation under the O.H.A. (Part V)</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage Landscape Identification in Secondary Plan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage Conservation Plan Statements in Secondary Plan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.1 Regulatory Approaches

*Inclusion of Individual Properties on Municipal Heritage Register as Non-Designated*

Individual properties identified as having potential or known significant cultural heritage value can be included on the Municipal Heritage Register. This is commonly referred to as listing. The *O.H.A.* allows for the listing of properties and provides 60 days interim protection upon the submission of a demolition permit application. This period provides heritage staff the opportunity to pursue conservation options including discussions with the owner respecting retention, adaptive re-use, and financial incentives; photo documentation of the property prior to demolition; and/or, designation under the *O.H.A.* where appropriate. When *Planning Act* Applications are proposed staff also have the opportunity to request or may require reports relating to the property's cultural heritage value or interest such as Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments. The Cultural Heritage Planner may provide comments on the application; and/or identify conditions of approval etc. Additionally, the Municipal Heritage Committee may also review Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments and provide Cultural Heritage Planning staff feedback.

Listing a non-designated property enables review of applications that require demolition permits only and therefore does not provide a mechanism to manage changes addressed under the Building Code, such as residential window replacement, re-cladding buildings, decorative detail removal, re-roofing, or tree removals for example. Listing a non-designated property on the Municipal Heritage Register does not prevent alterations to the property and does not require Heritage Permit approvals to make changes.

The Waterdown Village Built Heritage Inventory will result in recommendations to Council for the listing of non-designated properties on the Municipal Heritage Register.
While inclusion of non-designated properties on a heritage register is a useful tool for the review of individual built heritage resources, its utility as a conservation tool is limited when applied to multiple properties to conserve a specific cultural heritage landscape and particularly those aspects that when combined together contribute to cultural heritage value, or elements that are not regulated through the demolition review (i.e. building setbacks, height, materiality, adjacent infills). Listing on the Heritage Register can also be a means of flagging properties which may be of cultural heritage value or interest, however this is best reserved for individual properties only. The approach of listing individual properties, which together comprise a cultural heritage landscape, was utilized in the City of Mississauga for the protection of all cultural heritage landscapes identified in 2005. At that time, every property within each identified cultural landscape on the City of Mississauga’s Heritage Register was listed. Since that time, it has been recognized that clearly defined attributes and more specific tools are required to enable staff to appropriately manage change within C.H.L.s.

**Individual Property Designation**

Individual properties identified as having significant cultural heritage value can be designated under Part IV of the *O.H.A*. Designation allows for the protection of identified heritage values and attributes on a property, as defined in a designation by-law. The *P.P.S.* enables regulation of development on properties adjacent to designated heritage properties (i.e., “protected heritage property”). Adjacency is defined in the *U.H.O.P.* as, “In regard to cultural heritage and archaeology, those lands contiguous to, or located within 50 metres of, a protected heritage property.” (City of Hamilton 2013b:1 Chapter G).

A heritage permit and/or Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment is required if a designated property or a property adjacent to a designated property is to be altered or demolished. Alterations that require a permit typically include changes to building exteriors, changes to significant landscape features, or new construction. The evaluation of alterations considers adverse actions that result in the damage, loss or removal of valued heritage features or actions that result in detrimental changes to the setting or character of a heritage feature.

The Waterdown Village Built Heritage Inventory will result in the identification of candidates for designation under Part IV of the *O.H.A.* for Council’s consideration.

**Heritage Conservation District Designation**

Heritage Conservation Districts (H.C.D.) are defined as “areas whose cultural heritage value contributes to a sense of place extending beyond their individual buildings, structures and landscapes” (Ministry of Culture 2006). Designation of an area under Part V of the *O.H.A.* applies to all properties within a defined H.C.D. boundary in relation to the district’s objectives, goals, statement of cultural heritage value, and identified attributes as set out in an H.C.D. Plan. The process to designate an H.C.D. is completed in two phases, a Study and a Plan. The purpose of the Study is to understand and evaluate the area and delineate a boundary. The Study may find that an area does not meet the evaluation criteria, or a Council may decide not to proceed.
to the Plan Phase. The Plan Phase includes the preparation of guidelines to conserve and manage change in the area.

The process to amend an existing H.C.D., whether it is the boundaries, the Statement of Significance or the H.C.D. Plan document itself, requires an amendment to the existing by-law and adoption of a revised H.C.D. plan, which in effect removes the protection of the existing by-law and passes a new by-law. Some municipalities in Ontario have used a different approach and have successfully added adjacent areas to existing H.C.D.s through the creation of a new H.C.D. abutting an existing H.C.D. instead of repealing and replacing an existing H.C.D.

Property owners or community members can appeal the creation of a new H.C.D. or amendments to an existing H.C.D. to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (L.P.A.T.).

The Mill Street H.C.D. in Waterdown was enacted by by-law in 1996 under By-Law 34-H-96 and contained 92 properties at the time (Government of Ontario). A group of local stakeholders has requested that the existing Mill Street H.C.D. be expanded to include adjacent lands, or that those adjacent lands be protected by a new H.C.D. (Waterdown Mill Street HCD Committee n.d.).

Heritage district designation allows municipalities to manage change in the protected area through the heritage permit process and application of the H.C.D. Plan guidelines, which have been developed to manage change in a defined area, including alterations and demolitions. Alterations that require a heritage permit typically include significant changes to building exteriors and changes to significant landscape features that are visible from public areas. An H.C.D. plan specifies the types of major, significant alterations will require a heritage permit, and those which may be excluded. When an H.C.D. plan is enacted, a key step in its implementation is the identification of changes required to other municipal by-laws and Official Plan provisions that would be required to bring them into conformity and consistency with the H.C.D. plan.

Cultural Heritage Landscape Identification in Secondary Plan

Cultural Heritage Landscapes and their boundaries may be identified in an Official Plan or secondary plan and in the mapping schedules. Policies for the conservation and management of these landscapes should then be included in the related secondary plan. Municipal zoning by-laws may also be amended to implement standards to further manage the conservation of identified heritage attributes, where applicable. In Waterdown, a site plan control by-law is in place, however low-density housing is not currently subject to this by-law. The site plan control by-law could be amended to extend site plan control to properties included in cultural heritage landscapes. Additionally, or alternatively, the secondary plan may present specific policies to provide enhanced guidance when applying zoning by-law provisions in a manner that conserves identified cultural heritage landscapes. Other tools that may be developed to support implementation may include the development of a Cultural Heritage Conservation Plan Statement. Staff may request a heritage impact assessment as part of a Planning Act
development application to assess and resolve impacts to the cultural heritage landscape. Additional information on zoning by-laws, site plan control, and cultural heritage conservation plan statements is included in the below sections.

**Cultural Heritage Conservation Plan Statements**

Cultural Heritage Conservation Plan Statements are addressed in the City of Hamilton’s Urban Official Plan and are directed to be used for areas where the concentration or significance of cultural heritage resources requires detailed guidance and development of conservation and enhancement strategies. The Cultural Heritage Conservation Plan Statement triggers a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment for “proposed development”, “site alteration” and “redevelopment of lands”. See Section 2.4 for details on the Cultural Heritage Conservation Plan Statements as set out in the *U.H.O.P.*

**Area or Site Specific Policy Areas**

Area or Site Specific Policy Areas can be included in an Official Plan or Secondary Plan to provide detailed direction for land use, infrastructure, transportation, environment, urban design, or similar issues when they are required beyond the general framework of the Official Plan or Secondary Plan. The policies and guidelines can regulate such features including, but not limited to, building orientation, setbacks, lot coverage, building heights, and open space.

In Hamilton, Area Specific and Site Specific Policy Areas are identified in Volume 3 of the *U.H.O.P.*, except where the areas are located within a secondary plan area. The policies are then contained within the secondary plan in Volume 2 of the *U.H.O.P.*

Generally, guidelines and zoning by-law provisions are used in conjunction with Area and Site Specific Policy Areas to provide direction regarding how a new development can fit with and be sensitive to an area’s existing character. In addition, compatibility of a new development with existing character are linked to a Site Plan Application process or Building Permit. A municipality can determine what changes will trigger review within a defined character area and can use Site Plan or building permit application processes to review developments.

**Protected Views and View Corridors**

The identification of significant views and view corridors in an Official Plan, within a list and map or schedule, can allow for the protection of those views through the development review process. The level of detail integrated into the Official Plan, with respect to how protected view corridors intersect with real property can influence the scope and extent of how views and view corridors are able to be addressed as part of the development review process.

**Heritage Roads and Special Character Roads**

Through the *U.H.O.P.*, Heritage Roads and Special Character Roads can also be identified, conserved, and managed. Heritage roads are those that have attributes identified related to
specific historical associations or scenic amenity. Heritage roads or rights-of-way can be designated under the O.H.A. in addition to identification in the official plan. Their protection may include existing road surfaces, trees and tree lines, other vegetation, and features such as bridges, or all of these where they contribute to the character of the road.

Additional tools may be developed to manage lands outside of but adjacent to the scenic road, such as urban design guidelines, community plans, H.C.D. Plans and Secondary Plans. The municipal zoning by-law and the site plan control by-law could also be amended to implement standards to further regulate contributing elements located outside of the public road right-of-way, where applicable.

Within the road right-of-way, this approach is implemented by transportation planning staff who ensure that any Official Plan and/or Secondary Plan policies and any additional design recommendations as documented in supplementary guideline documents are integrated into the design process and maintenance of the public road right-of-way.

If the municipality develops urban design guidelines for lands adjacent to an identified scenic corridor to provide advice on how driveway, fencing, or setbacks for example, should be undertaken to be compatible with the scenic road, these guidelines could be addressed through site plan applications and/or through applying site-specific zoning requirements to these areas.

**Zoning By-Law**

Zoning by-laws take direction from the policies of the Official Plan and Secondary Plans to provide specific regulation and standards that control what can be done with a property. Zoning by-laws regulate the use of land, including how that land may be used, what types of buildings and structures are permitted, where buildings and structures can be located, and more detailed, often measurable development requirements for that land such as building size, height and coverage, mass, and parking requirements. Zoning by-laws can be used to ensure compatibility of development with surrounding properties and within a broader community.

Zoning by-laws are implemented through staff review of development proposals (including building permit applications) against the City’s zoning by-laws. If a development proposal does not comply with the zoning by-law, an application is required (either a zoning by-law amendment or minor variance application) to permit the development, and that application is subject to review by City staff and other agencies as appropriate. The implementation of additional or tailored zoning provisions, where applicable, would provide the City with additional benchmarks to assess development applications in the context of cultural heritage resources.

**Site Plan Control**

Site plan control is a tool that enables a municipality to require submission of an application to review a proposed development, including major building renovations or additions, prior to a
building permit application. The purpose of the City of Hamilton’s site plan approval process is to review site design features and coordinate: high quality building design; impact of the proposal on surrounding land uses; placement of buildings; overall site design; landscaping; pedestrian movement and barrier-free design; grading, drainage and storm water management; parking and loading layouts, and vehicular access and maneuvering (City of Hamilton 2015). It can be used to review matters such as heights, massing, exterior architectural detail, landscaping, fencing, driveways, parking, and lighting. The entire City of Hamilton is designated a site plan control area, however typically single detached, semi-detached, and duplex dwellings are exempt. In some instances, the requirement for site plan control has been extended to low density residential uses where there are specific considerations that require additional review. As an example, in 2019 the City of Hamilton made amendments that introduced site plan control for several of Ancaster’s neighbourhoods.

As part of Site Plan Approval, the City will consider the character, scale, appearance, and design of features of the exterior of new buildings and structures either attached or sited close to built heritage resources with the objective of retaining, protecting, complementing or not harming distinguishing heritage features (Chapter F, Policy 1.7.5 d).

Elsewhere for example, the City of Brampton requires site plan approval for additions or new/replacement dwellings that are 50 square metres or greater in floor area and recognizes that any building permit issued within a ‘Mature Neighbourhood’ must satisfy the City in terms compatibility with neighbourhood character. In the City of Toronto, as part of Site Plan Control applications, a heritage impact assessment is required where the subject property is included on the City of Toronto’s Inventory of Heritage Properties. Other municipalities have demonstrated application of site plan control to defined and protected heritage areas, such as heritage conservation districts. In the City of Mississauga, site plan control is extended to any development or redevelopment on lands contained within the Old Port Credit Village Heritage Conservation District for example (City of Mississauga By-law No. 0293-2006). Alternatively, the City of Kingston’s Site Control Plan By-law contains provisions to require site plan control for any development within the Barriefield Heritage Conservation District, subject to certain exclusions (City of Kingston By-law Number 2010-217).

**Holding By-Laws**

A holding by-law may be put into place to ensure, among other things, conditions are met prior to development taking place. In the City of Hamilton, Council may pass a holding by-law and specify which conditions must be met before the “H” symbol is removed from the zoning and the lands can be developed. A holding provision has been used in Downtown Hamilton with one of the conditions for removal being the submission of a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment demonstrating how the cultural heritage value has been incorporated and maintained.
Urban Design Guidelines

Urban design guidelines allow a municipality to guide new construction within residential, commercial, or industrial neighbourhoods, including elements such as streetscape, signage, built form, views, pedestrian amenities, and landscaping.

Urban design guidelines will be developed as part of the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan.

Tree Protection By-Law

Tree protection by-laws can regulate trees of a certain diameter on private property and city streets, with exceptions that include trees less than the size identified in a municipal by-law, or trees that are dying, injured, or posing danger to life or property. The City of Hamilton currently has a by-law protecting urban woodlands however this speaks more to groupings of trees (minimum of 0.2 hectares). The ongoing Urban Forest Strategy is considering several other tree protection strategies, which may include a by-law to protect individual trees on private property. This strategy can be useful in protecting cultural heritage landscapes where trees are a primary attribute of the landscape. Tree Protection By-laws are implemented through staff requests for an arborist report prior to removing a tree and a potential heritage impact assessment as part of a development application.

6.2 Non-Regulatory Approaches

Non-regulatory approaches do not explicitly protect cultural heritage resources however these strategies assist with creating awareness in the community around the history and significance of sites or landscapes. They are best used in conjunction with regulatory approaches.

Interpretation and Commemoration Strategy

An interpretation and commemoration strategy allows for the history and stories of significant cultural heritage landscapes to be shared, understood, and appreciated by members of the public through a variety of media, including, but not limited to, interpretive plaques, exhibits, tours, apps, and educational programs.

The Plaques and Markers Program administered by Hamilton’s Tourism and Culture Division currently include three plaque types: Commemorative, Heritage Recognition and Designated Property. Parties interested in a plaque may apply for review and approval by the Plaques and Markers Adjudication Committee (City of Hamilton 2018a). There is also funding available for three Commemorative plaques annually which are thematically related. For example, the 2019 theme was On the Waterfront: Stories from Cootes Paradise to Stoney Creek.

Public Art is commissioned by the City of Hamilton through the Public Art Master Plan. A list of prioritized projects in the Public Art Master Plan includes the Waterdown Rotary Memorial Park.
Skating Loop as an opportunity for a site with an interactive, functional, or aesthetic artwork. Public art can also link to the history of a site or landscape.

There may be opportunities to integrate interpretation and commemoration strategies through activities led by the City’s Heritage Presentation Coordinator, through Councillor-funded projects or through created collaborative partnerships with local B.I.A.s and heritage societies.

Some examples of installations that may be included in a heritage interpretation strategy include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Interpretation or Commemoration Strategy</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information boards/panels and signage</td>
<td>Information boards/panels and signage can provide context about the historical significance of a property. Where plaques have traditionally acted as the means of commemorating heritage properties, their content, materiality, and location typically do not provide the context and insight necessary to provide captivating interpretation of a property. Best practices in interpretation strategies include information boards and panels that incorporate historical photos, maps, text, and other information that provide an immersive experience for visitors of all ages and abilities. Where plaques have a limited malleability in terms of design, information boards and panels can be designed in an assortment of shapes and sizes and incorporated into a variety of features that meet urban design objectives (such as wayfinding, public art, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia displays (photos, video, audio)</td>
<td>A multimedia display provides an immersive interpretation experience for all ages and abilities. Displays can include video, photos and/or audio, which tell the story of a place and can be activated by touch screens. Audio recordings of residents can provide an oral history of the site and provide an inclusive and multi-layered experience that incorporates both local and general knowledge and research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Interpretation or Commemoration Strategy</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models and tactile displays</td>
<td>Models and tactile displays provide visitors with a physical re-creation of a site, providing spatial awareness and a three-dimensional understanding of a property. Comprised of a wide variety of materials including metal, bronze and graphite, tactile models are durable and can assist with wayfinding. A series of tactile models can depict the evolution of a property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape design and paving</td>
<td>Heritage interpretation can be achieved through creative landscape design to express significant heritage attributes in the built environment. Interpretation can include outlining building foundations in contrasting colours or materials embedded in the ground or through the incorporation of significant motifs or themes in new construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art/Murals</td>
<td>Public art and murals can depict and reinterpret elements that represent the history of a property. A collage of historical imagery that incorporates sites, people and events can be developed with input from the community. Public art pieces can incorporate motifs and elements inspired by or deriving from built heritage. Local or professional artists can be used to create murals and public art pieces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reinterpretation or reinstallation of salvaged heritage attributes in new designs.</td>
<td>Where whole buildings cannot be conserved, identified heritage attributes can be reinterpreted or conserved and reinstalled in new infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile.smart phone applications</td>
<td>The ubiquity of mobile phones creates opportunities to provide dynamic and immersive interpretive content. Applications can be developed to provide information, photos, videos and audio that provide information about the history and evolution of a property. A mobile phone application can be specific to a site or integrated into a larger electronic strategy for an area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Marketing and Promotions Strategy

Marketing and promotions strategies, including branding, wayfinding, and signage, walking tours, social media campaigns, cultural festivals and events, and public art, allow further understanding and appreciation of built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes by members of the public. The City of Hamilton’s Cultural Policy Plan sets out key actions related to built heritage and cultural heritage resources and includes strategies for the promotion of culture. Promotions could include educational packages for homeowners or realtors about the Secondary Plan and/or cultural heritage resources. The Waterdown Business Improvement Association and the Flamborough Archives coordinates walking tours and tourism-related programming.

7.0 Draft Policy and Recommendations

Development activities have the potential to affect cultural heritage resources in a variety of ways, and as such, appropriate conservation strategies and mitigation measures need to be considered in conjunction with the development of preferred land uses. A preliminary heritage impact analysis has been included below in Table 2 and Table 3 to inform the secondary plan process. Additional recommendations to support the conservation strategies are included in Section 7.3.

7.1 Recommended Strategies for Identified Built Heritage Resources in the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan Study Area

Table 2: Potential Impacts of Secondary Plan on Identified Built Heritage Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Conservation/Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Built Heritage Resources – individual | Alteration or removal of the heritage property and/or attributes due to:  
- Property redevelopment  
- Road widening  
- Loss of mature vegetation  
- Increased traffic volumes  
- Pedestrian realm improvements  
- Road improvements  
- Incompatible development adjacent to resource  
- Property redevelopment | Protection through Part IV designation under O.H.A. is recommended or alternatively, inclusion on the Heritage Register as non-designated properties of cultural heritage value or interest.  
Requirement for Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment, at the discretion of Cultural Heritage Planning staff, for development on or adjacent to the resource, if subject to a Planning Act application. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Type</th>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Conservation/Mitigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Built Heritage Resources – cluster of properties at the north end of Mill Street bounded by Main Street North, Parkside Drive, Victoria Street, and the existing Heritage Conservation District** | Alteration or removal of the heritage property and/or attributes due to:  
- Property redevelopment  
- Road widening  
- Loss of mature vegetation  
- Increased traffic volumes  
- Pedestrian realm improvements  
- Road improvements  
- Incompatible development adjacent to resource | Recognition through Part IV designation under *O.H.A.* is recommended, or alternatively, inclusion on the Heritage Register as non-designated properties of cultural heritage value or interest.  
Requirement for Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment, at the discretion of Cultural Heritage Planning staff, for development on or adjacent to the resource. |
| **Built Heritage Resources – individual properties within cultural heritage landscapes** | Alteration or removal of the heritage property and/or attributes due to:  
- Property redevelopment  
- Road widening  
- Loss of mature vegetation  
- Increased traffic volumes  
- Pedestrian realm improvements  
- Road improvements  
- Incompatible development adjacent to resource  
- Gradual loss of overall quality of cultural heritage landscape | Recognition through Part IV designation under *O.H.A.* is recommended or alternatively, inclusion on the Heritage Register as non-designated properties of cultural heritage value or interest.  
Requirement for Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment, at the discretion of Cultural Heritage Planning staff, for development on or adjacent to the resource.  
Align built heritage resource conservation measures with cultural heritage landscape conservation measures. |

7.2 **Recommended Strategies and Policy Directions for Identified Significant Cultural Heritage Landscapes in the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan Study Area**

A range of policies, legislation, and additional non-regulatory strategies have been recommended for the six significant cultural heritage landscapes identified as part of this study. Additional detail in terms of regulation, recommended use and implementation of those
recommended policies and strategies are also provided below. Priority legislative strategies for protection are presented in Table 3.
### Table 3: Potential Impacts of Secondary Plan on Identified Cultural Heritage Landscapes and Recommended Legislative Strategies for Protection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Heritage Landscape</th>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Conservation/Mitigation through Priority Legislative Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Dundas Street               | Alteration or removal of the heritage property and/or attributes due to:  
- Road widening  
- Loss of mature vegetation  
- Increased traffic volumes  
- Pedestrian realm improvements  
- Road improvements  
- Property redevelopment  
- Incompatible development adjacent to resource  
- Gradual loss of overall quality of cultural heritage landscape | 1. Identify as a Cultural Heritage Landscape in the Secondary Plan and a map showing location, boundaries and identified views, with Secondary Plan policies relating to the attributes as stated in the Statement of Significance. Recommended policies to develop include:  
   - Requiring Heritage Impact Assessments, at the discretion of Cultural Heritage Planning staff, for Planning Act applications for proposed development of properties within the cultural heritage landscape boundaries.  
   - Policies related to appropriate heights within or adjacent to landscape such as a pedestrian focused special policy area in the Secondary Plan with minimum 2-storey heights and maximum 3-storey heights fronting on Dundas Street.  
   - Policies related to setbacks and/or lot coverage to maintain distinctive qualities along the Dundas Street cultural heritage landscape.  
   - Policies for land uses to maintain commercial uses on the ground floor west of Grindstone Creek, such as pedestrian focus street policies.  
   - Policies related to the protection of the identified views.  
   - Road and pedestrian realm improvement approaches to conserve and enhance the corridor.  
   - Development and land use approaches that conserve and enhance the landscape and built form character of adjacent properties, Heritage impact analysis of proposed land use plan, once a preferred alternative has been developed, with the development of specific mitigation measures.  
2. Develop Urban Design Guidelines specific to the Dundas Street Cultural Heritage Landscape. Urban Design Guidelines should respond to the architectural qualities of the buildings within the cultural heritage landscape so that built form maintains the distinctive qualities of residential form (in particular, gable and hipped roofs) and commercial form (in particular, flat or sloped roofs).  
3. Identify as a Heritage Road in the Secondary Plan to protect the attributes as stated in the Statement of Significance.  
4. Existing zoning provisions should be reviewed and amended as needed to align with the Secondary Plan. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Heritage Landscape</th>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Conservation/Mitigation through Priority Legislative Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Main Street**            | Alteration or removal of the heritage property and/or attributes due to:  
  • Road widening  
  • Loss of mature vegetation  
  • Increased traffic volumes  
  • Pedestrian realm improvements  
  • Road improvements  
  • Property redevelopment  
  • Incompatible development adjacent to resource  
  • Decreased qualities of park and open space  
  • Gradual loss of overall quality of cultural heritage landscape | 1. Identify as a Cultural Heritage Landscape in the Secondary Plan and a map showing location and boundaries, with Secondary Plan policies relating to the attributes as stated in the Statement of Significance. Recommended policies to develop include:  
  o Requiring Heritage Impact Assessments, at the discretion of Cultural Heritage Planning staff, for Planning Act applications for proposed development of properties within the cultural heritage landscape boundaries.  
  o Restricting severances and consolidation to maintain the historic fine-grain lotting patterns.  
  o Policies related to appropriate heights within or adjacent to landscape such as a pedestrian focused special policy area in the Secondary Plan with minimum 1-storey heights and maximum 3-storey heights fronting on Main Street.  
  o Policies which maintain primary facades fronting on Main Street.  
  o Policies related to setbacks and/or lot coverage.  
  o Policies for sympathetic and compatible residential intensification, such as secondary suites, accessory structure conversions, etc.  
  o Policies for land uses to maintain residential uses with interspersed institutional and open space uses.  
  o Policies for land uses to maintain and enhance historic commercial uses along Main Street near to Dundas Street.  
  o Policies specific to park lands within cultural heritage landscape.  
  o Road and pedestrian realm improvement approaches to conserve and enhance the corridor.  
  o Development and land use approaches that conserve and enhance the landscape and built form character of adjacent properties, Heritage impact analysis of proposed land use plan, once a preferred alternative has been developed, with the development of specific mitigation measures.  
  2. Develop Urban Design Guidelines specific to the Main Street Cultural Heritage Landscape.  
  3. Identify as a Heritage Road in the Secondary Plan to protect the attributes as stated in the Statement of Significance.  
  4. Existing zoning provisions should be reviewed and amended as needed to align with the Secondary Plan. |
| **Waterdown Heights Subdivision** | Alteration or removal of the heritage property and/or attributes due to:  
  • Road widening  
  • Loss of mature vegetation  
  • Increased traffic volumes  
  • Pedestrian realm improvements  
  • Road improvements  
  • Property redevelopment  
  • Incompatible development adjacent to resource  
  • Decreased qualities of park and open space  
  • Gradual loss of overall quality of cultural heritage landscape | 1. Identify as a Cultural Heritage Landscape in the Secondary Plan and a map showing location and boundaries, with Secondary Plan policies relating to the attributes as stated in the Statement of Significance. Recommended policies to develop include:  
  o Requiring Heritage Impact Assessments, at the discretion of Cultural Heritage Planning staff, for Planning Act applications for proposed development of properties within the cultural heritage landscape boundaries.  
  o Restricting severances and consolidation to maintain the consistent lotting patterns.  
  o Policies related to appropriate massing and heights within or adjacent to landscape with a 1 to 2-storey height.  
  o Policies related to setbacks and/or lot coverage.  
  o Development and land use approaches that conserve and enhance the landscape and built form character of adjacent properties, Heritage impact analysis of proposed land use plan, once a preferred alternative has been developed, with the development of specific mitigation measures.  
  2. Develop Urban Design Guidelines specific to the Waterdown Heights Subdivision Cultural Heritage Landscape.  
  3. Existing zoning provisions should be reviewed and amended as needed to align with the Secondary Plan. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Heritage Landscape</th>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Conservation/Mitigation through Priority Legislative Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Waterdown Union Cemetery    | Alteration or removal of the heritage property and/or attributes due to:  
|                             | • Road widening  
|                             | • Loss of mature vegetation  
|                             | • Increased traffic volumes  
|                             | • Pedestrian realm improvements  
|                             | • Road improvements  
|                             | • Incompatible development adjacent to resource  
|                             | • Gradual loss of overall quality of cultural heritage landscape  
|                             | 1. Part IV Designation under the O.H.A. with Statement of Significance.  
|                             | OR  
|                             | 1. Identify as a Cultural Heritage Landscape in the Secondary Plan and a map showing location and boundaries, with Secondary Plan policies relating to the attributes as stated in the Statement of Significance.  
|                             | Recommended policies to develop include:  
|                             | o Develop policies requiring Heritage Impact Assessments for the addition of major facilities or changes within the cultural heritage landscape boundaries.  
| Sealey Park                 | Alteration or removal of the heritage property and/or attributes due to:  
|                             | • Road widening  
|                             | • Loss of mature vegetation  
|                             | • Increased traffic volumes  
|                             | • Pedestrian realm improvements  
|                             | • Road improvements  
|                             | • Incompatible development adjacent to resource  
|                             | • Gradual loss of overall quality of cultural heritage landscape  
|                             | 1. Part IV Designation under the O.H.A. with Statement of Significance.  
|                             | OR  
|                             | 1. Identify as a Cultural Heritage Landscape in the Secondary Plan in and a map showing location and boundaries, with Secondary Plan policies relating to the attributes as stated in the Statement of Significance.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Heritage Landscape</th>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Conservation/Mitigation through Priority Legislative Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waterdown Memorial Park</td>
<td>Alteration or removal of the heritage property and/or attributes due to:</td>
<td>1. Part IV Designation under the O.H.A. with Statement of Significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Road widening</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Loss of mature vegetation</td>
<td>1. Identify as a Cultural Heritage Landscape in the Secondary Plan and a map showing location, boundaries and identified views, with Secondary Plan policies relating to the attributes as stated in the Statement of Significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased traffic volumes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pedestrian realm improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Road improvements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Incompatible development adjacent to resource</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Gradual loss of overall quality of cultural heritage landscape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3 Additional Recommendations

Based on the work of the Review, and in addition to the conservation recommendations, the following future work is also recommended:

1. The Grindstone Creek valley should be researched and evaluated as a cultural heritage landscape for its significance as a natural landscape as well as being the site of numerous milling industries and the Canadian Pacific Railway line. The study area, at minimum, should extend along the creek valley from Smokey Hollow in the south to the site of James McMonies’ mill north of Parkside Drive. The research should consider the location of workers housing in relation to the mill sites and associated cultural groups. The understanding of Nelson Street and Board Street presented in the C.H.L. research and evaluation sheets should be considered and incorporated, where appropriate. This work may be conducted as part of related City studies or projects, including the pending Cultural Heritage Landscape Inventory and Management Plan and heritage interpretation or commemoration strategies.

2. A) The historical Village of Waterdown, located within the area bounded generally by Parkside Drive to the north, First Street to the east, Mountain Brow Road to the south, and Hamilton Street should be researched and evaluated as a cultural heritage landscape to assist in the conservation of the historical Village as a whole and as a means of relating the distinct C.H.L.s that have been identified in this report, to each other. The preferred option is to complete this work through initiation of an H.C.D. Study. As an alternative, this work could be completed through future work on the City-wide Cultural Heritage Landscape Inventory. The area recommended to be assessed as part of a future H.C.D. study focusing on the historical village of Waterdown is identified in Figure 7. This area consolidates the linear C.H.L.s identified as part of the Cultural Heritage Review as well as C.H.L.s which function as nodes in the Village (Figure 8). These areas reflect the nineteenth and early twentieth-century growth of the community and are associated with the earliest surveys carried out in the Village. Areas along Hamilton Street which reflect a post-1970s period of development have been excluded as well as subdivisions which date to between the 1940s and present. The boundary contains a high percentage of properties identified by the Waterdown Village Built Heritage Inventory as being significant, character-defining, or character-supporting. As an interim measure prior to initiation of an H.C.D. Study, site plan control may be used within the recommended H.C.D. study area to enable review of “development” as defined in the City’s existing site plan control by-law.

---

7 A.S.I. conducted a review of the historical Village of Waterdown (identified as a potential CHL by the City. The boundary corresponds to the Village limits and Lots 6 and 7, Concession 3) to determine an area that may serve as a basis to initiate a future H.C.D. Study. The review and finding were presented to the City of Hamilton in a memorandum written by A.S.I. dated July 27, 2021.
OR

B) As an alternative to an H.C.D., site plan control may be applied to lands/properties within the Secondary Plan area identified as significant built heritage resources or cultural heritage landscapes to enable review of “development” as defined in the City’s existing site plan control by-law. This would enable heritage review of substantial changes in size or usability to buildings and properties that are not otherwise subject to Planning Act applications. The existing site plan control by-law would require amendment to apply site plan control to the Main Street C.H.L., the Dundas Street C.H.L., and the Waterdown Heights Subdivision as well as the cluster of B.H.R.s at the north end of Mill Street bounded by Main Street North, Parkside Drive, Victoria Street, and the existing Heritage Conservation District.

Additionally, the following additional possible legislative strategies for protection are recommended for each of the cultural heritage landscapes:

1. Consider a Private Tree By-Law for trees within and along the edges of cultural heritage landscapes for the Dundas Street, Main Street, and Waterdown Heights Subdivision cultural heritage landscapes.

Non-regulatory strategies for the protection and stewardship of the cultural heritage landscapes are also recommended:

1. Develop an Interpretation and Commemoration Strategy.
2. Develop marketing and promotion strategies through walking tours, local tourism, etc.
Figure 7: Recommended area for a Heritage Conservation District Study in the Village of Waterdown.
Figure 8: Recommended area for a Heritage Conservation District Study in the Village of Waterdown overlaid with significant cultural heritage landscapes in Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan.
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Appendix A: City of Hamilton Framework for Determining the Cultural Heritage Value or Interest of Property for the Purposes of Designation under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*
- Cultural Heritage Landscape Evaluation Criteria
Historical Associations

Themes

Criterion 1: How well does the cultural heritage landscape illustrate one or more historical themes representative of cultural processes in the development and/or use of land in the context of the community, province or nation?

Event

Criterion 2: Is the cultural landscape associated with a specific event that has made a significant contribution to the community, province or nation?

Person and/or Group

Criterion 3: Is the cultural landscape associated with the life or activities of a person, group, organization or institution that has made a significant contribution to the community, province or nation?

Scenic Amenity

Sense of Place

Criterion 4: Does the cultural heritage landscape provide the observer(s) with a strong sense of position or place?

Serial Vision

Criterion 5: Does the cultural heritage landscape provide the observer(s) with opportunities for serial vision along paths of pedestrian or vehicular movement?

Material Content

Criterion 6: Is the cultural heritage landscape visually satisfying or pleasing to the observer(s) in terms of colour, texture, style and scale?

Integrity

Criterion 7: Is it all there?

Design

Criterion 8: Has the landscape been purposefully designed or planned?

Social Value

Public Perception

Criterion 9: Is the landscape regarded as having importance within the City?
2.0 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Introduction

This section outlines the historical development of the study area in the context of the growth of Waterdown. Its development is traced from its initial settlement by Euro-Canadians and the subsequent transformation of the rural landscape of East Flamborough Township to the Village of Waterdown.

2.2 Origins: 1823 to 1840

Waterdown is located just to the north of the edge of the Niagara Escarpment on Dundas Street (Highway 5). The Niagara Escarpment is a prominent geological and topographic feature that interrupts an otherwise flat, undulating Southern Ontario landscape. Along its length, from Tobermory to Niagara Falls, numerous creeks tumble over its steep scarp face. At many of these locations Euro-Canadian settlers found favourable conditions for the establishment of milling sites: first, lumber and saw mills developing in conjunction with forestry and land clearance and then grist and flour mills complementing agricultural development, notably wheat production.

Grindstone Creek and the Great Falls, which is located to the south of present day Dundas Street, drew a number of Euro-Canadian settlers. Land in this vicinity was originally granted to Alexander McDonnell in 1796 but passed undeveloped into the ownership of Alexander Brown in 1805. The enterprises of Brown at the turn of the nineteenth century and later Ebenezer Griffin in the 1820s and 1830s accounted for substantial industrial growth in the Grindstone Creek valley. This area became popularly known as Smokey Hollow. During the nineteenth century saw mills, flour mills, a woollen mill, tanneries, foundries, a rake, stave and basket factory and dams and raceways dominated this locale.
The first parcel of Lot 7 in Conc. 3 in East Flamborough Township to be sold separately was 42 acres to James Grierson in 1820. Ebenezer C. Griffin, a miller by trade, purchased 158 acres from Alexander Brown in 1823 which included the lower portion of the Grindstone Creek, the Great Falls and a one quarter mile of the river valley. He eventually owned a total of 360 acres of land in Lots 6 and 7, Conc. 3, East Flamborough Township.

At this time Dundas Street was the only access to the interior of the township and was the principal east-west route between York and Dundas. It did not conform to the concession lines of East Flamborough but ran through the third and fourth concessions swinging slightly north just east of the Grindstone River crossing. It was here that E.C. Griffin and his brother and business partner, Absalom, established saw and grist mills, an asher for making potash and a carding mill. E.C. Griffin also cleared land in Lot 7 for his farm. In 1837 Griffin acquired Lot 6 from George Brown and extended his village plan to include this area.

E.C. Griffin prepared a village plan for Waterdown around 1831 which became known as the Griffin Survey. In 1832 Absalom and Ebenezer built a sawmill above the Dundas Street bridge while Col. Alexander Brown built a second sawmill further upstream. In 1833 the Griffins built a second, larger carding mill. The first Common School was built in 1826 on the southwest corner of Flamborough and Dundas Streets. Mill Street South and Franklin Street were the only north-south roads opened to the south of Dundas Street by the 1830s. They provided access to Griffin’s mills just above Great Falls and to his farm. Mill Street South was situated slightly west of the lines between Lots 6 and 7. From Mill Street South, Water and Leather Streets ran east to provide access to milling sites. The only other road west of Grindstone Creek in 1841 was the former Hill Street which branched off to the southwest from Mill at its descent to river bank. On the east bank of the Grindstone Creek, only Broad Street ran north off Dundas.
Griffin sold a number of the village lots throughout the 1830s, primarily west of Mill Street along Dundas Street. The first lot was sold to Alex Markle in 1832. It included 78 perches (Perch: a measure of length or area of 5.5 yards or 30.25 square yards respectively) of Lot 1, southwest corner of Mill and Dundas Streets which became the site of the American Hotel. Other lots purchased were: Levi Hawke, village lots 2, 6 and 7, in Lot 7 in 1833 and 1834; Jeremiah Shute, village lot 2, Lot 7 in 1834; Henry Graham, village lot 12, Lot 7 (Maplebank) in 1837; Daniel Cummins (Weeks store) in 1839; and Joseph Carson, village lot 5, Lot 6 in 1839. Daniel Cummins bought the water privilege just above Dundas Street bridge and in 1840 built a sawmill above the bridge and a large turning shop below it.

Absalom and Ebenezer Griffin dissolved their business partnership in 1834 with Absalom taking the factory and upper sawmill and E.C. Griffin, the flour mill and the lower sawmill.

2.3 1840 to 1880: Growth and Consolidation

The majority of the village lots outlined in the Griffin Survey had been sold and built upon by the early 1840s. In 1841 Waterdown received its own post office. The village population comprised 165 people. The southern corners of Mill and Dundas Streets had developed first, forming the nucleus of the distinct commercial district which was to last into the mid twentieth century. The mercantile and artisan shops that grew up along Dundas Street appear to have been generally one storey frame structures, set on the road allowance, facing onto Dundas. They were mainly located on the south side of Dundas between Mill Street South and Main Street. The intersection of Mill and Dundas Streets was the exception with the American Hotel on the southwest corner.
and the Weeks Store on the southeast corner. Both of these structures were two storeys high and of stone construction. The northwest corner was soon filled with the Huxley-Stock Block, a third imposing, two storey stone commercial structure which housed the Mechanics' Institute Library.

The industrial sector was largely confined to the banks of the Grindstone above and below Dundas Street. It included a tannery, a rake, stave and basket factory, a turning factory and saw and grist mills. George Griffin operated the Griffin sawmill until it burned down in 1850. The site was then sold to Robert Lottridge who built a small factory and flour mill. By the late 1870s, the industrial areas were found between Mill and Main Street, north and south of the commercial district and along Grindstone Creek, north and south of Dundas Street.

In 1841 there were approximately 41 households listed in the assessment rolls for Waterdown. Most of these structures were located on the east bank of the Grindstone in the Vinegar Hill area. They generally consisted of one storey log or frame cottages facing onto Dundas Street. A few other residential buildings, including the former Griffin House, had been erected on the west bank below Dundas Street between Grindstone Creek and Main Street. The Presbyterians built a stone church on Mill Street North in 1844 on the location of the present Knox Presbyterian Church.

E.C. Griffin died in 1847 and his land holdings eventually passed to his heirs through a court settlement in 1856. The area below Dundas Street between Flamborough and Mill Street South including Griffin and Union was subdivided into individual parcels and allotted to the heirs to settle the estate in 1856. A few parcels already had existing buildings at this time. This subdivision of lands was not registered but the boundaries largely determined the location of Main and Flamborough Streets. The Henry Winter Map of Waterdown, August 1854, incorporated the property boundaries of the Griffin settlement.
In the early 1850s James McMonnies and Thomas Stock bought and subdivided all of the land in Lot 6 on the east side of Mill Street North, north of Church Street to the road allowance between the third and fourth concessions. Henry Winter surveyed the area and a plan was registered in 1856 which became known as the Stock Survey. Other smaller lot surveys were also conducted in the mid 1800s including: the Kelly Survey, in 1856 by M. MacKintosh, P.L.S. and registered as Plan 34 in December 1860; the Absalom Griffin Survey, Plan 26, August 1854 which surveyed Park Lot 2, Lot 7, Griffin Survey; Bushes Survey of village lot 7 and 8, part of Lot 6; and Reynolds Survey, village lot 4, part Lots 6 and 7.

As a sign of Waterdown’s increasing importance to the township as an industrial, commercial and population centre, the Council of East Flamborough bought a site for a town hall within the village in 1856. A year later the East Flamborough Township Hall was opened bestowing new importance to the community. The Grace Anglican Church was built in 1861 on Mill Street North, north of John Street and the Missionary Church was erected in 1865 beside the township hall.

The road network within the village was greatly extended during the 1840s and 1850s. Three key roads dominated the village: Mill Street, Main Street and Dundas Street. Mill Street, originally intended to run to the northern end of the township, was only extended north to the fourth concession where it stopped (circa 1840). Mill Street was extended south to Aldershot (the nearest railway station) and to Brown’s Wharf on Lake Ontario probably in the late 1840s or early 1850s. Main Street, built by James Kent Griffin in 1853 to 1854, followed the property line between the Griffin and Grierson land south of Dundas Street and the E.C. and Absalom Griffin lands north of Dundas Street. Known as Stone Road and Ransom Street, Main Street became an important stage route from Hamilton to Carlisle. The other new roads within Waterdown were local serving the residential areas.
Flamborough East (South portion)
Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth, 1875.
Village of Waterdown
Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth, 1875.
Enumerator James McMonnies described Waterdown in the 1861 Census Return as a small enterprising village with a population of approximately 800 people. It had six stores; four taverns; 3 flouring mills; one rake factory; one turning factory; two foundry and machine shops; two wagonmaker shops; five blacksmith shops; five shoemaker shops; two tailors; two harness stores; two medical men; and six churches. It also boasted some “very fine substantial stone buildings, private dwellings, and Public Buildings, a capacious stone Town hall, a large and commodious Grammar and Central School and pure water is available for almost all village lots”. By 1867 Waterdown’s population numbered 600 people and in the same year a new stone school was erected in the present Sealey Park. A number of widely scattered homes and three churches had now appeared north of Dundas Street on Mill Street North.

The Hugh Creen Survey which encompassed the north side of John Street was surveyed by David C. O’Keefe and registered as Plan 14 in 1870. Two new churches were built in the community including a Baptist Church at Mill and Water Streets and the German Evangelical Church on the north side of John Street facing onto Mill, both in 1870. The German Church was abandoned in 1885 and the Baptist Church burned down in 1905. Waterdown was incorporated as a village in 1878. The population was approximately 760 people by 1880.

By the late 1870s, the character of the village began to change. The number of village lots under one acre had risen substantially from the 1840s creating a more cohesive streetscape and Waterdown had taken on the appearance of a well-established, prosperous village. The houses had well-tended gardens, fences separated the front lawns from the dirt road, in some locations wooden sidewalks ran along the roadside and trees lined the streets. There were fewer farms within the village boundaries, with those that did remain now relegated to the periphery of the village. Frame and stone, one to one-and-a-half storey residences were
the most popular type of building construction between the 1840s and 1880s. Brick as a building material had not as yet played a major role in contributing to the character of the village. The east side of Grindstone Creek still remained exclusively residential in character.

2.4 1880 to 1920: Stability and Decline

Although known for its mills, the village commercial life was now centred on goods and services for the local farmers and villagers. The number of commercial buildings on Dundas Street had increased substantially from the 1840s. This had occurred by filling in vacant lots between Mill and Main Streets, rather than by expanding the commercial district east of the river or west of Main Street. Only two hotels had appeared north on Main Street outside of the Dundas Street commercial block. Most of the commercial buildings were still frame but now one-and-a-half to two storeys in height. A number had wooden roofs over the sidewalks along Dundas Street.

The most populous residential area of Waterdown circa 1880 was the area below Dundas Street between Flamborough and Mill Streets which includes Griffin and Union Streets. A number of large and grand Victorian brick houses appeared along Dundas Street and Main Street in the 1890s. Other more modest one-and-a-half storey brick houses began to fill in the vacant lots north on Mill Street. John Street had few houses on either side until the early twentieth century when the vacant lots were developed. Two and two-and-half storey brick houses had appeared on the four corners of John and Main Streets by 1900. On Mill Street North between Queen and Albert Streets, the former Slater property was redeveloped for residential use in the late 1890s and early 1900s. The southwest corner of John and Mill Street North was also developed circa 1900 changing the character of the street north of...
the Knox Presbyterian Church from one of large expanses of vacant lots to a well-defined streetscape.

Plan 355 for the Village of Waterdown, to combine the Griffin and McMonnies and Stock plans of the whole village, was registered in 1887. It was printed in the 1903 Imperial Atlas. Smokey Hollow, the industrial heart of Waterdown, was located south of the Leather Street bridge on Grindstone Creek. By the early 1890s this industrial area contained over seventeen buildings, including the two stone mills of W.P. Howland, three houses and nine outbuildings.

The last years of the nineteenth century were ones of general population decline for Waterdown. The industrial mills had steadily declined due to fire, flood and drought so that they were almost non-existent by 1900. Those remaining relied upon steam power due to the dwindling water supply in Grindstone Creek. In the spring of 1900 the dam below Dundas Street was destroyed by a spring flood and never rebuilt. Fire destroyed Howland Mills in Smokey Hollow. The land owned by Slater’s Mill on Mill and Queen Streets was redeveloped with large new houses in the 1890s and early 1900s. At the same time there was some development of the vacant lots on the west side of Mill Street below John Street and on the corner lot at Mill and John Street. In 1912 the South Ontario Pacific Railway Co. arrived in Waterdown, pushing its way up the Grindstone Creek Valley and radically changing the character of the river valley and its immediate environs. It eradicated both Spring and Hill Streets, destroyed most of Reid’s Turning Mill and rerouted the river thus eliminating most of the evidence of the former mills and mill raceways. An overhead bridge was built on Leather Street over the rail line.

The roads remained unpaved and some such as Water and Leather Street were closed by the 1920s. The commercial district on the north side of Dundas was interrupted between Mill and Main streets in the 1920s by the construction of Memorial Hall. The north corners of Main and Dundas as well as the south side of
south from Dundas Street on Mill and Franklin is a post W.W. II phenomenon.
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Appendix C: Individual Cultural Heritage Landscape Research, Evaluations and Statements of Significance
Board Street

1.0 Introduction

Board Street is located on the east side of Grindstone Creek in the community of Waterdown. It is a short north-south street extending north from Dundas Street East. Board Street slopes down into the Grindstone Creek valley. While roadways and lot patterns in Waterdown are oriented in a northwest-southeast axis, the study area will be described in a north-south orientation for ease of description. Dundas Street East will be described as travelling east-west, with Board Street located north of Dundas Street.

Figure 1: Location of the Board Street within the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan study area.

2.0 Historical Summary

Board Street is historically located on Lot 6, Concession 3 in East Flamborough Township running parallel to, and on the east side of, Grindstone Creek. Board Street is associated with milling on the creek. It provided access to Reid’s Mill and Dam, the Vance family home, and the Canadian Pacific Railway and, through a conversion of the Vance home, the South Waterdown Railway Station. Information was unavailable from the Flamborough Archives on the Vance Family’s associations with the property; however, it is believed to have been the home of John Franklin Vance and his wife Ada McMonies and may have been purchased by the McMonie’s
family. Both families were prominent in the Village of Waterdown and the Vances have remained active in the community through the twentieth century.

Grindstone Creek is a tributary of Lake Ontario and flows generally from Lake Medad through Waterdown making a 10-metre drop at Smokey Hollow over the Niagara Escarpment before travelling through Hidden Valley and the Royal Botanical Garden Hendrie Valley Sanctuary where it enters Lake Ontario. The Indigenous history of the area is embodied in part in the Grindstone Creek with trails travelling its west bank. The escarpment and related creeks created favourable conditions for early Euro-Canadian settlement and the establishment of milling sites, from lumber and sawmills to grist and flour mills complimenting agricultural development in the Grindstone Creek valley (City of Hamilton).

The adjacent Lot 7, Concession 3 was purchased by miller, Ebenezer C. Griffin, from Alexander Brown in the 1820s. Griffin is known as the founder of Waterdown and by 1831, he had purchased a substantial portion of what would become the Village of Waterdown. He established the second sawmill in the village, a flour mill, and a woollen mill. In 1831, Griffin prepared a plan (known as the Griffin Survey) to subdivide his land into smaller village lots (Unterman McPhail Cuming Associates 1996:2-2). Griffin acquired a further 200 acres of land from Alexander Brown of Concession 3, Lot 6 in East Flamborough including Union Cemetery which was approximately five acres. Griffin’s town plan was extended eastward along Dundas Street from what had been previously laid out in Concession 3, Lot 7 (Figure 2).

The first mill on Grindstone Creek was established by Alexander Brown at the top of the Great Falls before 1805. Milling was concentrated between the third and fourth concessions with as many as 12 mills operating at a time. In the 1890s, a single complex, known as Smokey Hollow, contained 17 buildings. The history of milling within Smokey Hollow is rich and extends into the early 1900s. Upstream from Smokey Hollow, mills were located at the east end of Griffin Street, which historically extended down to the creek as Water Street. Mills were also located along former Leather Street, which ran south of Water Street extending east from Mill Street. The mills in this location made use of Hawk’s Dam (Woods et al. 1967).

North of Dundas Street, Ebenezer C. and Absolom Griffin built a sawmill, and in the same year Alexander Brown built a second mill further upstream. In about 1834 the Griffin partnership dissolved, and the factory and sawmill were owned solely by Absolom Griffin. Around 1838 a flour mill was built by A. Griffin beside the sawmill. In 1840 David Cummins bought the water privilege for the land just above the Dundas Street Bridge, building a large turning shop below the bridge and a sawmill above the bridge. The turning shop was soon sold to Reid Baker for a rake factory (Griffin 1899).

At some point the area just north of the Dundas Street Bridge became associated with John Reid and was known as Reid’s Dam until the coming of the railway in 1911 (Figure 3, Figure 10 and Figure 11). The mill pond was used to drive John Reid’s turning mill on the east bank of Grindstone Creek. Reid was a well-known cabinet and furniture maker in Waterdown with several milling buildings along the east bank (Anon 2017a). The pond was used for recreation,
boating, fishing, and winter sports as well washing laundry (Figure 4 to Figure 9). Reid’s mill building was partially demolished to accommodate the railway and eventually the entire building was demolished. Slater’s and Rymal’s mills across the creek were above Reid’s pond and therefore fed by a raceway further upstream. John Forstner’s mill was built in 1875 and was owned by Slater between 1901-1939 until purchased by the Fieldings. In 1926 men worked a ten-hour day in Slater’s mill for 20 cents an hour, six days a week. The original mill burned in September 1936 and was rebuilt. It was the last operating mill and continued to produce lumber into the 1970s. When the water level became too low, the mill turned from water to steam power and then to electrical power. Shipping also shifted from roads to rails. An industrial frame structure and foundation of Slater’s construction are perhaps the sole surviving parts of a mill on Grindstone Creek between Dundas Street and Church Street (Waterloo Mutual Insurance Company 1937; Anon 2017b; Woods et al. 1967). The milling industry became obsolete as competition of industry in Hamilton increased and water supply in the creek decreased (Woods et al. 1967).
Figure 2: Board Street and surroundings, 1854 (Winter 1854)

Figure 3: Board Street with saw mills on both sides of Grindstone Creek, 1875 (Page & Smith 1875a).
Figure 4: Reid's Dam as seen from the north looking toward Dundas Street about 1905 (Flamborough Archives, Will Reid Collection).

Figure 5: Looking north from Dundas Street Bridge during spring flood, pre-1911. Vance house on the right, Slater Mill on the left, Reid’s mill centre right (The Mills of Waterdown via Flamborough Archives).
Figure 6: Dam located just north of Dundas Street Bridge, from west bank looking east, undated (Hamilton Postcards).

Figure 7: Dam located just north of the Dundas Street Bridge, from east bank looking west, c. 1900 (Flamborough Archives).
Figure 8: Reid's Pond just north of Dundas Street, undated, pre-1911 (Flamborough Archives).

Figure 9: Reid's Pond in winter, c. 1905 (Flamborough Archives).
Figure 10: Board Street and surroundings, 1903 (Tyrrell 1903).

Figure 11: Board Street and surroundings, 1909 (Department of Militia and Defence 1909)
The Canadian Pacific Railway (C.P.R.) line was constructed between 1910 and 1912.

The South Ontario Pacific was originally incorporated in 1887 to build from Woodstock to the Niagara River: with branches to Cooksville and Toronto, and to Lake Huron. Plans for this construction were dropped when the Canadian Pacific purchased part of the Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo line. Another company, the Hamilton & Guelph Jct. Railway was incorporated in 1906 to connect Guelph Jct. on the Canadian Pacific, with the TH&B (Toronto, Hamilton & Buffalo) at Hamilton. The South Ontario Pacific in 1910 received permission to build the line between Guelph Jct. and Hamilton, via Waterdown. In 1911, the railway was leased to the CPR for 999 years. The line opened in 1912, giving Hamilton its first direct connection to Lake Huron, and Guelph its long-desired link to Lake Ontario (Anon 2017a).

The railway routing took advantage of the natural path of Grindstone Creek through and down the escarpment and with it came significant changes to the character of the river valley (City of Hamilton). To construct the railway in this location, the creek was moved to the west side of the valley (Figure 12). The tracks were laid on oak ties and the gravel quarried in the C.P.R.’s Waterdown quarrying pit was used. The railway, 19 miles long, connected Guelph Junction to Hamilton for passenger and commercial travel. The cost of construction was one million dollars (Wray 1994:14). Leather Street was closed, and Hill Street was rerouted (present Mill Street South). The bridges were built in 1911 and people from the community came to watch the installation (Figure 13). While under construction, the surveyor and engineer lived in the former Post Office on Main Street and the construction workers lived in tents in Smokey Hollow (Wray 1994:14; Woods et al. 1967:56). The massive changes required for the railway resulted in the elimination of most of the evidence of the former mills and mill raceways in Waterdown (City of Hamilton).

The line was officially opened on July 1, 1912. The home of John and Ada Vance was converted for use as the South Waterdown Railway Station (Figure 14 to Figure 18). The building was also the home of the Station Master (Wray 1994:14). A second station was opened near Parkside Drive, known as North Waterdown Station.

The railway brought students from as far away as Campbellville on the daily train to Waterdown High School. The local farmers used the line to take their produce to the Hamilton Market every morning and freight for the village and surrounding area was delivered for pick-up. Slater Mill’s ongoing operation used the line to ship lumber. Increased car ownership in the middle of the twentieth century led to discontinued passenger service (City of Hamilton; Wray 1994:14). The Leather Street Bridge over the railway line was removed in 1950. The station was closed in 1962 (Anon 2017a).

When the Dundas Street Bridge was reconstructed in the mid-1960s the construction crew used the former station building as an office. Following this Council ordered the building demolished. Before that could happen, however, the station building was burned by an act of arson on June 23, 1966 (Anon 2017a). The line continues to be used for freight traffic by C.P.R. (Figure 19 to Figure 23).
Figure 12: Railway construction near Board Street, c. 1911 (Flamborough Archives, Will Reid Collection).

Figure 13: Railway construction in 1911 (Flamborough Archives, Will Reid Collection).
Figure 14: South Waterdown Station looking south to Dundas Street Bridge, c. 1912 (Flamborough Archives).

Figure 15: South Waterdown Station looking north from Dundas Street Bridge, 1920 (Flamborough Archives).
Figure 16: Looking up railway line with Dundas Street Bridge and station (Flamborough Archives, Will Reid Collection).

Figure 17: Passenger train at the Waterdown South Railway Station, c. 1920 (Flamborough Archives).
Figure 18: Waterdown South Station, n.d. (Flamborough Archives).

Figure 19: Board Street and surroundings, 1919 (DMD 1919)
Figure 20: Board Street and surroundings, 1939 (Underwriter’s Survey Bureau Ltd. 1939).

Figure 21: Board Street and surroundings, 1943 (Department of National Defence 1943).
Figure 22: Board Street and surroundings, 1954 (Hunting Survey Corporation Limited 1954).

Figure 23: Board Street and surroundings, 1963 (Natural Resources Canada 1963).
3.0 Existing Conditions

Board Street extends north from Dundas Street East, on the east side of Grindstone Creek. The roadway is a single lane that is paved for approximately 15 metres, with grass shoulders (Figure 24). The curb that runs along Dundas Street East curves onto Board Street for approximately two metres on both sides of the roadway, with curb cuts to accommodate the sidewalk located along the north side of Dundas Street East. A metal guardrail extends from the Dundas Street Bridge, that carries over the adjacent rail line, following the curve of the curb onto the west side of Board Street (Figure 25 and Figure 26).

Beyond the paved section of the roadway a grassed single lane trail continues north, cutting through the sloping topography formed by neighbouring Grindstone Creek (Figure 27). The trail runs parallel to the adjacent rail line, which is located to the west of Board Street and this grassy extension. The trail provides visuals of the neighbouring tracks as well as Dundas Street Bridge (Figure 28). A strip of forested land separates Board Street and the trail from the tracks. Treed land is also located on the sloping area between Board Street and the residential development located east of the valley (Figure 29). Residential development consisting of single detached residences is also located south of Dundas Street East (Figure 30).

![Figure 24: Board Street looking northwest from Dundas Street East (ASI 2020).](image-url)
Figure 25: Looking east along Dundas Street from south end of Board Street (ASI 2020).

Figure 26: Looking west along Dundas Street towards Dundas Street Bridge from south end of Board Street (ASI 2020).

Figure 27: Looking south along grassed single lane trail towards the paved section of Board Street, showing sloping topography towards the rail line and Grindstone Creek (ASI 2020).

Figure 28: View of rail tracks and Dundas Street Bridge located west of Board Street, looking southwest (ASI 2020).
Figure 29: Looking east from the grassed trail extension towards adjacent residential development (ASI 2020).

Figure 30: Looking south along the paved section of Board Street towards Dundas Street East (ASI 2020).
4.0 Cultural Heritage Evaluation

The following evaluation of Board Street as a cultural heritage landscape uses the City’s “A Framework for Evaluating the Cultural Heritage Value or Interest of Property for Designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act” which provides categorized criteria which expands upon, and is consistent with, Ontario Regulation 9/06. These criteria were developed for cultural heritage landscapes.

4.1 Historical Associations

Themes

Criterion 1: How well does the cultural heritage landscape illustrate one or more historical themes representative of cultural processes in the development and/or use of land in the context of the community, province, or nation?

Does not meet criterion.

Board Street is a remnant of nineteenth century settlement in the Village of Waterdown, of the milling industry on Grindstone Creek, and of the Canadian Pacific Railway’s passenger railway service. Board Street itself does not contain any features of these themes but is an important part of the overall waterscape, railscape, and history of the milling industry on Grindstone Creek.

Event

Criterion 2: Is the cultural landscape associated with a specific event that has made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation?

Does not meet criterion.

The area is not associated with any specific events which made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation.

Person and/or Group

Criterion 3: Is the cultural landscape associated with the life or activities of a person, group, organization, or institution that has made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation?

Partially meets criterion.

The area is associated with the C.P.R. as the former location of the South Waterdown Station on the C.P.R. line between Hamilton and Guelph Junction. The C.P.R. is a significant national company and its construction of the Hamilton and Guelph Junction line through Waterdown
and brought the railway for passenger and freight service to the area and provided connections to Hamilton and Guelph and dramatically modified the Grindstone Creek valley. The significance of this contribution is better understood for the railscape through the length of the valley rather than in Board Street itself especially since the station building is no longer extant.

4.2 Scenic Amenity

Sense of Place

Criterion 4: Does the cultural heritage landscape provide the observer(s) with a strong sense of position or place?

Does not meet criterion.

Due to the lack of extant features associated with the history of Board Street, there is not a strong sense of position or place.

Serial Vision

Criterion 5: Does the cultural heritage landscape provide the observer(s) with opportunities for serial vision along paths of pedestrian or vehicular movement?

Does not meet criterion.

Board Street is a straight road and does not provide opportunities for serial vision.

Material Content

Criterion 6: Is the cultural heritage landscape visually satisfying or pleasing to the observer(s) in terms of colour, texture, style, and scale?

Does not meet criterion.

Board Street has some degree of material content in a visually pleasing way as an access point into the Grindstone Creek valley edged with trees and underbrush. However, it does not sufficiently meet this criterion due to a lack of extant features.

4.3 Integrity

Criterion 7: Is it all there?

Does not meet criterion.

Key elements associated with the history of Board Street including the Reid’s Mill and Dam and Vance house/South Waterdown Railway Station are not extant. Board Street, however, contributes the integrity of the overall waterscape, railscape, and history of the milling industry in Grindstone Creek.
4.4 **Design**

*Criterion 8: Has the landscape been purposefully designed or planned?*

**Partially meets criterion.**

Board Street was purposefully planned to provide access to Reid’s Mill and the Vance home in the nineteenth century. In the twentieth century, Board Street continued to be used to access the South Waterdown Railway Station by passengers travelling the rail line. The street continues to provide free access into the Grindstone Creek valley.

4.5 **Social Value**

*Public Perception*

*Criterion 9: Is the landscape regarded as having importance within the City?*

**Meets criterion.**

The area is named and described in Sylvia Wray’s book *Dundas Street: Waterdown 1793-1993* for both Board Street and the Waterdown South Railway Station. It is also a topic highlighted on the Flamborough Archives website in the article “The Railway in Waterdown – Vignette”.

4.6 **Ontario Regulation 9/06**

Table 1: Cultural Heritage Evaluation of Board Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value: <em>is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a landscape</em></td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value: <em>High degree of design/aesthetic appeal</em></td>
<td>Partially meets criterion. See Section 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value: <em>High Degree Technical/Scientific Interest</em></td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/Associative Value: <em>Direct Association with a Theme, Event, Person, etc.</em></td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical or Associative Value: <em>contributes to an understanding of a community/culture</em></td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/Associative Value: <em>Reflects work or ideas of architect, artist, builder, etc.</em></td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value:</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important in defining character of area</td>
<td>See Section 4.2.1 and 4.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value: Historically, physically, functionally</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or visually linked to surroundings</td>
<td>See Section 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, and 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value: Landmark</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Section 4.3 and 4.5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.7 Evaluation Summary

This cultural heritage evaluation of Board Street concludes the area has limited cultural heritage value or interest. As an access point to the Grindstone Creek valley and the former location of the milling industry and rail station, the street contributes to the overall waterscape, railscape, and history of the milling industry in Grindstone Creek. However, the diminished integrity of the street’s historical features including the loss of Reid’s Mill and Dam and Vance house/South Waterdown Railway Station do not warrant Board Street being a cultural heritage landscape on its own. The Grindstone Creek valley should be researched and evaluated as a cultural heritage landscape for its significance as a natural landscape as well as the site of numerous milling industries and the C.P.R. line. The study area, at minimum, should extend along the creek valley from Smokey Hollow in the south to the site of James McMonies’ mill north of Parkside Drive.
Dundas Street

1.0 Introduction

The previously-identified potential cultural heritage landscape boundary for Dundas Street extends far beyond the boundaries of the study area for the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan, from Highway 6 in the west to Kerns Road in the east (Figure 1). For the purposes of this study, a boundary has been defined between just east of Goldenview Court to First Street. Dundas Street is a public roadway that extends through the community of Waterdown. While roadways and lot patterns in Waterdown are oriented in a northwest-southeast axis, the study area will be described in a north-south orientation for ease of description. Dundas Street East will be described as travelling east to west.

![Figure 1: Location of Dundas Street East within the Waterdown Community Node Study Area.](image)

2.0 Historical Summary

The only access to the interior of Nelson Township in the early 1800s, Dundas Street was the principal route between York and Dundas and was known as the “The Governor’s Road,” following trails established by Indigenous peoples (Unterman McPhail Cuming Associates 1996). The design of Dundas Street was proposed by Lieutenant-Governor John Graves Simcoe to link Lake Ontario, Lake Erie, Lake Claire, and Lake Huron and to encourage settlement along the route (Flamborough Archives and Heritage Society 2017). The route proposed by Simcoe...
followed trails established by Indigenous peoples. Simcoe determined that an inland passage would prevent invasion from recently-liberated American colonies and enable safe movement of troops and supplies away from the Great Lakes (Wray 1994). The first section of Dundas Street was opened in October 1793, and in 1795, Dundas Street was extended from Dundas to York, running at an angle between the third and fourth concession line (Donkin 1969; Wray 1994).

Following land grants from Simcoe to the military personnel who opened the road, Waterdown was settled in 1796 on land originally granted to Alexander McDonnell, an officer in the North West Company (Flamborough Archives and Heritage Society 2017; Donkin 1969). In 1805, the undeveloped land was passed to Alexander Brown whose enterprises, along with Ebenezer Griffin and others, accounted for substantial industrial growth in the Grindstone Creek valley (later known as Smokey Hollow) with the establishment of saw, flour, and woolen mills, tanneries, foundries, factories, dams, and raceways (Figure 2) (Unterman McPhail Cuming Associates 1996).

Following land grants from Simcoe to the military personnel who opened the road, Waterdown was settled in 1796 on land originally granted to Alexander McDonnell, an officer in the North West Company (Flamborough Archives and Heritage Society 2017; Donkin 1969). In 1805, the undeveloped land was passed to Alexander Brown whose enterprises, along with Ebenezer Griffin and others, accounted for substantial industrial growth in the Grindstone Creek valley (later known as Smokey Hollow) with the establishment of saw, flour, and woolen mills, tanneries, foundries, factories, dams, and raceways (Figure 2) (Unterman McPhail Cuming Associates 1996).

The second phase of the construction of Dundas Street commenced following the 1806 survey of Nelson Township (Green and Green 1997). In 1823, 158 acres within Lot 7 were purchased by Miller Ebenezer Culver Griffin who established a saw and grist mill along Grindstone Creek. In 1821, Griffin purchased the southwest corner of Mill Street and Griffin Street from Alexander Brown. The American Hotel on the site was believed to have been in operation between 1824 and 1830 (Wray 1994). In 1826, the first Common School was built on the southwest corner of Flamboro and Dundas Streets, and Mill Street South and Franklin Street were the only north-
south roads opened to the south of Dundas Street by the 1830s (Unterman McPhail Cuming Associates 1996; Wray 1994).

In 1831, Griffin drew up a plan for the Village of Waterdown and began to sell lots along Dundas Street, primarily west of Mill Street. The first lot was sold to Alex Markle in 1831 at the southwest corner of Mill and Dundas Streets (the site of the American Hotel) (Donkin 1969; Unterman McPhail Cuming Associates 1996). Griffin acquired a further two hundred acres of land from George Brown of Concession 3, Lot 6 in East Flamborough in 1837 including Union Cemetery which was approximately five acres (Unterman McPhail Cuming Associates 1996:2-2). In the early 1840s, a merchant class began to grow and continued to establish shops along Dundas Street (Donkin 1969). Dundas Street, Mill Street, and Main Street dominated the Village of Waterdown in the mid-nineteenth century, although the road network was significantly expanded during this time (Unterman McPhail Cuming Associates 1996).

The intersection of Mill Street (originally Centre Road) and Dundas Street developed first with the construction of a merchant’s shop and inn in 1819 (Donkin 1969). This intersection became the centre of a commercial district and was a popular destination for farmers in the surrounding area (Unterman McPhail Cuming Associates 1996; Wray 1994). The intersection of Mill Street and Dundas Street, located within the southern portion of the Mill Street Heritage Conservation District, has retained its nineteenth-century buildings on all four corners (Figure 7); Eager’s General Store (also known as the Weeks Building) built by Ebenezer Griffin in 1819 on the southeast corner (Figure 3); the American Hotel (c. 1824) on the southwest corner (Figure 4); Reid’s Harness Shop (c. 1890s) on the northeast corner (Figure 5); and the Huxley-Stock Block (c. 1860) on the northwest corner (Figure 6).

By 1841, there were approximately 48 households listed on the Assessment Rolls for Waterdown and the majority of these houses were located on the east bank of the creek in Vinegar Hill (Wray 1994:8). Most were one-storey log or frame cottages typical of the period. Board Street and Spring Street provided access to milling operations on the east bank north and south of Dundas Street.

The community has known the area east of Grindstone Creek as Vinegar Hill “from earliest times” (Wray 1994:8). The name is not recorded on any historical mapping, though the name appears on a photograph of a bridge carrying Dundas Street over Grindstone Creek from c. 1901 (Figure 8). The area does contain a hill, following the eastern rise out of the Grindstone Creek valley. East of First Street the land flattens substantially. “Vinegar” may have come from the many market gardens with apple orchards that lined the hill. The apples were primarily used for cider which was made from late summer onwards. Without refrigeration, the cider would have quickly fermented leaving the area with the smell of vinegar (Wray 1994:8). Market gardens were also in operation throughout the village and are remembered in Vinegar Hill, Union, and Main Streets, and “on the Farwell property” (Woods et al. 1967:87). Early nineteenth-century images of the area show Dundas Street through Vinegar Hill lined with trees (Figure 9).
Figure 3: Eager’s General Store, c. 1904 (Reid 1904).

Figure 4: Stagecoach at the American Hotel, c. 1900 (Anon 1900a).

Figure 5: Looking north up Mill Street from Dundas Street intersection, showing the Huxley-Stock Block on the northeast corner and G.M. Reid, Saddle and Harness Maker Store on the northwest corner, c. 1910 (Flamborough Archives).

Figure 6: G.M. Reid, Saddle and Harness Maker Store, c. 1900 (Reid 1900).
Figure 7: Dundas Street looking east from Franklin Street towards Vinegar Hill, c.1912, annotated by ASI (Reid 1912).

Figure 8: Photograph of Dundas Street carrying over Grindstone Creek, c. 1901 (Flamborough Archives, Will Reid Collection c. 1901)
The intersection of Main and Dundas Streets developed slightly later than the intersection of Mill and Dundas Streets. The Kirk Hotel (now Royal Coachman) was constructed c. 1870 on the northwest corner. The Crooker General Store (later the Crooker Block) was constructed c. 1890 before multiple fires in the early twentieth century led to its reconstruction on the site on the northeast corner c.1922 (Figure 10 and Figure 11). Early buildings at the intersection have been replaced with a low-rise commercial building (c. 2011) on the southeast corner and a low-rise commercial bank building (c. 1965) on the southwest corner.
Most of the original structures along Dundas Street, mainly between Mill Street and Main Street on the south side of Dundas Street are thought to have been one-storey and wood construction, built close to the right-of-way, with most two-storey structures constructed between 1840 and 1850 (Donkin 1969; Unterman McPhail Cuming Associates 1996). The Winter’s 1854 *Map of The Village of Waterdown, County of Wentworth* shows lots along the north and south sides of Dundas Street within the study area, generally between Main and First Streets (Figure 12). The 1859 *Tremaine’s Map of the County of Wentworth* likewise shows density in the same area with additional lots shown south of Dundas Street East to the west of Hamilton Street (Figure 13).
Figure 12: 1854 Map of The Village of Waterdown, County of Wentworth (Winter 1854).

Figure 13: 1859 Tremaine's Map of the County of Wentworth (Tremaine 1859).
The 1875 *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth* shows the division of lots in the eastern portion of the study area along Dundas Street. Charles Sealey and Edmund Fields are identified as the owners of the south and north parts of Lot 7, Concession 3 (Figure 14).

Figure 14: 1875 *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth* (Page & Smith 1875a).

In her book *Dundas Street, Waterdown, 1793-1993*, Wray documents eight properties within Vinegar Hill, four located east of Grindstone Creek (all extant) and three located west of Grindstone Creek (none are extant), suggesting that the local reference to Vinegar Hill consists of properties on both sides of the creek. The chapter on Vinegar Hill also includes sections on “Board Street and the Dundas Street Bridge,” “The Waterdown South Railway,” and “Dundas Street Bridge.” The four extant properties discussed are Kirby House (365 Dundas Street East, 1870), Pille House (353 Dundas Street East, 1879), Raycoft Cottage (348 Dundas Street East, 1860), and Eager House (340 Dundas Street East, 1871).

The Village of Waterdown was incorporated in 1878, and the first Council meeting was held in the Bell House (Figure 15) on Dundas Street between Mill and Main Streets (Donkin 1969). By 1880, the number of commercial properties along Dundas Street had increased substantially, filling in vacant lots between Mill and Main Streets (Unterman McPhail Cuming Associates 1996). The Bell House was demolished c. 1921 and the Memorial Hall (now a theatre) was constructed in the general location of the Bell House in 1922 between Mill and Main Streets to

\[1\] Note addresses indicated in Wray differ from current municipal addresses. The current municipal address has been used here.
honour First World War veterans (Figure 16). The original bell from the Bell House is incorporated into a memorial cairn in front of the building (Unterman McPhail Cuming Associates 1996; Flamborough Archives and Heritage Society 2017).

Figure 15: Original Bell House, c. 1900 (Drummond c. 1900).
In the 1890s, several grand houses were constructed along both Dundas Street and Main Street. These houses include the Carson House built c. 1895 (Figure 17) and the Crooker House built c. 1884 (Figure 18) for merchant William H. Crooker, who built the Crooker Block on the northeast corner of Dundas Street and Main Street (Unterman McPhail Cuming Associates 1996). Dundas Street was considered an elegant location as it was close to shops but removed from industry that extended behind commercial properties along Dundas Street to the north and south (Donkin 1969).
Throughout the beginning of the twentieth century, development continued along Dundas Street. The 1903 *Imperial Atlas of Wentworth County* shows the growth and division of lots along Dundas Street East west towards Hamilton Street (Figure 19), while the 1909 *National Topographic Map* shows several structures along both the north and south sides of Dundas Street East, with additional structures shown to the west of Hamilton Street (Figure 20). East of the Dundas Street Bridge, Board Street, Spring Street, and the north portion of James Street were all closed. While Board Street was closed, a sawmill is shown at its northern end.

Figure 19: 1903 *Imperial Atlas of Wentworth County* (Tyrrell 1903).
Between 1910 and 1911, the introduction of the Canadian Pacific Railway line resulted in the relocation of Grindstone Creek to the west side of the valley (Wray 1994). Dundas Street East carries over Grindstone Creek via the Dundas Street Bridge, connecting the village on the west side of the creek with the area known as Vinegar Hill, an early nineteenth-century residential area in Waterdown. The eastern terminus of the study area reaches First Street, located east of Vinegar Hill. Between 1965 and 1966, the Gaffney Construction Company reconstructed the
Dundas Street Bridge (Wray 1994). An analysis of early photographs of the bridge shows the evolution of the bridge construction, including the replacement of early railings with contemporary metal railings (Figure 23 through Figure 24).

![Figure 23: Waterdown: Bridge on Dundas Street, looking east up Vinegar Hill, c. 1913 (Reid 1913).](image1)

![Figure 24: Looking east on Dundas Street towards the bridge and Vinegar Hill (Anon 1993).](image2)

In 1906, a village fire destroyed the tailor and barber shop next to the Crooker Block on the northeast corner of Dundas Street and Mill Street. On May 25, 1915, a second fire destroyed the Crooker Block (Jeffries 2017). The corner block was rebuilt with a one-storey red brick building by Crooker before the end of the First World War (Wray 2017). A subsequent fire in the 1920s razed several stores on the north side of Dundas Street, including this replacement building (Figure 25). This building and others destroyed by the fire were replaced by smaller, less ornate buildings characteristic of the period (Wray 2017).
Figure 25: View of Fire Damage in Waterdown following the Great Fire, c. 1922, showing the northeast corner of Main Street and Dundas Street East (Reid 1922).

By the beginning of the twentieth century, Dundas Street remained a dirt road with wooden sidewalks (Figure 26). In the 1920s, telephone and hydro poles began to line Dundas Street, the roadway was paved, and concrete sidewalks were installed within the commercial area (Wray 1994; Donkin 1969).
In 1928, the Waterdown District High School was constructed at the southwest corner of Dundas Street and Hamilton Street at a cost of $70,000 (Figure 27). On opening day, February 27, 1928, a group of 800 people gathered to watch the ceremonies (Flamborough Archives and Heritage Society 2017). The school was expanded with additions throughout the 1950s and 1960s (Wray 1994). The school closed in 1993 and was later redeveloped into condominiums.

The 1943 and 1963 National Topographic Maps show the density of development along Dundas Street East in the mid-twentieth century. The 1943 National Topographic Map (Figure 28) identifies the Waterdown District High School at the southwest corner of Dundas Street East and Hamilton Street. Howard Boulevard is shown to the west of the school along the south side
of Dundas Street East. The 1963 National Topographic Map shows increased development south of Dundas Street East along Howard Boulevard and Berry Hill Avenue with additional new structures shown at the west end of the study corridor along the north side of Dundas Street East (Figure 29). The northwest corner of Dundas and Hamilton Streets was previously the Metcalfe farm, which included a garden centre selling small fruits such as black currants. This area changed significantly in the 1950s with the construction of a commercial strip development along Hamilton Street (Wray 1994). In the Vinegar Hill area, the road pattern extending from the south side of Dundas Street varies but generally the area remains consistent with increasing dwellings between existing buildings.

Figure 28: 1943 National Topographic Map (Department of National Defence 1943).
Dundas Street has been significantly altered over time. Like most major transportation routes, the roadway has been widened within the right-of-way and several parking bays introduced throughout the village core (Figure 30 and Figure 31). However, the corner buildings at the intersection of Mill and Dundas Streets, which are designated as part of the Mill Street Heritage Conservation District, have prevented further road widening in this location (Unterman McPhail Cuming Associates 1996). Between 1992 and 1993, Dundas Street was reconstructed (Figure 32), and in 1993, the bicentennial of the opening of Dundas Street was celebrated (Wray 1994). Dundas Street Waterdown: 1793-1993 includes a hand-drawn map in the back cover identifying those important properties along Dundas Street extant along the right-of-way in 1993 (Figure 33).
Figure 32: Looking east towards Mill Street intersection and Vinegar Hill, c. 1993 (Flamborough Archives: Green 1993).

Figure 33: Map of Dundas Street East from *Dundas Street Waterdown: 1793-1993*
3.0 Existing Conditions

The previously-identified boundary for Dundas Street extends far beyond the boundaries of the study area for the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan from Highway 6 in the west to Kerns Road in the east. The review of existing conditions for Dundas Street was undertaken within the boundaries of the study area, beginning just west of Dundas Street and Goldenview Court to First Street in the east. The western terminus of Dundas Street East within the study area is a residential subdivision along the south side of Dundas Street and a townhouse development on the north side of Dundas Street (Figure 34 and Figure 35). Continuing east along Dundas Street is another residential subdivision to the south on Sunncroft Court, and to the north more low-rise residential development.

Figure 34: Looking southeast into Goldenview Court (ASI 2019).  
Figure 35: Contemporary townhouses along the north side of Dundas Street East (ASI 2019).

St. Thomas Roman Catholic Cemetery is located along the south side of Dundas Street East to the east of Sunncroft Court and falls outside of the study area (Figure 36). The cemetery has very little street presence as a long driveway is flanked by fencing and mature trees which limit visibility from the public realm. Beyond the cemetery is a commercial property to the north and gas station to the south at Berry Hill Avenue (Figure 37).
To the east of Berry Hill Avenue, Dundas Street East becomes mostly commercial in character. A large c. 1980s-1990s shopping complex extends along the north side of Dundas Street East between Berry Hill Avenue and Hamilton Street North (Figure 38). Along the south side of Dundas Street East are low-rise commercial buildings with residential properties further south. Low-rise condominiums are located at the southwest corner of Dundas Street East and Hamilton Street. These condominiums are part of the former Waterdown High School, constructed in the early twentieth century but since significantly altered (Figure 39).

A low-rise commercial complex and detached commercial buildings are located on the northeast corner of Dundas Street and Hamilton Street, while the southeast corner is
dominated by a c. 1971 high-rise residential apartment building known as the Braeburn Apartments (Figure 40 through Figure 42).

Figure 40: Dundas Street East looking north along Hamilton Street North (ASI 2019).

Figure 41: Dundas Street looking south along Hamilton Street South (ASI 2019).

Figure 42: Looking east along Dundas Street East from Hamilton Street North.

Moving west beyond the c. 1895 Smith-Carson House at 289 Dundas Street East, the Dundas Street East corridor to Main Street has retained many buildings on both north and south sides (see Figure 43). The north side is comprised of a row of buildings constructed between 1870 and 1926, interrupted only by one property constructed in 1990 (Figure 44 through Figure 49). Along the south side all but two properties were constructed between the mid-nineteenth century and mid-twentieth century, and the row is interrupted by the 1960s bank building at the southwest corner of Dundas Street East and Main Street (Figure 51 through Figure 56).
Figure 43: Aerial photograph of Dundas Street East through the study area showing historical corridor between 289 Dundas Street East and Main Street in yellow.
North side:

Figure 44: 289 Dundas Street East.

Figure 45: 291 Dundas Street East.

Figure 46: 293 Dundas Street East.

Figure 47: 293-299 Dundas Street East.

Figure 48: 299 Dundas Street East.

Figure 49: 301 Dundas Street East.

Figure 50: 1 Main Street North.
South side:

Figure 51: 290 Dundas Street East.

Figure 52: 292 Dundas Street East.

Figure 53: 296 Dundas Street East.

Figure 54: 298 Dundas Street East.

Figure 55: 300 and 302 Dundas Street East.

Figure 56: 304 Dundas Street East.

To the east of Main Street, the study area includes Dundas Street East to the Dundas Street Bridge over Grindstone Creek, an area which is located within the boundary of the Mill Street Heritage Conservation District (Figure 57 through Figure 61). The Dundas Street Bridge crosses the Canadian Pacific Railway line and Grindstone Creek (Figure 62 and Figure 63). Buildings along the north side of Dundas Street in this section date between the mid-nineteenth century to the early twentieth century. A new low-rise building dominates the corner of Franklin Street and the south side of Dundas Street, with early-nineteenth century landmark buildings further east at the intersection of Mill Street and Dundas Street East (Figure 59 through Figure 61).
Figure 57: Chestnut Grove at 315 Dundas Street East (ASI 2019).

Figure 58: Waterdown Memorial Hall (ASI 2019).

Figure 59: Dundas Street East looking west from Mill Street North (ASI 2019).

Figure 60: Northeast corner of Mill Street North and Dundas Street East (ASI 2019).
East of the bridge, Dundas Street East features a single lane of traffic in each direction with a centre turning lane. Raised concrete medians with concrete planters are intermittently placed within the centre turning lane (Figure 69). Paved sidewalks line both sides of the roadway, and the south sidewalk is separated from the road by a grassed verge. Residential roadways branch north and south off Dundas Street East. The dates of construction for the single-detached residential properties that front Dundas Street East represent a range from the late-nineteenth century through to present day (Figure 70 to Figure 72). Large landscaping stones form a retaining wall along the outer edges of the sidewalks for a portion of the eastern-most section of Dundas Street East within the study area (Figure 73). The stones on the north side of the roadway continue for approximately fifteen metres along the west side of First Street.
Figure 64: Dundas Street East, looking west (ASI 2020).

Figure 65: Looking north on Margaret Street with Union Cemetery (left) and residential properties (right) (ASI 2020).

Figure 66: Dundas Street East bridge, looking northwest from the west boundary of the study area towards Grindstone Creek (ASI 2020).

Figure 67: Looking north along First street, the east boundary of the Vinegar Hill study area (ASI 2020).
Figure 68: Looking west along Dundas Street East, showing mature trees within the study area (ASI 2020).

Figure 69: Dundas Street East looking southeast along the roadway (ASI 2020).

Figure 70: Example of nineteenth-century residential properties on the south side of Dundas Street East (ASI 2020).

Figure 71: Example of converted residential to commercial properties on Dundas Street East (ASI 2020).
4.0 Cultural Heritage Evaluation

The following evaluation of Dundas Street as a cultural heritage landscape uses the City’s “A Framework for Evaluating the Cultural Heritage Value or Interest of Property for Designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act” which provides categorized criteria which expands upon, and is consistent with, Ontario Regulation 9/06. These criteria were developed for cultural heritage landscapes.

4.1 Historical Associations

Themes

Criterion 1: How well does the cultural heritage landscape illustrate one or more historical themes representative of cultural processes in the development and/or use of land in the context of the community, province, or nation?

Meets criterion.

The Dundas Street East corridor within the study area is directly associated within the growth of commercial and residential development within the community of Waterdown from the early-nineteenth century.

Event

Criterion 2: Is the cultural landscape associated with a specific event that has made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation?

Does not meet criterion.
The area is not associated with any specific event which made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation.

**Person and/or Group**

*Criterion 3: Is the cultural landscape associated with the life or activities of a person, group, organization, or institution that has made a significant contribution to the community, province or nation?*

*Meets criterion.*

Dundas Street has historical and associative value as an historical Indigenous route, and later as a military and transportation route that has been in continuous use since its establishment by Lieutenant Governor John Graves Simcoe in the late eighteenth-century.

**4.2 Scenic Amenity**

**Sense of Place**

*Criterion 4: Does the cultural heritage landscape provide the observer(s) with a strong sense of position or place?*

*Meets criterion.*

The changes in topography between First Street and Flamboro Street provide the observer with a strong sense of the Grindstone Creek valley and provides views across the valley from these points along Dundas Street.

**Serial Vision**

*Criterion 5: Does the cultural heritage landscape provide the observer(s) with opportunities for serial vision along paths of pedestrian or vehicular movement?*

*Meets criterion.*

The changes in topography between First Street and Flamboro Street provide the observer with opportunities for serial vision along Dundas Street.

**Material Content**

*Criterion 6: Is the cultural heritage landscape visually satisfying or pleasing to the observer(s) in terms of colour, texture, style, and scale?*

*Meets criterion.*

Within the study area, the section of Dundas Street beginning just east of Hamilton Street extending east to Grindstone Creek is a mixed-use corridor that has retained many of its
nineteenth- and early-twentieth century properties along the right-of-way, with additional aesthetic appeal relating to mature trees throughout portions of the corridor as well as lampposts along the right-of-way.

4.3 Integrity

*Criterion 7: Is it all there?*

**Meets criterion.**

Since the nineteenth century, the Dundas Street corridor within the study area has been continuously used for commercial, residential, and public purposes. Many mid-nineteenth and early twentieth-century properties are extant along the Dundas Street corridor within the study area.

Historical images and aerial photography demonstrate the retention of many trees along Dundas Street within the study area, particularly those within the late-nineteenth century properties along north side of Dundas Street, as well as through Vinegar Hill. The edges of Grindstone Creek also have mature trees and dense vegetation.

Although Dundas Street has been significantly altered over time, the relationship of the street as it extends towards the Dundas Street Bridge over Grindstone Creek and the railway corridor remains. Historical images demonstrate similar views looking up and down Dundas Street to and from Vinegar Hill and down from the intersections of Main Street and Dundas Street as well as Mill Street and Dundas Street.

4.4 Design

*Criterion 8: Has the landscape been purposefully designed or planned?*

**Meets criterion.**

Dundas Street has physical value as an early road and transportation route through the community of Waterdown as proposed by Lieutenant-Governor John Graves Simcoe. Early development within the community began along Dundas Street East within the study area around the intersection with Mill Street and continued to expand west.

4.5 Social Value

*Public Perception*

*Criterion 9: Is the landscape regarded as having importance within the City?*

**Meets criterion.**
As a former Indigenous route and later principal route and historical military road between York and Dundas in the 1800s, Dundas Street has contributed significantly to the growth of Waterdown and the establishment of Waterdown’s identity. Dundas Street East’s historical intersections within the study area include those at Main Street and Mill Street, which are landmarks in the local area. These intersections are often identified with Waterdown’s community image and appear in marketing and promotional materials.

Moving east from Hamilton Street, Dundas Street East has a distinct character as a primarily nineteenth- and early-twentieth streetscape with commercial and residential properties of about two-storeys and a mix of brick, stone, and wood construction, surrounded by mature trees as well as lampposts along the right-of-way. Properties with an original residential context are set back from the property line while those with a commercial focus are set at the property line.

Dundas Street East is part of the Waterdown Business Improvement Area. A portion of Dundas Street East within the study area is also located within the Mill Street Heritage Conservation District, and several properties along Dundas Street are identified heritage properties.

Dundas Street East is the subject of local history publications, including *Dundas Street Waterdown: 1793-1993* written by the Flamborough Historical Society. The street has also been included in local historical walking tours. Portions of the Dundas Street East corridor within the study area, including the intersection of Main Street and Dundas Street East and the intersection of Mill Street and Dundas Street East, are frequently photographed. Additionally, longtime Waterdown resident Peter Vance produced many pen sketches of properties along Dundas Street and throughout Waterdown. The Waterdown Arts Fest has been held along the street in the past and parades have traditionally been held along Dundas Street.

The Dundas Street East corridor within the study area is included in several walking tours published by the Flamborough Historical Society, including the Dundas Street Walk and the John Street Walk. Additionally, the portion of Dundas Street East within the Mill Street Heritage Conservation District, and in particular commercial establishments at the intersection of Main Street and Dundas Street East and the intersection of Mill Street and Dundas Street East, are promoted on the City of Hamilton’s Tourism Website (Tourism Hamilton 2019).

### 4.6 Ontario Regulation 9/06

**Table 2: Cultural Heritage Value of Dundas Street**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value: is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a landscape</td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value:</td>
<td>Meets criterion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High degree of design/aesthetic appeal</td>
<td>See Section 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value: High Degree Technical/Scientific Interest</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/Associative Value: Direct Association with a Theme, Event, Person, etc.</td>
<td>Meets criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Section 4.1.1 and 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical or Associative Value: contributes to an understanding of a community/culture</td>
<td>Meets criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Section 4.1.1 and 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/Associative Value: Reflects work or ideas of architect, artist, builder, etc.</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Section 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value: Important in defining character of area</td>
<td>Meets criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Section 4.2.1 and 4.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value: Historically, physically, functionally or visually linked to surroundings</td>
<td>Meets criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Section 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, and 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value: Landmark</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Section 4.3 and 4.5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.7 Evaluation Summary

Dundas Street is a significant cultural heritage landscape due to its cultural heritage value, community value, and historical integrity. Dundas Street is an evolved mixed-use eighteenth-century transportation corridor that has retained nineteenth and early-twentieth century commercial, residential, and public properties along the right-of-way. The following Statement of Significance and identified cultural heritage attributes apply to the portion of Dundas Street East within the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan Study Area between the west property boundary of the property at 289 Dundas Street on the north side and the west property boundary of 290 Dundas Street along the south side to the eastern edge of First Street.

### 5.0 Statement of Significance

**Description of Place**

Dundas Street is an evolved mid-nineteenth and twentieth-century streetscape with commercial, public, and residential uses that continue today. The boundary of the Dundas Street cultural heritage landscape includes the properties between 289 and 290 Dundas Street and the eastern edge of First Street.
Cultural Heritage Value

Dundas Street in Waterdown has cultural heritage value as a cultural heritage landscape due to its design and physical value, historical and associative value, and historical integrity.

Dundas Street has physical value as an early transportation and military route through the community of Waterdown as proposed by Lieutenant-Governor John Graves Simcoe in the late eighteenth-century. Within the core of Waterdown, Dundas Street is a mixed-use corridor that has retained many of its nineteenth- and early-twentieth century properties along the right-of-way. Additional aesthetic appeal is provided by the mature trees throughout portions of the corridor as well as lampposts along the right-of-way. The topography of Dundas Street provides a strong sense of the village’s location on Grindstone Creek which was instrumental to the settlement of the area. Additionally, the Dundas Street Bridge provides views through the railway corridor and along Grindstone Creek.

Dundas Street has historical and associative values as an Indigenous and Euro-Canadian transportation route that has been in continuous use for hundreds of years. Originally an Indigenous trail, Dundas Street has historically connected communities between Dundas and Toronto. Dundas Street is also associated with Lieutenant Governor John Graves Simcoe, who proposed the route which is still referred to as Governor’s Road along other stretches. Historically, Dundas Street within the cultural heritage landscape has been a mixed-use area with commercial development growing from the intersections of Mill and Main Streets along Dundas Street and residential development surrounding the commercial core.

Dundas Street has contextual value as it is physically, visually, and functionally linked to its surroundings, connecting Waterdown to communities to the east and west, following the route of a former Indigenous trail, and providing visual and physical links to Grindstone Creek via the Dundas Street Bridge and across the creek valley.

The eastern portion of Dundas Street within Waterdown is known as Vinegar Hill and has a primarily nineteenth-century residential character. Travelling westward the street has a bridge crossing at Grindstone Creek. To the west of Grindstone Creek Dundas Street intersects with the Mill Street Heritage Conservation District, which is designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act, and contains properties recognized on the City of Hamilton’s Municipal Heritage Register. Dundas Street, named for Henry Dundas, former Home Secretary and responsible for Colonial Affairs, has been written about in local history publications, including Dundas Street Waterdown 1793-1993 by the Flamborough Historical Society. Dundas Street East’s intersections within the study area include those at Main Street and Mill Street, which are landmarks in the local area and are highly photographed and promoted as tourist and walking tour destinations. Between Mill Street and Hamilton Street, Dundas Street has a distinct character as a primarily nineteenth- and early-twentieth streetscape with commercial and residential properties surrounded by mature trees as well as lampposts along the right-of-way.

Cultural Heritage Attributes
• The characteristics of Dundas Street as a publicly accessible thoroughfare
• Mature trees, in particular along Grindstone Creek and within several nineteenth- and early-twentieth century properties along the right-of-way
• View along Dundas Street east towards Vinegar Hill until First Street from Flamboro Street and west through Vinegar Hill towards Flamboro Street from First Street
• View from the Dundas Street Bridge north and south along the Grindstone Creek and Canadian Pacific Railway line
• The scale, form, massing, and architectural details of the historical residential and commercial buildings throughout the Dundas Street corridor which has the following characteristics:
  o set at the right-of-way for commercial building types or shallow but varied set-backs for residential types.
  o constructed primarily of masonry or wood-frame construction
  o historically one to two-and-one-half storeys in height
  o modest scale
• The historical aesthetic and scenic quality of the Dundas Street Corridor, including the scale of built form to road width, mature trees, and vegetation
• Landmark properties including the Smith/Carson House, Crooker House, Maple Lawn, Chestnut Grove, Former New Connexion Church, Eager House, and Memorial Hall and its public space
• Key intersections with Mill Street and Main Street, and their landmark buildings, including the former Kirk Hotel, American Hotel, Weeks/Eager Store, and the Stock Building
6.0 Boundary

The proposed boundary for the Dundas Street Waterdown Cultural Heritage Landscape within the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan study area is as follows:

- Rear property lines of those properties along the north and south sides of Dundas Street East east of Hamilton Street, from the west property boundary of 289 Dundas Street on the north side and the west property boundary of 290 Dundas Street East along the south side to the First Street.

Figure 74: Proposed boundary for the Dundas Street Waterdown Cultural Heritage Landscape.
Former Glenlea (Glenlee) Farm

1.0 Introduction

The Former Glenlea (Glenlee) Farm is located along the south side of Dundas Street East between Hamilton Street South and Flamboro Street, extending south to Main Street East (Figure 1). The former Glenlea Farm study area is located within a mixed-use area, with commercial properties within the northern portion and residential properties within the central and southern portions of the study area. A water treatment plant is also located in the southern portion of the study area. While roadways and lot patterns in Waterdown are oriented in a northwest-southeast axis, the study area will be described in a north-south orientation for ease of description. Main Street South will be described as travelling north-south, with the former Glenlea (Glenlee) Farm located west of Main Street.

Figure 1: Location of the Former Glenlea (Glenlee) Farm within the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan study area.

2.0 Historical Summary

Following land grants from Simcoe to the military personnel who opened Dundas Street, Waterdown was settled in 1796 on land originally granted to Alexander McDonnell, an officer in the North West Company (Flamborough Archives and Heritage Society 2017; Donkin 1969). In 1805, the undeveloped land was passed to Alexander Brown whose enterprises, along with
those of Ebenezer Griffin, accounted for substantial industrial growth in the Grindstone Creek valley (later known as Smokey Hollow) with the establishment of saw, flour and woolen mills, tanneries, foundries, factories, dams, and raceways (Figure 2) (Unterman McPhail Cuming Associates 1996).

![Figure 2: Smokey Hollow, c. 1870 (Anon 1870).](image)

In 1831, Griffin drew up a plan for the Village of Waterdown and began to sell lots along Dundas Street, primarily west of Mill Street, with the first lot sold to Alex Markle in 1831 at the southwest corner of Mill and Dundas Streets (the site of the American Hotel) (Donkin 1969; Unterman McPhail Cuming Associates 1996). In the early 1840s, a merchant class began to grow and continued to establish shops along Dundas Street (Donkin 1969). Charles Sealey (Figure 3) was one of these merchants, and the owner of the Glenlea Farm property in the mid-nineteenth century. The 1875 County Atlas also records Sealey as a farmer and lumberman (Page & Smith 1875a).

**Charles and William Oscar Sealey**

In 1831, Charles Henry Sealey immigrated with his wife Mary Ann and his family from New York State to Flamborough West (Page & Smith 1875a; Flamborough Archives 1908). Charles was a farmer, a store and sawmill owner, and, following the incorporation of the Village of Waterdown in 1878, was elected the first Reeve of Waterdown. Charles was also a school trustee in Waterdown for 27 years (Flamborough Archives 1908).
In 1880, Charles constructed his house known as “Chestnut Grove” at 315 Dundas Street East (Figure 4). Chestnut Grove is believed to have been constructed around an earlier house, with great care taken to match the existing brickwork and window openings so that the work was scarcely noticeable. It is thought that Sealey named the property for the large number of horse chestnut trees behind the house (Wray 1994:36). At that time, Charles also donated land to the Waterdown Union Cemetery. Over a period of several years, he bought and sold Crooker’s General Store (McBurney 1987). According to an undated collection of photographs, family trees, wills, and other documents titled “The Sealey Family” held by the Flamborough Archives, Charles Henry Sealey was also registered as the owner of the following properties: 68 South Flamborough Street (present-day 68 Flamboro Street); 13 Orchard Street (present-day 7 Orchard Street); 37 Dundas Street (present-day 298 Dundas Street); and 57 Dundas Street (present-day 292 Dundas Street).

Sealey’s son, William Oscar Sealey (Figure 5) joined his father’s lumber business in the 1880s and later opened a bank in the Crooker building on the northeast corner of Main and Dundas Streets which operated between 1875 and 1889. William Oscar Sealey was one of Wentworth County’s most prominent citizens at the time (Flamborough Review 2008).
William Oscar Sealey was a Reeve in East Flamborough, member of Wentworth County Council, and in 1908 was elected to the Dominion Parliament as a Liberal Candidate where he served until 1911 (Flamborough Review 2008). In 1908, William Oscar introduced a bill for free rural mail delivery in Canada, and on October 10, 1908, the first ever rural mail delivery brought mail to 37 rural households between Ancaster and Hamilton (Ancaster Heritage News 1998). William Oscar was also considered a pioneer in Hamilton in the building and selling of houses, and later constructed apartments like Sealey Apartments at 17, 19 and 21 Locke Street South (Kennedy).

**Former Glenlea (Glenlee) Farm**

The former Glenlea Farm property is historically located within Lot 7, Concession 3, in the former Village of Waterdown, now part of the City of Hamilton.

The 1854 *Map of the Village of Waterdown, County of Wentworth* identifies Charles Sealey as the owner of the entire Glenlea Farm property (Figure 6). The Parcel Register Book for “Waterdown, Parts of Lot 6 and 7, Concession 3 East Flamborough, Prior Title to E.C. Griffins Survey, Village Lot in Waterdown” includes numerous land transactions in Waterdown associated with Charles Sealey. The Land Abstract book for Lot 7 in the Village of Waterdown, however, indicates that the farm property transferred to Sealey through a Bargain & Sale in 1873.
The 1875 Map of the Village of Waterdown, County of Wentworth identifies Charles Sealey as the owner of the majority of the former Glenlea Farm, with the exception of the northwest corner of the property along Dundas Street owned by William Horning. A stone quarry, one of several quarries in the area in the nineteenth century, is identified within the north half of the site close to Barton Street, while the south half is identified as “Glenlee Park” and contains a creek (formerly known as Grierson Creek) with steep slopes on either side (Figure 7).
The 1875 *Illustrated Historical Atlas of Wentworth County* identifies Charles Sealey as the owner of the lot to the west of the former Glenlea Farm property, with a structure within the interior of that lot, now 7 Orchard Drive, and the former St. Thomas Church (non-extant but cemetery remains) along the west lot line (Figure 8). The 1903 *Imperial Atlas of Waterdown* shows Barton Street as established, while Prospect Street and Grierson Street are shown as planned but were never actualized. Subdivided lots are shown within the northern portion of the property. The southern portion of the former Glenlea Farm property is identified as “Glenlee Farm” and the presence of a stone quarry is noted (Figure 9).
Figure 8: 1875 *Illustrated Historical Atlas of Wentworth County* (Page & Smith 1875a).

Figure 9: 1903 *Imperial Atlas of Waterdown* (Tyrrell 1903).
The 1909, 1919, and 1923 National Topographic Maps show Barton Street extending from Hamilton Street South to Main Street South and intersecting with Flamboro Street (Figure 10 through Figure 12). A wooden structure is shown south of Barton Street along Hamilton Street South, while a building is shown in the general location of the Glenlea House south of the Catholic church building and several buildings are shown along the south side of Dundas Street. A tributary of Grindstone Creek, formerly known as Grierson Creek, is shown through the centre of the former Glenlea property through dense trees.

Figure 10: 1909 National Topographic Map (Department of Militia and Defence 1909).
Figure 11: 1919 National Topographic Map (DMD 1919).

Figure 12: 1923 National Topographic Map (Department of National Defence 1923).
In 1929, William Oscar Sealey purchased property south of Dundas Street, along the east side of Main Street. This property was the site of the Waterdown Public and High School between 1873 and 1918 in which the first entrance exams in Ontario were written. The school was closed in 1918 due to overcrowding and a new school was built (Flamborough Archives and Heritage Society 2017). By 1929, a new high school building had been constructed at the corner of Hamilton Street and Dundas Street East, and most of the former Waterdown Common School building had been demolished following a fire, apart from a lower section of the school (Figure 14). Sealey Park, named for William Oscar Sealey’s father Charles, was officially presented to the town in 1931 (McBurney 1987) (Figure 13 through Figure 16).

Figure 13: Students at Recess at Waterdown Public School, n.d. (Anon n.d.).

Figure 14: Lower Section of Waterdown Public School, Sealey Park, c. 1947 (Anon 1947).

Figure 15: Sealey Park entrance, 2019 (ASI 2019).

Figure 16: Remnant of the lower section of Waterdown Public School, Sealey Park (ASI 2019).
The 1931 *National Topographic Map* shows little change within the former Glenlea Farm property (Figure 17). An additional structure is shown south of the Glenlea House along Flamboro Street.

![Figure 17: 1931 National Topographic Map](image)

Figure 17: 1931 *National Topographic Map* (Department of National Defence 1931).

Fire insurance plans from 1937 show only a portion of the former Glenlea Farm property, with properties shown along the south side of Dundas Street East and along Flamboro Street. A school building associated with the Waterdown High School building, constructed in 1928, is located at the southwest corner of Hamilton Street and Dundas Street, outside of the former Glenlea Farm property. The Roman Catholic Church at the southwest corner of Flamboro Street and Barton Street is identified, while the Glenlea House is shown further south on Flamboro Street beyond two frame structures (Figure 18).
The 1943 *National Topographic Map* identifies the former Glenlea Farm property as a "Park," shows a creek within the subject property extending from Grindstone Creek, and additional structures to the southeast of the study area along Main Street South (Figure 19).

The 1963 *National Topographic Map* (Figure 20) shows development between Dundas Street and Barton Street within the northern portion of the original Glenlea Farm and along the east side of Flamboro Street. The former St. Thomas Catholic School building (non-extant) is shown in the study area, while the new Waterdown High School building, constructed c. 1928, is shown at the southwest corner of Hamilton Street South and Dundas Street East. An additional structure is shown in the interior of the study area away from the roadway.
Figure 19: 1943 National Topographic Map (Department of National Defence 1943).

Figure 20: 1963 National Topographic Map (Natural Resources Canada 1963).
In the 1970s, the Glenlea Survey, located along the west side of Main Street, significantly altered the historical context of the former Glenlea Park (Figure 21).

Figure 21: Glenlea Survey, 1969 (Lawrence G. Woods 1969).

Figure 22: Aerial Photograph showing location of Glenlea Survey (Nancy Court) outlined in blue.

In 1971, the Braeburn Apartments were constructed at the southeast corner of Hamilton Street South and Dundas Street East, replacing the two-storey residential building in that location (Figure 23 and Figure 24).

Figure 23: Braeburn, Dundas Street at Hamilton Street South, c.1960 (Flamborough Archives).

Figure 24: Braeburn Apartments at Dundas Street East and Hamilton Street South (ASI 2019).
Subsequent development throughout the late-twentieth century has significantly altered the original Glenlea Farm property. The Woodview Heights residential complex was constructed at the end of Hamilton Street across from Silver Court. The Water Treatment Plant was constructed in 1979 within the southern half of the site. There is ongoing construction of a new townhouse subdivision and mid-rise residential complex at the southeast corner of Hamilton Street South and Barton Street on the former St. Thomas School site (Figure 25).

Figure 25: Aerial photograph of the former Glenlea Farm within the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan study area

The red brick Victorian farmhouse at 68 Flamboro Street (c.1860) and Grierson Creek in the south half of the area are the remaining features of the estate belonging to Charles Sealey. The middle and southern portions of the area retain natural features, such as the tree canopy, visible from aerial photography.
3.0 Existing Conditions

The former Glenlea (Glenlee) Farm is generally bounded by Hamilton Street to the west, Dundas Street East to the north, and Main Street to the east and south. A high-rise residential building, Braeburn Apartments, is located at the southeast corner of Hamilton Street South and Dundas Street East, extending south to Barton Street. It is surrounded by several mature trees as well as a large asphalt parking lot that connects to both Dundas Street East and Barton Street (Figure 26). Several mid-nineteenth and early-twentieth century residential buildings along Dundas Street have been adapted for commercial use (Figure 27).

The Glenlea House at 68 Flamboro Street is the only remaining built structure south of Dundas Street East associated with the original estate that stretched south to Snake Road and west to Hamilton Street. Situated on top of an embankment, the house is located behind mature trees with a contemporary garage to the rear (Figure 28).
The central portion of this area is dominated by recent development, including a development currently under construction at the southeast corner of Hamilton Street South and Barton Street, a recent subdivision in the centre of Barton Street, and a 2013 development incorporating the former 1914 St. Thomas Roman Catholic Church along the east side (Figure 29 and Figure 30).

Along the west side of the former Glenlea Farm is a 1986 townhouse development at the end of Hamilton Street across from Silver Court, which is surrounded by a densely-treed area that extends north to the development under construction, east to the rear property lines of residential properties along Flamboro Street and Nancy Court, and south to the Water Pumping Station (Figure 31 and Figure 32).
South of the Glenlea House along Flamboro Street are a series of properties, primarily of a 1950s and 1960s vintage (Figure 33). Beyond the boundaries of the study area, Nancy Court (Figure 34), constructed in 1975, extends from the west side of Flamboro Street. Further south are primarily twentieth-century properties with one house constructed in 1857 (Figure 35). Further south, at the southern boundary of the former Glenlea Farm, is the Waterdown Pumping Station (Figure 36).
The western boundary of the study area forms the rear lot lines of Howard Boulevard and Thomson Drive and is not accessible from the public right-of-way. The interior of the area, which is densely treed, is also inaccessible.

4.0 Cultural Heritage Evaluation

The following evaluation of former Glenlea (Glenlee) Farm as a cultural heritage landscape uses the City’s “A Framework for Evaluating the Cultural Heritage Value or Interest of Property for Designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act” which provides categorized criteria which expands upon, and is consistent with, Ontario Regulation 9/06. These criteria were developed for cultural heritage landscapes.

4.1 Historical Associations

Themes

Criterion 1: How well does the cultural heritage landscape illustrate one or more historical themes representative of cultural processes in the development and/or use of land in the context of the community, province, or nation?

Partially meets criterion.

The former Glenlea Farm study area was once associated with the theme of settlement of the Village of Waterdown in the nineteenth century. While the area no longer represents this theme due to the twentieth and twenty-first century subdivisions and development, the home at 68 Flamboro Street remains an important remnant of Glenlea Farm.
**Event**

*Criterion 2: Is the cultural landscape associated with a specific event that has made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation?*

**Does not meet criterion.**

The area is not associated with any specific event which made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation.

**Person and/or Group**

*Criterion 3: Is the cultural landscape associated with the life or activities of a person, group, organization, or institution that has made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation?*

**Meets criterion.**

The former Glenlea Farm property is directly associated with Charles Sealey, a farmer, merchant, miller, and the first Reeve of Waterdown. The former Glenlea Farm property is also associated with Charles Sealey’s son, William Oscar Sealey, who was a significant figure in the community of Waterdown and who established Sealey Park to the east of the study area in honour of his father. The former Glenlea Farm property is also associated with local industry as it also contained a stone quarry, one of several in the area, along Grindstone Creek.

**4.2 Scenic Amenity**

**Sense of Place**

*Criterion 4: Does the cultural heritage landscape provide the observer(s) with a strong sense of position or place?*

**Does not meet criterion.**

Due to the alterations to the land use patterns through the study area, there is not a strong sense of position or place.

**Serial Vision**

*Criterion 5: Does the cultural heritage landscape provide the observer(s) with opportunities for serial vision along paths of pedestrian or vehicular movement?*

**Does not meet criterion.**
The topography of Flamboro Street and the turn onto and curvilinear quality of Main Street South provides some opportunities for serial vision. However, this does not relate directly to the potential historical significance of the Glenlea Farm.

**Material Content**

*Criterion 6: Is the cultural heritage landscape visually satisfying or pleasing to the observer(s) in terms of colour, texture, style, and scale?*

**Does not meet criterion.**

While the area has some visually satisfying elements these do not tell the story of the former Glenlea Farm.

**4.3 Integrity**

*Criterion 7: Is it all there?*

**Does not meet criterion.**

Although some historical buildings remain along the north boundary of the former Glenlea Farm study area and along Flamboro Street, the land use pattern and historical relationships have been significantly altered through the twentieth- and twenty-first century development through several subdivisions. The former Glenlea Farm study area is now a mixed-use area, with commercial and mixed-use properties within the northern portion, dense townhouse developments within the central portion, single-detached residential use along the southeast boundary, and public infrastructure at the southern end. Within the interior of the former Glenlea Farm study area, dense trees, vegetation, and Grierson Creek remain intact. However, the study area is not known to retain any plantings such as hedgerows or shade trees throughout the site, apart from those mature trees surrounding the Glenlea House at 68 Flamboro Street.

**4.4 Design**

*Criterion 8: Has the landscape been purposefully designed or planned?*

**Does not meet criterion.**

While the property may have had specific design elements related to the Sealeys, the area south of the properties on Dundas Street East has been significantly altered through twentieth- and twenty-first century development, leaving no visible evidence from the public right-of-way of the former landscape, apart from dense vegetation and Grierson Creek within the south portion of the study area and the former Glenlea House at 68 Flamboro Street.
4.5 Social Value

Public Perception

Criterion 9: Is the landscape regarded as having importance within the City?

Does not meet criterion.

The former Glenlea Farm study area is not used to tell the story of the Waterdown community and is not a landmark. While Charles Sealey is identified in local history publications as the first Reeve of Waterdown and as the owner of a general store, sawmills, and as a farmer, the former Glenlea Farm is not described in detail within local history books. However, Sealey Park, to the east of the former Glenlea Farm property, was dedicated in the memory of Charles Sealey by his son, William Oscar Sealey. Sealey Park is also being evaluated as a cultural heritage landscape within this study.

4.6 Ontario Regulation 9/06

Table 3: Cultural Heritage Value of the former Glenlea (Glenlee) Farm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value: <em>is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a landscape</em></td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value: <em>High degree of design/aesthetic appeal</em></td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See section 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value: <em>High Degree Technical/Scientific Interest</em></td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/Associative Value: <em>Direct Association with a Theme, Event, Person, etc.</em></td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical or Associative Value: <em>contributes to an understanding of a community/culture</em></td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/Associative Value: <em>Reflects work or ideas of architect, artist, builder, etc.</em></td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value: <em>Important in defining character of area</em></td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.2.1 and 4.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value: <em>Historically, physically, functionally or visually linked to surroundings</em></td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, and 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value: <em>Landmark</em></td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.3 and 4.5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.7 Evaluation Summary

The former Glenlea (Glenlee) Farm property does not meet the criteria used to evaluate identified cultural heritage landscapes within the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan study area. While the former Glenlea Farm does have historical and associative value due to its associations with Charles and his son William Oscar Sealey and the quarrying industry within the community of Waterdown, all that remains of the former farm and park is the Glenlea House along Flamboro Street and dense vegetation within the southern portion of the site. The former Glenlea Farm is not known to have any identified community value and its historical integrity has been lost through twenty-first century subdivision and development of the original property.
Main Street

1.0 Introduction

The previously-identified potential cultural heritage landscape boundary for Main Street extends from Main Street North at Hamilton Street North south to the intersection of Main Street South and Snake Road, extending to the west just beyond the Waterdown Montessori School property (Figure 1). Within the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan study area, Main Street extends from Centre Road in the north to the south boundary of the study area at the intersection of Main Street South and Snake Road.

While roadways and lot patterns in Waterdown are oriented in a northwest-southeast axis, the study area will be described in a north-south orientation for ease of description. Main Street South will be described as travelling north-south. Main Street is referred to as Main Street North, north of Dundas Street, and Main Street South to the south of Dundas Street. For ease of reference, “Main Street” will be used throughout the description of the study area.

Figure 1: Location of Main Street within the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan study area
2.0 Historical Summary

Main Street is historically located on Lot 7, Concession 3 in East Flamborough Township. It has been known at different times as Stone Road, Ransom Street, Hamilton Carlisle Gravel Road, and Centre Road. There is evidence to suggest that the Grindstone Creek created a gap in the escarpment which was used as a trail by Indigenous people travelling between Hamilton Bay and Lake Medad (Figure 2) (Woods et al. 1967; Donkin 1969:32).

Figure 2: Possible location of the Indigenous trail following along Grindstone Creek (Donkin 1969: Map 4).

Main Street south of Dundas Street may follow the Indigenous trail and was built on part of the land purchased by miller Ebenezer C. Griffin from Alexander Brown in the 1820s. Griffin is known as the founder of Waterdown, and by 1831 he had purchased a substantial portion of what would become the Village of Waterdown. He established the second sawmill in the village, a flour mill, and a woollen mill. In 1831, Griffin prepared a plan (known as the Griffin Survey) to subdivide his land into smaller village lots (Unterman McPhail Cuming Associates 1996:2-2).
The alignment of Main Street was drawn in the subdivision of lands below Dundas Street between Flamboro and Mill streets following the death of E.C. Griffin in 1847 and the settling of his estate in 1856. Main Street followed the property lines between village lots in a generally north-south orientation and is identified with a dotted line labelled “Line of road built by J.K. Griffin” (Figure 3). During this period E.C. Griffin’s eldest son, James Kent Griffin, had a home built on the land labelled “Henry and Dyke” which was also recorded as Park Lot A on the 1854 Winter Plan. The stone home (built c. 1844) stands at 201 Main Street South.

Figure 3: Diagram showing alignment of Main Street (identified as “Line of road built by J.K. Griffin”) in relation to lot divisions (Donkin 1969: Map 12).

The southern portion of Main Street was built as a toll road between 1853 and 1854 by James Kent Griffin (Flamborough Review 2006). The roadway connected Hamilton and Carlisle and had a toll gate located near the current Woodland Cemetery. The road follows the present-day Snake Road to Waterdown where it becomes Main Street and then continues north to the community of Carlisle as Centre Road. The route appears to have been in use before 1853 but was impassable in the wet season (Figure 4 and Figure 5) (Donkin 1969). Snake Road is one of the oldest roads in Ontario, believed to be named for the winding route the roadway takes over the steep escarpment (Flamborough Review 2006). By the mid-1950s, the City of Burlington became responsible for the upkeep and maintenance of Snake Road due to the annexation of the lower concessions of East Flamborough Township (Flamborough Review 2007).
Figure 4: Snake Road, n.d. (Anon).

Figure 5: Horse and buggy along Snake Road, n.d. (Reid).
Along with the building of Main Street, the road network within the Village of Waterdown was greatly extended during the 1840s and 1850s as shown in the 1854 *Map of the Village of Waterdown* (Figure 6). Main Street developed later than Mill and Dundas Streets, however it became one of the three key roads in the village. The 1854 map shows the connection of Main Street to Snake Road in the southern part of the study area. It provided the first direct connection to Hamilton and was used until after 1900 as an important stagecoach route from Hamilton to Waterdown, Carlisle, and Mountsberg (Donkin 1969).

Figure 6: 1854 *Map of the Village of Waterdown*, showing the road network (Winter 1854)
The 1859 Tremaine’s Map of the County of Wentworth shows Main Street connecting through the core of the study area, with dense development along the southern portion of Main Street in the study area in particular (Figure 7). The 1875 Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth shows similar detail to the Tremaine map (Figure 8).

Figure 7: 1859 Tremaine’s Map of the County of Wentworth (Tremaine 1859).
Figure 8: 1875 Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Wentworth (Page & Smith 1875b).
Properties along Main Street within Waterdown have historically been a mix of residential, commercial, public, and institutional properties, with a commercial node at the intersection of Main and Dundas Streets (Figure 10 and Figure 11). The intersection of Main and Dundas Streets developed slightly later than the intersection of Mill and Dundas Streets. The Kirk Hotel (now Royal Coachman) was constructed c. 1870 on the northwest corner and the original Crooker General Store was constructed c. 1890 on the northeast corner and was later replaced.
c. 1920s after being destroyed by the Great Fire of 1922 (Figure 12 and Figure 13). On the south side of the intersection, early buildings have been replaced with a low-rise commercial building (c. 2011) on the southeast corner and a low-rise commercial bank building (c. 1965) on the southwest corner. The first Waterdown Post Office was established in 1841, and took up operation in 1860 in a frame building on Main Street constructed in 1857 to originally serve as a combined shop and residence (Figure 14) (Canada’s Historic Places 2019; Woods et al. 1967). Earlier post offices were located at Main Street South at Griffin Street, 9 Main Street North, and 34 Main Street North (still extant but heavily modified). A two-storey stone school was constructed in the southern portion of Main Street on Lot 10 for the Waterdown Grammar and Common School between 1853 and 1867. This school was located immediately south of the drill hall and faced south onto what would become School Street. Following the closure of the school, the building was partially demolished, reducing the structure to a single room. In 1931, the land was donated by William Oscar Sealy in commemoration of his father, Charles. Memorial Park was established at the north end of Main Street on the west side in 1946.
The Waterdown Heritage Conservation District Study offers a general description of the streetscapes in Waterdown c. 1880:

The number of village lots under one acre had risen substantially from the 1840s creating a more cohesive streetscape and Waterdown had taken on the appearance of a well-established, prosperous village. The houses had well-
tended gardens, fences separated the front lawns from the dirt road, in some locations wooden sidewalks ran along the roadside and trees lined the streets. There were fewer farms within the village boundaries, with those that did remain now relegated to the periphery of the village. Frame and stone, one to one-and-a-half storey residences were the most popular type of building construction between the 1840s and 1880s. Brick as a building material had not as yet played a major role in contributing to the character of the village (Unterman McPhail Cuming Associates 1996:2–8).

In 1906, a village fire destroyed the tailor and barber shop next to the Crooker Block on the northeast corner of Dundas Street and Mill Street, and on May 25, 1915, a second fire destroyed the Crooker Block (Jeffries 2017). The corner block was rebuilt by Crooker with a one-storey red brick building by the end of the First World War (Wray 2017). A subsequent fire in the 1920s razed several stores on the north side of Dundas Street, including this replacement building (Figure 15). This building and others destroyed by the fire were replaced by smaller, less ornate buildings (Wray 2017).

Figure 15: View of Fire Damage in Waterdown following the Great Fire, c. 1922, showing the northeast corner of Main Street and Dundas Street East (Reid 1922).

A number of grand brick houses appeared along Main Street and Dundas Street in the 1890s. Two and two-and-half storey brick houses had appeared on the four corners of John and Main Streets by 1900 (Unterman McPhail Cuming Associates 1996). Photographs along Main Street from the early twentieth century show residential development along Main Street with an unpaved roadway (Figure 16 and Figure 17).
Figure 16: John Prudham's Delivery Service, looking north along Main Street, c. 1900-1906 (Newell 1900).

Figure 17: Looking north on Main Street north of Dundas Street East, c. 1910-1914 (Anon 1910).
National Topographic Maps between 1909 and 1923 show a relatively established streetscape, with structures on the east and west sides of Main Street between Parkside Drive to Sealey Park, and relatively undeveloped from Waterdown Park to Snake Road (Figure 18 through Figure 20). A branch of Grindstone Creek, known as Grierson Creek, is shown flowing under Main Street, near Snake Road, which was not depicted on earlier mapping. Sand pits are identified on the southeast corner of Parkside Drive and Main Street, and Main Street is shown as a “metalled” road. Grace Anglican Church cemetery is identified further south along the east side of Main Street, and a blacksmith shop is shown just north of the intersection of Main Street and Dundas Street East. The 1909 National Topographic Map shows a hotel north of Dundas Street along the east side of Main Street; however, it is not shown in mapping from 1919 or 1923 (Figure 18).

Figure 18: 1909 National Topographic Map (Department of Militia and Defence 1909).
Figure 19: 1919 *National Topographic Map* (DMD 1919).
The rate of growth in Waterdown during the early twentieth century slowed as the population declined, resulting in a sharp decline in development. Main Street, like all the roads in Waterdown, remained unpaved until at least 1920 (Unterman McPhail Cuming Associates 1996).
The 1937 Fire Insurance Plans for Waterdown that depict portions of the study area show properties along Main Street throughout almost the full extent of the portion covered, with more development within Main Street south of Dundas Street East and fewer structures along the east side of Main Street North towards Parkside Drive (Figure 21).

Figure 21: 1937 Fire Insurance Plan (Waterloo Mutual Insurance Company 1937).
The 1943 *National Topographic Map* shows additional structures on the west side of Main Street North, south of Kelly Street, with additional structures towards the northern terminus of Main Street within the study area (Figure 22). In the southwest corner of Main Street and Parkside Drive, a driveway is visible extending east from Main Street within the central portion of the future park, terminating at a gravel pit in the future location of Waterdown Memorial Park. The Kelly Street water tower is visible at the southeast corner of Kelly Street and Main Street North. A post office is also identified on the northwest corner of Main Street and Dundas Street (Figure 22). A small collection of additional structures is indicated on the west side of Main Street South, south of Sealey Park, and two more indicated on the east side of the roadway further south along the street.

Figure 22: 1943 *National Topographic Map* (Department of National Defence 1943).
The 1963 *National Topographic Map* identifies the dense development along most of the Main Street corridor. There are increasing numbers of houses within the northern and southern portions of the corridor (Figure 23). Waterdown Memorial Park is identified at the southwest corner of Main Street and Parkside Drive. Waterdown Memorial Park is a community park that was established in 1946 to serve as a memorial to Second World War veterans, as well as provide space for recreational activities and events for the community (Waterdown Memorial Public Art Project Focus Group 2019).

Figure 23: 1963 *National Topographic Map* (Natural Resources Canada 1963).
3.0 Existing Conditions

The previously-identified boundary for Main Street extends from Main Street North at Hamilton Street North south to the intersection of Main Street South and Snake Road, extending to the west just beyond the Waterdown Montessori School property, into the jurisdiction of the City of Burlington. Within the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan study area, Main Street extends from Centre Road in the north to the south boundary of the study area at the intersection of Main Street South and Snake Road. Main Street is referred to as Main Street North, north of Dundas Street, and Main Street South to the south of Dundas Street. For ease of reference, “Main Street” will be used throughout the description of the study area.

Figure 24: Mature trees along the west side of Main Street West north of Parkside Drive (ASI 2019).

Figure 25: Properties along the west side of Main Street towards the terminus of Main Street North (ASI 2019).

The northern terminus of Main Street is a cul-de-sac. Provision for pedestrian connection to Hamilton Street North has been made with a concrete sidewalk. Within this portion of the study area only the properties along the west side of Main Street are included (Figure 24 and Figure 25). The properties located along the west side of Main Street north of Parkside Drive include an 1847 property (341 Main Street North) (Figure 26), two 1960s properties, and two recently constructed properties. Mature trees and vegetation are located along the right-of-way.
South of Parkside Drive, Waterdown Memorial Park is located along the west side of Main Street North to Kelly Street. South of Kelly Street, the west side of Main Street includes single-detached residential buildings of varying age and architectural style (Figure 29 through Figure 33). The intersection of John Street West and Main Street, located south of Kelly Street, contains prominent brick homes located on each corner of the intersection which are included in the Mill Street Heritage Conservation District and designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act (Figure 27 and Figure 28). This consistent streetscape along the west side of Main Street ends at the driveway for a 1990s retirement village, south of which are commercial properties extending to Dundas Street East. A low-rise commercial building at the northwest corner of Dundas Street East and Main Street known as the Royal Coachman anchors the corner (Figure 33).
Figure 29: Looking northwest into Waterdown Memorial Park from Main Street (ASI 2019).

Figure 30: Looking north along Main Street, across from Mary Hopkins Public School yard (ASI 2019).

Figure 31: Looking north along Main Street, north of John Street (ASI 2019).

Figure 32: Looking north along Main Street, north of Cedar Street (ASI 2019).
South of Dundas Street East to Barton Street, the west side of Main Street contains several contemporary one to two-storey commercial properties. Moving further south, the streetscape on the west side of Main Street once again includes single-detached residential properties ranging from the mid-nineteenth century to the late twentieth-century. Sealey Park is a prominent feature within the neighbourhood on the east side of the street (Figure 36 and Figure 37). The southern boundary for the Main Street potential cultural heritage landscape study area terminates just south of the Waterdown Pumping Station (Figure 38 and Figure 39).
Along the east side of Main Street between Parkside Drive south to Kelly Street are single-detached residential properties with buildings constructed between the mid-nineteenth century to the mid-twentieth century with mature trees along the streetscape (Figure 40). At the southeast corner of Main Street and Kelly Street is a large water tower, set back significantly from Main Street. A small utility building is west of the water tower. To the south of the water tower are two residential properties. There are large open fields on the west side of the Mary Hopkins Public School property (Figure 41). A row of mature spruce trees lines almost the entire length of the school property along the north lot line. South of the school property along the east side of Main Street are several residential properties, extending south until the driveway for the 1990s retirement village along the west side, after which the properties become commercial properties until Dundas Street (Figure 42 and Figure 43).
Figure 40: Looking south on Main Street towards the corner of Main Street and John Street (ASI 2019).

Figure 41: Water tower at southeast corner of Main Street and Kelly Street (ASI 2019).

Figure 42: Looking south on Main Street towards Dundas Street (ASI 2019).

Figure 43: Looking south on Main Street towards Dundas Street (ASI 2019).

4.0 Cultural Heritage Evaluation

The following evaluation of Main Street as a cultural heritage landscape uses the City’s “A Framework for Evaluating the Cultural Heritage Value or Interest of Property for Designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act” which provides categorized criteria which expands upon, and is consistent with, Ontario Regulation 9/06. These criteria were developed for cultural heritage landscapes.
4.1 Historical Associations

Themes

Criterion 1: How well does the cultural heritage landscape illustrate one or more historical themes representative of cultural processes in the development and/or use of land in the context of the community, province, or nation?

Meets criterion.

The Main Street corridor is associated with the history of the settlement and development of the Village of Waterdown as well as with the Griffin family. The alignment of Main Street south of Dundas Street East is believed to follow the route of an Indigenous trail along Grindstone Creek. It persists through the subdivision of lands below Dundas Street between Flamborough and Mill Street following the death of Ebenezer Griffin by his son J.K. (James Kent) Griffin. Residential and commercial development grew along Main Street East from its establishment in the mid-nineteenth century throughout the twentieth century.

Event

Criterion 2: Is the cultural landscape associated with a specific event that has made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation?

Does not meet criterion.

The Main Street corridor is not associated with any specific events which made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation.

Person and/or Group

Criterion 3: Is the cultural landscape associated with the life or activities of a person, group, organization, or institution that has made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation?

Meets criterion.

The Main Street corridor is associated with the Griffin family. Ebenezer Griffin is considered the founder of the Village of Waterdown, and the southern portion of Main Street was built as a toll road between 1853 and 1854 by his son James Kent Griffin.

4.2 Scenic Amenity

Sense of Place

Criterion 4: Does the cultural heritage landscape provide the observer(s) with a strong sense of position or place?
Meets criterion.

The Main Street corridor has a high degree of design and aesthetic appeal as a well-treed, mature neighbourhood with a significant percentage of properties constructed between the mid-nineteenth century to mid-twentieth century. The alignment of Main Street was determined by the subdivision of lands below Dundas Street between Flamborough and Mill Street and is linked to Parkside Drive at the north end of the study area, Dundas Street within the central portion of the study area and connecting to former Snake Road beyond the study area to the south.

*Serial Vision*

*Criterion 5: Does the cultural heritage landscape provide the observer(s) with opportunities for serial vision along paths of pedestrian or vehicular movement?*

Meets criterion.

The topography and curvilinear route of Main Street provides opportunities for serial vision along both pedestrian and vehicular travel along the street.

*Material Content*

*Criterion 6: Is the cultural heritage landscape visually satisfying or pleasing to the observer(s) in terms of colour, texture, style, and scale?*

Meets criterion.

The Main Street corridor is intrinsically linked to the main residential and commercial streets within the historical Village of Waterdown. The Main Street corridor is a picturesque, scenic roadway through established residential neighbourhoods of varied building age, architectural style, and character. The character of Main Street at Dundas Street is that of a historic commercial intersection. With mature trees, a narrow roadway, and a variety of architectural styles and building construction dates from the mid-nineteenth century to late twentieth century, Main Street is intrinsically connected with the historical character of the area and in particular the corridors of Mill Street and Dundas Street East.

4.3 Integrity

*Criterion 7: Is it all there?*

Meets criterion.

Since its establishment in the mid-nineteenth century, Main Street has remained an important transportation corridor, as well as a primary residential and commercial corridor, with key public facilities such as the post office and Memorial Park.
With several individual properties along the Main Street corridor, ownership has not been consistent since the roadway was established in the mid-nineteenth century. Many original structures throughout the Main Street corridor within the study are extant. Mature trees line the Main Street corridor within the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan study area, within the residential neighbourhood to the north of Dundas Street. Main Street has not maintained significant natural relationships; however, to the south, it descends the escarpment into a valley where Main Street becomes Snake Road. Historical photographs identify similar views from the intersection of Main Street and Dundas Street looking north.

4.4 Design

*Criterion 8: Has the landscape been purposefully designed or planned?*

**Meets criterion.**

Main Street is a representative example of an evolved mid-nineteenth streetscape. The street follows an Indigenous trail along Grindstone Creek south of Dundas Street East. The property lines between village lots was established in the early nineteenth century with the alignment of Main Street partially determined by the subdivision of lands below Dundas Street between Flamborough and Mill Street. The north end of Main Street which bends westward towards Centre Road may relate to early nineteenth century land divisions.

4.5 Social Value

*Public Perception*

*Criterion 9: Is the landscape regarded as having importance within the City?*

**Meets criterion.**

Main Street is part of the story of the community of Waterdown’s identity through its establishment following the Griffin Survey as well as the important intersection of Main Street and Dundas Street within the commercial core of Waterdown, and its connection to an early stagecoach route. While several buildings along the Main Street corridor within the study area are recognized as landmarks, such as the Royal Coachman at the intersection of Dundas Street East and Main Street, the Main Street corridor is not known to be a landmark within the community.

Several places of public gathering are located along this street. Waterdown Memorial Park is a public space along the east side of Main Street North, south of Parkside Drive. Sealey Park, also a public space, is located at the southern terminus of the Main Street corridor within the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan study area. Various buildings have also provided space for public gatherings including Coachman (formerly Kirk House Hotel), former Crooker General Store/later Drug Store, and various post office locations just north of Dundas. Main
Street is a Greenbelt Cycling route providing a connection up the escarpment and carrying significant recreational cycling traffic.

Main Street and Snake Road are discussed in local history publications, including *Waterdown and East Flamborough: 1867-1968* by John Eaton. The Royal Coachman at the intersection of Main Street and Dundas Street East is widely photographed, and properties along Main Street have been drawn by late Waterdown artist Peter Vance.

### 4.6 Ontario Regulation 9/06

#### Table 4: Cultural Heritage Value of Main Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value: is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a landscape</td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value: High degree of design/aesthetic appeal</td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value: High Degree Technical/Scientific Interest</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/Associative Value: Direct Association with a Theme, Event, Person, etc.</td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical or Associative Value: contributes to an understanding of a community/culture</td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/Associative Value: Reflects work or ideas of architect, artist, builder, etc.</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value: Important in defining character of area</td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.2.1 and 4.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value: Historically, physically, functionally or visually linked to surroundings</td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, and 4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation Summary

Main Street is an evolved mid-nineteenth and twentieth-century streetscape with commercial, public, and residential use that continues today. The following Statement of Significance and identified cultural heritage attributes apply to the portion of Main Street within the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan Study Area between the northern terminus of Main Street at Centre Road and the south boundary near the Waterdown Pumping Station.

### 5.0 Statement of Significance

**Description of Place**

Main Street is an evolved mid-nineteenth and twentieth-century streetscape with commercial, public, and residential use that continues today. The Main Street Cultural Heritage Landscape consists of properties fronting onto the street between Parkside Road and the south boundary near the Waterdown Pumping Station.

**Cultural Heritage Value**

Main Street has cultural heritage value as a cultural heritage landscape due to its physical value, historical and associative value, and its contextual value.

Main Street has physical value as a representative example of an evolved mid-nineteenth and twentieth-century streetscape. The Main Street corridor has a high degree of design and aesthetic value as a well-treed, mature neighbourhood with a significant percentage of properties constructed between the mid-nineteenth and mid-twentieth century. Main Street is associated with the history of the development of the Waterdown village core, as well as with Indigenous people and the Griffin family. Following property lines between village lots, the alignment of Main Street was largely determined by the subdivision of lands below Dundas Street between Flamborough and Mill Street following the death of E.C. Griffin in 1847 and the settling of his estate in 1856. Residential and commercial development grew along Main Street from its establishment in the mid-nineteenth century throughout the twentieth century as along other main roadways through the Village of Waterdown. The Main Street corridor has contextual value as it is linked to the main residential and commercial streets within the historical Village of Waterdown. With mature trees, a narrow, winding roadway, a variety of architectural styles and building construction dates from the mid-nineteenth century to late-twentieth century, Main Street is historically and visually connected to the character of the area, and in particular, the Mill Street corridor to the east. Main Street is physically connected
to the topography of the area as the street climbs along the escarpment through the Village. This topography contributes to the scenic quality of the street.

Historically, Main Street was one of the three key roads within the Village of Waterdown, and it remains part of the core of the Village today. At the corner of Main Street and Dundas Street East, the Royal Coachman (formerly the Kirk House Hotel) is a known landmark in the community, is widely photographed, and is included in local tourism materials including walking tours. Many individual properties have been identified as having significant cultural heritage value throughout the corridor. Waterdown Memorial Park serves as a community park at the north end of Main Street, and it and the roadway are discussed in local publications. The water tower on the east side of Main Street is a well-known landmark in the area. The Main Street corridor is a picturesque, scenic roadway through an evolved residential neighbourhood of varied building age, architectural style and character, intersected by a commercial node at Main Street and Dundas Street East.

Cultural Heritage Attributes

- The characteristics of Main Street as a publicly accessed thoroughfare
- Mature trees along the roadway
- The scale, form, massing, and architectural details of the historical residential and commercial buildings throughout the Main Street corridor which has the following characteristics:
  - set at the right-of-way for commercial building types or shallow but varied setbacks for residential types.
  - constructed primarily of masonry or wood-frame construction
  - one to two-and-one-half storeys in height
  - modest scale
  - simplified form
- The historical aesthetic and scenic quality of the Main Street Corridor, including the narrow road width, topography, curving quality of the roadway, scale of built form to road width, mature trees, and vegetation as well as the unique placement and lot size and orientation of the properties at the intersection of Main Street North and John Street
- Views of the water tower along Main Street looking north from around 170 Main Street North and south from Buchan Court

6.0 Proposed Boundary

The proposed boundary for the Main Street Waterdown Cultural Heritage Landscape is as follows:

- The rear property lines of all properties along Main Street between Parkside Drive and the southern portion of Main Street near to the Waterdown Pumping Station.
Figure 44: Proposed boundary for the Main Street Waterdown Cultural Heritage Landscape.
Nelson Street and Mill Site

1.0 Introduction

Nelson Street is an east-west street located off Victoria Street between Elgin Street and Raglan Street in the community of Waterdown. The former mill site may have been situated on the east side of Grindstone Creek (Figure 1). Nelson Street is a residential street which ends at the top of the Grindstone Creek valley. While roadways and lot patterns in Waterdown are oriented in a northwest-southeast axis, the study area will be described in a north-south orientation for ease of description.

Figure 1: Location of the Nelson Street and Mill Site CHL within the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan study area.

2.0 Historical Summary

Nelson Street is historically located on Lot 6, Concession 3 in East Flamborough Township.

James McMonies and Thomas Stock owned a large portion of Lot 6, Concession 3 (Figure 2). The McMonies and Stock Survey was registered in 1856 (Figure 3 and Figure 4). This plan of subdivision created five blocks on the east side of Mill Street between present-day Church Street and Parkside Drive with lots fronting onto Mills Street and a newly created Victoria Street (Page & Smith 1875a; Anon). Two east-west blocks were created between Victoria Street...
and Grindstone Creek with lots on the north side of Raglan Street, both sides of Nelson Street, and the south side of Elgin Street. James McMonies continued to own a large piece of land in the northeast portion of the village. Woods stated there may have been a race track in the vicinity of Churchill Street which was probably used for sulky racing (1967:103).

James McMonies came to East Flamborough from Scotland with his wife and three children and settled on Lot 5, Concession 4, northeast of the Village of Waterdown. He built a log home and established a sawmill on the creek which ran through the front part of his farm. He later built a frame house which was still extant in the 1960s (its presence today has not been verified). This property is currently the site of Connon Nurseries. McMonies sat on the School Board, was a member of the Ontario Legislative Assembly in 1865-1867 and was member of the Dominion Government for Wentworth County in 1867-1872. Upon his retirement in 1875 he sold his farm.

Thomas Stock, came to East Flamborough from England and settled on Lot 9, Concession 2 in 1831. Stock served on County Council and was Warden of the county for several years. In 1875 he was elected M.P.P. for Wentworth North for a short time before being unseated and disqualified for a minor infraction of the election law. Stock was reeve of East Flamborough (Page & Smith 1875a).

Figure 2: James McMonies’ land at Lot 5, Concession 4 highlighted in orange, McMonies and Stock land at Lot 6, Concession 3 highlighted in green (Tremaine 1859).
Figure 3: Excerpt from Registered Plan 355, showing the McMonies and Stock Survey, c. 1897.

Figure 4: Nelson Street and surrounding area, 1875 (Page & Smith 1875a).
The 1903 *Atlas of Waterdown* shows the twenty-three lots laid out on Nelson Street with Lots 1 to 10 on the south side and 14 to 23 on the north side (Figure 5). Nelson Street appears to extend down to Grindstone Creek at its east end. A mill pond and dam are in this area of Grindstone Creek with Forester and Greenlees and A. Brown operating on the east bank north of the dam and F. Slater operating on the west bank, south of the dam.

The first mill on Grindstone Creek was established by Alexander Brown at the top of the Great Falls before 1805. Milling was concentrated between the third and fourth concessions with as many as 12 mills operating at a time. In the 1890s, a single complex, known as Smokey Hollow, contained 17 buildings. The history of milling within Smokey Hollow is rich and extends into the early 1900s. Upstream from Smokey Hollow, mills were located at the east end of Griffin Street, which historically extended down to the creek as Water Street. Mills were also located along former Leather Street, which ran south of Water Street extending east from Mill Street. The mills in this location made use of Hawk’s Dam (Woods et al. 1967).

North of Dundas Street, Ebenezer C. and Absolom Griffin built a sawmill, and in the same year Alexander Brown built a second mill further upstream. In about 1834 the Griffin partnership dissolved, and the factory and sawmill were owned solely by Absolom Griffin. Around 1838 a flour mill was built by A. Griffin beside the sawmill. In 1840 David Cummins bought the water privilege for the land just above the Dundas Street Bridge, building a large turning shop below the bridge and a sawmill above the bridge. The turning shop was soon sold to Reid Baker for a rake factory (Griffin 1899).

Figure 5: Nelson Street and surrounding area, 1903 (Tyrrell 1903).
At some point the area just north of the Dundas Street Bridge became associated with John Reid and was known as Reid’s Dam until the coming of the railway in 1911 (Figure 3, Figure 10 and Figure 11). The mill pond was used to drive John Reid’s turning mill on the east bank of Grindstone Creek. Reid was a well-known cabinet and furniture maker in Waterdown with several milling buildings along the east bank (Anon 2017a). The pond was used for recreation, boating, fishing, and winter sports as well washing laundry (Figure 4 to Figure 9). Reid’s mill building was partially demolished to accommodate the railway and eventually the entire building was demolished. Slater’s and Rymal’s mills across the creek were above Reid’s pond and therefore fed by a raceway further upstream. John Forstner’s mill was built in 1875 and was owned by Slater between 1901-1939 until purchased by the Fieldings. In 1926 men worked a ten-hour day in Slater’s mill for 20 cents an hour, six days a week. The original mill burned in September 1936 and was rebuilt. It was the last operating mill and continued to produce lumber into the 1970s. When the water level became too low, the mill turned from water to steam power and then to electrical power. Shipping also shifted from roads to rails. An industrial frame structure and foundation of Slater’s construction are perhaps the sole surviving parts of a mill on Grindstone Creek between Dundas Street and Church Street (Waterloo Mutual Insurance Company 1937; Anon 2017b; Woods et al. 1967). The milling industry became obsolete as competition of industry in Hamilton increased and water supply in the creek decreased (Woods et al. 1967).

Figure 6: Forstner’s Grist Mill (later Slater’s Saw Mill) putting in steam power (Woods et al. 1967).
By 1909 (and continuing through 1919) ten wooden buildings had been constructed on Nelson Street (Figure 7). There was also a minor tributary of Grindstone Creek running through this area which required a bridge crossing. On the 1937 map, eight dwellings are shown fronting Nelson Street and one is located at the corner of Nelson and Victoria Streets and fronts onto Victoria (Figure 8). All except one, which is wood with brick veneer, are wood construction. The 1939 Fire Insurance Plan is much the same but provides additional details on street widths with Nelson Street being comparable to other streets in the area such as Albert, Queen, and Church Streets at 45 feet (Figure 9). Raglan Street is slightly narrower at 40 feet and Victoria Street wider at 50 feet. The 1953 National Topographic Map no longer details the bridge on Nelson Street but does show a building southeast of Nelson Street which is oriented in relation to Grindstone Creek (Figure 10 and Figure 11). The houses on Nelson and Raglan Street were often occupied with mill workers. This area is known locally as “Dutchtown,” a corruption of Deutschtown, which may be due to the number of early families of German origin who were employed by the mills (Anon 2017b). An Evangelical German Church was located on the north side of John Street, between Main and Mill streets between 1870 and 1885 (Woods et al. 1967:70). Nelson Street is noted by the Flamborough Archives Walking Tour of Main Street as having many houses that “have been beautifully renovated, especially number 7, 10, 21, 33, and 42” (Flamborough Archives and Heritage Society).

Figure 7: Nelson Street and surrounding area, 1909 (Department of Militia and Defence 1909).
Figure 8: Nelson Street and surrounding area, 1937 (Waterloo Mutual Insurance Company 1937).

Figure 9: Nelson Street and surrounding area, 1939 (Underwriter’s Survey Bureau Ltd. 1939).
Figure 10: Nelson Street and surrounding area, 1953 (Natural Resources Canada 1953).

Figure 11: Nelson Street and surrounding area, 1954 (Hunting Survey Corporation Limited 1954).
3.0 Existing Conditions

Nelson Street is a residential roadway that extends east from Victoria Street and terminates in a cul-de-sac at the top of the valley formed by Grindstone Creek. The roadway features a single lane of traffic in each direction and concrete curbs. A sidewalk runs along the south side, separated from the roadway by a grassed verge (Figure 12 to Figure 15). Grindstone Creek, and the rail line that runs alongside it, is visible through the forested buffer that separated the cul-de-sac from the waterway in the valley below (Figure 16). Mature trees line the roadway. The residential properties located along Nelson Street represent a range of dates of construction. There are a few late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century vernacular residences and cottages, as well as split-level homes from the 1970s and several contemporary buildings (Figure 17 to Figure 19). Overall, the street features an eclectic range in the dates of construction, style, and setbacks.

Figure 12: Nelson Street looking west towards Victoria Street (ASI 2020).

Figure 13: Nelson Street looking east towards the cul-de-sac (ASI 2020).

Figure 14: Nelson Street looking west from the cul-de-sac (ASI 2020).

Figure 15: Grindstone Creek and rail tracks, located east of the study area (ASI 2020).
4.0 Cultural Heritage Evaluation

The following evaluation of Nelson Street and Mill Site as a cultural heritage landscape uses the City’s “A Framework for Evaluating the Cultural Heritage Value or Interest of Property for Designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act” which provides categorized criteria which expands upon, and is consistent with, Ontario Regulation 9/06. These criteria were developed for cultural heritage landscapes.
4.1 Historical Associations

Themes

Criterion 1: How well does the cultural heritage landscape illustrate one or more historical themes representative of cultural processes in the development and/or use of land in the context of the community, province, or nation?

Does not meet criterion.

The milling industry was significant in the establishment of the Village of Waterdown in the early-nineteenth century and continued to be a significant industry into the early-twentieth century. The largest concentration of milling activity occurred in Smokey Hollow south of the village. The first mill was established by Alexander Brown at the north edge of the Great Falls just above Smokey Hollow. Significant milling also occurred just north and south of Dundas Street East. While milling is known to have occurred on the Grindstone Creek as far north as James McMonies’ property at Lot 5, Concession 4, northeast of the village, some mills have been more prominently recorded in source materials. While milling did occur on the east bank of the creek with a dam and mill pond and the 1909 National Topographic Survey map shows a bridge on Nelson Street crossing a minor tributary of Grindstone Creek it does not appear to provide a connection to the east bank and the mills situated there. No documentation could be found to support milling on the west bank of the Grindstone Creek at the east end of Nelson Street. A direct connection between Nelson Street and the mills on the east bank has remained unsubstantiated. The rich history of milling along Grindstone Creek between Smokey Hollow and the north end of the former Village of Waterdown should be further studied and evaluated for its potential as a cultural heritage landscape.

Event

Criterion 2: Is the cultural landscape associated with a specific event that has made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation?

Does not meet criterion.

The area is not associated with any specific events which made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation.

Person and/or Group

Criterion 3: Is the cultural landscape associated with the life or activities of a person, group, organization, or institution that has made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation?

Potentially meets criterion.
The area of Nelson Street has been referred to locally as “Dutchtown,” a corruption of Deutschtown, likely due to the number of early families of German origin who may have lived on this street and were employed in the nearby mills. While an Evangelical German Church was located on the north side of John Street, between Main and Mill streets near Nelson Street for a short time, available secondary sources do not discuss cultural groups so this information could not be verified at this time.

Nelson Street is also associated with McMonies and Stock through their survey of the area. Nelson Street, however, is not distinct from the rest of the survey.

4.2 Scenic Amenity

*Sense of Place*

*Criterion 4: Does the cultural heritage landscape provide the observer(s) with a strong sense of position or place?*

*Does not meet criterion.*

Nelson Street does not provide the observer with a strong sense of place. The heavily treed east end of the street did provide some glimpses of the Grindstone Creek in early spring, though once the trees are in full leaf the street is fully obstructed from any relationship with the creek. The street, while narrow, is consistent with surrounding streets and comparable in building age and types.

*Serial Vision*

*Criterion 5: Does the cultural heritage landscape provide the observer(s) with opportunities for serial vision along paths of pedestrian or vehicular movement?*

*Does not meet criterion.*

Nelson Street is a straight street and does not provide opportunities for serial vision.

*Material Content*

*Criterion 6: Is the cultural heritage landscape visually satisfying or pleasing to the observer(s) in terms of colour, texture, style, and scale?*

*Meets criterion.*

Nelson Street is visually satisfying due to the extant large deciduous tree on both sides of the street.
4.3 Integrity

*Criterion 7: Is it all there?*

**Does not meet criterion.**

Nelson Street does not appear to have sufficient integrity to distinguish it from the surrounding neighbourhood as a distinctive place as there is insufficient evidence of a mill site of significance to the community related to this street.

4.4 Design

*Criterion 8: Has the landscape been purposefully designed or planned?*

**Does not meet criterion.**

Nelson Street was laid out as part of the McMonies and Stock Survey but was not specifically designed as a distinct place. Nelson Street is consistent with other streets laid out in the survey.

4.5 Social Value

Public Perception

*Criterion 9: Is the landscape regarded as having importance within the City?*

**Potentially meets criterion.**

Nelson Street is a stopping point on the Mill Street and the Smokey Hollow walking tours published by the Flamborough Archives. It is unknown if the street is historically noteworthy as the location of mill workers’ residences. Milling operations in the village were extensive and it could be assumed that numerous people in the village were employed by the mills and would not have been unique to this location.

4.6 Ontario Regulation 9/06

Table 5: Cultural Heritage Evaluation of Nelson Street and Mill Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value: <em>is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a landscape</em></td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.1 and Section 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value: <em>High degree of design/aesthetic appeal</em></td>
<td>Meets this criterion. See Section 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value: <em>High Degree Technical/Scientific Interest</em></td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/Associative Value:</td>
<td>Potentially meets this criterion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Association with a Theme, Event, Person, etc.</td>
<td>See Section 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical or Associative Value:</td>
<td>Potentially meets this criterion. See Section 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contributes to an understanding of a community/culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/Associative Value:</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflects work or ideas of architect, artist, builder, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value: Important in defining character of area</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.2.1 and 4.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value: Historically, physically, functionally or visually linked to surroundings</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, and 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value: Landmark</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.3 and 4.5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.7 Evaluation Summary

This cultural heritage evaluation of Nelson Street and Mill Site concludes the area does not have sufficient evidence to support the area as a significant cultural heritage landscape. The street may be a feature of a larger cultural heritage landscape related to the establishment and growth of the milling industry along Grindstone Creek in the Village of Waterdown. The Grindstone Creek valley should be researched and evaluated as a cultural heritage landscape for its significance as a natural landscape as well as the site of numerous milling industries and the C.P.R. line. The research should consider the location of workers housing in relation to the mill sites and associated cultural groups.
Sealey Park

1.0 Introduction

Sealey Park is located at 115 Main Street South, along the east side of the street between Union Street and School Street, in the community of Waterdown (Figure 1). Sealy Park is a public community park situated within a residential neighbourhood. It sits on a rise over Mill Street South to the east. While roadways and lot patterns in Waterdown are oriented in a northwest-southeast axis, the study area will be described in a north-south orientation for ease of description. Main Street South will be described as travelling north-south, with Sealy Park located east of Main Street.

Figure 1: Location of Sealey Park within the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan Study Area.

2.0 Historical Summary

Historically, the land on which the park is situated is within Lot 7 Concession 3 in the Township of Flamborough (Figure 2). The land was initially granted to Alexander McDonnell, an officer in the North West Company (Flamborough Archives and Heritage Society 2017; Donkin 1969). The property is associated with the Waterdown Public and High School, the drill shed, W.O. Sealey, and the theme of recreation in the Village of Waterdown.
In 1823, 158 acres within Lot 7 were purchased by miller Ebenezer Culver Griffin who established a saw and grist mill along Grindstone Creek. In 1831, Griffin drew up a plan for the Village of Waterdown and began to sell lots. Dundas Street, Mill Street, and Main Street dominated the Village of Waterdown in the mid-nineteenth century, although the road network was significantly expanded during this time (Unterman McPhail Cuming Associates 1996).

There is evidence to suggest that Grindstone Creek created a gap in the escarpment which was used as a trail by Indigenous people travelling between Hamilton Bay and Lake Medad (Woods et al. 1967; Donkin 1969:32). The alignment of Main Street was drawn in the subdivision of lands below Dundas Street between Flamborough Street and Mill Street following the death of E.C. Griffin in 1847 and the settling of his estate in 1856. Main Street followed the property lines between village lots in a generally north-south orientation and is identified with a dotted line labelled “Line of road built by J.K. Griffin” (Figure 3). School Street connected Main Street South and Hill Street (now Mill Street South) in a generally east-west direction.
In 1867, the land at Lot 10, Block XLIII of the Griffin Survey at the southern end of Main Street South\(^2\) was purchased for $260.00 for the construction of the Waterdown Grammar and Common School\(^3\). Prior to this period the education of Waterdown children had been held in various locations throughout the village. The first school, with lessons taught by Miss Mary Hopkins, was a one room log structure built in 1815 by Alexander Brown (where the American Hotel now stands at 324 Dundas Street East). In 1826, the first common school was opened and the following year a grammar school was built on the southwest corner of Flamborough and

\(^2\) Also known as Stone Road, Ransom Street, Hamilton & Carlisle Gravelled Road, Centre Road, and Hamilton and Milton Road.

\(^3\) The date of construction of the school is uncertain with sources stating the building was marked 1853, fourteen years prior to the purchase of the property (Flamborough Archives). The *Journal and Transactions of the Wentworth Historical Society, Vol. 2* provides a date of construction of 1855 stating, “a new two-storey school house was built, which was afterwards enlarged and is still used.” (1899:61).

Figure 3: Diagram showing alignment of Lots 9 and 10 of the land division resulting from the will of Ebenezer Culver Griffin (Donkin 1969: Map 12)
Dundas Streets (not extant). The Common School and the Grammar School Boards were united in 1857, becoming known as The Joint Board of the Grammar and Common School Trustees, a partnership that continued into the early twentieth century.

Although the school was partially demolished in 1931, historical photographs show the new school was an elegant building constructed of stone in the Classical Revival style (Figure 5 to Figure 7). The building was constructed on an L- or T-shaped plan rising two storeys with an end gable roof and oriented with the porticoed, primary entrance facing south. Detailing included stone stepped quoins at the corners, sills, and jack arches, wooden six-over-six sash windows, eaves returns, and entrances. The portico had squared columns supporting a deep entablature and a very shallow sloping roof. The end gable contained a semi-circular arched window and opening while the front facing pediment contained a round opening. The roof was topped with short chimneys and what is likely a bell cote with a weathervane. The building had a formal symmetry with a central hall and flanking window opening. The younger students at the Grammar School attended classes on the first floor and the older students of the Common School attended classes on the second floor. The Village of Waterdown map of 1875 labels the building as “Union School” (Figure 8). It also shows School Street (unlabelled) extending down the valley to Hill Street (now Mill Street South).

In 1878 an addition was made to the school, infilling the northeast portion of the plan (Figure 5 to Figure 7). The addition was made to correspond stylistically to the original building however breaking from the symmetry presumably to accommodate the necessary functions. The series of existing photos show an increasingly treed landscape towards the valley ridge.

Figure 4: Students at recess at Waterdown Public School, n.d. (Anon n.d.).

Figure 5: West elevation from the southwest, undated (Flamborough Archives).
Figure 6: Waterdown Public and High School, undated. Present Scout Hall is first storey portion at right foreground of picture (Flamborough Archives).

Figure 7: Waterdown Public and High School, undated (Flamborough Archives).
Figure 8: Village of Waterdown, 1875 with “Union School” (Page & Smith 1875a).

Figure 9: Imperial Atlas of Waterdown, 1903 which shows the location and footprint of the drill shed, labelled “Drill Hall”. School building not depicted (Tyrrell 1903).
During the second half of the nineteenth century, a drill shed (also known as a drill hall) was constructed near to Main Street just north of the school, on Lot 9 of Block XLIII of the Griffin Survey (Figure 9). The wooden building was “erected in 1867 ‘for military purposes,’ following an agreement between the Crown, who agreed to advance the sum of $440 toward its construction and the corporation of East Flamborough Township” (Wray 2018). The extent of the uses of the drill shed in the nineteenth century are not known but its repair is noted in Sessional Papers in the later part of the century (Parliament 1896; Parliament 1899). One journal article describes the hall being used for a community social in 1884 (Anon 1884). It is noted that the B Company of the 77th Regiment had left Waterdown for Dundas prior to the Second World War though their history in the location is not described (Vance 2018).

In 1911 the building was loaned to the public school to use as a playroom for younger students. There are stories about its use by the high school students for basketball games and as a skating rink while other sources state it was determined to be unsafe for the students and was turned into barrel storage. In 1914 the Department of Militia and Defence turned the building over to the village without completing the repairs needed (Vance 2018). Following the onset of the First World War in 1915, the drill shed, still in need of repairs, was granted by Waterdown council members for use by the 129th Wentworth Overseas Battalion (Wray 2018).

In his book A Township at War, Jonathan F. Vance describes the recruits who were signed up in the township by a local, Stan Sawell, an officer for the 129th Battalion:

They were a cross-section of a typical rural community. A handful of farmers from Carlisle: Lewis Best, Lloyd Binkley, Ingle Bousfield, and Achilles Hearn. And from Waterdown, George Arnold the teamster, Fred Hayman the grocer, Robert Major the farmer, Will Chisholm the clerk, Vern Willis the market gardener, and Richard James the blacksmith. Soon after enlisting, 14 of the new soldiers posed for photos with their officers, Stan Sawell and Cec Nicholson, beside Waterdown's hastily repaired drill shed. The photo is at once intensely local and strikingly archetypal. It freezes a moment and suspends those young men in time, before a shell-burst at Arras tore apart Fred Hayman's foot. Before poison gas corrupted George Arnold's lungs. Before wounds sustained on the Vimy front took Achilles Hearn's life only a year after his wedding. Before everything changed.

Following the First World War, the drill shed continued to be used for concerts on several occasions, for spring training for soldiers, and by the Bowling Green (Woods et al. 1967). During the Second World War, the Department of Defense allowed the use of the land as long as “it was not required for military purposes” (Woods et al. 1967). After the War, the Town Council purchased the property for $25 and added it to Sealey Park. The drill shed does not appear on National Topographic Mapping through the twentieth century and aerial photography from the mid-twentieth century is not clear enough to determine when the drill shed was removed or demolished. A separate property parcel addressed 105 Main Street South remains of this history.
Figure 10: 129th Battalion Waterdown Training Group in front of Drill Shed, c. 1915-1916 (Flamborough Archives).

Figure 11: 129th Battalion in front of former Common School ground, c. 1915-1916 (Flamborough Archives).
The conditions of both buildings ultimately led to their demolition. During the First World War when the property was seeing its peak use as a school and active drill hall, the condition of the school was declining.

It was always an open question as to whether Waterdown’s drill shed would survive another winter’s ravages, but now the nearby school was starting to match it in decrepitude. With four primary classrooms on the ground floor and three secondary classrooms above, its seven woodboring stoves couldn’t keep up with the winder cold... The outdoor toilets were positively toxic and a little too close for comfort to the school’s drinking water supply... At best, the school was becoming inadequate, if not downright unsafe (Vance 2018).

In 1914, more room was needed, and some students began attending classes in the upper floor of the Township Hall on Main Street. By 1921 the school was again crowded and this time it was closed permanently with students ultimately relocating to a new school on Mill Street, complete with washrooms and drinking fountains (Woods et al. 1967). Ten years later, the school building was partially demolished leaving a single room of the original building.

An artillery piece was added to the property in 1920, following a request by the council at the time to have one for display in Waterdown (Figure 12). The Sealy Park "cannon" is the barrel assembly for a 10.5 cm leFH model 1916 German Howitzer. The complete artillery piece was brought to Waterdown on August 23, 1920, and the barrel remains on display (Flamborough Archives).

Figure 12: Historian Jonathan Vance and his sister Valerie, as children, at a German artillery piece, Sealy Park, Waterdown, c. 1966 (Department of Communications and Public Affairs, Western University 2018, Photographer Peter Vance).
The year 1931 marked the golden jubilee of the incorporation of the Village of Waterdown. Celebrations took place throughout the village including the dedication and official opening of Sealey Park. William Oscar Sealey established the park as a public amenity, gifting it to the village in memory of his father Charles. Sealey also gifted a portion of the property to the Bowling Green to make their area larger and increase their frontage. The events of the Jubilee Celebration were covered on the front page of the Waterdown Review on July 9, 1931. The park is described in detail, including that “a fountain and many flower urns have been artistically placed on the grounds, and a gateway of two stone pillars, taken from the old building, with an arch and the name "Sealey Park" connecting, has been erected at the Main street entrance.” (Woods et al. 1967). Tom Dent is attributed with putting in the pillars and arch at the park entrance though Dent is otherwise unknown (Woods et al. 1967).

William and Oscar Sealy were both prominent in the history of Waterdown. In 1831, Charles Henry Sealey immigrated with his wife Mary Ann and his family from New York State to Flamborough West (Page & Smith 1875a; Flamborough Archives 1908). Charles was a farmer, a store and sawmill owner, and, following the incorporation of the Village of Waterdown in 1878, was elected the first Reeve of Waterdown. Charles was also a school trustee in Waterdown for 27 years (Flamborough Archives 1908). William Oscar Sealey joined his father’s lumber business in the 1880s and later opened a bank in the Crooker building on the northeast corner of Main and Dundas Streets which operated between 1875 and 1889. William Oscar Sealey was one of Wentworth County’s most prominent citizens at the time (Flamborough Review 2008). William Oscar Sealey was a Reeve in East Flamborough, member of Wentworth County Council, and in 1908 was elected to the Dominion Parliament as a Liberal Candidate where he served until 1911 (Flamborough Review 2008). In 1908, William Oscar introduced a bill for free rural mail delivery in Canada, and on October 10, 1908, the first ever rural mail delivery brought mail to 37 rural households between Ancaster and Hamilton (Ancaster Heritage News 1998). William Oscar was also considered a pioneer in Hamilton in the buildings and selling of houses, and later constructed apartments like Sealey Apartments at 17, 19 and 21 Locke Street South (Kennedy).

Today, the park is remembered as the location of the first Entrance Exams taken in Ontario in 1873⁴ and serves as a stopping point on many walking tours of the village (Flamborough Archives and Heritage Society 2017; Donkin 1969). The remnant portion of the school is used as a meeting hall for the Waterdown Scouts and the Optimist Club. Evidence suggests that an addition was made to the building between 1947 and 1963 (Figure 15 and Figure 16).

---

⁴ The accuracy of this part of the history is uncertain. Egerton Ryerson introduced entrance examinations to secondary schools in 1853 (Fine-Meyer and Brehaut 2013).
Figure 13: 1943 *National Topographic Map* (Department of National Defence 1943)

Figure 14: 1963 *National Topographic Map* (Natural Resources Canada 1963)
Figure 15: The front, lower section of the school, 1947 (Flamborough Archives, Photographer Peter Vance).

Figure 16: Scout Hall in Sealey Park, c. 1967 (Woods et al. 1967:100)
3.0 Existing Conditions

Sealey Park is located east of Main Street South and north of School Street (Figure 17 and Figure 18). The northern border of the park is bound by residential properties that front Main Street South and Union Street. Mill Street South and the rail line run just outside the east border of the study area, including a rail bridge that carries the line over Mill Street South (Figure 19). The park is situated within a residential neighbourhood (Figure 20 and Figure 21).

Mature trees line both sides of School Street, with a grassed lawn located to the north. Sealey Park Scout Hall is located east of this open area, on the north side of School Street (Figure 22). The Scout Hall consists of a remnant stone structure, originally constructed in the mid-nineteenth century as the Waterdown Grammar and Common School, and a concrete block addition on the east elevation constructed in the mid-twentieth century. The one-storey remnant of the original school features quoining on the northwest and southwest corners and a flat roof. The stone is showing signs of deterioration, primarily through spalling stones along the base of the structure on the south elevation caused by moisture in the ground (Figure 23). The original window openings have been maintained along with their six-over-six double hung windows, though storm windows were added, and the stone sills have been painted. The exterior of the concrete block addition has also been painted, and several windows have been infilled (Figure 24). The addition has a flat roof, except for a northern extension that has a slanted roof (Figure 25).

Mature trees also dot the west border of the park, which has a pedestrian sidewalk that runs parallel to Main Street South (Figure 26). The park is accessible to vehicular traffic from Main Street South, provided by a drive marked by a stone gate that features a metal sign reading “Sealey Park” that spans the entryway (Figure 27). The entrance gate was reconstructed in c. 2010 though the extent of the work is unknown. The drive leads to a paved parking lot that is located north of Scout Hall (Figure 28). A concrete pedestrian path also leads from the sidewalk along Main Street South to the north elevation of Scout Hall in the same location as in historical images (Figure 29).
Figure 17: Looking north from the intersection of Main Street South and School Street, with Sealey Park located right (ASI 2020).

Figure 18: Looking northeast from the west terminus of School Street (ASI 2020).

Figure 19: Looking north towards Mill Street South and rail bridge (right) from forested eastern boundary of the study area (ASI 2020).

Figure 20: Looking south on Main Street South towards School Street, showing residential neighbourhood surrounding Sealey Park (ASI 2020).
Figure 21: Looking northwest along Main Street South from the north corner of Sealey Park showing the surrounding residential neighbourhood (ASI 2020).

Figure 22: West elevation of Scout Hall, looking east from grassed lawn (ASI 2020).

Figure 23: Detail of south elevation of stone remnant of original school, looking north (ASI 2020).

Figure 24: Scout Hall looking northwest showing original school (left) and concrete block addition (right) (ASI 2020).
Figure 25: North and west elevation of original school and addition, looking southeast (ASI 2020).

Figure 26: Looking north along Main Street South, the west boundary of Sealey Park (ASI 2020).

Figure 27: Looking east from Main Street South toward “Sealey Park” entrance gate leading to parking lot (ASI 2020).

Figure 28: Paved parking lot located north of Scout Hall, looking west towards Main Street South (ASI 2020).
East of the Scout Hall and running north along the east boundary of the study area is a forested stretch with mature trees that slopes towards the east boundary of the study area (Figure 30). Pathways run through this forested area (Figure 31). East of this forested stretch is Mill Street South and a bridge carrying the rail line over the roadway, which is visible from the pathways that weave through the trees. The area provides a vista over the Grindstone Creek valley and the Niagara Escarpment.

North of the Scout Hall and the paved parking lot are recreational amenities surrounded by grassed open space (Figure 32). Playground equipment is located within a rectangular sand pit, east of Main Street South. The northwest corner of the study area is the former location of the drill shed and the parcel is demarcated by the placement of wooden benches within an open grassed area (Figure 33). Continuing east from the playground there are two tennis courts surrounded by chain-link fencing with overhead lighting (Figure 34). In the grassed open space between the tennis courts and the forested area that runs along the eastern border of the park is the “cannon” that was installed in the 1920s (Figure 35 and Figure 36). A chain-link fence marks the northern boundary of the park, separating the recreational space from the residential properties to the north (Figure 37).
Figure 30: Looking north towards forested area located east of Scout Hall showing slope to Mill Street South and the rail line (ASI 2020).

Figure 31: Pathways cut through the forested area located along the east side of the park (ASI 2020).

Figure 32: Looking northeast from entrance gates towards park amenities (ASI 2020).

Figure 33: Looking southeast towards the playground equipment (ASI 2020).

Figure 34: Looking east from Main Street South towards playground equipment and tennis courts (ASI 2020).

Figure 35: Looking north from the edge of the forest the runs along the east border of the park, with the tennis courts (left) and cannon (centre) in view (ASI 2020).
4.0 Cultural Heritage Evaluation

The following evaluation of Sealey Park as a cultural heritage landscape uses the City’s “A Framework for Evaluating the Cultural Heritage Value or Interest of Property for Designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act” which provides categorized criteria which expands upon, and is consistent with, Ontario Regulation 9/06. These criteria were developed for cultural heritage landscapes.

4.1 Historical Associations

Themes

Criterion 1: How well does the cultural heritage landscape illustrate one or more historical themes representative of cultural processes in the development and/or use of land in the context of the community, province, or nation?

Meets criterion.

Sealey Park illustrates the theme of community and institutional development and the theme of war and memorials. Sealey Park is the former site of the drill shed which was in use from the mid-nineteenth century through to the mid-twentieth century for military and community uses. The park is also the former site of the Waterdown Grammar and Common School. Following these uses the property was converted for recreational use as a park and the remnant portion of the school converted for community group uses. This long history of community use of the property is generally known and understood by the community of Waterdown.
**Event**

*Criterion 2: Is the cultural landscape associated with a specific event that has made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation?*

**Potentially meets criterion.**

Sealey Park is associated with the first Entrance Exams held in Ontario in 1873 at the Waterdown Grammar and Common School. According to research, Entrance Exams were introduced by Egerton Ryerson in 1853. Therefore, a direct connection between the history of Secondary School education in Ontario and the history of the Waterdown Grammar and Common School requires further verification.

**Person and/or Group**

*Criterion 3: Is the cultural landscape associated with the life or activities of a person, group, organization, or institution that has made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation?*

**Meets criterion.**

Sealey Park is associated with the 129th Wentworth Overseas Battalion and was used for training during the First World War. The property is also associated with William Oscar Sealey who established the park in memoriam of his father, Charles Sealey. Both father and son made significant contributions to the community of Waterdown. The park is associated with the former Waterdown Grammar and Common School as well as existing community organizations such as the Optimist Club and Boy Scouts which have all contributed to the education and development of the children of the Waterdown community.

**4.2 Scenic Amenity**

**Sense of Place**

*Criterion 4: Does the cultural heritage landscape provide the observer(s) with a strong sense of position or place?*

**Meets criterion.**

While the park is generally open and flat as one approaches the edge of the rise over the Grindstone Creek valley the observer is presented with a vista of the valley and the Niagara Escarpment. This vista provides the observer with a strong sense of their position in the natural landscape of the area.
Serial Vision

Criterion 5: Does the cultural heritage landscape provide the observer(s) with opportunities for serial vision along paths of pedestrian or vehicular movement?

Meets criterion.

While the park is generally open and flat as one approaches the edge of the rise over the Grindstone Creek valley the observer is presented with a vista of the valley and the Niagara Escarpment. This vista is limited at the edge of the rise but opens as one travels down the eastern slope of the property where it opens at the edge of the C.P.R. line.

Material Content

Criterion 6: Is the cultural heritage landscape visually satisfying or pleasing to the observer(s) in terms of colour, texture, style and scale?

Does not meet criterion.

Sealey park does have some elements which are visually satisfying such as the remnant school building and the Sealey Park stone gate and metal sign. However, the park as a whole is not visually satisfying in terms of colour, texture, style, and scale.

4.3 Integrity

Criterion 7: Is it all there?

Meets criterion.

While the integrity of the mid-nineteenth and early twentieth century uses of the property has been diminished through the partial demolition of the school building and the removal of the drill shed, there are sufficient features of the property which indicate its historical relationships. The property also has a long-standing function as a public park which continues to the present.

4.4 Design

Criterion 8: Has the landscape been purposefully designed or planned?

Does not meet criterion.

Sealey Park has elements which have been purposefully designed but lacks an overall unifying design. While school was purposefully designed, the partial demolition of the building has reduced the evidence of that design. The park has elements for recreational use, but they do not come together to present a purposeful plan for the functions provided for community and recreational uses.
4.5 Social Value

Public Perception

Criterion 9: Is the landscape regarded as having importance within the City?

Meets criterion.

Sealey Park is regarded as having importance within the community of Waterdown for the role it has played in the history of the community. The property is discussed in many secondary sources which tell the history of the Village of Waterdown. This property was also identified by the community as a place of value during the Waterdown Village Built Heritage Inventory review process.

4.6 Ontario Regulation 9/06

Table 6: Cultural Heritage Evaluation of Sealey Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criterion</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value: is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a landscape</td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value: High degree of design/aesthetic appeal</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value: High Degree Technical/Scientific Interest</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/Associative Value: Direct Association with a Theme, Event, Person, etc.</td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical or Associative Value: contributes to an understanding of a community/culture</td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/Associative Value: Reflects work or ideas of architect, artist, builder, etc.</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value: Important in defining character of area</td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.2.1 and 4.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value: Historically, physically, functionally or visually linked to surroundings</td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, and 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value: Landmark</td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.7 Evaluation Summary

This cultural heritage evaluation of Sealey Park concludes that the area has cultural heritage value for its associations with the Waterdown Grammar and Common School, the drill shed, the Sealey family, and as a place of community recreation.

5.0 Statement of Significance

Description of Property

Sealey Park is a community park established in 1931. The site served the community prior to its designation as a park, as the location of the Waterdown Grammar and Common School and the drill shed, both of which date to the mid-nineteenth century. Sealey Park is comprised of 105 and 115 Main Street South and is located on the east side of Main Street South, bounded by School Street to the south, the bank of the Grindstone Creek to the east and residential properties to the north.

Cultural Heritage Value

Sealey Park has cultural heritage value as a cultural heritage landscape for its associations with the Waterdown Grammar and Common School, the drill shed, the Sealey family, and as a place of community recreation. Sealey Park has physical value as an early remaining example of a school site in the Village of Waterdown. The remnant school building provides a physical presence of this history and provides an understanding of the original design of the school in combination with the rich historical photographic record of the building prior to its partial demolition. The entrance gate which reads “Sealey Park” has design value as one of the original features of the park, installed for its opening in 1931, and used stone from the school building in their construction. The entrance gate was reconstructed in the c. 2010s.

The property has historical value as the site of the drill shed serving as a training site during the First World War. The property is associated with the Sealey family through William Oscar Sealey’s gift of the land to the community for use as a public park. This act preserved the remnant building through its ongoing use for community groups such as the Boy Scouts and the Optimist Club. This property has continued to be used for recreation by the community into the twenty-first century.

The property is a local landmark for the community of Waterdown and is important in defining the character of Main Street South as an important part of the nineteenth-century settlement character. The property is historically, physically, functionally, and visually linked to its surroundings, situated on the rise over the Grindstone Creek valley and the escarpment.

Cultural Heritage Attributes

- The size and boundary of the park.
• The entrance gate feature with stone pillars and metal sign reading “Sealey Park.”
• The main portion of the current Scout Hall, remnant of the former Waterdown Grammar and Common School which was constructed in the Classical Revival style including:
  o The stone construction;
  o The stone corner quoins;
  o The fenestration, window openings, wooden frames and double-hung six-over-six sash, stone sills, and jack arches;
  o The semi-circular engraved plaque remaining from the original school’s 1878 addition and relocated to the top of the west elevation; and
  o The location of the entrance to the addition from School Street which is in the same position as would have been in the school as it was built in the mid-nineteenth century.
• The concrete pathways which are in the same location as historical images of the school.
• The German artillery piece, as the sole remaining element associated with the military history of the property.
• Mature trees throughout the park and on the east side of the park on the downward slope towards Mill Street South.
• Vista over the Grindstone Creek valley and the escarpment from the east side of the park which is visible from the top of the rise and opens as one travels down the trail through the treed slope.

6.0 Proposed Boundary

The proposed boundary for the Sealey Park Cultural Heritage Landscape is as follows:

• The existing parcel boundaries of 105 and 115 Main Street South.
Figure 38: Proposed boundary for the Sealey Park Cultural Heritage Landscape.
1.0 Introduction

Vinegar Hill is located along Dundas Street East, east of Grindstone Creek, and includes William Street and Margaret Street in the community of Waterdown (Figure 1). Vinegar Hill is a residential neighbourhood that contains the Waterdown Union Cemetery. While roadways and lot patterns in Waterdown are oriented in a northwest-southeast axis, the study area will be described in a north-south orientation for ease of description. Dundas Street East will be described as travelling east-west with the cemetery located north of Dundas Street.

2.0 Historical Summary

Vinegar Hill is historically located within Lot 6, Concession 3 in East Flamborough Township, on the east side of Grindstone Creek.

The adjacent Lot 7, Concession 3 was purchased by miller Ebenezer C. Griffin from Alexander Brown in the 1820s. Griffin is known as the founder of Waterdown and, by 1831, had purchased a substantial portion of what would become the Village of Waterdown. He established the second sawmill in the village, a flour mill, and a woollen mill. In 1831, Griffin prepared a plan...
(known as the Griffin Survey) to subdivide his land into smaller village lots (Unterman McPhail Cuming Associates 1996:2-2). Griffin acquired a further two hundred acres of land from George Brown of Concession 3, Lot 6 in East Flamborough in 1837 including Union Cemetery which was approximately five acres (Unterman McPhail Cuming Associates 1996:2-2). Griffin’s town plan was extended eastward along Dundas Street from what had been previously laid out in Concession 3, Lot 7. The plan, as drawn in 1854 by Henry Winter, included streets branching north and south from Dundas Street East (Figure 2). On the south side of Dundas from east to west, was Spring Street (not extant), Reynold Street, George Street, and James Street. On the north side was Board Street, William Street, George Street, and James Street. Only George Street and James Street crossed Dundas Street. Lots primarily faced onto Dundas Street. Reynold Street was laid out with small lots. William Street and George Street provided access to lots north of Dundas Street. At the eastern edge of the survey, wide lots fronted onto a road dividing Lots 5 and 6, Concession 3 (now First Street). The cemetery (now Waterdown Union Cemetery) was laid out at the north end of William Street behind Dundas Street on Lots 2 and 3. Some burials pre-date the 1854 plan.

Figure 2: Plan for the area known as Vinegar Hill as drawn in 1854 (Winter 1854).

It is unclear how much of Griffin’s plan was speculative and what was documenting existing land patterns. Settlement along Dundas Street is thought to have begun by the time the village plan was drawn up in 1831. By 1841, there were approximately 48 households listed on the Assessment Rolls for Waterdown and most of these houses were located on the east bank of the creek in Vinegar Hill (Wray 1994:8). Most were one-storey log or frame cottages, typical of the period. Board Street and Spring Street provided access to milling operations on the east bank
north and south of Dundas Street. Board Street is associated with milling on Grindstone Creek. It provided access to Reid’s Mill and Dam, the Vance family home, the Canadian Pacific Railway and, through a conversion of the Vance home, the South Waterdown Railway Station.

The community has known the area east of Grindstone Creek as Vinegar Hill “from earliest times” (Wray 1994:8). The name is not recorded on any historical mapping, though the name appears on a photograph of a bridge carrying Dundas Street over Grindstone Creek from c. 1901 (Figure 3). The area does contain a hill, following the eastern rise out of the Grindstone Creek valley. East of First Street the land flattens substantially. “Vinegar” may have come from the many market gardens with apple orchards that lined the hill. The apples were primarily used for cider which was made from late summer onwards. Without refrigeration, the cider would have quickly fermented leaving the area with the smell of vinegar (Wray 1994:8). Market gardens were also in operation throughout the village and are remembered in Vinegar Hill, Union, and Main Streets, and “on the Farwell property” (Woods et al. 1967:87). Early nineteenth-century images of the area show Dundas Street through Vinegar Hill lined with trees (Figure 9 and Figure 5).

Figure 3: Photograph of Dundas Street carrying over Grindstone Creek, c. 1901 (Flamborough Archives, Will Reid Collection c. 1901)
Figure 4: Dundas Street looking west down Vinegar Hill toward the village, 1911 (Flamborough Archives, Will Reid Collection 1911).

Figure 5: Dundas Street looking east with Vinegar Hill’s tree lined street in the centre background, c. 1912 (Flamborough Archives, Will Reid Collection c. 1912).
In her book, *Dundas Street, Waterdown, 1793-1993*, Wray documents eight properties within Vinegar Hill, four located east of Grindstone Creek (all extant) and three located west of Grindstone Creek (none are extant), suggesting that the local reference to Vinegar Hill consists of properties on both sides of the creek. The chapter on Vinegar Hill also includes sections on “Board Street and the Dundas Street Bridge,” “The Waterdown South Railway,” and “Dundas Street Bridge.” The four extant properties discussed are Kirby House (365 Dundas Street East, 1870), Pille House (353 Dundas Street East, 1879), Raycoft Cottage (348 Dundas Street East, 1860), and Eager House (340 Dundas Street East, 1871).

A review of mapping indicates the street and lot pattern remained consistent with the 1854 *Winter Plan* through much of the nineteenth century (Figure 6). By 1903, Board Street, Spring Street and the north portion of James Street were all closed (Figure 7). While Board Street is closed, a sawmill is shown at its northern end. The cemetery had also been enlarged by this time. Mary Snow is indicated as the owner of Lots 2 and 3, Block XIV, fronting onto Dundas Street. Early twentieth-century topographic mapping shows about 24 houses on the east side of Grindstone Creek, two of which are brick or stone while the rest are wood (Figure 8 and Figure 9).

---

5 Note addresses indicated in Wray differ from current municipal addresses. The current municipal address has been used here.
Figure 7: Vinegar Hill, 1903 (Tyrrell 1903).

Figure 8: Vinegar Hill, 1909 (Department of Militia and Defence 1909).
The *Fire Insurance Plan* from 1937 provides some evidence of the market garden functions in the community (Figure 10). Sawell Greenhouses are located at Main and Union Streets and appear to be a substantial operation. An additional greenhouse is shown on the east side of William Street in Vinegar Hill. There seems to be a difference between the two as Sawell Greenhouses is listed as an industry in the “Table of Specials” part of the plan, while the greenhouse on William Street is not. Dundas, William, and George Streets are paved while Board, Reynold, James, and Back Streets as well as Concession Road (now First Street) are unpaved. Unlike in prior mapping, Board Street appears as an open street. The lots can be assumed to be narrower than in earlier periods due to the number of houses contained in each block. There are now thirty houses in the area, the majority are of wooden construction with some constructed of wood with brick veneer. There is one stone or concrete block house at the southwest corner of Dundas Street and Reynold Street. A couple years later the 1939 *Fire Insurance Plan*, while only showing a portion of the area, provides some more details (Figure 11). The small lotting pattern on Reynold Street is drawn though only Lot 4 has a dwelling. A tourist camp is indicated with three dwellings on Lot 2 of Dundas Street.
Figure 10: Vinegar Hill, 1937 (Waterloo Mutual Insurance Company 1937).

Figure 11: Vinegar Hill, 1939 (Underwriter's Survey Bureau Ltd. 1939).
Through the second half of the twentieth century the road pattern extending from the south side of Dundas Street varies but generally the area remains consistent with increasing dwellings between existing buildings (Figure 12 and Figure 15). To the north of Vinegar Hill, Margaret Street was extended for the Waterdown Gardens and Margaret Gardens subdivisions established in 1954 and 1958 respectively (Figure 13 and Figure 14).

Figure 12: Vinegar Hill, 1954 (Hunting Survey Corporation Limited 1954).
Figure 13: Plan of Waterdown Gardens, 1954 Registered Plan 894 (City of Hamilton)

Figure 14: Plan of Margaret Gardens, 1958, Registered Plan 1134 (City of Hamilton)
3.0 Existing Conditions

The main east-west thoroughfare in Vinegar Hill is Dundas Street East (Figure 64). The area within the boundary of the Vinegar Hill study area is primarily residential, featuring single family homes and a few semi-detached residences. Additionally, Union Cemetery occupies the northwest corner of the study area (Figure 65). Grindstone Creek and the rail line that runs along the eastern bank of the waterway mark the western border of Vinegar Hill (Figure 66). First Street outlines the eastern border of the study area (Figure 67). A notch in the northeast border of the study area excludes the Waterdown Garden Subdivision, a residential subdivision registered in 1954, which is connected to First Street. The north and south boundaries are defined by the edges of residential properties and the northern limit of the cemetery. The area is also topographically defined by the upward climb from Grindstone Creek valley towards a gradual flattening off by First Street. Mature trees are located along the roadways and throughout the properties within the study area (Figure 68).

Dundas Street East features a single lane of traffic in each direction with a centre turning lane. Raised concrete medians with concrete planters are intermittently placed within the centre turning lane (Figure 69). Paved sidewalks line both sides of the roadways, and the south sidewalk is separated from the road by a grassed verge. Residential roadways branch north and south off Dundas Street East. The dates of construction for the single-detached residential properties that front Dundas Street East represent a range from the late-nineteenth century through to present day (Figure 70 to Figure 72). Large landscaping stones form a retaining wall...
along the outer edges of the sidewalks for a portion of the eastern-most section of Dundas Street East within the study area likely a result of roadway regrading over time (Figure 73). The stones on the north side or the roadway continue for approximately fifteen metres along the west side of First Street.

Figure 16: Dundas Street East, looking west (ASI 2020).

Figure 17: Looking north on Margaret Street with Union Cemetery (left) and residential properties (right) (ASI 2020).

Figure 18: Dundas Street East Bridge, looking northwest from the west boundary of the study area towards Grindstone Creek (ASI 2020).

Figure 19: Looking north along First Street, the east boundary of the Vinegar Hill study area (ASI 2020).
Figure 20: Looking west along Dundas Street East, showing mature trees within the study area (ASI 2020).

Figure 21: Dundas Street East looking southeast along the roadway (ASI 2020).

Figure 22: Example of nineteenth-century residential properties on the south side of Dundas Street East (ASI 2020).

Figure 23: Example of converted residential to commercial properties on Dundas Street East (ASI 2020).

Figure 24: Example of a mid twentieth-century residence on the north side of Dundas Street East (ASI 2020).

Figure 25: Large landscaping stones line the north and south sides of Dundas Street East (ASI 2020).
Within the east end of the study area (ASI 2020).

Within the study area, Reynold Street is the western-most extant roadway that runs south of Dundas Street East. The roadway features a single lane of traffic in each direction with a concrete curb terminating in a cul-de-sac. Two nineteenth-century residential properties flank the roadway where it meets Dundas Street East. George Street, located to the east of Reynold Street and south of Dundas Street East, features a single lane of traffic in both directions with concrete curbs and a sidewalk on the east side of the roadway (Figure 26 and Figure 27). Beyond the boundary of the study area, George Street curves eastward to become an east-west running roadway before turning again to cross over a branch of Grindstone Creek (formerly known as Spring Creek and Spring Falls or Arnold Falls).

Figure 26: Looking southeast along Dundas Street East with entry to George Street right (ASI 2020).

Figure 27: Looking south from Dundas Street East towards George Street (ASI 2020).

Board Street is the western-most roadway within the study area that is located north of Dundas Street East. The single-lane roadway is paved for approximately 15 metres, with grass curbs (Figure 28). No residential properties or other structures front Board Street. East of Board Street on the north side of Dundas Street East is William Street, which features a single lane of traffic in each direction (Figure 29). William Street curves eastward at the south boundary of Union Cemetery, where it intersects with Margaret Street (Figure 30). Margaret Street also runs north from Dundas Street East and features a single lane of traffic in each direction. There is a concrete sidewalk on the west side of the roadway and a grass shoulder on the east, with a gradual upward slope in the terrain. Margaret Street jogs slightly around 4 Margaret Street, a c. 1865 dwelling, then continues in a north-south direction (Figure 31). The residences on Margaret Street date from the late-nineteenth century through to present (Figure 32). West of Margaret Street is Union Cemetery and Margaret Street Park (north of the cemetery). Beyond the boundary of the study area, Margaret Street curves eastward to connect with First Street. First Street is the eastern-most roadway within the study area that runs north-south. It features a single lane of traffic in each direction with a sidewalk separated by a grassed verge on the east side of the roadway. The west side of the roadway is residential. The east side of First
Street is a large commercial parking lot on the northeast corner with Dundas Street East, with residential properties to the north (Figure 33). East of First Street the character of Dundas Street East shifts as the roadway widens to accommodate two lanes of traffic in each direction with a centre turning lane, and the south side of the street is primarily vegetation.

Figure 28: Board Street, looking northwest from Dundas Street East (ASI 2020).

Figure 29: William Street, looking north from Dundas Street East (ASI 2020).

Figure 30: William Street, looking east towards intersection with Margaret Street (ASI 2020).

Figure 31: Margaret Street, looking north towards jog in roadway and intersection with William Street (ASI 2020).
4.0 Cultural Heritage Evaluation

The following evaluation of Vinegar Hill as a cultural heritage landscape uses the City’s “A Framework for Evaluating the Cultural Heritage Value or Interest of Property for Designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act” which provides categorized criteria which expands upon, and is consistent with, Ontario Regulation 9/06. These criteria were developed for cultural heritage landscapes.

4.1 Historical Associations

Themes

Criterion 1: How well does the cultural heritage landscape illustrate one or more historical themes representative of cultural processes in the development and/or use of land in the context of the community, province, or nation?

Partially meets criterion.

As an eastward expansion of the Village of Waterdown across Grindstone Creek, the Vinegar Hill area could illustrate the theme of settlement in East Flamborough. However, Mill Street and its intersection with Dundas Street East on the west side of the Grindstone Creek represents this historical theme more strongly as it has retained a greater concentration of properties/buildings from the early nineteenth century. While Vinegar Hill is said to have been the location of the earliest part of the settlement, evidence of the high concentration of homes in Vinegar Hill in the 1830s and 1840s is no longer extant. Some mid- to late-nineteenth century properties along Dundas Street are best understood as part of Dundas Street which is being separately evaluated. Union Cemetery, which is also being evaluated separately, dates to the 1830s and relates to the settlement of the Village of Waterdown.
Event

Criterion 2: Is the cultural landscape associated with a specific event that has made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation?

Does not meet criterion.

The area is not associated with any specific event which made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation.

Person and/or Group

Criterion 3: Is the cultural landscape associated with the life or activities of a person, group, organization, or institution that has made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation?

Partially meets criterion.

The Vinegar Hill area is associated with Ebenezer C. Griffin as part of the eastward expansion of the plan for the Village of Waterdown. Griffin made a significant contribution to the settlement of Waterdown as its founder, however his contributions are more directly associated with Mill Street and Griffin Street as the locations of his business and home. Residences in the area are associated with the following: John Reid who operated a sawmill on Board Street and William Reid Jr., a photographer who recorded life in Waterdown in the 1900s (8 Margaret Street and 356-358 Dundas Street East); the Eager family who operated the village general store at Mill Street and Dundas Street (340 Dundas Street East); and several community members who owned 365 Dundas Street East and 348 Dundas Street East. While these properties were owned by significant community members, as a group they do not adequately contribute to the overall significance of Vinegar Hill.

4.2 Scenic Amenity

Sense of Place

Criterion 4: Does the cultural heritage landscape provide the observer(s) with a strong sense of position or place?

Partially meets criterion.

The area provides a view of the Village of Waterdown looking eastward along Dundas Street. East. However, this sense of Waterdown’s siting adjacent to the Grindstone Creek valley is better understood as part of Dundas Street as it continues across Grindstone Creek and into the western half of the village rather than as part of Vinegar Hill. The Union Cemetery provides observers with a strong sense of the community’s location on Grindstone Creek with its
prominent siting at a ridge overlooking the creek. This aspect of the area is better understood within Union Cemetery itself rather than as part of Vinegar Hill.

**Serial Vision**

*Criterion 5: Does the cultural heritage landscape provide the observer(s) with opportunities for serial vision along paths of pedestrian or vehicular movement?*

**Partially meets criterion.**

Dundas Street East provides opportunities for serial vision as one travels westward from First Street and with the view opening up into the Grindstone Creek valley however this is better understood as part of Dundas Street rather than Vinegar Hill. While the area has some jogged streets and corners, overall, the area does not provide strong opportunities for a sense of discovery or drama.

**Material Content**

*Criterion 6: Is the cultural heritage landscape visually satisfying or pleasing to the observer(s) in terms of colour, texture, style, and scale?*

**Partially meets criterion.**

The area has visually satisfying elements such as the tree-lined view eastward along Dundas Street East and the cemetery paired with the large trees along Margaret Street. The area, however, does not have sufficient material content to be a cohesive cultural heritage landscape.

**4.3 Integrity**

*Criterion 7: Is it all there?*

**Does not meet criterion.**

The area does not retain aspects of the earliest settlement of Waterdown in the 1830s and 1840s except for Union Cemetery which is also being separately evaluated for its cultural heritage value or interest. The four earliest extant properties date to the 1850s and 1860s which is consistent with or later than extant properties in other areas of Waterdown. Many of the properties in the area date from the World Wars period and beyond with 13 of the 37 properties in the area dating from the 1970s to present. The area does not have sufficient integrity to be a cohesive cultural heritage landscape.

**4.4 Design**

*Criterion 8: Has the landscape been purposefully designed or planned?*
Does not meet criterion.

The area is part of the eastward expansion of Griffin’s survey and was drawn in 1854 by Henry Winter. Assessment rolls from the 1840s indicate there were many households extant in the area and it is unclear whether the plan responded to existing properties or was purposefully designed. Aspects within the area evolved gradually with buildings infilling blocks where larger lots have been initially planned and the cemetery expanding, gradually overtaking lots which were previously residential properties.

4.5 Social Value

Public Perception

Criterion 9: Is the landscape regarded as having importance within the City?

Partially meets criterion.

The area is named and described as a section of Dundas Street in Sylvia Wray’s book *Dundas Street: Waterdown 1793-1993*. The material focused primarily on the properties and aspects of the area which are along Dundas Street and only makes mention of the cemetery as it relates to Vinegar Hill but does not mention other streets, properties, or homes in the area. The importance of the area to the City relates more broadly to the Village of Waterdown or Dundas Street East through Waterdown.

4.6 Ontario Regulation 9/06

Table 7: Cultural Heritage Evaluation of Vinegar Hill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value: <em>is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a landscape</em></td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value: <em>High degree of design/aesthetic appeal</em></td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value: <em>High Degree Technical/Scientific Interest</em></td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/Associative Value: <em>Direct Association with a Theme, Event, Person, etc.</em></td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical or Associative Value: <em>contributes to an understanding of a community/culture</em></td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/Associative Value:</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflects work or ideas of architect, artist, builder, etc.</td>
<td>See Section 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value: Important in defining character of area</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.2.1 and 4.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value: Historically, physically, functionally or visually linked to surroundings</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, and 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value: Landmark</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.3 and 4.5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.7 Evaluation Summary

The cultural heritage evaluation of Vinegar Hill concludes that while some features within the larger area have potential cultural heritage value or interest, the area is not considered to have sufficient cultural heritage value or interest to make it a significant cultural heritage landscape. Those features of potential cultural heritage value or interest, including Dundas Street East and Union Cemetery, are also being evaluated separately as part of this study. Individual properties within the Vinegar Hill study area have been recommended for protection under the *Ontario Heritage Act* as part of the Built Heritage Inventory review being conducted by the City of Hamilton.
1.0 Introduction

The Waterdown Heights Subdivision is a four-block residential subdivision located near Mill Street South and Parkside Drive in the community of Waterdown (Figure 1). It is bounded by Parkside Drive to the north, 157 and 144 Wellington Street to the east, Elgin Street to the south, and Victoria Street to the west. While roadways and lot patterns in Waterdown are oriented in a northwest-southeast axis, the study area will be described in a north-south orientation for ease of description.

Figure 1: Location of the Waterdown Heights Subdivision CHL within the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan study area.

2.0 Historical Summary

The Waterdown Heights Subdivision is historically located on a portion of Lot 6, Concession 3 in East Flamborough Township. The subdivision was built on part of the land belonging to James McMonies and Thomas Stock in the mid-nineteenth century.

James McMonies and Thomas Stock owned a large portion of Lot 6, Concession 3 (Figure 2). The McMonies and Stock Survey was registered in 1856 which created five blocks on the east side of Mill Street between present-day Church Street and Parkside Drive with lots fronting
onto Mill Street and a newly created Victoria Street (Anon 2017b; Page & Smith 1875a). Two east-west blocks were created between Victoria Street and Grindstone Creek with lots on the north side of Raglan Street, both sides of Nelson Street, and the south side of Elgin Street. James McMonies continued to own a large piece of land in the northeast portion of the village which was ultimately subdivided as the Waterdown Heights Subdivision (Figure 3). Woods stated there may have been a race track in the vicinity of Churchill Street which was probably used for sulky racing (1967:103). By the early nineteenth century, mapping shows the property belonging to C. McMonies (Figure 4). This land is believed to have been a small farm until the 1940s (Donkin 1969:86).

James McMonies came to East Flamborough from Scotland with his wife and three children and settled on Lot 5, Concession 4, northeast of the Village of Waterdown. He built a log home and established a sawmill on the creek which ran through the front part of his farm. He later built a frame house which was still extant in the 1960s (its presence today has not been verified). This property is currently the site of Connon Nurseries. McMonies sat on the School Board, was a member of the Ontario Legislative Assembly in 1865-1867 and was member of the Dominion Government for Wentworth County in 1867-1872. Upon his retirement in 1875 he sold his farm.

Thomas Stock, came to East Flamborough from England and settled on Lot 9, Concession 2 in 1831. Stock served on County Council and was Warden of the county for several years. In 1875 he was elected M.P.P for Wentworth North for a short time before being unseated and disqualified for a minor infraction of the election law. Stock was reeve of East Flamborough (Page & Smith 1875a)

Figure 2: James McMonies’ land at Lot 5, Concession 4 highlighted in orange, McMonies and Stock land at Lot 6, Concession 3 highlighted in green (Tremaine 1859).
Figure 3: James McMonies land within the Village of Waterdown, 1875 (Page & Smith 1875a).

Figure 4: C. McMonies land within the Village of Waterdown, 1903 (Tyrrell 1903).
In the mid-twentieth century a descendant of James McMonies, Harold McMonies Vance, (1902-1984) owned the last undivided Block VIII of Plan No. 355 in Lot 6, Concession 3 (Figure 5) (Archives of the Law Society of Ontario 2014). Vance registered a Plan for Waterdown Heights, subdividing the block in 1945 (Figure 5). The plan extended the east-west Wellington Street eastward to the division line between Lots 5 and 6, established Churchill Avenue running north-south between Parkside Drive and Elgin Street, and set out lots on the north side of Elgin Street, the south side of Parkside Drive and the east side of Victoria Street. The plan consisted of 50 lots with two additional parcels of land at the west end of the subdivision on Victoria Street between Wellington Street and Parkside Drive, one labelled “Lands of Staples,” the other labelled “Lands of H.M. Vance.” Vance lands within the subdivision are now known as 198 Victoria Street which contains a two-storey home built in 1941. The home is believed to have been built for Vance (City of Hamilton 2020) and judging by its location the idea of a subdivision may have already been underway.

Figure 5: Waterdown Heights Subdivision, Registered Plan 791 (City of Hamilton).

Harold McMonies Vance was the great grandson of James McMonies. Harold McMonies Vance (1902-1984) was called to the bar on October 15, 1925 and was a lawyer in the firm Vance and Vance with offices on James Street South in Hamilton (Smith et al. 1925). Vance’s son, John Peter Fleming Vance (1933-2017), co-authored with his son Johnathan F. Vance a township history book titled A Township at War published in 1967 and was the founding president of the Waterdown East Flamborough Heritage Society.
Waterdown Heights was the first post-Second World War subdivision in the Village of Waterdown. During this period there was growth occurring in towns and cities across Ontario and Canada in response to the need for housing for returning veterans and their families. Much of this housing was designed and coordinated by the Wartime Housing Corporation (which became the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation). The one new street created, which was not an extension of the 1856 McMonies and Stock Survey, was named Churchill for Sir Winston Churchill, prime minister of Britain during the Second World War. Many of the houses in the neighbourhood are likely built to designs published by the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation in the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s. There is no evidence of a consistent building program in the neighbourhood though some blocks such as on the south side of Parkside Drive between Churchill Avenue and the concession line, and on Wellington Street between Victoria Street and Churchill Avenue have consistent plans which may indicate the same builder.

Based on the dates of construction of extant properties in the neighbourhood, the first houses were built on Parkside Drive between Victoria Street and Churchill Avenue in 1947. Properties on the north side of Parkside Drive appear to correspond in style and type though may be slightly earlier date of construction as they are more modest in design and materials. Except for a few earlier properties, the three blocks north of Albert Street to the west of the Waterdown Heights Subdivision developed at a similar pace to the new subdivision. By 1951 there were 35 or 40 homes built in the new plan. A photograph was published in the Hamilton Spectator by photographer Bruce Murdoch on February 10, 1951, showing the north side of Wellington Street between Victoria Street and Churchill Avenue with the caption:

Waterdown Being Rapidly Built Up With New Homes – This photograph was taken on Wellington Street in the Waterdown Heights Survey, where some 35 or 40 new homes have been erected, and gives an idea of the way the community is expanding (Anon 2013).

When the photo was posted to social media by the Flamborough Archives sixty-eight years later, the community reacted with fond memories of living in the neighbourhood (Figure 6).

By 1955, the neighbourhood appears to have been fully built out with 50 homes. A few lots, however, were rearranged from the original plan adding two building lots, and two lots have contemporary structures which may have replaced earlier buildings (Figure 7 and Figure 8). The population of Waterdown grew from 867 in 1940 to 1,794 in 1960 (Donkin 1969:81). For the most part this new population was working outside the village at nearby industries in Hamilton and elsewhere. Beginning in 1978, several lots along Churchill Avenue were subdivided to create eight new properties in the subdivision. Six of the eight properties have buildings which date between 1978 and 1980.

Other subdivisions which followed in Waterdown include Hawksview Gardens (1952), Waterdown Gardens (1954), and Margaret Gardens (1958).
Figure 6: Wellington Street in the Waterdown Heights Subdivision, c. 1951 (Hamilton Public Library, Bruce Murdoch Collection, Hamilton Spectator Collection).

Figure 7: Waterdown Heights and surrounding area, 1953 (Natural Resources Canada 1953).
Figure 8: Waterdown Heights and surrounding area, 1963 (Natural Resources Canada 1963).
3.0 Existing Conditions

The Waterdown Heights Subdivision study area includes the area south of Parkside Drive, north of Elgin Street, east of Victoria Street and west of the eastern terminus of Wellington Street. The area contains residential properties with dates of construction primarily ranging from 1947 to 1955 and 1978 to 1980. These properties are typically one to one-and-a-half storeys (Figure 9 to Figure 13). A few properties have dates outside these ranges, one from 1941, one from 1973, and four from 2002 to present (Figure 14). These properties are typically two storeys.

Parkside Drive is an east-west roadway that features a single lane in each direction with a gravel shoulder on the south side and a sidewalk separated by a grassed verge on the north side. Victoria Street is north-south roadway that features a single lane of traffic in both directions with concrete curbs and sidewalks on both sides. Wellington is an east-west roadway that features a single lane of traffic in both directions with concrete curbs and sidewalks on both sides separated from the roadway by grassed verges. Elgin Street is an east-west travelling roadway with a single lane of traffic in each direction with concrete curbs and a sidewalk on the north side of the street, separated by a grassed verge. Churchill Avenue is a north-south roadway that features a single lane of traffic in both directions with concrete curbs and sidewalks separated by grassed verges on both sides of the street. The roadway extends from Parkside Drive south, where it terminates at Elgin Street.

Many of the properties in the area remain unchanged from their original designs, although a few have been added to in a way that alters their original scale and form. A few properties constructed since 2002 in the neighbourhood are larger in massing, scale, and form than the rest of the neighbourhood. The neighbourhood is consistent in building dates and types when compared to the surrounding streets. The south side of Elgin Street contains properties more consistently from the second half of the 1950s and early 1960s.

Figure 9: North side of Wellington Street between Victoria Street and Churchill Avenue (ASI 2020).

Figure 10: South side of Wellington Street between Victoria Street and Churchill Avenue (ASI 2020).
4.0 Cultural Heritage Evaluation

The following evaluation of Waterdown Heights Subdivision as a cultural heritage landscape uses the City’s “A Framework for Evaluating the Cultural Heritage Value or Interest of Property for Designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act” which provides categorized criteria which expands upon, and is consistent with, Ontario Regulation 9/06. These criteria were developed for cultural heritage landscapes.

4.1 Historical Associations

Themes

Criterion 1: How well does the cultural heritage landscape illustrate one or more historical themes representative of cultural processes in the development and/or use of land in the context of the community, province, or nation?
Meets criterion.

Waterdown Heights Subdivision is representative of the theme of residential intensification as the earliest post-Second World War subdivision in the Village of Waterdown. This residential intensification was noteworthy in the City of Hamilton, warranting mention in the *Hamilton Spectator*. The population of Waterdown doubled during the period this subdivision was developed. While this type of growth occurred throughout the village, it occurred in a concentrated way in this area.

**Event**

*Criterion 2: Is the cultural landscape associated with a specific event that has made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation?*

**Does not meet criterion.**

The area is not associated with any specific events which made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation.

**Person and/or Group**

*Criterion 3: Is the cultural landscape associated with the life or activities of a person, group, organization, or institution that has made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation?*

**Does not meet criterion.**

The subdivision is associated with the activities of Harold McMonies Vance. He is not known to have made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation.

**4.2 Scenic Amenity**

**Sense of Place**

*Criterion 4: Does the cultural heritage landscape provide the observer(s) with a strong sense of position or place?*

**Does not meet criterion.**

Waterdown Heights Subdivision does not have a strong sense of place.

**Serial Vision**

*Criterion 5: Does the cultural heritage landscape provide the observer(s) with opportunities for serial vision along paths of pedestrian or vehicular movement?*
Does not meet criterion.

Waterdown Heights Subdivision is a very open landscape and does not provide opportunities for serial vision.

Material Content

Criterion 6: Is the cultural heritage landscape visually satisfying or pleasing to the observer(s) in terms of colour, texture, style and scale?

Does not meet criterion.

While Waterdown Heights Subdivision has properties which are pleasing, there is inconsistency in the setback, massing, scale, and landscape treatments of the properties which does not present with an overall visually satisfying or pleasing combination of colours, textures, styles, and scale.

4.3 Integrity

Criterion 7: Is it all there?

Meets criterion.

Waterdown Height Subdivision is, for the most part, intact in terms of the lotting pattern and period of construction. Waterdown Heights Subdivision has historical integrity.

4.4 Design

Criterion 8: Has the landscape been purposefully designed or planned?

Meets criterion.

The subdivision was intentionally laid out, establishing a strong street and lot pattern for the area. There is a wide right-of-way and purposeful, grassed front yards representative of the post-Second World War approach to subdivision design. The homes are consistent in their deep setback, low height, and small-scale massing. The design of the buildings come out of plans for modest post-Second World War housing. The simplified massing is consistent with post-Second World War designs such as modest bungalows, cottages and ranch styles incorporating concrete foundations, and brick veneer or horizontal siding.

4.5 Social Value

Public Perception

Criterion 9: Is the landscape regarded as having importance within the City?
Does not meet criterion.

The area is not known to have importance within the City of Hamilton.

4.6 Ontario Regulation 9/06

Table 8: Cultural Heritage Evaluation of Waterdown Heights Subdivision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a landscape</td>
<td>Meets criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Section 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High degree of design/aesthetic appeal</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Section 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Degree Technical/Scientific Interest</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Section 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/Associative Value:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Association with a Theme, Event, Person, etc.</td>
<td>Meets criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Section 4.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical or Associative Value:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contributes to an understanding of a community/culture</td>
<td>Meets criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Section 4.1 and 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/Associative Value:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflects work or ideas of architect, artist, builder, etc.</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Section 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important in defining character of area</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Section 4.2.1 and 4.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historically, physically, functionally or visually linked to surroundings</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Section 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, and 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landmark</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>See Section 4.3 and 4.5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.7 Evaluation Summary

This cultural heritage evaluation of Waterdown Heights Subdivision concludes that the area has cultural heritage value as the earliest post-Second World War subdivision during a period when the Village of Waterdown’s population doubled in size. The naming of Churchill Avenue and the housing designs are reflective of the period.
5.0 Statement of Significance

Description of Property

Waterdown Heights Subdivision is a residential neighbourhood in the northeast corner of the Village of Waterdown. The area is bounded by Parkside Drive to the north, the concession line to the east, Elgin Street to the south, and Victoria Street to the west.

Cultural Heritage Value

Waterdown Heights Subdivision is of cultural heritage value as the earliest post-Second World War subdivision in the Village of Waterdown. The area was registered as a plan of subdivision by Harold McMonies Vance in 1945 and the housing in the subdivision was constructed primarily between 1945 and 1955 incorporating his home constructed in 1941 into the plan.

The subdivision was intentionally laid out, establishing a strong street and lot pattern for the area. There is a wide right-of-way and purposeful, grassed front yards representative of the post-Second World War approach to subdivision design. The homes are consistent in their deep setback, low height, and small-scale massing. The design of the buildings come out of plans for modest post-Second World War housing.

Waterdown Heights Subdivision is representative of the theme of post-Second World War residential intensification. During the period between 1940 and 1960, the population of Waterdown doubled. This growth occurred throughout the village however it occurred in a concentrated way in Waterdown Heights due to the early subdivision plan. The residential intensification and rapid growth of the Waterdown Heights subdivision was noteworthy in the City of Hamilton, warranting mention in the Hamilton Spectator.

Cultural Heritage Attributes

- Housing designs consistent with plans issued by the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation.
  - 1 to 1-1/2 storeys in height and modest scale.
  - Simplified massing consistent with post-Second World War designs such as modest bungalows, cottages and ranch styles incorporating concrete foundations, and brick veneer or horizontal siding.
- Lot sizes and pattern with lots back-to-back and generally 75 feet wide by 180 feet deep.
- The name of Churchill Avenue as it connects the subdivision to the Second World War.

6.0 Proposed Boundary

The proposed boundary for the Waterdown Heights Subdivision Cultural Heritage Landscape is as follows:
• The centre line of the street along Parkside Drive, Elgin Street, and Victoria Street as well as the line between Lots 5 and 6 to align with the plan of subdivision.

• Conservation measures should consider the north side of Parkside Drive, south side of Elgin Street and the west side of Victoria Street as these streets are consistent with the character of the Waterdown Heights Subdivision in their period of construction and design.

Figure 15: Proposed boundary for the Waterdown Heights Subdivision Cultural Heritage Landscape.
Waterdown Memorial Park

1.0 Introduction

Waterdown Memorial Park is located along the south side of Parkside Drive between Hamilton Street North and Main Street North in the community of Waterdown (Figure 1). Waterdown Memorial Park is a public community park situated to the east of a commercial corridor along Hamilton Street North and residential streets along Parkside Road to the north and Main Street North to the east. While roadways and lot patterns in Waterdown are oriented in a northwest-southeast axis, the study area will be described in a north-south orientation for ease of description. Main Street South will be described as travelling north-south, with Waterdown Memorial Park located west of Main Street.

![Figure 1: Location of Waterdown Memorial Park within the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan Study Area](image)

2.0 Historical Summary

The land which the park is situated on historically formed the northwest corner of Lot 7, Concession 3, in the Township of East Flamborough.

Early-twentieth-century mapping shows the area where Waterdown Memorial Park would be established as undeveloped land. The 1903 Imperial Atlas of Waterdown shows the future
location of Waterdown Memorial Park within Block X between Main Street and Hamilton Road (now Hamilton Street North) (Figure 2). The 1909 National Topographic Map shows a single brick structure at the south end of the future park location and does not identify any trees or other structures within the area. East of the future park site, sand and gravel pits are identified on the southeast corner of Parkside Drive and Main Street, and structures are visible along Main Street to the south (Figure 3).

Figure 2: 1903 Imperial Atlas of Waterdown (Tyrrell 1903).
The 1943 and 1952 *National Topographic Maps* shows the first changes to the future park area south of Parkside Drive (Figure 4 and Figure 5). The 1943 map shows a water tower at the southeast corner of Main Street and Kelly Street, east of the future park site. A driveway is visible extending east from Main Street within the central portion of the future park, terminating at a gravel pit. Trees are now illustrated along the south boundary of the future park. Although park construction began prior to 1952, no evidence of the park is yet visible in the 1952 *National Topographic Map* (Figure 5).
Figure 4: 1943 *National Topographic Map* (Department of National Defence 1943).

Figure 5: 1952 *National Topographic Map* (Department of National Defence 1952).
The park was proposed in 1946 as a memorial to Second World War veterans and as parklands to provide a place for community recreation activities and events (Waterdown Memorial Public Art Project Focus Group 2019). The idea was realized through the work of a local committee spearheaded by members of the Waterdown Amateur Athletic Association (W.A.A.A.), the Waterdown Women’s Institute, and the Waterdown Business Men’s Association (now the Waterdown Board of Trade) (Flamborough Historical Society 2019).

In August 1946, 4.8 hectares of land were purchased in the northwest corner of the village (the north-westerly block of the present park). This land belonged to the Anderson family and was the site of Anderson’s Sand and Gravel Pit (Flamborough Historical Society 2019). Mrs. Elizabeth Anderson wished that it be used for a park and set a low price of $1,200 for the land (Gallin 1997). The W.A.A.A. joined with the Waterdown Women’s Institute and the Waterdown Business Men’s Association who each paid one third of the purchase price (Flamborough Historical Society 2019). Plans for the park included a hockey rink, track, baseball diamond, tennis courts, and a grandstand (Figure 6) (Gallin 1997).

Figure 6: Proposed Park Layout, 1947 (Waterdown Board of Trade Annual Yearbook 1947).

The park was completed quickly due to the contributions of local citizens who loaned equipment and volunteered time and labour to the project (Flamborough Historical Society 2019). Members of the public also contributed monetary donations to fund the park’s
construction (Figure 8). By the end of 1947, a fully landscaped park was completed, equipped with floodlights, washrooms, dressing rooms, bleachers, and baseball diamonds (Figure 7).

Figure 7: Completed Waterdown Community Park, c. 1949 (Anon 1949).

Figure 8: Donation Letter, c. 1946 (Baker 1946).
In 1949, the park was expanded through the acquisition of an additional 3.2 hectares Elizabeth Anderson’s adjacent land to the north of the park and fronting onto Parkside Drive and Main Street North. The Flamborough and Waterdown Agricultural Society became an additional partner in the park project (Flamborough Historical Society 2019). To ensure the continued funding and maintenance of the park, ownership of the park was transferred by donation to the Corporation of the Village of Waterdown in 1949.

Motions in the minute books of both the Women’s Institute and the Board of Trade state that the donation was made on the “understanding that such land and park property be maintained as Community Park for the use of the Community as a whole” (Waterdown Memorial Public Art Project Focus Group 2019). Entrance gates along Main Street North at the east boundary of the park identify the individuals on the original park committee, as well as the Memorial Park Board (Figure 9).

A financial statement from the Waterdown and Community Memorial Park Board from 1951 indicates that in the same year, the Park Board erected a modern building in the park containing washrooms, dressing rooms, and a storeroom, at a cost of $3,375.51, and that the south end of the park, commonly known as the sandpit, was being developed (Waterdown and Community Memorial Park Board 1951).
Aerial photography from 1950 shows a baseball diamond within the centre of the park, and entrances to the park on the east and west sides. Some trees are located along the south end of the east property line while a line of trees is shown along the south property line. A small structure is visible north of the west entrance, near Hamilton Street North. (Figure 10).

Figure 10: 1950 Aerial Photograph showing Waterdown Memorial Park (Air Photo Division, Energy Mines & Resources 1950).

Between 1949 and 1970, the park hosted several events, including the Waterdown Farmer’s Market (Figure 11-Figure 14) and the annual two-day Agricultural Society Fall Fair between 1949 and 1970 (Figure 13). Though no permanent exhibition buildings were erected, the fair typically attracted over 6,000 people annually for events including a horse show, small animal and field crop classes, and school exhibits. A recurring open-air Farmer’s Market was held starting in 1959 and continued for over 20 years, attracting hundreds of visitors during the summer and fall months. The park has been home to many annual events, including the Antique Car Show during the 1980s which attracted thousands of visitors. Ongoing events include the Rotary Club’s “O Canada Ribfest,” movies in the park, and Victoria Day celebrations.
Figure 11: Waterdown Farmer's Market, Memorial Park, c. 1952 (Flamborough Archives: Caswell c. 1952).

Figure 12: Waterdown Farmer's Market, Memorial Park, c. 1952 (Flamborough Archives: Caswell c. 1952).

Figure 13: Waterdown Fair, c.1960 (Flamborough Archives)
Figure 14: Scout Parade and Drumhead Service, Waterdown Memorial Park, 1952 (Anon 1958)

The 1963 and 1978 National Topographic Map identifies the property as a park, with three structures identified in the central portion of the site (Figure 15). Trees are again shown along the southern boundary of the park.
The community continued to be involved in park improvement and using it for commemorations. A picnic shelter was erected by the Waterdown and District Lions Club in 1983. Memorials installed include a red maple tree to commemorate the Diamond Jubilee of Queen Elizabeth II and the Queen’s Bench to commemorate the longest reigning monarch in modern history. The Queen’s Bench was unveiled on September 9th, 2017, by the Honourable Elizabeth Dowdeswell, 29th Lieutenant Governor of Ontario (Figure 16).

A skatepark was added in 2006. In 2014, dozens of ash trees at the northwest corner of the park were removed following an infestation with emerald ash borer, while three willow trees were cut down following damage from a 2013 ice storm (O’Hara 2014). New additions and facilities installed in the park since 2016 include an ice-skating loop (2014), a paved walking trail around the north-west half of the park with new landscaping and trees, a clock installed by the Rotary Club in 2017, a washroom facility, and a paved parking lot (Flamborough Historical Society 2019).

3.0 Existing Conditions

While roadways and lot patterns in Waterdown are oriented in a northwest-southeast axis, the study area will be described in a north-south orientation for ease of description.

Waterdown Memorial Park is located along the south side of Parkside Drive between Hamilton Street North to the west and Main Street North to the east, extending south towards the rear property lines of those properties located along the north side of John Street West (Figure 17 through Figure 21). A commercial complex is located to the west of the park along the west side
of Hamilton Street, with residential and institutional properties to the north, and residential properties to the east and south.

Figure 17: Looking south into Waterdown Memorial Park from the intersection of Parkside Drive and Hamilton Street North (ASI 2019).

Figure 18: Looking northwest into Waterdown Memorial Park from Main Street North (ASI 2019).

Figure 19: Looking east into Waterdown Memorial Park from the west side of Hamilton Street North (ASI 2019).

Figure 20: Looking northeast into Waterdown Memorial Park from the west side of Hamilton Street North (ASI 2019).
Mature trees extend along the east property line on the west side of Main Street North and continue to the south of the park along the rear lot lines of the properties on the west side of Main Street as well as along the south boundary of the park (Figure 22 through Figure 24). The vegetative edges of the park screen areas of the park from surrounding uses. Chain-link fencing extends around the perimeter of the park (Figure 25).
A gated entrance is located along the east boundary of the park, with plaques on either stone column identifying both the board and committee members associated with the establishment of the park (Figure 26 through Figure 30). The gate dates to c. 1950 and is known to have been photographed in that year.
Figure 26: Looking east towards the entrance gates from within Waterdown Memorial Park (ASI 2019).

Figure 27: Looking west towards the entrance gates from Main Street North (ASI 2019).

Figure 28: Engraved stone plaque on south column at entrance gates to Waterdown Memorial Park (ASI 2019).

Figure 29: Engraved stone plaques on central columns at entrance gates to Waterdown Memorial Park (ASI 2019).
Figure 30: Engraved stone plaque on north column at entrance gates to Waterdown Memorial Park (ASI 2019).

The park is accessible to vehicular traffic near the southwest corner of the park through an asphalt driveway that extends into a large asphalt parking lot within the centre of the site (Figure 31 and Figure 32). The south portion of the park contains several baseball fields with contemporary lighting and surrounded by low chain-link fencing (Figure 33 and Figure 34). Based on the 1947 park plan, the original topography, boundary, fence line of the park, and entrance gates are extant. No other built features or circulation routes identified within the plan are extant.

Figure 31: Looking east into Waterdown Memorial Park, showing chain link fencing, the west driveway, and parking lot (ASI 2019).

Figure 32: Looking northwest from within the asphalt parking lot in Waterdown Memorial Park (ASI 2019).
A paved walkway extends through the northern half of the park, connecting into the existing sidewalk at the intersection of Parkside Drive and Hamilton Street North, the entrance to the park from the east side of Main Street North, and into the central parking lot (Figure 35 and Figure 36). Within the central portion of the site, this walkway wraps around a skating rink and splashpad, as well as a one-storey washroom building (Figure 37). A skatepark is located along the west boundary of the park along Hamilton Street North (Figure 38), and a gable-roofed picnic pavilion and a raised mound/landscape feature containing several trees and a contemporary clock are located further to the north (Figure 39 and Figure 40).
Figure 37: Washroom building within Waterdown Memorial Park (ASI 2019).

Figure 38: Skatepark along the west property line in Waterdown Memorial Park (ASI 2019).

Figure 39: Raised hill feature within the west portion of Waterdown Memorial Park (ASI 2019).

Figure 40: Looking northwest towards the clock and picnic shelter on the raised hill features within Waterdown Memorial Park (ASI 2019).

4.0 Cultural Heritage Evaluation

The following evaluation of Waterdown Memorial Park as a cultural heritage landscape uses the City’s “A Framework for Evaluating the Cultural Heritage Value or Interest of Property for Designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act” which provides categorized criteria which expands upon, and is consistent with, Ontario Regulation 9/06. These criteria were developed for cultural heritage landscapes.
4.1 Historical Associations

**Themes**

*Criterion 1:* How well does the cultural heritage landscape illustrate one or more historical themes representative of cultural processes in the development and/or use of land in the context of the community, province, or nation?

*Meets criterion.*

Waterdown Memorial Park is directly associated with the theme of athletics and recreation in Waterdown and the City of Hamilton. The park was established in the mid-twentieth century as a memorial to Second World War veterans and as parkland to provide a place for community recreation and events. The park is also historically associated with industry through the former use for resource extraction as a former sand and gravel quarry.

**Event**

*Criterion 2:* Is the cultural landscape associated with a specific event that has made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation?

*Meets criterion.*

Waterdown Memorial Park is associated with the Second World War as a memorial to the community’s veterans.

**Person and/or Group**

*Criterion 3:* Is the cultural landscape associated with the life or activities of a person, group, organization, or institution that has made a significant contribution to the community, province or nation?

*Meets criterion.*

The park is associated with members of the Lion’s Club, Waterdown Amateur Athletic Association (WAAA), the Waterdown Women’s Institute, and the Waterdown Business Men’s Association (now the Waterdown Board of Trade). These organizations have made significant contributions to the community of Waterdown through their activities.

4.2 Scenic Amenity

**Sense of Place**

*Criterion 4:* Does the cultural heritage landscape provide the observer(s) with a strong sense of position or place?
Meets criterion.

The recreational elements within the park, combined with its size and presence along the southeast corner of Parkside Drive and Hamilton Street North and within a mixed-use area define the character of the area and provide a centralized centre for recreation for residents of Waterdown. The park’s location at the northwest corner of a neighbourhood links it historically, physically, functionally, and visually to Main Street North. The topography and changes in grade produced by the former resource extraction physically and functionally connect the park to its former use.

This park is a landmark on the southeast corner of Parkside Drive and Hamilton Street North, and is highly visible from the west, north, and east sides of the park from the public right-of-way.

Serial Vision

Criterion 5: Does the cultural heritage landscape provide the observer(s) with opportunities for serial vision along paths of pedestrian or vehicular movement?

Meets criterion.

The east entrance gates to Waterdown Memorial Park and the generally treed east edge of the part presents the observer with opportunities for serial vision when walking along Main Street North and entering the park along the existing paths. The view into the park from the gates is defined in the foreground by the gates themselves and is lined by trees on the north and south sides of the path.

Material Content

Criterion 6: Is the cultural heritage landscape visually satisfying or pleasing to the observer(s) in terms of colour, texture, style, and scale?

Does not meet criterion.

While the park has some visually satisfying moments, particularly along the east edge of the park where it connects with Main Street North, overall, the park does not present a visually satisfying combination of colour, texture, style, and scale in its features.

4.3 Integrity

Criterion 7: Is it all there?

Partially meets criterion.

Waterdown Memorial Park has been continuously used for recreational purposes since its establishment in 1947 and has been municipally owned since that period. The entrance gates
along the east edge of Waterdown Memorial Park remain and are in sound condition, however no other built features original to the 1947 park are extant. Natural features such as mature vegetation and trees line the east and south property lines of Waterdown Memorial Park.

The raised topography with mature trees is prominent along the eastern edge of Waterdown Memorial Park and is a remnant of the resource extraction which took place on the site.

It is unclear from aerial photographs or mapping if the 1947 plans for Waterdown Memorial Park were ever fully realized. The existing landscape within the park has been altered over time, most recently with the introduction of contemporary recreational facilities including a skate park, a washroom pavilion, and sports fields. The park primarily presents as a contemporary park with some historical features.

4.4 Design

Criterion 8: Has the landscape been purposefully designed or planned?

Meets criterion.

While the park is one of several recreational facilities within Waterdown and the City of Hamilton, the park is representative of a park focused on recreational and athletic facilities within the community of Waterdown through its purposeful design and planning.

4.5 Social Value

Public Perception

Criterion 9: Is the landscape regarded as having importance within the City?

Meets criterion.

Waterdown Memorial Park is a landmark on the southeast corner of Parkside Drive and Hamilton Street North, and is highly visible from the west, north, and east sides of the park from the public right-of-way. The park is valued as a recreational and community space within the community of Waterdown. Waterdown Memorial Park has been in the subject of local history publications, including *The History of Waterdown Memorial Park* by the Flamborough Historical Society and has been photographed during events like farmers markets and fairs.

There are several elements within Waterdown Memorial Park that speak to the community’s pride and stewardship of the place. The Lion’s Club donated a picnic shelter in 1983. The Rotary Club dedicated a clock located within Waterdown Memorial Park in 2017. An ongoing Waterdown Memorial Public Art Project will result in a public work project that is proposed to “enhance and reflect the atmosphere of the park as Waterdown’s ‘Public Backyard’ through an artwork that recognizes the park as a community gathering place and responds to its historical and physical context in a way that is playful and interactive” (City of Hamilton 2019:para. 4).
The gate feature at the east entrance to the park contains engraved stone plaques identifying those involved in the park’s creation. The park was named Waterdown Memorial Park as a memorial to those from Waterdown who served in Second World War. Lastly, the “Queen’s Bench” was installed within the park in 2015 to commemorate the historic reign of Queen Elizabeth II.

Waterdown Memorial Park is a public space within the community of Waterdown and has been referred to as “Waterdown’s Public Backyard” (City of Hamilton 2019). Many recreational and community events are held within the park including fitness classes, Waterdown Ribfest, and events relating to Hamilton Winterfest.

4.6 Ontario Regulation 9/06

Table 9: Cultural Heritage Value of Waterdown Memorial Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value: is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a landscape</td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value: High degree of design/aesthetic appeal</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value: High Degree Technical/Scientific Interest</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/Associative Value: Direct Association with a Theme, Event, Person, etc.</td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical or Associateive Value: contributes to an understanding of a community/culture</td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/Associative Value: Reflects work or ideas of architect, artist, builder, etc.</td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value: Important in defining character of area</td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.2.1 and 4.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value: Historically, physically, functionally or visually linked to surroundings</td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, and 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value: Landmark</td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.3 and 4.5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.7 Evaluation Summary

Waterdown Memorial Park is a significant cultural heritage landscape due to its cultural heritage value, community value, and historical integrity. Waterdown Memorial Park is a community park established in the mid-twentieth century in the Village of Waterdown as a memorial to Second World War veterans and as parkland to provide a place for community recreation and events.

5.0 Statement of Significance and List of Attributes

Description of Place

Waterdown Memorial Park is a publicly-owned community park established between 1946 and 1947 with a history of use for industrial resource extraction. The park is located at 200 Hamilton Street North in Waterdown, generally bounded by Hamilton Street to the west, Parkside Drive to the north, Main Street to the east and the rear lot lines of the properties on the north side of John Street West.

Cultural Heritage Value

Waterdown Memorial Park has cultural heritage value as a cultural heritage landscape due to its design and physical value, historical and associative value, and its contextual value.

Waterdown Memorial Park has physical value as it is representative of a park focused on recreational and athletic facilities within the community of Waterdown and for its remnant topography from the period of resource extraction. While recreational facilities and built features within the park itself have changed over the years, mature vegetation and trees are extant along the east and south property lines, and the original entrance gates remain extant along the east property line. Views from the east entrance gate on Main Street North into the interior of Waterdown Memorial Park are still extant.

Waterdown Memorial Park also has historical and associative value, as it was established in the mid-twentieth century as a memorial to Second World War veterans and as parkland to provide a place for community recreation and events. The park is associated with members of the Lion’s Club, Waterdown Amateur Athletic Association (W.A.A.A.), the Waterdown Women’s Institute, and the Waterdown Board of Trade (formerly the Waterdown Business Men’s Association). Waterdown Memorial Park is directly associated with the theme of athletics and recreation in Waterdown and the City of Hamilton. The park’s contextual value is derived from the topography, recreational elements within the park, its size and landmark presence within a mixed-use area and along Main Street, a historical residential streetscape. The park is historically, physically, functionally, and visually linked to its surroundings at the northwest corner of the Village of Waterdown.
Several elements within the park, including the Lion’s Club picnic shelter, Rotary Club clock, and Queen’s Bench, as well as an ongoing public art project, speak to the community’s pride and stewardship of the park. The east entrance gate feature contains engraved stone plaques identifying those involved in the park’s creation, and the name of the park serves as a memorial to the Waterdown lives lost during the Second World War. Referred to as “Waterdown’s Public Backyard” and written about by local history groups, many recreational and community events are held with the park throughout the year. The park has historically been the site of the annual fall fair and a farmers’ market. Waterdown Memorial Park is also identified in the Urban Hamilton Official Plan which includes policies that speak to public parks.

Cultural Heritage Attributes

- The size and boundary of the park.
- The stone entrance feature with wrought-iron gates, stone pillars, and engraved stone plaques.
- Mature trees lining the east and south property lines, and which screen the park from surrounding uses.
- Views from the east entrance gate on Main Street North into the interior of Waterdown Memorial Park.
- Commemorative features such as the name of the park, the red maple tree, and the “Queen’s Bench.”
6.0 Proposed Boundary

The proposed boundary for the Waterdown Memorial Park Cultural Heritage Landscape is as follows:

- The existing boundary of Waterdown Memorial Park located between Parkside Drive to the north, Main Street East to the east, the rear property lines of properties along John Street to the south, and Hamilton Street North to the west.

Figure 41: Proposed boundary for the Waterdown Memorial Park Cultural Heritage Landscape.
Waterdown Union Cemetery

1.0 Introduction

Waterdown Union Cemetery is located at 9 Margaret Street, north of Dundas Street East, in the community of Waterdown (Figure 1). Waterdown Union Cemetery has been an active municipal cemetery since 1830. It is currently situated within a residential neighbourhood, on a rise overlooking Grindstone Creek to the west, and contains approximately 1,010 monuments (Hamilton 2014). While roadways and lot patterns in Waterdown are oriented in a northwest-southeast axis, the study area will be described in a north-south orientation for ease of description. Dundas Street East will be described as travelling east-west, with the cemetery located north of Dundas Street.

![Figure 1: Location of the Waterdown Union Cemetery CHL within the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan study area.](image)

2.0 Historical Summary

Waterdown contains three cemeteries, the oldest of which is Waterdown Union Cemetery. The other two, located west of Grindstone Creek, are St. Thomas Roman Catholic Cemetery (c. 1846) and Grace Anglican Cemetery (c. 1847). The oldest burial recorded on a monument at the Union Cemetery is for young Mabel Robina, daughter of Samuel and Maggie Mitchell, who died May 16, 1830, at age 1 year 3 months. A dozen other burials date to the 1830s. The oldest
section sits on the west side of the property overlooking Grindstone Creek and contains the names of Waterdown’s earliest pioneer families including Baker, Stock, Griffin, Cummer, and McGregor (Waterdown-East Flamborough Heritage Society 2020).

The name Union Cemetery is thought to come from the cemetery’s origins as a shared property of the early Presbyterian Church and the Episcopal Methodist Church. These two churches were located near each other at the top of Vinegar Hill and shared the cost of maintaining the cemetery (Ontario Genealogical Society 2006; Waterdown-East Flamborough Heritage Society 2020). It is recorded that a village schoolhouse was built on part of the property in 1827 and was used by the Methodists on Sunday morning and the Presbyterians in the afternoon (Waterdown-East Flamborough Heritage Society 2020).

Ebenezer C. Griffin acquired 200 acres of land from Alexander Brown of Concession 3, Lot 6 in East Flamborough including Union Cemetery which was approximately five acres. Griffin’s town plan was extended from what had been previously laid out in 1831 in Concession 3, Lot 7. In 1843 the cemetery property was purchased from E.C. Griffin by George Bush. In 1846 the property was transferred to the Trustees of the Waterdown Chapel and in 1849 another parcel of land was sold by Absolom Griffin, mill owner and brother of E.C. Griffin, to the Trustees of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, increasing the size of the property (Waterdown-East Flamborough Heritage Society 2020).

On January 1, 1877, the Trustees sold the cemetery to the Waterdown Cemetery Company for $400. At that time, the property is recorded as The Waterdown Burying Ground. In 1878, the first annual meeting of the cemetery company took place. At that time, the price of full lots were two dollars each and one dollar for single graves. In 1888, C. Teeple was appointed caretaker of the cemetery and was responsible for the clean-up and filling of graves and keeping them in proper condition. The charges increased to three dollars for full-size plots and two dollars for children under 12 years of ages.

In 1915, a community of women were thanked in the cemetery account books for the “careful and painstaking way in which they have beautified the grounds and also upon the digging of a well which was very much needed and also for the installing of a pump and for water furnishing basins.” The pump was still extant in 1977 (Ontario Genealogical Society 2006). The cemetery was managed by the Cemetery Board of the Village of Waterdown as of 1977.

Mapping of the area from the nineteenth and twentieth century provides a general understanding of the evolution of the property boundaries and the surrounding area. The cemetery is indicated on the 1854 Map of the Village of Waterdown drawn by Henry Winter (Figure 2). It is approximately 2.5 acres and consists of only the southwest portion of the existing cemetery boundaries. Four residential lots are drawn on the east side of George Street, now known as Margaret Street. The 1875 Village of Waterdown map shows the cemetery with the same boundaries and generally the same surrounding land divisions as 1854 (Figure 3). This

6 General histories of the Village of Waterdown do not mention a schoolhouse in Vinegar Hill.
map only depicts commercial, industrial, and religious buildings in the village and shows a sawmill (noted as S. Mill) adjacent to the cemetery in Lot 3. In 1905, the cemetery’s northern boundary was extended northward to its current location and the southeast corner was extended into Lot 8 (Figure 4). The surrounding context appears to have remained the same except for the sawmill being replaced by the name Mary Snow. On this map, several names are highlighted throughout the village. It is unclear, however, how these specific names were chosen, and secondary sources do not reference Mary Snow.

Figure 2: Plan for the area which is now Union Cemetery as drawn in 1854 (Winter 1854).
Figure 3: Boundary of cemetery and surrounding area with adjacent sawmill, 1875 (Page & Smith 1875a).

Figure 4: Northward and southeast corner expansions of the cemetery, 1903 (Tyrrell 1903).
A photograph taken looking east across Grindstone Creek, which is undated but pre-dates the railway line built in 1911, shows the cemetery in the background on the rise out of the creek valley (Figure 5). The cemetery has numerous prominent gravestones. The Vance house and some milling operations are shown in the middle ground of the photograph. A photograph taken c. 1911 during the construction of the railway line looking across Grindstone Creek shows the cemetery location at the top of the valley (Figure 6). A fence marking the southern boundary of the cemetery and leading into the valley, separating the grounds from William Street located south, is visible in the photograph. An undated photograph taken looking west into the cemetery from the William Street provides detail of the grounds (Figure 7). The Waterdown Union Cemetery in this image features stone gravestones with no clear or discernable rows or patterns. The grassed grounds have a slightly undulating topography and mature trees line the border.

Figure 5: Looking east across Grindstone Creek with Vance house in the right middle ground and Waterdown Union Cemetery in the background on the rise out of the creek valley, pre-1911 (Flamborough Archives, Will Reid Collection).
Figure 6: View of the Waterdown Union Cemetery from across Grindstone Creek during construction of the railway, c. 1911 (Flamborough Archives, Will Reid Collection c. 1911)

Figure 7: Looking west into Waterdown Union Cemetery from the entrance on William Street, undated (Flamborough Archives, Will Reid Collection n.d.)
National topographic mapping through the twentieth century provides information on buildings which surrounded the cemetery. In 1909, the sawmill depicted in the nineteenth century is shown for the last time on historical mapping and houses are shown on the east and west sides of present Margaret Street and along Dundas Street (Figure 8). In 1919, the houses on the west side of present Margaret Street are no longer extant and the cemetery is drawn as it had been previously (Figure 9). The railway line is shown in 1919 with the Vance house in use as the railway station. In 1943, there is one house on the west side of present Margaret Street within the present cemetery boundaries and there is increased density of houses on Dundas Street (Figure 10).

Figure 8: Union Cemetery and surrounding area, 1909 (Department of Militia and Defence 1909).
Figure 9: Union Cemetery and surrounding area, 1919 (DMD 1919).

Figure 10: Union Cemetery and surrounding area, 1943 (Department of National Defence 1943)
The 1954 aerial photography is not clear enough to describe specific details however within the present cemetery boundaries, on the west side of Margaret Street, the land appears generally clear of buildings and trees except the northeast corner (Figure 11). The Waterdown Garden Subdivision (Registered Plan 894, 1954) which ultimately extended Margaret Street northward appears to be under construction on former agricultural land. By 1963 the subdivision is complete, and the cemetery boundaries correspond to today’s property boundaries. The building at the northwest corner of the cemetery remains in 1963 (Figure 12). The buildings shown along the east bank of Grindstone Creek and the railway on the 1963 map are no longer extant.

Figure 11: Union Cemetery and surrounding area, 1954 (Hunting Survey Corporation Limited 1954).

Figure 12: Union Cemetery and surrounding area, 1963 (Natural Resources Canada 1963)
3.0 Existing Conditions

Union Cemetery is bound to the east by Margaret Street, to the north by Margaret Street Park, to the west by Grindstone Creek, and to the south by William Street and a residential property fronting William Street (Figure 13 to Figure 15 and Figure 20). Access to the grounds is granted by an entrance on Margaret Street and a second entrance on William Street, where that roadway transitions from a north-south to an east-west orientation (Figure 16 and Figure 18). An internal paved roadway connects the Margaret Street entrance to the William Street entrance, which also indicates the former eastern boundary of the oldest part of the cemetery (Figure 17). The roadway, with mature trees growing along its west side, was likely a continued path to the grounds from William Street before the cemetery expanded north and eastward. The location of the entrance on Margaret Street also points to the likely location of the southern boundary of the residential parcel that occupied the northeast corner of the cemetery into the twentieth century.

The William Street entrance has a turnstile pedestrian entry (Figure 19). Wrought iron and metal fencing borders the eastern and southern limits of the cemetery grounds. A concrete sidewalk runs along the east fence, parallel with Margaret Street (Figure 21). There is a break in the fence on the southeast corner to accommodate a granite slab sign incised to read “Union Cemetery” and placed on an angle on the corner (Figure 22). The northern border and a portion of the western border of the cemetery have chain-link fencing (Figure 23 and Figure 24). The cemetery grounds feature a slightly undulating, rolling topography that gradually slopes towards the west edge of where the forested area drops into the Grindstone Creek valley. Mature trees and occasional hedges dot the landscape within.

Margaret Street Park, located north of the cemetery, contains a playground and open lawn. The area to the east and south of the cemetery is residential consisting of primarily single-detached residences. West of the cemetery is a forested area that slopes into a valley formed by Grindstone Creek. The rail line that runs along the east of the creek is also visible from the cemetery grounds through the trees.
Figure 13: Looking north on Margaret Street with Union Cemetery on the west side (left) (ASI 2020).

Figure 14: Margaret Street Park, looking northwest (ASI 2020).

Figure 15: William Street, looking north towards the change in road direction and the cemetery (ASI 2020).

Figure 16: Looking west towards the Margaret Street cemetery entrance (ASI 2020).

Figure 17: Looking south along the internal paved roadway towards the William Street entrance (ASI 2020).

Figure 18: William Street cemetery entrance, looking north (ASI 2020).
Figure 19: Pedestrian entrance to the cemetery from William Street (ASI 2020).

Figure 20: Looking west towards the cemetery (left) and Margaret Street Park (right) (ASI 2020).

Figure 21: Concrete sidewalk located along the east perimeter fence, adjacent to Margaret Street (ASI 2020).

Figure 22: Granite sign located on the southeast corner of the cemetery, looking northwest (ASI 2020).

Figure 23: Chain-link fence on the northern border of the grounds (ASI 2020).

Figure 24: Chain-link fence that lines a portion of the western border, showing
proximity to the rail line and Grindstone Creek to the west (ASI 2020).

The southwest corner of the grounds, representing the oldest section of the cemetery, overlooks Grindstone Creek and contains rows of gravestones, which are somewhat unevenly spaced and, in some places, have fallen over (Figure 25 and Figure 27). A dirt roadway cuts through the grounds from the internal paved roadway west towards the rail line and Grindstone Creek (Figure 28). A dirt pile is located at the west terminus of this dirt roadway. North of the dirt roadway and west of the paved roadway is another section of older cemetery ground. Like the plots in the southwest corner, this section features rows of gravestones that are occasionally unevenly spaced (Figure 29 and Figure 30). A small concrete mausoleum is also located in the northwest corner of this section of the cemetery (Figure 31). On the east half of the cemetery grounds, separated from the earlier sections by the paved internal roadway, the gravestones and plots are more regularly placed and spaced closer together (Figure 32 and Figure 33). Several memorial benches are located along the north end of this east portion of the grounds (Figure 34).

Figure 25: Looking north along the west boundary of the grounds from the oldest section of the cemetery (ASI 2020).

Figure 26: Southwest section of the cemetery, looking northeast (ASI 2019).
Figure 27: Southwest section looking west towards Grindstone Creek (ASI 2020).

Figure 28: Looking west towards Grindstone Creek with internal dirt roadway on left (ASI 2020).

Figure 29: Northwest section of the cemetery, north of the internal dirt road, looking west (ASI 2020).

Figure 30: Looking south along the west (older) half of the cemetery grounds (ASI 2020).
Figure 31: Small concrete mausoleum located in the northeast corner of the oldest section of the cemetery, looking northeast (ASI 2020).

Figure 32: Northeast section of the grounds, looking east towards the residential properties on the other side of Margaret Street (ASI 2020).

Figure 33: East section of the grounds, looking southwest from Margaret Street (ASI 2020).

Figure 34: Memorial benches located on the north boundary of the cemetery grounds (ASI 2020).

4.0 Cultural Heritage Evaluation

The following evaluation of Waterdown Union Cemetery as a cultural heritage landscape uses the City’s “A Framework for Evaluating the Cultural Heritage Value or Interest of Property for Designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act” which provides categorized criteria which expands upon, and is consistent with, Ontario Regulation 9/06. These criteria were developed for cultural heritage landscapes.
4.1 Historical Associations

Themes

Criterion 1: How well does the cultural heritage landscape illustrate one or more historical themes representative of cultural processes in the development and/or use of land in the context of the community, province, or nation?

Meets criterion.

The cemetery illustrates the themes of settlement and community spaces in East Flamborough beginning in 1830. The cemetery is significant as the earliest cemetery in the community. The active use of the cemetery through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and into the twenty-first century demonstrates the continuation of Waterdown as a village of significance within East Flamborough and the City of Hamilton.

Event

Criterion 2: Is the cultural landscape associated with a specific event that has made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation?

Does not meet criterion.

The area is not associated with any specific events which made a significant contribution to the community, province, or nation.

Person and/or Group

Criterion 3: Is the cultural landscape associated with the life or activities of a person, group, organization, or institution that has made a significant contribution to the community, province or nation?

Meets criterion.

The cemetery is historically associated with the Presbyterian and Methodist churches which jointly maintained the cemetery and from which the name Union originates. While many significant members of the Waterdown community are buried here, the cemetery is not associated with their contributions to the community.

4.2 Scenic Amenity

Sense of Place

Criterion 4: Does the cultural heritage landscape provide the observer(s) with a strong sense of position or place?
Meets criterion.

The Union Cemetery provides observers with a strong sense of the community’s location on Grindstone Creek with its prominent siting on a ridge overlooking the creek.

**Serial Vision**

*Criterion 5: Does the cultural heritage landscape provide the observer(s) with opportunities for serial vision along paths of pedestrian or vehicular movement?*

Does not meet criterion.

The cemetery is a very open landscape and does not provide opportunities for serial vision. There are no views of significance identified within the cemetery.

**Material Content**

*Criterion 6: Is the cultural heritage landscape visually satisfying or pleasing to the observer(s) in terms of colour, texture, style, and scale?*

Meets criterion.

The cemetery is visually satisfying with its stepped topography and siting above Grindstone Creek, the age and variety of vegetation, and the long history which provides a variety of scales, textures, and styles of gravestones throughout the cemetery.

### 4.3 Integrity

*Criterion 7: Is it all there?*

Meets criterion.

The cemetery has historical integrity in its location and siting on Grindstone Creek and its relationships with adjacent William Street. The cemetery has been in active use since the first burial in 1830 and while the cemetery has expanded overtime to remain active it maintains all the component parts which exhibit its long history. Union Cemetery has historical integrity.

### 4.4 Design

*Criterion 8: Has the landscape been purposefully designed or planned?*

Does not meet criterion.

The cemetery has not been purposefully designed. It has been laid out organically in relation to the surrounding area and has replaced residential properties along the west side of Margaret Street as it has grown.
4.5 Social Value

Public Perception

Criterion 9: Is the landscape regarded as having importance within the City?

Meets criterion.

The cemetery is described within a discussion of Vinegar Hill in Sylvia Wray’s book Dundas Street: Waterdown 1793-1993. The cemetery has importance within the City for its long history and continuing activity.

4.6 Ontario Regulation 9/06

Table 10: Cultural Heritage Evaluation of Waterdown Union Cemetery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value: <em>is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a landscape</em></td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value: <em>High degree of design/aesthetic appeal</em></td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design/Physical Value: <em>High Degree Technical/Scientific Interest</em></td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/Associative Value: <em>Direct Association with a Theme, Event, Person, etc.</em></td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical or Associative Value: <em>contributes to an understanding of a community/culture</em></td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.1.1, 4.1.2, and 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/Associative Value: <em>Reflects work or ideas of architect, artist, builder, etc.</em></td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value: <em>Important in defining character of area</em></td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.2.1 and 4.2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value: <em>Historically, physically, functionally or visually linked to surroundings</em></td>
<td>Meets criterion. See Section 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, and 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Value: <em>Landmark</em></td>
<td>Does not meet criterion. See Section 4.3 and 4.5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.7 Evaluation Summary

This cultural heritage evaluation of Waterdown Union Cemetery concludes that the property has cultural heritage value or interest for physical reasons, historical associations, and context. A Statement of Significance is presented in Section 5.0.

5.0 Statement of Significance

Description of Property

Waterdown Union Cemetery is an active cemetery in Waterdown, located at 9 Margaret Street, north of Dundas Street East along the east bank of the Grindstone Creek.

Cultural Heritage Value

Waterdown Union Cemetery is of cultural heritage value as the earliest cemetery established in the Village of Waterdown with the first burial taking place in 1830. A dozen other burials took place in the 1830s and the cemetery has been active throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and into the twenty-first century with approximately 1,010 burials. The cemetery is sited on the rise over Grindstone Creek which historically provided views of the cemetery from the west bank of the creek due to tree cutting in the area. Much of the vegetation has grown back providing a landscaped screen between the cemetery and Grindstone Creek in some areas. Its stepped topography, the age and variety of vegetation, and the long history which provides a variety of scales, textures, and styles of gravestones throughout the cemetery contributes to its aesthetic appeal. A row of maple trees borders the main north-south pathways through the cemetery providing an orienting feature within the cemetery and aesthetic appeal.

The cemetery contains burials of both historically significant and common members of the community; Together, these burials and associated gravestones provide important insights into the history of Waterdown. The cemetery provides an understanding of the settlement and development of Waterdown as a village through the nineteenth century to the present. The cemetery was established and maintained through a collaboration between the Presbyterian and Methodist churches from which its name, Union, originates. Vinegar Hill was one of the earliest areas of the village to develop in the 1820-1840 period. The cemetery is a remnant of this period in Vinegar Hill’s history. The cemetery is physically, functionally, visually, and historically linked to William Street which provides the earliest and primary access point to the cemetery as represented by the iron gate and turnstile. The cemetery is also physically, visually, and historically linked to Grindstone Creek with the earliest sections of the cemetery siting closest and looking over the creek.

Cultural Heritage Attributes

- The siting of the cemetery on the east bank and overlooking Grindstone Creek.
The three entrances to the cemetery at William Street and Margaret Street.
- The iron fence including three entrance gates and one turnstile.
- The L-shaped laneway through the property connecting William Street and Margaret Street which delineates the gradual expansion of the cemetery property through its alignment with historical property boundaries.
- The line of trees on the west side of the north-south laneway and along Margaret Street.
- The mix of coniferous and deciduous trees and shrubs throughout the cemetery.
- The general arrangement of the cemetery with burials facing east and west and arranged with the oldest sections to the west and newest to the east.
- The terraced land stepping down towards Grindstone Creek.
- The mausoleum, gravestones, monuments, and burial sites.

6.0 Proposed Boundary

The proposed boundary for the Waterdown Union Cemetery Cultural Heritage Landscape is as follows:

- The parcel boundaries for 9 Margaret Street.

Figure 35: Proposed boundary for the Waterdown Union Cemetery Cultural Heritage Landscape.
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