

CBM AGGREGATES

HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

1420 CHARLESTON SIDEROAD, TOWN OF CALEDON,
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF PEEL, ONTARIO

ORIGINAL REPORT: JULY 28, 2023

UPDATED REPORT: SEPTEMBER 19, 2025

SECOND UPDATED REPORT: FEBRUARY 26, 2026





HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

1420 CHARLESTON
SIDEROAD, TOWN OF
CALEDON, REGIONAL
MUNICIPALITY OF PEEL,
ONTARIO

CBM AGGREGATES

PROJECT NO.: OCUL2216

ORIGINAL REPORT: JULY 28, 2023

UPDATED REPORT: SEPTEMBER 19, 2025

SECOND UPDATED REPORT: FEBRUARY 26, 2026

WSP

WSP.COM

SIGNATURES

PREPARED BY



Johanna Kelly, M.Sc. CAHP
Cultural Heritage Specialist

July 28, 2023 (Original Report)
September 19, 2025 (Updated Report)
February 26, 2026 (Updated Report)
Date


REVIEWED¹ BY



Henry Cary, PhD, CAHP, RPA
Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist

July 28, 2023 (Original Report)
September 19, 2025 (Updated Report)
February 26, 2026 (Updated Report)
Date

APPROVED² BY



Heidi Schopf, MES, CAHP
Cultural Heritage Team Lead

July 28, 2023 (Original Report)
September 19, 2025 (Updated Report)
February 26, 2026 (Updated Report)
Date

¹ Approval of this document is an administrative function indicating readiness for release and does not impart legal liability on to the Approver for any technical content contained herein. Technical accuracy and fit-for-purpose of this content is obtained through the review process. The Approver shall ensure the applicable review process has occurred prior to signing the document.

² Approval of this document is an administrative function indicating readiness for release and does not impart legal liability on to the Approver for any technical content contained herein. Technical accuracy and fit-for-purpose of this content is obtained through the review process. The Approver shall ensure the applicable review process has occurred prior to signing the document.

PROJECT PERSONNEL

WSP

Project Manager:	Heather Melcher (2023) Ana Ricon Gomez, MES, BSc. (2025)
Cultural Heritage Specialists:	Johanna Kelly, M.Sc., CAHP Chelsea Dickinson, B.A. Hons. Robert Pinchin, B.A. Hons, CAHP Intern
Report Preparation:	Johanna Kelly, M.Sc., CAHP
Graphics:	Shannon Orellana
Report Reviewers:	Henry Cary, Ph.D., CAHP, RPA Heidy Schopf, MES, CAHP

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Senior Heritage Planner Town of Caledon	Sally Drummond, MA, CAHP
Heritage Planner, Town of Caledon	Cassandra Jasinski, MA, CAHP
Acting Provincial Heritage Registrar, Ontario Heritage Trust	Kevin Baksh
Team Lead, Heritage Planning Unit, Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism	Karla Barboza, MCIP, RPP, CAHP

ABBREVIATIONS

BHR	Built Heritage Resource
CHER	Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report
CHIS	Cultural Heritage Impact Statement
CHL	Cultural Heritage Landscape
CHVI	Cultural Heritage Value or Interest
HCP	Heritage Conservation Plan
HIA	Heritage Impact Assessment
MCM	Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism
OHA	<i>Ontario Heritage Act</i>
PHP	Provincial Heritage Property
PPS	Provincial Planning Statement
SCHVI	Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

GLOSSARY

UPDATE No. 1 (September 2025): Note that Glossary definitions relating to the Provincial Planning Statement (originally Provincial Policy Statement 2020, now 2024) have been updated for this Updated Report (2025) to reflect changes in policy since the original HIA submission (2023).

Adjacent lands	Those lands contiguous to a protected heritage property or as otherwise defined in the municipal official plan (PPS 2024).
Built Heritage Resource:	Means a building, structure, monument, installation or any manufactured or constructed part or remnant that contributes to a property's cultural heritage value or interest as identified by a community, including an Indigenous community (PPS 2024).
Conserved:	Means the identification, protection, management and use of built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources in a manner that ensures their cultural heritage value or interest is retained. This may be achieved by the implementation of recommendations set out in a conservation plan, archaeological assessment, and/or heritage impact assessment that has been approved, accepted or adopted by the relevant planning authority and/or decision maker. Mitigative measures and/or alternative development approaches can be included in these plans and assessments (PPS 2024).
Cultural Heritage Landscape:	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 Indigenous community. The area may include features such as buildings, structures, spaces, views, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or association (PPS 2024).
Heritage Attributes:	Means, as defined under the Ontario Heritage Act, in relation to real property, and to the buildings and structures on the real property, the attributes of the property, buildings and structures that contribute to their cultural heritage value or interest (PPS 2024).
Protected Heritage Property:	Means property designated under Part IV or VI of the Ontario Heritage Act; property included in an area designated as a heritage conservation district under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act; property subject to a heritage conservation easement or covenant under Part II or IV of the Ontario Heritage Act; property identified by a provincial ministry or a prescribed public body as a property having cultural heritage value or interest under the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties; property protected under federal heritage legislation; and UNESCO World Heritage Sites (PPS 2024).
Significant:	Means in regard to cultural heritage and archaeology, resources that have been determined to have cultural heritage value or interest. Processes and criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest are established by the Province under the authority of the Ontario Heritage Act (PPS 2024).

UPDATES

UPDATE NO. 1 (SEPTEMBER 2025)

This report has been produced to update the original submission made in July 2023. Specifically, updates to the July 2023 report include:

- 1 Revisions made in response to comments received from Heritage Planning staff at the Town of Caledon dated March 18, 2025.*
- 2 Updates made to address new relevant provincial policies and regulatory frameworks.*
- 3 Updates to address changes in the status of the subject property, namely the Town's issuance of a Notice of Intention to Designate (NOID) on March 12, 2024 and the subsequent work and monthly discussions, since June 2024, that have occurred with Heritage Planning staff following the issuance of the NOID.*

UPDATE NO. 2 (FEBRUARY 2026)

This report has been produced to update the submission made in September 2025. Specifically, updates to the September 2025 report include:

- 1 Revisions made in response to comments received from Heritage Planning staff at the Town of Caledon dated December 21, 2025.*
- 2 Recommendation #9 has been added to guide heritage conservation recommendations that must be included on the ARA Site Plan Technical Recommendations.*

Where updates have been made, this is indicated with an emphasis box, as modelled here. Editorial updates in response to Town of Caledon comments are identified in Appendix E.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

WSP Environment & Infrastructure Canada Limited (WSP) was retained by CBM Aggregates (CBM), a division of St. Marys Cement Inc. (Canada), to complete a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) for 1420 Charleston Sideroad in the Town of Caledon, Regional Municipality of Peel, Ontario (Study Area). The rectangular-shaped, 1.4-hectare (3.4-acre) Study Area is located on the northwest side of Charleston Sideroad, between Cataract Road/Main Street and Mississauga Road. The Study Area is surrounded on its other three sides by agricultural fields, which were originally associated with the Study Area. Within the Study Area is a two-storey red brick Italianate style residence constructed between 1891 and 1901 and with additions built in the 20th century. The Town of Caledon issued a Notice of Intention to Designate (NOID) for the Study Area under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* on March 12, 2024. The Study Area is not identified as a Cultural Heritage Landscape in the Town's Cultural Heritage Landscape Inventory (Scheinman 2009).

CBM proposes to develop the Study Area as part of the 261.2-hectare CBM Caledon Pit / Quarry site licensed under the *Aggregate Resources Act* and designated or zoned under the *Planning Act* (the Project). A Cultural Heritage Report: Existing Conditions and Preliminary Impact Assessment (Cultural Heritage Report) completed for the Project determined that the Study Area may meet the criteria prescribed in Ontario Regulation 9/06 (O. Reg. 9/06, amended through O. Reg. 569/22) of the *Ontario Heritage Act* and recommended an HIA to address the Project's potential impacts to the Study Area's potential heritage attributes (WSP 2022).

The preparation of this HIA was guided by the Town's *Terms of Reference for Heritage Impact Assessment* (Town of Caledon 2019) and Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) *Ontario Heritage Tool Kit InfoSheet #5* (2006b) and *Heritage Property Evaluation: A Guide to Listing, Researching, and Evaluating Cultural Heritage Property in Ontario Communities* (2006a). The HIA was also informed by guidance provide in the *MCM Standards & Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties: Heritage Identification and Evaluation Process* (MCM 2014) and Canada's *Historic Places Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada* (Canada's Historic Places 2010).

An evaluation of the Study Area determined that the Study Area has CHVI because it meets four criteria prescribed in O. Reg 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (1, 2, 7, and 8). The Study Area's CHVI is principally linked to its farmhouse, which has physical value as a well-preserved representative example of an Italianate style farmhouse with a high degree of craftsmanship in its detailing and contextual value for its physical and historical connections to the locally significant Cameron family, and since it is important in defining, maintaining, and supporting the agricultural and rural character of the area.

An impact assessment of the proposed work determined that the Study Area will be subject to both direct and indirect negative impacts. To avoid or reduce these effects, WSP recommends to:

- **Adaptive re-use of the farmhouse as an office/laboratory site for the quarry operations, to be converted back to its original use after extraction operations are complete.**

UPDATE No. 1 (September 2025): The following recommendations have been updated to respond to comments received from Town of Caledon Heritage Planning staff, regulatory updates, and project progression since the July 2023 submission. In particular, the status of the property's designation process under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, the preparation of a draft reference plan to delineate limits of heritage attributes and the proposed details and timing of conservation measures have been updated and included to reflect monthly meetings with the Town, ongoing since June 2024, and comments received on the July 2023 submission on March 18, 2025.

UPDATE No. 2 (February 2026): As part of the updated report submission, recommendation #9 has been added to guide heritage conservation recommendations that must be included on the ARA Site Plan Technical Recommendations.

To achieve this conservation strategy, the following mitigation measures are recommended:

- 1 If the property is vacated before the site-specific mitigation measures are implemented, a qualified specialist shall develop a mothball plan for the farmhouse, with a maintenance and inspection schedule, to conserve the structure until further action is implemented.
- 2 The limit of extraction has been revised as shown on Figure 12 and Appendix B to accommodate the 50 m buffer to protect the heritage attributes of the property from potential adverse impacts as a result from construction related activity. This no-go zone shall be indicated on all project mapping and communicated to project personnel.
 - a Prior to site preparation, erect fencing around the property and clearly identify the area on project mapping and via signage as a 'no-go zone' during adjacent mineral aggregate operation activities to reduce the risk of accidental damage from vehicles, heavy equipment operation, or other activities of the mineral aggregate operation.
- 3 Vibration impacts:
 - a Implement the recommendations of the blast impact assessment to ensure the structural integrity of the farmhouse is maintained.
 - b Vibration from blasting activities will potentially impact the heritage attributes identified for this property. To avoid or reduce the risk of vibrations resulting in adverse impact and ensure the structural integrity of the heritage attributes is maintained, the vibration monitoring protocol developed by a qualified vibration specialist shall be implemented during the activities of the mineral aggregate operation. Should the vibration threshold be exceeded, blasting designs which are affecting the receptors must be reassessed to determine appropriate next steps.
- 4 Fugitive dust impacts:
 - a The application has been designed to meet provincial blasting limits and air quality guidelines. CBM has conducted air quality monitoring in the vicinity of the site. Overall the air quality is consistently below provincial guidelines, taking into account the existing aggregate operations and the existing truck traffic in the area. With the addition of the proposed CBM Caledon Pit / Quarry operations, including emissions from aggregate trucks accessing the site, the air quality is still predicted to be below provincial guidelines at surrounding residences.
 - b Implement the recommendations of the Air Quality Impact Assessment (WSP 2023), Best Management Practices Plan for the Control of Fugitive Dust (WSP 2025a), and Air Quality Monitoring Plan (WSP 2025b).
- 5 A Heritage Documentation Report and Salvage Plan shall be conducted for the property with a focus on the barn foundation ruins on the property.

- a Options should be explored which retain the barn foundation ruins. If the barn foundation ruins are retained in situ, a Heritage Documentation Report and Salvage Plan is not required.
- 6 Develop a Heritage Conservation Plan for the farmhouse prior to use of the farmhouse as office or laboratory space to guide the adaptive re-use efforts and outline how the heritage attributes of the structure will be conserved, protected, and enhanced during the rehabilitation program and into the future.
- 7 Once adjacent mineral aggregate operation activities are complete, during final rehabilitation of the site, remove any protective measures implemented during the time the farmhouse is used as an office/laboratory site (Recommendation 2a) and rehabilitate the farmhouse for a compatible existing or new use.
- 8 As the evaluation of the farmhouse and its associated parcel determined that the property meets two or more criteria under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, it is eligible for designation under Part IV. Consider designating the farmhouse and a portion of the parcel associated with the heritage attributes under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.
 - a *It is acknowledged as part of this updated report that the Town has issued a NOID for the property. Accordingly, WSP has facilitated the development of a Draft Reference Plan (R-Plan) to guide the limits of the future Part IV Designation (Appendix F)*
- 9 Add the following notes to the ARA Site Plan Technical Recommendations to establish required conservation measures for 1420 Charleston Sideroad that shall be tracked by the Ministry of Natural Resources as part of the CBM Caledon Pit / Quarry site license:

In order to conserve the heritage attributes located at 1420 Charleston Sideroad the licensee shall:

1. During operations, the farmhouse shall be adaptively re-used as an office/laboratory site for the quarry operations. Prior to the surrender of the license, the building shall be converted back to its original use.
2. To conserve the farmhouse at 1420 Charleston Sideroad, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:
 - a. If the property is vacated prior to converting the farmhouse to an office/laboratory a qualified specialist shall develop a mothball plan for the farmhouse, with a maintenance and inspection schedule, to conserve the structure until further action is implemented.
 - b. The limit of extraction shall include a 50 m buffer from the farmhouse to protect the heritage attributes of the property.
 - c. Prior to site preparation, the licensee shall erect fencing at the 50 m buffer to identify a 'no-go zone' to reduce the risk of accidental damage from vehicles, heavy equipment operation, or other activities of the mineral aggregate operation.
 - d. Implement the recommendations of the blast impact assessment to ensure the structural integrity of the farmhouse is maintained.
 - e. A Heritage Conservation Plan shall be prepared for the farmhouse prior to use of the farmhouse as an office or laboratory space to guide the adaptive re-use efforts and outline how the heritage attributes of the structure will be conserved, protected, and enhanced during the rehabilitation phase and into the future.
 - f. Prior to the surrender of the license, remove any temporary protective measures implemented during the time the farmhouse is used as an office/laboratory site and rehabilitate the farmhouse back to its original use.

Provided that the recommendations contained in this report are implemented, the applicable Ontario Heritage Act, PPS 2024, Aggregate Resources Act, and Regional and Municipal Official Plan policies related to built heritage are satisfied.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Background.....	1
1.2	Scope.....	1
2	METHODOLOGY	5
2.1	Regulatory Requirements.....	5
2.1.1	Aggregate Resources Act.....	5
2.1.2	Provincial Planning Statement.....	5
2.1.3	Ontario Heritage Act.....	6
2.1.4	Region of Peel Official Plan	7
2.1.5	Town of Caledon Official Plan	8
2.2	Guidance Documents	10
2.2.1	Provincial Guidance	10
2.2.2	Town of Caledon Heritage Impact Assessment Terms of Reference	11
2.3	Background Research	11
2.4	Information Gathering.....	11
2.5	Field Review	11
2.6	Cultural Heritage Evaluation	11
2.7	Impact Assessment.....	12
2.8	Mitigation Measures	12
3	HISTORICAL CONTEXT	13
3.1	Physiography.....	13
3.2	Indigenous History	13
3.3	Township Survey and Settlement.....	15
3.3.1	Peel County	15
3.3.2	Town of Caledon and the former Township of Caledon.....	15
3.4	Study Area History	16
3.4.1	Land Use History	16
3.4.2	20th- and 21st-Century Mapping and Aerial Imagery	19
3.4.3	Summary of Property History	20

4	EXISTING CONDITIONS	29
4.1	Information Gathering.....	29
4.2	Field Review Results.....	29
4.2.1	Location Context	29
4.2.2	Landscape Context	31
4.2.3	Farmhouse.....	35
4.2.4	Interpretation	46
4.2.5	Analysis of Physical Conditions and Heritage Integrity	48
5	EVALUATION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST	52
5.1	Ontario Regulation 9/06	52
5.1.1	Design or Physical Value	53
5.1.2	Historical or Associative Values	53
5.1.3	Contextual Value	53
5.1.4	Summary	54
5.2	Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest	54
5.2.1	Description of Property	54
5.2.2	Proposed Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest.....	54
5.2.3	Heritage Attributes	54
6	IMPACT ASSESSMENT	56
6.1	Description of Proposed Work.....	56
6.2	Assessment of Potential Impacts	56
6.3	Summary of Potential Impacts	58
7	CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES.....	59
7.1	Option 1: Retention of the Building on-site in its original use	59
7.2	Option 2: Adaptive reuse	59
7.3	Option 3: Relocation and Rehabilitation	60
7.4	Option 4: Salvage and Commemoration	61
7.5	Summary	61



8	SUMMARY STATEMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS	65
9	ASSESSOR QUALIFICATIONS	68
10	BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	69

TABLES

TABLE 1: LAND REGISTRY DATA FOR THE STUDY AREA (PART OF LOT 16, CONCESSION 4, W.H.S., CALEDON TOWNSHIP, PEEL COUNTY).....	16
TABLE 2: REVIEW OF 20TH CENTURY HISTORICAL MAPPING AND AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHS	20
TABLE 3: ANALYSIS OF PHYSICAL CONDITIONS....	48
TABLE 4: ANALYSIS OF HERITAGE INTEGRITY.....	50
TABLE 5: EVALUATION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST	52
TABLE 6: ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS TO 1420 CHARLESTON SIDEROAD	57
TABLE 7: POLICIES AND GUIDELINES MET AS PART OF THIS ASSESSMENT	62

FIGURES

FIGURE 1: LOCATION OF THE STUDY AREA.....	3
FIGURE 2: AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH SHOWING THE LOCATION OF THE STUDY AREA	4
FIGURE 3: 1859 HISTORICAL MAP	21
FIGURE 4: 1877 HISTORICAL MAP	22
FIGURE 5: 1937 HISTORICAL TOPOGRAPHIC MAP	23
FIGURE 6: 1952 TOPOGRAPHIC MAP	24
FIGURE 7: 1954 HISTORICAL AERIAL	25
FIGURE 8: 1973 HISTORICAL TOPOGRAPHIC MAP	26
FIGURE 9: 1994 HISTORICAL TOPOGRAPHIC MAP	27
FIGURE 10: EXISTING CONDITIONS AT 1420 CHARLESTON SIDEROAD	34
FIGURE 11: EXISTING CONDITIONS AT 1420 CHARLESTON SIDEROAD	38
FIGURE 12: PROPOSED 50 M BUFFER.....	64

PLATES

PLATE 1: HISTORICAL PHOTOGRAPH OF THE HOUSE AND OUTBUILDINGS, DATE UNKNOWN.....	18
PLATE 2: BARN FIRE, JULY 1964.....	19
PLATE 3: 1985 AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH SHOWING FARM COMPLEX.....	28

PLATE 4: 1996 AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH SHOWING FARM COMPLEX	28
PLATE 5: FARMSCAPE AT 18501 MISSISSAUGA ROAD.....	30
PLATE 6: TREE LINED DRIVEWAY AT 18667 MISSISSAUGA ROAD.....	30
PLATE 7: FARMHOUSE AT 18667 MISSISSAUGA ROAD.....	30
PLATE 8: FARMSCAPE AT 18722 MAIN STREET	31
PLATE 9: VIEW UP THE DRIVEWAY TOWARDS HOUSE, FACING NORTHWEST	32
PLATE 10: VIEW FROM THE REAR OF THE DRIVEWAY TOWARDS CHARLESTON SIDEROAD	32
PLATE 11: VEGETATIVE WINDBREAK ALONG SOUTHWEST BOUNDARY, LOOKING NORTHWEST	32
PLATE 12: LOW FIELDSTONE WALL ALONG THE SOUTHWEST SIDE OF THE STUDY AREA	32
PLATE 13: LATE 20 TH -CENTURY OUTBUILDING	32
PLATE 14: BARN FOUNDATION RUINS, LOOKING SOUTHWEST	33
PLATE 15: CLOSEUP OF INSCRIPTION ON BARN RUINS.....	33
PLATE 16: SOUTH (FRONT) ELEVATION, FACING CHARLESTON SIDEROAD	35
PLATE 17: EAST ELEVATION SHOWING THE ORIGINAL HOUSE (OUTLINED IN RED), REAR TAIL (OUTLINED IN GREEN) AND REAR/SIDE ADDITION (OUTLINED IN YELLOW).....	36
PLATE 18: NORTH (REAR) ELEVATION (REAR AND SIDE ADDITION VISIBLE ONLY)	36
PLATE 19: OBLIQUE VIEW OF NORTH AND WEST ELEVATIONS OF REAR AND SIDE ADDITIONS (OUTLINED IN YELLOW, ORIGINAL MAIN BLOCK IS OUTLINED IN RED)	37
PLATE 20: SOUTH PORTION OF THE WEST ELEVATION OF ORIGINAL MAIN BLOCK.....	37
PLATE 21: DETAIL OF THE LATE-19TH TO EARLY 20TH-CENTURY PHOTOGRAPH OF THE HOUSE.....	40
PLATE 22: OVERHANGING EAVES AND PAIRED BRACKET DETAIL	40
PLATE 23: MAIN BLOCK WINDOW EXAMPLE	40

PLATE 24: CUT STONE FOUNDATION	41
PLATE 25: SOUTH ELEVATION BOX BAY WINDOW	41
PLATE 26: DETAIL OF BOX BAY SIDE WINDOWS	41
PLATE 27: MAIN ENTRANCE DOORWAY (SOUTH ELEVATION)	41
PLATE 28: MAIN ENTRANCE PORCH	42
PLATE 29: SIDE PORCH.....	42
PLATE 30: STONE FOUNDATION OF THE FRONT AND SIDE PORCHES	42
PLATE 31: BELLCAST ROOF OF THE SIDE PORCH	42
PLATE 32: DECORATIVE PORCH ACCENTS	43
PLATE 33: DECORATIVE PORCH ACCENTS	43
PLATE 34: SECOND ENTRANCE TO THE HOUSE ADJACENT TO THE BAY WINDOW ON THE EAST ELEVATION.....	43
PLATE 35: BAY WINDOW OF EAST ELEVATION	43
PLATE 36: ENCLOSED PORCH OF EAST ELEVATION	44
PLATE 37: UPPER STOREY WINDOWS OF MAIN BLOCK WEST ELEVATION SHOWING POSSIBLE LATER REPLACEMENTS OF SOME DECORATIVE ELEMENT SUCH AS BRICK ARCH HEADS	44
PLATE 38: BASEMENT ACCESS ON WEST ELEVATION.....	44
PLATE 39: EAST ELEVATION WITH FORMER EXTERNAL CHIMNEY VISIBLE ONE ORIGINAL MAIN BLOCK (HIGHLIGHTED IN YELLOW)	44
PLATE 40: EAST ELEVATION OF REAR TAIL, WITH REAR ADDITION VISIBLE ON THE RIGHT.....	45
PLATE 41: PERSPECTIVE VIEW OF THE NORTH AND WEST ELEVATIONS OF REAR/SIDE ADDITION.....	45
PLATE 42: NORTH ELEVATION OF REAR/SIDE ADDITION.....	45
PLATE 43: DETAIL OF NORTH ELEVATION BAY WINDOW	46
PLATE 44: DETAIL OF EAST ELEVATION BAY WINDOW	46
PLATE 45: SOUTH ENTRANCE TO SIDE ADDITION.	46
PLATE 46: EXAMPLE OF WEST ELEVATION WINDOWS ON SIDE ADDITION	46
PLATE 47: ITALIANATE STYLE MODEL HOUSE FROM 1865 THE CANADA FARMER JOURNAL (BLUMENSON 1990).....	47



APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: PART OF THE EAST HALF OF LOT
16, PLAN 43R-4021.....75

APPENDIX B: SITE PLAN (MAY 2025)76

APPENDIX C: ASSESSOR QUALIFICATIONS77

APPENDIX D: LIMITATIONS.....79

APPENDIX E: SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO
TOWN COMMENTS.....81

APPENDIX F: DRAFT REFERENCE PLAN.....82

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

WSP Environment & Infrastructure Canada Limited (WSP) was retained by CBM Aggregates (CBM), a division of St. Marys Cement Inc. (Canada), to complete a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA)³ for 1420 Charleston Sideroad in the Town of Caledon, Regional Municipality of Peel, Ontario (Study Area) (Figure 1 and Figure 2). The rectangular-shaped, 1.4-hectare (3.4-acre) Study Area is located on the northwest side of Charleston Sideroad, between Cataract Road/Main Street and Mississauga Road. The Study Area is surrounded on its other three sides by agricultural fields, which were originally associated with the Study Area. Within the Study Area is a two-storey red brick Italianate style residence constructed between 1891 and 1901 and with additions built in the 20th century. Figure 10 identifies the location of built and landscape features within the Study Area. The Town of Caledon issued a Notice of Intention to Designate (NOID) for the Study Area under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* on March 12, 2024. The Study Area is not identified as a Cultural Heritage Landscape in the Town's Cultural Heritage Landscape Inventory (Scheinman 2009).

CBM proposes to develop the Study Area as part of the 261.2-hectare CBM Caledon Pit / Quarry site licensed under the *Aggregate Resources Act* and designated or zoned under the *Planning Act* (the Project). A Cultural Heritage Report: Existing Conditions and Preliminary Impact Assessment (Cultural Heritage Report) completed for the Project determined that the Study Area may meet the criteria prescribed in Ontario Regulation 9/06 (O. Reg. 9/06, amended through O. Reg. 569/22) of the *Ontario Heritage Act* and recommended an HIA to address the Project's potential impacts to the Study Area's potential heritage attributes (WSP 2022).

The preparation of this HIA was guided by the Town's *Terms of Reference for Heritage Impact Assessment* (Town of Caledon 2019) and Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) *Ontario Heritage Tool Kit InfoSheet #5* (2006b) and *Heritage Property Evaluation: A Guide to Listing, Researching, and Evaluating Cultural Heritage Property in Ontario Communities* (2006a). The HIA was also informed by guidance provide in the *MCM Standards & Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties: Heritage Identification and Evaluation Process* (MCM 2014) and Canada's *Historic Places Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada* (Canada's Historic Places 2010).


1.2 SCOPE

To complete this HIA, WSP:




- Undertook background research, including review of primary and secondary written sources and historical maps and aerial imagery, to trace the Study Area's history;
- Collected online data and contacted the Town of Caledon, Ontario Heritage Trust, and the MCM for information on the Study Area, such as its current heritage status;
- Analysed the results of the field investigation conducted for the Cultural Heritage Report to identify the Study Area's existing conditions, built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscape components, and heritage attributes;
- Evaluated the Study Area using the criteria prescribed in O.Reg. 9/06 (amended through O. Reg. 569/22) of the Ontario Heritage Act and drafted a statement of Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (SCHVI);

³ Although the Town of Caledon Official Plan refers to this type of study as a "Cultural Heritage Impact Statement," the Town's more recent Terms of Reference uses the term "Heritage Impact Assessment."

- Assessed the potential direct and indirect impacts from the Project on the CHVI and heritage attributes of the Study Area;
- Recommended mitigation measures and a conservation strategies to avoid or reduce the negative impacts to the Study Area’s CHVI and heritage attributes;
- Updates to the initial report to respond to Town of Caledon planning and heritage staff comments received March 18, 2025; and
- Updates to the September 2025 report to respond to Town of Caledon planning and heritage staff comments dated December 21, 2025.



LEGEND

-  STUDY AREA
-  LIMIT OF EXTRACTION
-  LICENCE BOUNDARY



NOTE(S)
1. ALL LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE

REFERENCE(S)

1. LIO TOPOGRAPHIC DATA CACHE, ONTARIO MINISTRY OF NATURAL RESOURCES AND FORESTRY, OPEN GOVERNMENT LICENCE – ONTARIO
2. SERVICE LAYER CREDITS: SOURCES: ESRI, HERE, GARMIN, USGS, INTERMAP, INCREMENT P, NRCAN, ESRI JAPAN, METI, ESRI CHINA (HONG KONG), ESRI KOREA, ESRI (THAILAND), NGCC, (C) OPENSTREETMAP CONTRIBUTORS, AND THE GIS USER COMMUNITY
3. PROJECTION: TRANSVERSE MERCATOR DATUM: NAD 83
COORDINATE SYSTEM: UTM ZONE 17 VERTICAL DATUM: CGVD28


CLIENT
CBM AGGREGATES, A DIVISION OF ST. MARYS CEMENT INC. (CANADA)

PROJECT
CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT STATEMENT, 1420 CHARLESTON SIDEROAD, TOWN OF CALEDON, REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF PEEL, ONTARIO

TITLE
LOCATION OF STUDY AREA

CONSULT**	YYYY-MM-DD	2023-07-31
	DESIGNED	AM
	PREPARED	BR
	REVIEWED	HS
	APPROVED	HM


PROJECT NO. 19129150	CONTROL 0047	REV. 0	FIGURE 1
-------------------------	-----------------	-----------	--------------------



SCALE 1:150,000

LEGEND

STUDY AREA



NOTE(S)

1. ALL LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE

REFERENCE(S)

1. CONTAINS INFORMATION LICENSED UNDER THE OPEN GOVERNMENT LICENCE - ONTARIO
2. IMAGERY CREDITS: SOURCES: ESRI, HERE, GARMIN, INTERMAP, INCREMENT P CORP., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GEOBASE, IGN, KADASTER NL, ORDNANCE SURVEY, ESRI JAPAN, METI, ESRI CHINA (HONG KONG), (C) OPENSTREETMAP CONTRIBUTORS, AND THE GIS USER COMMUNITY
3. COORDINATE SYSTEM: NAD 1983 UTM ZONE 17N

CLIENT

CBM AGGREGATES, A DIVISION OF ST. MARYS CEMENT INC.
(CANADA)

PROJECT

CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT STATEMENT, 1420 CHARLESTON SIDEROAD,
TOWN OF CALEDON, REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF PEEL, ONTARIO

TITLE

AERIAL PHOTOGRAPH SHOWING THE LOCATION OF THE STUDY AREA

CONSULTANT



YYYY-MM-DD	2023-07-31
DESIGNED	SD
PREPARED	SD
REVIEWED	HS
APPROVED	HM

PROJECT NO.
19129150

CONTROL
0047

REV.
0

FIGURE
2

PATH: E:\Clients\Waterloo_Chemical\Bung_Pie_S_Calendar\B_Pie_S_Calendar\B_Pie_S_Calendar\19129150_0047.CH002\0047.CH_1420_Charleston19129150_0047.CH_002.mxd PRINTED ON: 2023-08-18 AT: 11:21:30 AM

25mm IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM A4/ANSI B

2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS

The requirements to consider cultural heritage under the Planning Act process is found in the *Provincial Planning Statement (PPS)* (Government of Ontario 2024) and the *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18 (Government of Ontario 1990).

2.1.1 AGGREGATE RESOURCES ACT

UPDATE No. 1 (September 2025): Section 2.1.1 was added to reflect changes in policy since the original HIA submission (2023). This update was made in response to Town comment No. 11.

As reflected in the Cultural Heritage Report, the Aggregate Resources of Ontario: Technical Reports and Information Standards (2020) adopted by *Ontario Regulation 244/97* under the *Aggregates Resources Act* states that applications for a Class A license, Class B licence, or an aggregate permit must include a Cultural Heritage Report consistent with provincial requirements under the *Ontario Heritage Act* and Provincial Planning Statement. The Standards indicate that a screening checklist with supporting documentation is required to evaluate the potential for BHRs and CHLs. Following the checklist, the Standards state that a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) is required for any potential BHRs and/ or CHLs identified, and that the CHER must be prepared by a professional with appropriate experience and expertise. Following the CHER, if the evaluation determines one or more BHRs or CHLs to have CHVI, a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) must be completed.

This HIA satisfies the requirements to conduct a CHER and HIA, as per the requirements of the *Aggregate Resources Act*.

2.1.2 PROVINCIAL PLANNING STATEMENT

UPDATE No. 1 (September 2025): Section 2.1.2 was updated to reflect changes in policy since the original HIA submission (2023). This update was made in response to Town comment No. 12.

The *Planning Act* describes planning direction in Ontario. In particular, Section 2 of the *Planning Act* identifies that planning authorities at the municipality should have regard to matters of provincial interest, including the conservation of features of significant architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological or scientific interest.

Similarly, the Provincial Planning Statement (Government of Ontario 2024) prioritizes the long-term conservation of the Province's cultural heritage resources, including built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes, and archaeological resources as they provide environmental, economic and social benefits. It is in the provincial interest to protect and utilize these resources effectively over a long term. Section 6.2 states:

- 1 A coordinated, integrated and comprehensive approach should be used when dealing with planning matters within municipalities, across lower, single and/or upper-tier municipal boundaries, and with other orders of government, agencies, boards, and Service Managers including:
 - a managing natural heritage, water, agricultural, mineral, and cultural heritage and archaeological resources;

Section 4.6 also details the conservation of cultural heritage and archaeology through the following five policies:

- 1 Protected heritage property, which may contain built heritage resources or cultural heritage landscapes, shall be conserved.
- 2 Planning authorities shall not permit development and site alteration on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential unless the significant archaeological resources have been conserved.
- 3 Planning authorities shall not permit development and site alteration on adjacent lands to protected heritage property unless the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved.
- 4 Planning authorities are encouraged to develop and implement:
 - a archaeological management plans for conserving archaeological resources; and
 - b proactive strategies for conserving significant built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes.
- 5 Planning authorities shall engage early with Indigenous communities and ensure their interests are considered when identifying, protecting and managing archaeological resources, built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes.

2.1.3 ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT

The *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18 enables municipalities and the provincial government to protect heritage properties and archaeological sites (Government of Ontario 1990). The *Ontario Heritage Act* includes two regulations for determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (CHVI):

- O. Reg. 9/06 (as amended by O. Reg. 569/22) (Government of Ontario 1990) to determine if a property has CHVI at a local level, and
- O. Reg. 10/06 (Government of Ontario 2006) to determine if a property has CHVI of provincial significance.

For this study, O. Reg. 9/06 was used. The criteria for determining CHVI under O. Reg. 9/06 are:

- 1 The property has design or physical value because it is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method,
- 2 The property has design or physical value because it displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or
- 3 The property has design or physical value because it demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
- 4 The property has historical value or associative value because it has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community,
- 5 The property has historical value or associative value because it yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or
- 6 The property has historical value or associative value because it demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.
- 7 The property has contextual value because it is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area,
- 8 The property has contextual value because it is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or
- 9 The property has contextual value because it is a landmark.

(Government of Ontario 1990)

2.1.3.1 BILL 23 AND BILL 200

UPDATE No. 1 (September 2025): Section 2.1.3.1 was added during the updated report (2025) to reflect changes in policy since the original HIA (2023). This update was made in response to Town comment No. 13.

Bill 23 was passed by the provincial government and received Royal Assent on November 28, 2022 (Government of Ontario 2022a). Schedule 6 of Bill 23 amends the *Ontario Heritage Act*, which impacts processes and planning

approvals related to listed and designated heritage properties. The amendments came into effect on January 1, 2023, and all municipalities are required to comply with the changes. Changes to the *Ontario Heritage Act* made through Bill 23 relevant to this project include the following (ERO 2023):

- If a municipality does not issue a Notice of Intention to Designate (NOID) a property listed on the municipal heritage register, then Council is required to remove the property from the heritage register and it cannot be readded for a period of five years.
- A NOID may only be issued for properties that are listed on a municipal heritage register.
- A property must meet two or more criteria of O. Reg. 9/06 to be designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.
- If a municipality intends to designate a property subject to a development application under the *Planning Act*, a NOID must be issued within 90 days of the receipt of a complete application.

The deadline prescribed in Bill 23 for removing non-designated (i.e. listed) properties from the municipality's register if the council does not issue a NOID on or before January 1, 2025.

Bill 200 was passed by the provincial government and received Royal Assent on June 6, 2024. Schedule 2 amends the *Ontario Heritage Act* and the deadline previously prescribed in Bill 23 for removing non-designated (i.e. listed) properties from the municipality's register if council does not issue a NOID on or before January 1, 2025. Bill 200 (Schedule 2) amends this date to January 1, 2027, providing municipalities with additional time to assess their heritage registers (Government of Ontario 2024). Schedule 2 of Bill 200 also adds new subsections to section 27, which prevent relisting a non-designated property for five years after it is removed from the register.

2.1.4 REGION OF PEEL OFFICIAL PLAN

UPDATE No. 1 (September 2025): Per Ontario Bill 23 (*More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022*) and Bill 185 (*Cutting Red Tape to Build More Homes Act, 2024*), in force as of July 1, 2024, the *Region of Peel Official Plan (June 2024 Consolidation)* constitutes the *Official Plan for Peel's lower-tier municipalities (such as the Town)*.

The Region of Peel Official Plan outlines policies concerning cultural heritage resources and states that the Region:

Encourages and supports conservation of the cultural heritage resources of all peoples whose stories inform the history of Peel. The Region recognizes the significant role of heritage in establishing a shared sense of place, contributing to environmental sustainability and developing the overall quality of life for residents and visitors to Peel. The Region supports the identification, conservation and interpretation of cultural heritage resources, including but not limited to the built heritage resources, structures, archaeological resources, and cultural 3.6 Cultural Heritage Region of Peel Official Plan Chapter 3: Resources Page 111 heritage landscapes (including properties owned by the Region or properties identified in Regional infrastructure projects), according to the criteria and guidelines established by the Province.

(Region of Peel 2022: 110-11)

Objectives and policies relating to the development and protection of cultural heritage are included in Section 3.6 of the Region of Peel Official Plan. Those relevant to this HIA are:

Objectives:

- 3.6.1 To identify, conserve and promote Peel's non-renewable cultural heritage resources, including but not limited to built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources for the well-being of present and future generations.
- 3.6.2 To encourage stewardship of Peel's built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes and promote well-designed built form to support a sense of place, help define community character, and contribute to Peel's environmental sustainability goals.

- 3.6.3 To strengthen the relationship between the local municipalities, Indigenous communities and the Region when a matter having inter-municipal cultural heritage significance is involved.
- 3.6.4 To support the heritage policies and programs of the local municipalities.

Policies:

- 3.6.5 Work with the local municipalities, stakeholders and Indigenous communities in developing and implementing official plan policies and strategies for the identification, wise use and management of cultural heritage resources.
- 3.6.6 Direct the local municipalities to include policies in their official plans for the identification, conservation and protection of significant cultural heritage resources, including significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes as required in cooperation with the Region, the conservation authorities, other agencies and Indigenous communities, as appropriate.
- 3.6.8 Require cultural heritage resource impact assessments, where appropriate for infrastructure projects, including Region of Peel projects and ensure that recommended conservation outcomes resulting from the impact assessment are considered.
- 3.6.9 Encourage the local municipalities to consult with the Indigenous communities when commemorating cultural heritage resource and archaeological resources.
- 3.6.10 Require local municipal official plans to include policies where the proponents of development proposals affecting cultural heritage resources provide sufficient documentation to meet provincial requirements and address the Region's objectives with respect to cultural heritage resources.
- 3.6.11 Direct the local municipalities to only permit development and site alteration on adjacent lands to protected heritage property where the proposed property has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved.

(Region of Peel 2022: 111-112)

2.1.5 TOWN OF CALEDON OFFICIAL PLAN

UPDATE No. 1 (September 2025): *Town comment 14 suggested review of Future Caledon Official Plan (adopted March 2024 but not yet approved). However, project applications were filed prior to the adoption or approval of Future Caledon. Accordingly, the Project is not subject to this Official Plan and the summary of applicable policies remains the same as the 2023 submission.*

The Town of Caledon outlines the Official Plan as a “a statement of principles, goals, objectives and policies intended to guide future land use, physical development and change, and the effects on the social, economic, and natural environment within the Town of Caledon” (Town of Caledon 2018: 1-3). The policies outlined are “designed to promote public input and involvement in the future of the Town and to maintain and enhance the quality of life for the residents of Caledon” (Town of Caledon 2018: 1-3).

Section 3.3 of the Official Plan is entitled “Cultural Heritage Conservation” and outlines policies for the Town’s heritage resource management strategy. Policies relevant to development and protection of cultural heritage are included below.

- 3.3.3.1.5 Heritage Impact Assessment s
 - a) Where it is determined that further investigations of cultural heritage resources beyond a Cultural Heritage Survey or Cultural Heritage Planning Statement are required, a Heritage

Impact Assessment may be required. The determination of whether a Heritage Impact Assessment is required will be based on the following:

- i) the extent and significance of cultural heritage resources identified, including archaeological resources and potential, in the Cultural Heritage Survey or Cultural Heritage Planning Statement and the recommendations of the Cultural Heritage Survey or Cultural Heritage Planning Statement;
 - ii) the potential for adverse impacts on cultural heritage resources; and,
 - iii) the appropriateness of following other approval processes that consider and address impacts on cultural heritage resources.
- b) Where it is determined that a Heritage Impact Assessment should be prepared, the Heritage Impact Assessment shall be undertaken by a qualified professional with expertise in heritage studies and contain the following:
- i) a description of the proposed development;
 - ii) a description of the cultural heritage resource(s) to be affected by the development;
 - iii) a description of the effects upon the cultural heritage resource(s) by the proposed development;
 - iv) a description of the measures necessary to mitigate the adverse effects of the development upon the cultural heritage resource(s); and,
 - v) a description of how the policies and guidance of any relevant Cultural Heritage Planning Statement have been incorporated and satisfied.

Where a Heritage Impact Assessment is required, the proponent is encouraged to consult with the Town and other relevant agencies concerning the scope of the work to be undertaken.

3.3.3.1.7 Should a development proposal change significantly in scope or design after completion of an associated Cultural Heritage Survey, Cultural Heritage Planning Statement or Heritage Impact Assessment, additional cultural heritage investigations may be required by the Town.

3.3.3.1.8 Appropriate conservation measures, identified in a Cultural Heritage Planning Statement, Cultural Heritage Survey or Heritage Impact Assessment, may be required as a condition of any development approval. Where the Town has the authority to require development agreements and, where appropriate, the Town may require development agreements respecting the care and conservation of the affected cultural heritage resource. This provision will not apply to cultural heritage resources in so far as these cultural heritage resources are the subject of another agreement respecting the same matters made between the applicant and another level of government or Crown agency.

3.3.3.1.14 Cultural and Natural Landscapes

In its consideration of all development and redevelopment proposals, the Town will have regard for the interrelationship between cultural heritage landscapes and scenic natural landscapes, in accordance with Section 3.2.3.5 of this Plan.

3.3.3.1.15 Vegetation

The Town will encourage the conservation of significant cultural heritage vegetation. Retention of significant cultural heritage vegetation shall be a consideration in the design of any development. The conservation of significant cultural heritage vegetation along streets and roads shall be encouraged by the Town, except where removal is necessary because of disease, damage or to ensure public health and safety.

3.3.3.3 Retention/Relocation of Heritage Buildings

The Town shall encourage the retention of significant built heritage resources in their original locations whenever possible. Before such a building is approved for relocation to another site, all options for on-site retention shall be investigated. The following alternatives, in order of priority, shall be examined prior to approval for relocation:

- a) Retention of the building on-site in its original use. In a residential subdivision, a heritage dwelling could be retained on its own lot for integration into the residential community;
- b) Retention of the building on-site in an adaptive re-use, e.g. in a residential subdivision, a heritage dwelling could be retained for a community centre or a day care centre;
- c) Relocation of the building on the development site. A heritage building, if of significant historical, architectural or contextual importance, could be relocated to another location within the proposed development; and,
- d) Relocation of the building to a sympathetic site. If interest is demonstrated, the heritage building could be relocated to an available lot at a sympathetic site within the Town

(Town of Caledon 2018: 3-32 - 3-38)

Section 5.11.2.4.2 of the Official Plan sets out the requirements for approval of an application for an Official Plan Amendment to designate lands identified as Aggregate Resource Lands. Among the requirements is the following:

- f) The applicant has completed a Cultural Heritage Survey as described by Section 5.11.2.4.12 and, where required, additional cultural heritage studies, such as a Heritage Impact Assessment, or an archaeological assessment and has demonstrated that there will not be any unacceptable impacts;

(Town of Caledon 2018: 5-138)

Section 5.11.2.4.12 further outlines conservation measures which may be applicable:

- b) Cultural heritage resource conservation measures may include, as appropriate, retention and use or adaptive re-use of heritage buildings and structures, incorporation of cultural heritage elements such as fence lines and tree lines where possible, and carrying out appropriate salvage and recording of cultural heritage resources that may be removed as a result of aggregate extraction operations.

(Town of Caledon 2018: 5-141)

2.2 GUIDANCE DOCUMENTS

2.2.1 PROVINCIAL GUIDANCE

The MCM is responsible for the administration of the *Ontario Heritage Act* and has developed checklists, information bulletins, standards and guidelines, and policies to support the conservation of Ontario's cultural heritage resources, including built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes, and archaeological sites.

The MCM released the *Ontario Heritage Tool Kit* in 2006, which is a series of guidelines that outline the heritage conservation process in Ontario. Two volumes from the *Ontario Heritage Tool Kit* were used to guide the preparation of this HIA, including:

- *Heritage Property Evaluation: A Guide to Listing, Researching, and Evaluating Cultural Heritage Property in Ontario Communities* (MCM 2006a)
- *Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process, InfoSheet #5, Heritage Impact Assessments and Conservation Plans* (MCM 2006b)

Also used to guide the preparation of this HIA was the MCM *Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties: Heritage Identification & Evaluation Process* (MCM 2014), which provides detailed direction on the completion of O. Reg. 9/06 evaluations.

2.2.2 TOWN OF CALEDON HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Town of Caledon's Terms of Reference for Heritage Impact Assessments (ToR) assists developers and consultants by outlining a set of guidelines that ensures consistent and comprehensive HIAs (Town of Caledon 2019). The ToR details the required components and states that HIAs must adhere to the conservation principles outlined in documents such as the MCM's *Heritage Conservation Principles for Land Use Planning* (MCM 2007), *Eight Guiding Principles in the Conservation of Historic Properties* (MCM 1997), Parks Canada's *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada* (CHP S&Gs) (Canada's Historic Places 2010), and Fram's 2003 *Well-Preserved: The Ontario Heritage Foundations Manual of Principles and Practice For Architectural Conservation*.

2.3 BACKGROUND RESEARCH

Background research was carried out to gain a thorough understanding of the historical context of the Study Area. Primary and secondary sources, historical maps, and aerial photographs were consulted, as appropriate, to identify historical themes relevant to the Study Area. Specifically, research regarding the physiography, survey and settlement, and 19th and 20th century land use of the Study Area was completed. A review of historical mapping and aerial photographs was also conducted to identify settlements, structures, and landscape features within, and adjacent to, the Study Area. This included historical maps from 1859 to 1994 and aerial photographs and imagery from 1954 to the present.

The results of the background research are presented in Section 3 of this report.

2.4 INFORMATION GATHERING

The Town of Caledon, Ontario Heritage Trust, and MCM, were contacted by email or telephone to confirm the heritage status of the property and gather background information to inform the heritage evaluation. In addition, cultural heritage input gathered from community consultation sessions and Public Information Centres (PICs) completed as part of the Project have been reviewed by WSP staff and incorporated into this HIA, as appropriate.

The results of the community consultation activities are presented in Section 4.1 of this report.

2.5 FIELD REVIEW

The purpose of the field review was to establish the existing conditions of the Study Area and identify potential heritage attributes in the Study Area. Photographic documentation of the Study Area and its spatial context was completed.

The results of the field review are presented in Section 0 of this report.

2.6 CULTURAL HERITAGE EVALUATION

The scope of work for this HIA included an evaluation of the Study Area to determine if it met the criteria for CHVI prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The Study Area is considered to have potential CHVI as it is listed on the Town of Caledon's heritage register but not designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

The results of the O. Reg. 9/06 evaluation are provided in Section 5 of this report.

2.7 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

An impact assessment is required when a study area evaluated to have CHVI is anticipated to be directly or indirectly affected by a new development. InfoSheet#5 of *Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology Policies of the Ontario Provincial Policy Statement* (MCM 2006b) provides guidance to assess the following direct and indirect impacts that may occur when development is proposed within, or adjacent to, a heritage property:

- Direct Impacts
 - Destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features
 - Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance
- Indirect Impacts
 - Shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden
 - Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or significant relationship
 - Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features
 - A change in land use such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in formerly open spaces
 - Land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soils and drainage patterns that adversely affect an archaeological resource.

2.8 MITIGATION MEASURES

When an impact assessment determines that the new development will negatively affect the CHVI and heritage attributes of a study area, mitigation measures are required. MCM InfoSheet#5 presents the following general strategies to minimize or avoid negative impacts to cultural heritage resources:

- Alternative development approaches
- Isolating development and site alteration from significant built and natural features and vistas
- Design guidelines that harmonize mass setback, setting, and materials
- Allowing only compatible infill and additions
- Reversible alterations
- Buffer zones and other planning mechanisms

In addition to the mitigation measures contained in InfoSheet#5, general standards for preservation, rehabilitation, and restoration are found in the *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada* (CHP S&Gs) (Canada's Historic Places 2010:22). The CHP S&Gs are widely accepted as the guiding document for heritage conservation in Canada and contain general conservation standards and guidelines that are specific to cultural heritage resource types such as buildings, engineering works, and cultural heritage landscapes. Where applicable, guidelines from the CHP S&Gs were used in this HIA to recommend mitigation measures that are specific to a resource type.

3 HISTORICAL CONTEXT

3.1 PHYSIOGRAPHY

The Study Area is situated within the Guelph Drumlin Field physiographic region of southern Ontario (Chapman and Putnam 1984). The Guelph Drumlin Field physiographic region occupies approximately 830 km² between the Regional Municipality of Waterloo and the northwest portion of the Region of Peel, and is centred on the City of Guelph. Within the Guelph Drumlin Field are approximately 300 drumlins —oval hills of glacial till— that vary in size and are mostly broad and oval in form. They are more widely dispersed, and have less steep slopes, than drumlin fields elsewhere in Ontario and are composed of loam and chalk originating from the Amabel Formation dolostone exposed along the Niagara Escarpment and red shale found below the Escarpment (Chapman and Putnam 1984:137).

The Study Area is located within a spillway or glacial meltwater channel within the Guelph Drumlin Field. Spillways are typically broad troughs floored wholly or in part by gravel beds and in the lowest beds are typically vegetated by cedar swamps. These formations are frequently found in association with moraines but are entrenched rather than elevated landforms. They are often occupied by stream courses, which raises the debate of their glacial origin (Chapman and Putnam 1984).

The Study Area is also within the Mixed-wood Plains ecozone of Ontario (Ecological Framework of Canada 2015). Although altered by human activity in the 19th century, this ecozone once supported a wide variety of deciduous trees, such as various species of ash, birch, chestnut, hickory, oak, and walnut, as well as a variety of birds and small to large land mammals, such as raccoon, red fox, white tailed deer, and black bear.

Finally, the Study Area is within the Credit River Watershed, which spans 1,000 km² and drains into Lake Ontario at Port Credit on the Mississauga waterfront (Credit Valley Conservation 2022). The Credit River flows south approximately 900 m east of the Study Area.

3.2 INDIGENOUS HISTORY

Indigenous peoples have lived in Ontario for thousands of years. The following only briefly summarizes this long and complex human history but aims to illustrate the major developments in Indigenous life as revealed through oral history, archaeology, and ethnohistory. In this summary, “culture” —the term archaeologists use to describe a shared material culture that identifies a time period or group— is substituted with “way of life” to reflect the direct Indigenous lineage from those living in the earliest periods to the present day (Julien *et al.* 2010).

The earliest archaeological remnants of Indigenous life in southern Ontario date to the end of the Wisconsin Glacial Period, approximately 11,000 years ago. These were left by people following what archeologists refer to as the Paleo way of life, with small, highly mobile groups taking advantage of seasonally available resources and following the migration patterns of large mammals, including now extinct megafauna.

As the climate changed and people following a Paleo way of life grew familiar with their surroundings, they developed local adaptations around 9,500 years ago known as the Archaic or Pre-ceramic way of life. Seasonal mobility continued, but more emphasis was placed on adapting to smaller territories and broadening the resource base. The archaeological record suggests that in general the social structures of Archaic people became increasingly complex, with Late Archaic archaeological sites showing evidence of exchange networks stretching as far away as the Mid-Atlantic as well as defined cemeteries with individuals buried with varied grave goods, possibly indicating a stratified society (Ellis and Ferris 1990).

The transition from an Archaic to Woodland way of life is marked by the introduction of pottery around 2,400 years ago. Despite its advantages for storing and cooking food, pottery appears to have had little impact on the hunter-gatherer way of life that had developed in the Late Archaic, though does suggest that people were consuming more plants, such as nuts, in their diet. Cemeteries dating to the Early Woodland sometimes involved constructing large

earthen mounds and interring items that had been acquired through exchange networks extending hundreds of kilometres in all directions. These elaborate burials, as well as finely made ground stone and chert objects, point to a sophisticated system of beliefs and ceremonies that may have been influenced by the Hopewell people of southern Ohio and Illinois. Hunter-gathering continued as the primary economy among some groups, while others in the Middle Woodland between 1,600 and 1,500 years ago were beginning to live in sedentary communities, a trend that continues into the Late Woodland Period (A.D. 500–900), when there is the earliest direct evidence for agriculture.

From the Late Woodland to contact with Europeans in the 16th century, southern Ontario was a culturally dynamic area, populated by distinct Nadowek (Iroquoian) and Anishinaabeg (Algonkian) groups (Englebrecht 2003; Trigger 2000; Schmalz 1991). Nadowek life increasingly revolved around growing maize and other crops such as beans, squash, sunflower, and tobacco, while people ancestral to the Anishinaabe following the Western Basin way of life were more mobile, moving with seasonally available resources. However, at the borderlands of the Nadowek and Western Basin were agricultural communities living in small, palisaded villages with a mix of small and large houses, and who were both farming and seasonally mobile.

During the 18th century, the British colonial regime entered into a series of treaties with the Indigenous Nations in Canada. While these treaties were intended as formal legally binding agreements that would set out the rights, responsibilities and relationships between Indigenous Nations and the federal and provincial governments, the government of Ontario acknowledges that Indigenous nations may have different understandings of the treaties (Government of Ontario 2022b, Historica Canada 2021). As French and British encroachment increased from the early 19th century onwards, Indigenous ways of life adapted to the change in complex and varied ways.

The Seven Years' War (1756-1763) was a global war that was fought in Europe, India, America, and at sea (Historica Canada 2006). In North America, Britain and France struggled for dominance with each side supported by Indigenous allies. At the conclusion of the war, Britain became the leading colonial power in North America (Historica Canada 2006). In 1763, the British issued the Royal Proclamation, which stated that land that was not in control of the British belonged to Indigenous Nations and that the Nations would retain their lands unless ceded to the Crown (Historica Canada 2006). The Nations and the British met at Fort Niagara in 1764 where they negotiated a new alliance that was embodied in the Covenant Chain Wampum Belt and the Treaty of Niagara Alliance Medal (Canadian Museum of History 2023). The Royal Proclamation of 1763 and the Niagara Treaty of 1764 are of great significance since the British recognized that Indigenous Nations owned the land and were an autonomous entity (Canadian Museum of History 2023). This relationship is conveyed on the 1764 Covenant Chain Wampum Belt that depicts two people side by side, as equals (Canadian Museum of History 2023).

The Study area is located on the territory of Treaty 19, also known as the Ajetance Purchase, an agreement signed on 28 October 1818 between representatives of the Credit River Mississauga, led by Chief Ajetance, and William Claus, Superintendent of the British colonial Indian Department. In exchange for approximately 648,000 acres within the present-day Regions of Halton and Peel, the Mississaugas were to be paid £522, 10 shillings in goods annually and retain access to their land along the Credit River and their three reserves at the mouths of the Credit River, Sixteen Mile Creek and Twelve Mile Creek (Surtees 1984:77-78). While some have interpreted Ajetance's agreement to the Treaty 13 terms as the result of his weakened negotiating position, others have noted how he likely anticipated the British would press for further treaties, so fought to retain the strategic location of the river mouth reserves (Surtees 1984:78).

To recognize and honour the municipality's Indigenous heritage and land rights, the Town of Caledon, in consultation with the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation, has developed the following land acknowledgement:

Indigenous Peoples have unique and enduring relationships with the land.

Indigenous Peoples have lived on and cared for this land throughout the ages. We acknowledge this and we recognize the significance of the land on which we gather and call home.

We acknowledge the traditional Territory of the Huron-Wendat and Haudenosaunee Peoples, and the Anishnabek of the Williams Treaties.

This land is part of the Treaty Lands and Territory of the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation.

We honour and respect Indigenous heritage and the long-lasting history of the land and strive to protect the land, water, plants and animals that have inhabited this land for the generations yet to come.

3.3 TOWNSHIP SURVEY AND SETTLEMENT

During the British colonial period, the Study Area was within Lot 16, Concession 4, West of Hurontario Street (W.H.S.), in the Geographic Township of Caledon, Peel County.

3.3.1 PEEL COUNTY

In 1788, the colonial government of British North America began dividing Ontario into districts and counties. The Study Area was originally within the district of Nassau, renamed the Home District in 1792, which included the lands at the northwest portion of Lake Ontario and the Niagara Peninsula (Armstrong 1985, Archives of Ontario 2022). The Home District's administrative centre was Newark, now Niagara-on-the-Lake. Each district was further subdivided into counties and townships but by 1852, the district system was abandoned, leaving governance to the counties, townships, and cities and towns (Archives of Ontario 2022). The former Home District became the United Counties of York, Ontario, and Peel; after Ontario separated to form its own administration in 1854, Peel officially separated from York in 1867 (Armstrong 1985, PAMA⁴ n.d.).

Peel County was named for Sir Robert Peel, a British politician who had previously served as the Home Secretary and Prime Minister of Great Britain. In 1974, the Region of Peel replaced Peel County as an upper-tier municipality (PAMA n.d.).

3.3.2 TOWN OF CALEDON AND THE FORMER TOWNSHIP OF CALEDON

Caledon Township was surveyed in 1819-1820 with concession lines running northwards from Lake Ontario and side roads intersecting the concessions from east to west (Walker and Miles 1877). Caledon Township is between Erin Township and Albion Township, all referencing the Latin names of Scotland, Ireland, and England – Caledonia, Eire, and Albion, respectively (Gardiner 1899). The principal roadway through Caledon Township was Hurontario Street, which stretched from Lake Huron south to Lake Ontario. Hurontario Street formed the baseline for six concessions extending from both sides of the street. These concessions are identified as West of Hurontario Street (W.H.S.) and East of Hurontario Street (E.H.S.).

Early colonial settlement in the township was by Scots, Irish, and United Empire Loyalists (Mika and Mika 1977), who established some of the first communities at Alton, Cataract, Charleston, Belfountain, and Silver Creek. Woolen and gristmills, combined with the arrival of the Credit Valley Railway and Toronto, Grey, and Bruce Railway in the 1870s, brought economic prosperity to the township and supported its many agricultural industries. Railway connections to the urban markets at Guelph, Orangeville, and Toronto from the late 19th to early 20th century further enabled large-scale farming in Caledon Township (PAMA 2023).

On January 1, 1974, Caledon Township amalgamated with the north half of Chinguacousy Township, the Village of Bolton, the Village of Caledon East, and the Township of Albion to become the new Town of Caledon – a lower tier municipality within the upper tier Peel Region (Mika and Mika 1977).

⁴ As part of the updated report, it was noted that the Region of Peel Archives has separated from the Peel Art Gallery, Museum and Archives (PAMA). As of April 2025, PAMA's website still indicates that the Region of Peel Archives at PAMA is the official archives of the Region of Peel and its constituent municipalities of Mississauga, Brampton and Caledon.

3.4 STUDY AREA HISTORY

3.4.1 LAND USE HISTORY

Land registry data for the Study Area was accessed from the Ontario Land Property Records Portal and is reproduced in Table 1. Available census data, tax assessment rolls, and other archival material was also reviewed.

Table 1: Land Registry Data for the Study Area (Part of Lot 16, Concession 4, W.H.S., Caledon Township, Peel County)

INSTRUMENT	DATE	GRANTOR	GRANTEE	QUANTITY OF LAND
Patent	September 1832	Crown	Canada Company	West half of Lot 16 (100 acres)
Patent	November 1833	Crown	Canada Company	East half of Lot 16 (100 acres)
Bargain & Sale	April 1836	Canada Company	John Cameron	Entirety of Lot 16 (200 acres)
Bargain & Sale	1852	Estate of John Cameron	James Cameron	Lot 16 (200 acres)
Bargain & Sale	January 1897	James and Mary Cameron	James Cameron Jr.	Southwest half of the west half of Lot 16 (50 acres, present day 18501 Mississauga Road)
Bargain & Sale	March 1901	James Cameron Jr and Mary Cameron	George Cameron	Remaining 150 acres (including the Study Area)
*note that records between 1901 and 1940 were not available from the Land Registry Office				
Grant	July 1968	John H. Cameron	Chan Kwok-Leung in trust	East half and east half of west half (150 acres)
Grant	October 1968	Chan Kwok-Leung in trust	Chen Investments Limited	East half and east half of west half (150 acres)
Grant	December 1975	Chen Investments Limited	Bonnie McClennan in trust	East half and east half of west half (150 acres)
Reference plan (43R-4021) dated May 20, 1976, shows survey of Study Area as the boundaries exist at present, totalling 2.973 acres and divided into two parts (Appendix A). Part 1 (southeast portion) is 2.573 acres and part 1 (northwest portion) is 0.399 acres.				
Grant	May 1976	Bonnie McClellan, in trust	David Gordon McWilliams, to use	Study Area
Grant	October 1990	David Gordon McWilliams	David Gordon McWilliams and Joan Millicent McWilliams	Study Area
Transfer	June 2000	David Gordon McWilliams and Joan Millicent McWilliams	Allan Cameron Hutcheon and Margaret Ruth Hutcheon	Study Area
Transfer	June 2008	Allan Cameron Hutcheon and Margaret Ruth Hutcheon	Steve Fokas and Stacey Fokas	Study Area
Transfer	July 2022	Steve Fokas and Stacey Fokas	St. Marys Cement Inc. (Canada)	Study Area

The larger parcel on which the Study Area is situated —Lot 16, Concession 4, W.H.S., Township of Caledon, Peel County— was granted through Crown patent in two 100-acre parts to the Canada Company. The west half was granted in September 1832, and the east half in November 1833. A description of the adjacent Lot 17 indicated that the land was originally wooded with maple, elm, beech, and bass, and the soil was a black loam (PAMA n.d., Reel 08, 0663). Both halves of the Lot were purchased by John Cameron in April 1836 at a price of \$50 each (Ontario Land Registry n.d.: 307).

Born in 1782, John Cameron had emigrated to Canada from Perthshire, Scotland in 1828 with his wife Helen (nee Ferguson), seven sons, and two daughters. Tragically, his son David died at sea during the crossing (PAMA, n.d., 8509). The family had settled at Lot 16, Concession 4 W.H.S. by 1833. A decade after they purchased Lot 16, Concession 4 W.H.S. in 1836, one of John's sons, Duncan Cameron, purchased the adjacent 200-acres to the north at Lot 17. John Cameron died in 1848 and his estate settled in 1852 with his youngest surviving son, James Cameron (born 1824), purchasing all 200-acres of Lot 16 from his brothers and mother for \$200 (Ontario Land Registry n.d.: 307). The 1851 Census records Helen Cameron (age 64) as living with her sons Hugh (36), Donald (29), and James (26) (1851 Personal Census, District 2, Caledon, p.135). Duncan Cameron was still living at Lot 17 with his wife and children.

Tremaine's 1859 map of the County of Peel shows James Cameron as owner of the entire 200 acres of Lot 16, Concession 4 W.H.S., and depicts a house in the centre of the property's southwest half, today at 18501 Mississauga Road (Tremaine 1859; Figure 3). A Cameron family history, written by Annie Beatty in 1935, states that this house was built by James Cameron in 1850 (PAMA n.d., 8511). No structures are depicted within the Study Area.

The 1861 Census lists James Cameron as a farmer living with his wife Mary (nee McGill), three sons, and two daughters.⁵ The Agricultural Census of the same year records James Cameron at Concession 4, Lot 16, with 300 acres, of which 200 were cultivated, 123 under cultivation (79 acres of wheat, 5 acres of peas, 7 acres of oats, 1 acre of potatoes, and 1 acre of turnips), 73 as pasture, and 2 as orchards. The farm had a total value of \$7,500 (1861 Agricultural Census, District 6, Caledon, 86). While Lot 16 was only 200 acres, Tremaine's 1859 map also shows James as owner of Lot 16, Concession 5 W.H.S., which would account for the 300 acres listed in the Agricultural Census.⁶

In the 1871 Census, James (44) and Mary (43) Cameron were living with eight children: John (18), Annie J. (15), Margaret E. (13), James (11), Peter (9), Mary (7), George A. (5), and David (2). Both James and the eldest son John are listed as farmers. The Camerons were Baptists (1871 Census, Schedule 1, Cardwell 40/A, Caledon No.4, 43). James Cameron is listed as the owner of 400 acres, with one house and four barns/stables (Ibid., Schedule 3, 8). Of the 400 acres, 210 were identified as improved, including 70 acres of wheat, $\frac{3}{4}$ of an acre of potatoes, 40 acres of hay, and 20 acres of pasture. An additional two acres of orchards produced 50 bushels of apples (Ibid., Schedule 4, 8). Other assets and products of the farm included 7 horses, 1 colts/fillies, 7 milch cows, 18 other horned cattle, 60 sheep, 8 swine and yearly production of 400 pounds butter, 150 pounds of cheese, and 400 pounds of wool (Ibid., Schedule 5, 8).

The 1877 Historical Atlas map shows James Cameron as owner of the whole 200 acres of Lot 16, Con. 4 W.H.S., as well as the adjacent 200-acre property at Lot 16, Con. 5 (Walker and Miles 1877, Figure 4). Two structures are shown on Cameron's land, one near the southwest corner of the lot with an adjacent orchard to the northeast, and a second in the northeast corner of the property. Neither house is illustrated in the location of the extant house in the Study Area.

James Sr. owned all of Lot 16 for another 20 years. In January 1897, James and Mary sold the southwest 50 acres of the southwest half of the lot to their son, James Cameron Jr. for \$1,250 (Ontario Land Registry n.d., 432). The boundaries of this part are not specified in the abstract book, but the modern property boundary suggests that the delineation was made by a straight line parallel to the Concession Road. This transfer would have included the

⁵ The ages of the family have been recorded incorrectly in the 1861 census, so they are not listed here.

⁶ While the total acreage of Lot 16, Concession 4 and Lot 16 in Concession 5 is 400 acres, it is unclear why 300 (and not 400) acres are enumerated in the Agricultural Census.

extant house and barns on the southwest half of the property shown on the 1859 and 1877 maps, in the present-day location of 18501 Mississauga Road.

In the 1891 census, James Sr. (now 66 years old) was listed as farmer living with his wife Mary (63), their son George (24), and a “general servant” named Winnie Carpenter (18) (1891 Personal Census, District 54, Cardwell, 22). The house is indicated in Schedule 1 as a brick structure that had 2 rooms on the second storey and 10 rooms on the main floors. George would marry Charlotte (nee McClellan) in 1894. Despite ownership of the southwest half of Lot 16 transferring to James Cameron Jr. in 1897, it appears that the younger son, George A. was farming all of Lot 16, Con. 4 at the time; in the 1897 Tax Assessment, G. A. Cameron was assessed a value of \$7,000 for all of the 200-acre lot, with 150 acres listed as improved and the remaining 50 acres being woodlot (PAMA 1897, Division 7, 38).

By the 1901 census James Sr. and Mary Cameron were living with George A. (35), his wife Charlotte (33), and their two sons John H. (4) and Andrew (2) (1901 Personal Census, District 51, Cardwell, 49). Their son Hilton was born the following year, but Andrew would die shortly afterward in 1906 (Find a Grave 2010a). Although the extended family may have been resident at the house near the northeast corner of the Lot, it is likely that they lived in the house that stands in the Study Area today. In March 1901 James Sr. and Mary transferred ownership of the northeastern 150 acres of the Lot (containing the Study Area) to George Cameron for \$1 (Ontario Land Registry n.d., 432).

An undated photograph of the farm complex shows the house and several outbuildings, likely during the first decade of the 20th century (Plate 1). The two-storey brick house is seen as fully constructed, including a rear tail or summer kitchen. To the rear of the house is a single storey brick building with a gable roof and circular gable window. The stone foundation barn is partially visible at the rear of the property, clad with wood and featuring a gable roof with two cupolas and a weathervane. A smaller timber framed structure is seen in the background, between the barn and the brick outbuilding which appears to be of the same style and construction as the barn. It is unclear if this structure is freestanding or part of the barn. Obscuring the barn, to the north of the house, is a two-storey carriage house with stone foundations, brick masonry on the ground floor, likely load bearing, and the upper storey clad in wood, with a gable roof. The windows of the ground floor are accented with stone segmental arch heads and lug sills.



Plate 1: Historical photograph of the house and outbuildings, date unknown.

The 1921 census records George and Charlotte living with their sons Harrold (John H., 25) and Hilton Cameron (23) (1921 Personal Census, District 115, Caledon Township, 18). The 1921 census also indicates that the family was living in a brick house that had 7 rooms on the second storey and 8 rooms on the main floor. This house is most likely the extant house in the Study Area; the one enumerated in the 1891 census is therefore likely the house that stood at the northeast corner of Lot 16.

Land registry records relating to the Study Area are missing between 1901 and 1940 but in that time, it is known that Lot 16 passed to John H. (Harold) Cameron as he appears as granting an easement to the Hydro Electric Power Commission of Ontario in 1948. As John. H. Cameron married Helen Ruth Babcock in 1923 and George Cameron died in 1932 (Find a Grave 2010b), it is reasonable to theorize that the property passed from George to John at some point during the 1920s or early 1930s. Charlotte Cameron died in 1951 (Find a Grave 2010c).

John H. and Helen had three children: Arloine, Rolph, and Philip. Philip Cameron moved to Kapuskasing, Cochrane District prior to 1953 when he is enumerated in the voters list, as an Electrical Engineer, along with his wife Shirley (nee. Lowe). Their son, James Cameron, was born the following year in 1954 and is a celebrated Canadian filmmaker. He grew up in Chippawa, in the City of Niagara Falls, where ties to his childhood are recognized in tourism marketing and a plaque recognizing his contributions to the art of filmmaking (Tourism Niagara 2023; City of Niagara Falls 2023). There is an association between the Study Area and the filmmaker, James Cameron, however this is a common familial association, and does not contribute to the CHVI of the property.

The barn with stone foundation, visible in Plate 1, burned down in July 1964 (Plate 2). Oral history from Carol Coulter Crews, who lived on the adjacent farm at 18473 Main Street, notes that only the tractor was saved from the Cameron barn fire, as it was in the garage (Caledon Heritage Foundation 2024). John H. sold the property in 1968 and died in 1973 (Find a Grave 2020). The property changed hands several times in the decades followed the Cameron's ownership before being sold to the current owner, St. Marys Cement Inc. in 2022. It appears that the Study Area was severed from the surrounding agricultural fields in the 1970s, as a reference plan dated May 20, 1976 shows a survey of the property boundaries in the same configuration as present-day.



Plate 2: Barn fire, July 1964.

3.4.2 20TH- AND 21ST-CENTURY MAPPING AND AERIAL IMAGERY

Mapping and aerial photography from the 20th to 21st century indicates that the Study Area and surrounding area continued in its 19th-century rural agricultural land use. Only minor change occurred within the Study Area as outbuildings were constructed and demolished. Table 2 provides a summary of the available maps and aerial photographs and these sources are illustrated in Figure 5 to Figure 9.


Table 2: Review of 20th Century Historical Mapping and Aerial Photographs

YEAR	SOURCE	HISTORICAL FEATURE(S)
1937 (Figure 5)	1937 Topographic Map of Ontario, <i>Orangeville Sheet</i> (Department of National Defence 1937)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A structure is shown in the same location as the house that currently stands in the Study Area • An outbuilding with L-shaped plan is northwest of the house, and partially overlaps where the barn foundation currently stands in the Study Area. • Tree-lined fields are depicted east and west of the farm complex in the Study Area, while to the north and northeast is a wooded area.
1952 (Figure 6)	1952 Topographic Map of Ontario, <i>Orangeville Sheet</i> (Department of National Defence 1952)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structures in the Study Area are shown in the same configuration as the 1937 mapping. • Charleston Sideroad is illustrated as a loose surface road that has been graded and drained.
1954 (Figure 7)	1954 Aerial photograph 437.801 (Hunting Survey Corporation Limited 1954)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The arrangement of the building complex and tree-lined agricultural fields appear similar to current conditions in the Study Area and immediate area.
1973 (Figure 8)	1973 Topographic Map of Ontario, <i>Orangeville Sheet</i> (Department of Energy, Mines and Resources 1973)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The L-shaped outbuilding shown on the mid-20th century mapping are no longer illustrated. Only the house is pictured.
1985 (Plate 3)	Town of Caledon (1985)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The house is visible, as is the rear tail and rear and side additions. • The extant outbuilding to the rear of the house is visible. • The barn foundation ruins are visible at the rear of the Study Area, as is the stone wall that extends from Charleston Sideroad to the rear of the property on the southwest side of the driveway and house. • Mature vegetation is visible throughout the Study Area.
1994 (Figure 9)	1994 National Topographic System, <i>Orangeville Sheet</i> (Department of Energy, Mines and Resources 1994)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The house is illustrated, as is the outbuilding to the rear, as oriented east-west.
1996 (Plate 4)	Town of Caledon (1996)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The elements of the Study Area are little changed from the 1985 aerial photograph with the exception of newly planted windbreaks on the southwest and northeast sides of the Study Area.
2001-2022	Online Google Earth Aerial Imagery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The configuration of the Study Area is little changed from the 1954 aerial photograph and subsequent mapping.


3.4.3 SUMMARY OF PROPERTY HISTORY

Historic mapping, land registry data, and census data indicate that the house in the Study Area was constructed between 1891 and 1921. This can be further refined to the George Cameron tenure, and between 1891 and 1901. George was in his 20s during the 1890s, and newly married in 1894. The house enumerated in the 1891 census (brick with 2 rooms on the upper storey and 10 rooms on the main floor) better describes the house known to have been located at the northeast corner of Lot 16, and illustrated on the 1877 mapping (Figure 4). This would have served the family until George constructed the house in the Study Area, enumerated in the 1921 census as a brick house with 7 upper storey rooms and 8 main floor rooms.

By the 1930s there was a large L-shaped outbuilding on Lot 16 that is also visible on the 1937 and 1952 topographic maps. It is presumed that the ruins at the rear of the Study Area once formed part of this structure.



LEGEND
 SITE LOCATION



NOTE(S)
 1. ALL LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE

REFERENCE(S)
 1. 1877 TOWNSHIP OF CALEDON, PEEL COUNTY (ONTARIO MAP REF #20), ILLUSTRATED HISTORICAL ATLAS OF THE COUNTY OF PEEL, ONT. TORONTO, WALKER & MILES, 1877.
 2. COORDINATE SYSTEM: NAD 1983 UTM ZONE 17N



CLIENT
 CBM AGGREGATES, A DIVISION OF ST. MARYS CEMENT INC. (CANADA)

PROJECT
 CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT STATEMENT, 1420 CHARLESTON SIDEROAD, TOWN OF CALEDON, REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF PEEL, ONTARIO

TITLE
 1877 HISTORICAL AERIAL


CONSULTANT	YYYY-MM-DD	DATE
	DESIGNED	2023-07-31
	PREPARED	SD
	REVIEWED	HS
	APPROVED	HM

PROJECT NO. 19129150	CONTROL 0047	REV. 0	FIGURE 4
-------------------------	-----------------	-----------	-------------



SCALE 1:150,000

LEGEND
 [Yellow Box] STUDY AREA



NOTE(S)
 1. ALL LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE

REFERENCE(S)
 1. ORANGEVILLE, ONTARIO. 1:63,360. MAP SHEET 040P16, [ED. 1], 1937
 2. COORDINATE SYSTEM: NAD 1983 UTM ZONE 17N

CLIENT
 CBM AGGREGATES, A DIVISION OF ST. MARYS CEMENT INC.
 (CANADA)

PROJECT
 CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT STATEMENT, 1420 CHARLESTON SIDEROAD,
 TOWN OF CALEDON, REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF PEEL, ONTARIO



TITLE
 1937 TOPOGRAPHIC MAP

CONSULTANT	YYYY-MM-DD	2023-07-31
	DESIGNED	SD
	PREPARED	SD
	REVIEWED	HS
	APPROVED	HM

PROJECT NO. 19129150 CONTROL 0047 REV. 0 FIGURE 5

PATH: C:\Users\Volunteer\OneDrive\Par 5_Calendar\PROJ\19129150\19129150_PROD\047_CU\007.mxd PRINTED ON: 2023-08-18 AT: 11:03:38 AM

25mm IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM ANSIB



SCALE 1:150,000

LEGEND
 STUDY AREA



NOTE(S)
 1. ALL LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE

REFERENCE(S)
 1. ORANGEVILLE (EAST) ONTARIO. 1:50,000. MAP SHEET 040P16, ED. 1, 1952
 2. COORDINATE SYSTEM: NAD 1983 UTM ZONE 17N

CLIENT
 CBM AGGREGATES, A DIVISION OF ST. MARYS CEMENT INC. (CANADA)

PROJECT
 CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT STATEMENT, 1420 CHARLESTON SIDEROAD, TOWN OF CALEDON, REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF PEEL, ONTARIO


TITLE
 1952 TOPOGRAPHIC MAP

CONSULTANT	YYYY-MM-DD	2023-07-31
	DESIGNED	SD
	PREPARED	SD
	REVIEWED	HS
	APPROVED	HM

PROJECT NO. 19129150	CONTROL 0047	REV. 0	FIGURE 6
-------------------------	-----------------	-----------	-------------

PATH: S:\Cadastral\Information\Chemungung_Par_5_Calendar\05_Plan\19129150_0047_0000\0047_Cat_1420_Calendar\19129150_0047_Cat_1420_0000.mxd PRINTED ON: 2023-08-16 AT: 11:23:23 AM

25mm IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM ANSIS



SCALE 1:150,000

LEGEND
 STUDY AREA



NOTE(S)
 1. ALL LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE

REFERENCE(S)
 1. SOUTHERN ONTARIO, 1954, 437801, ONTARIO. DEPARTMENT OF LANDS AND FORESTS
 2. COORDINATE SYSTEM: NAD 1983 UTM ZONE 17N

CLIENT
 CBM AGGREGATES, A DIVISION OF ST. MARYS CEMENT INC.
 (CANADA)

PROJECT
 CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT STATEMENT, 1420 CHARLESTON SIDEROAD,
 TOWN OF CALEDON, REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF PEEL, ONTARIO



TITLE
 1954 HISTORICAL AERIAL

CONSULTANT	YYYY-MM-DD	2023-07-31
	DESIGNED	SD
	PREPARED	SD
	REVIEWED	HS
	APPROVED	HM

PROJECT NO. 19129150	CONTROL 0047	REV. 0	FIGURE 7
-------------------------	-----------------	-----------	-------------

PATH: E:\Client\Waterloo_Chenieredung_Peel_S_Caledon\03_PRCU\031515\031515_00_PRCU\0047_CIL_1420_Charleston\03151515_0047_CIL_007.mxd PRINTED ON: 2023-08-18 AT: 11:23:34 AM

25mm IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM ANS/B



LEGEND
 STUDY AREA



NOTE(S)
 1. ALL LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE

REFERENCE(S)
 1. ORANGEVILLE ONTARIO, 1:50,000, MAP SHEET 040P16, ED. 2, 1973
 2. COORDINATE SYSTEM: NAD 1983 UTM ZONE 17N

CLIENT
 CBM AGGREGATES, A DIVISION OF ST. MARYS CEMENT INC. (CANADA)

PROJECT
 CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT STATEMENT, 1420 CHARLESTON SIDEROAD, TOWN OF CALEDON, REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF PEEL, ONTARIO



TITLE
 1973 HISTORICAL TOPOGRAPHIC MAP

CONSULTANT	YYYY-MM-DD	
	2023-07-31	
	DESIGNED	SD
	PREPARED	SD
	REVIEWED	HS
	APPROVED	HM

PROJECT NO. 19129150 CONTROL 0047 REV. 0 FIGURE 8

PATH: C:\Users\jvictoria\OneDrive\Documents\19129150\19129150_047_CHEM\19129150_047_CHEM.dwg PLOTTED ON: 2023-08-18 AT: 11:52:21 AM

25mm IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM ANS/B



SCALE 1:150,000

LEGEND

STUDY AREA

DRAFT



NOTE(S)

1. ALL LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE

REFERENCE(S)

- 1. ORANGEVILLE ONTARIO, 1:50,000, MAP SHEET 040P16, ED. 5, 1994
- 2. COORDINATE SYSTEM: NAD 1983 UTM ZONE 17N

CLIENT

CBM AGGREGATES, A DIVISION OF ST. MARYS CEMENT INC. (CANADA)

PROJECT

CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT STATEMENT, 1420 CHARLESTON SIDEROAD, TOWN OF CALEDON, REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF PEEL, ONTARIO

TITLE

1994 HISTORICAL TOPOGRAPHIC MAP

CONSULTANT



YYYY-MM-DD	2023-07-31
DESIGNED	SD
PREPARED	SD
REVIEWED	HS
APPROVED	HM

PROJECT NO.
19129150

CONTROL
0047

REV.
A

FIGURE
9

PATH: S:\Clients\Nobroker_ChenhuiLiang_Pic_S_Calendar_Productions_PROD\047_Cul_1420_Coulterville\19129150_047_Cul_1420_Coulterville\19129150_047_Cul_1420_Coulterville\19129150_047_Cul_1420_Coulterville_11.25.19.dwg

25mm IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM ANSIB



Plate 3: 1985 aerial photograph showing farm complex



Plate 4: 1996 aerial photograph showing farm complex

4 EXISTING CONDITIONS

4.1 INFORMATION GATHERING

The Town of Caledon, Ontario Heritage Trust, and the MCM were consulted on March 27, 2023 to gather information on the Study Area.

Cassandra Jasinski, Heritage Planner at the Town of Caledon, confirmed receipt of the request on March 31, 2023 and indicated that she would provide materials they have on file.

Kevin Baksh, Acting Provincial Heritage Registrar at the Ontario Heritage Trust, confirmed on April 11, 2023 that the Trust does not have any additional information, background documents, or previous reports relating to the Study Area.

Karla Barboza, Team Lead of the Heritage Planning Unit at the MCM, confirmed on March 31, 2023 that no properties have been designated by the Minister within the Study Area and that there are no provincial heritage properties within or adjacent to the Study Area.

***UPDATE No. 1 (September 2025):** This HIA has been updated to address comments received on March 18, 2025. Additionally, since June 2024, WSP has been meeting with the Town monthly. As a result of the March 18th comments and these monthly meetings, the Town has shared archival photographs and resources pertaining to the property. Further discussions from these meetings centred around the designation of the property under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, the potential need for a Heritage Easement Agreement, and the details and timing of proposed conservation measures. The updates made to this report as a result of these meetings can be found in Section 7.5 and Section 8.*

4.2 FIELD REVIEW RESULTS

A field review of the Study Area as part of the Cultural Heritage Report (WSP 2022) was undertaken on November 18, 2022, by WSP Cultural Heritage Specialist Chelsea Dickenson and Cultural Heritage Technician Robert Pinchin. Weather conditions during the field review were sunny with seasonally cool temperatures. The property inspection (Section 4.2) and heritage evaluation (Section 5) are based on an exterior assessment of the property.

4.2.1 LOCATION CONTEXT

The Study Area is on the northwest side of Charleston Sideroad between Main Street and Mississauga Road (Figure 1). The Credit River meanders south to the east of the Study Area. The surrounding area is generally agricultural and residential and the broader area has aggregate extraction locations.

The properties in close proximity to the Study Area (18501 Mississauga Road, 18667 Mississauga Road, and 18772 Main Street) are rural agricultural and all listed on the Town's heritage register (Plate 5 to Plate 8). Historically, these properties were all granted to and owned by various members of the Cameron family in the 19th century.



Plate 5: Farmscape at 18501 Mississauga Road



Plate 6: Tree lined driveway at 18667 Mississauga Road



Plate 7: Farmhouse at 18667 Mississauga Road



Plate 8: Farmscape at 18722 Main Street

4.2.2 LANDSCAPE CONTEXT

The approximately 1.4-hectare (3.4-acre) Study Area features a large farmhouse, barn foundation, and other landscape features that historically were associated with the surrounding agricultural fields and wooded areas.

The farmhouse is accessed from Charleston Sideroad by a paved driveway that wraps around the southwest side of the house (Plate 9 and Plate 10). Mature deciduous and coniferous trees stand on either side of the driveway and windbreaks line the northeast and southwest boundaries of the Study Area (Plate 11). A low, dry-laid fieldstone wall extends approximately 140 metres from Charleston Sideroad to the rear of the Study Area, on the southwest side of the driveway and house (Plate 12).

An outbuilding at the rear of the Study Area is northwest of the house. It is oriented east-west and is wood clad with a gambrel roof (Plate 13). Based on aerial photographs and topographic mapping this building was constructed between 1973 and 1985 (Figure 6 to Figure 9 and Plate 3).

The parged fieldstone ruins of an earlier barn are also located at the rear of the Study Area and oriented approximately northeast-southwest along the northwest boundary (Plate 14). Etched into the parging is “G.A.C./H.R.C./J.H.C./MAYS(?)/190_/_8_”, likely the initials of George A. Cameron (G.A.C) and his sons, John H. Cameron (J.H.C.) and Hilton R. Cameron (H.R.C.), who would have been children at this time (Plate 15). It could not be determined whether this etching is part of the original construction or a later repair. It was noted during the site visit that a wooden covered area has been added to the ruins, featuring red brick flooring (Plate 14). This barn is visible in the early 20th-century photograph that shows the barn as a timber frame structure with a gable roof (see Plate 1) and burned down in July 1964 (see Plate 2). Gable roofed barns are often earlier than those build with a gambrel roof, although in this case we know from the engraving that the barn dates to the first decade of the 20th century, at the latest (McIlwraith 1997).



Plate 9: View up the driveway towards house, facing northwest



Plate 10: View from the rear of the driveway towards Charleston Sideroad



Plate 11: Vegetative windbreak along southwest boundary, looking northwest



Plate 12: Low fieldstone wall along the southwest side of the Study Area




Plate 13: Late 20th-century outbuilding



Plate 14: Barn foundation ruins, looking southwest




Plate 15: Closeup of inscription on barn ruins



LEGEND

- CIRCULATION ROUTE
- BARN
- BARN FOUNDATION RUINS
- DRIVEWAY
- FARMHOUSE
- FIELDSTONE WALL
- HOCKEY RINK
- MATURE TREES
- OUTBUILDING
- TREES
- VEGETATIVE WINDBREAK



NOTE(S)
1. ALL LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE

REFERENCE(S)
1. CONTAINS INFORMATION LICENSED UNDER THE OPEN GOVERNMENT LICENCE - ONTARIO
2. IMAGERY CREDITS: SOURCES: ESRI, HERE, GARMIN, INTERMAP, INCREMENT P CORP., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GEOBASE, IGN, KADASTER NL, ORDNANCE SURVEY, ESRI JAPAN, METI, ESRI CHINA (HONG KONG), (C) OPENSTREETMAP CONTRIBUTORS, AND THE GIS USER COMMUNITY
3. COORDINATE SYSTEM: NAD 1983 UTM ZONE 17N

CLIENT
CBM AGGREGATES, A DIVISION OF ST. MARYS CEMENT INC. (CANADA)

PROJECT
CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT STATEMENT, 1420 CHARLESTON SIDEROAD, TOWN OF CALEDON, REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF PEEL, ONTARIO

TITLE
EXISTING CONDITIONS AT 1420 CHARLESTON SIDEROAD

CONSULTANT	YYYY-MM-DD	2023-07-31
	DESIGNED	SD
	PREPARED	SD
	REVIEWED	HS
	APPROVED	HM

PROJECT NO.	CONTROL	REV.	FIGURE
19129150	0047	0	10

4.2.3 FARMHOUSE

The farmhouse is composed of three elements: the original main block, a rear tail, and the rear and side addition on the north and west sides of the house. These are described individually in the following subsections. The four elevations of the structure are shown in Plate 16 to Plate 20. The house is oriented in a northwest to southeast fashion but for ease of description it is described in a north-south orientation where the south (front) elevation is on the southeast and the north (rear) elevation is on the northwest.



Plate 16: South (front) elevation, facing Charleston Sideroad




Plate 17: East elevation showing the original house (outlined in red), rear tail (outlined in green) and rear/side addition (outlined in yellow)



Plate 18: North (rear) elevation (rear and side addition visible only)





Plate 19: Oblique view of north and west elevations of rear and side additions (outlined in yellow, original main block is outlined in red)



Plate 20: South portion of the west elevation of original main block



PATH: S:\Clients\Watershed_Consulting_Par_5_Caledon\02_PICO\19129150_047_PICO\047_CU_1420_Caledon\19129150_047_CU_0011.mxd PRINTED ON: 2023-08-16 AT 11:46:47 AM



NOTE(S)
 1. ALL LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE

REFERENCE(S)
 1. CONTAINS INFORMATION LICENSED UNDER THE OPEN GOVERNMENT LICENCE - ONTARIO
 2. IMAGERY CREDITS: SOURCES: ESRI, HERE, GARMIN, INTERMAP, INCREMENT P CORP., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GEOBASE, IGN, KADASTER NL, ORDNANCE SURVEY, ESRI JAPAN, METI, ESRI CHINA (HONG KONG), (C) OPENSTREETMAP CONTRIBUTORS, AND THE GIS USER COMMUNITY
 SOURCE: ESRI, MAXAR, EARTHSTAR GEOGRAPHICS, AND THE GIS USER COMMUNITY
 3. COORDINATE SYSTEM: NAD 1983 UTM ZONE 17N

CLIENT
 CBM AGGREGATES, A DIVISION OF ST. MARYS CEMENT INC.
 (CANADA)

PROJECT
 CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT STATEMENT, 1420 CHARLESTON SIDEROAD,
 TOWN OF CALEDON, REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF PEEL, ONTARIO

TITLE
 EXISTING CONDITIONS AT 1420 CHARLESTON SIDEROAD

CONSULTANT	YYYY-MM-DD	2023-07-31
	DESIGNED	SD
	PREPARED	SD
	REVIEWED	HS
	APPROVED	HM

25mm IF THIS MEASUREMENT DOES NOT MATCH WHAT IS SHOWN, THE SHEET SIZE HAS BEEN MODIFIED FROM ANSIB

4.2.3.1 MAIN BLOCK

The original main block is a two-storey, red brick, Italianate-style farmhouse with an irregular footprint and a low-pitch truncated hipped roof clad in asphalt shingles. The original metal cresting is no longer extant (see Plate 1). At the roof's projecting eaves are decorative paired brackets on all elevations (Plate 22). The main block stands on an ashlar stone foundation, three courses of which are visible on the exterior, and the topmost course of stone has chiselled margins (Plate 24). The red-brick walling, laid entirely in a stretcher bond pattern, suggests that the house is frame construction with brick veneer; however, given its high quality, the masonry could also be load-bearing, with the inner and outer wythes connected with metal ties.

Contrasting with the red brick are the stone segmental arch heads and lug sills of the window and door openings. The stone heads have central and projecting "keystones" while the lug sills are bush hammered with chiselled margins (Plate 23). Generally, the windows of the main block are identical in style and materials except for the second storey windows on the west elevation, which have buff brick arched heads that may be a repair or replacement for the stone heads (Plate 37). Some windows were wood, double-hung and protected by storms, but others have been replaced in vinyl, including those at the foundation level on the west elevation. A 2022 home inspection report notes that some of the wood windows have not opened for many years and are seized (Home to Home Inspections Ltd. 2022).

The south elevation features a box bay window with mansard roof and paired brackets (Plate 25). Four windows are on the bay, one narrower window on either side and a pair matching the remaining windows of the main block on the face, all with the same decorative elements (decorative stone heads, decorative arched wooden frames, and stone lug sills) (Plate 26). The paired windows on the face are accented further by recessed buff brick panels below each window.

A second, canted bay window projects from the east elevation of the two-storey frontispiece that stands the full height of the main block and is topped by a hipped roof (Plate 29). This "tower" element is distinct to the Italianate style. This east bay features a mansard roof with paired brackets and three windows with the same stone heads and sills as seen throughout the main block, as well as recessed buff brick panels below the windows (Plate 35). The main block's east elevation also has an enclosed porch or sunroom that is set between the "tower" element and the rear tail to the main block (Plate 36). This porch was originally open but has since been enclosed (Plate 21). Photographs of the interior of the porch from the 2022 home inspection report suggest that portions of the structure date to the main block's initial construction and its roof is bellcast.

The main entrance on the south façade has a double door with flat transom (Plate 27). The doors are protected by double storms and hung within a wooden frame topped with the same decorative arched head and decorative stone arch and sills as the windows. Although the transom lights appear to date to the main block's original construction, the storm doors are modern replacements. It was unclear based on exterior view alone whether the interior doors are also recent replacements.

Access to the main entrance is via a porch that wraps around the south and east elevations, extending from the main entrance on the south elevation to the "tower" element of the east elevation (Plate 27). Its stone foundation is continuous and extends the length of the porch (Plate 28 to Plate 30). Two roofs cover the porch, one for the portion on the south elevation and one for the east elevation. The south porch has a mansard roof with second-storey door, which is also visible in the historical photo (compare Plate 21 to Plate 16 and Plate 29). The east porch features a hipped roof, the underside of which is bellcast (Plate 31). Both porch roofs are accented with decorative paired brackets and supported by wooden arcades with square posts featuring decorative scrollwork and filigree accents (Plate 32 to Plate 33).

A second entrance to the house is located at the north terminus of the porch, on the south side of the east elevation's frontispiece or projection (Plate 34). The entrance is single leaf and similar in style to the main entrance in that it also features a flat transom, a storm door, and segmental arched head. The storm door is glazed with a large opening over three horizontal panels. This style of door is similar to the "five-cross-panel door" popular in the late 19th-to-early 20th centuries (Garvin 2001). It is likely that this storm door is original to the main block's construction, though the window appears to be a later addition. The transom was covered at the time of the site visit. On the west elevation is basement access, a modern addition built in cast-in-place concrete (Plate 38).

The historical photo of the house shows at least three chimneys on the main block. An internal chimney on the east elevation and external chimneys on the north and west elevations are no longer extant (compare Plate 21 to Plate 20, Plate 29, and to Plate 39). At the time of the field review, the west elevation features the original west elevation chimney, as well as two external vents that extend the height of the first storey and are constructed of brick masonry (Plate 20 and Plate 38). Neither of the two external vents date to the original construction of the main block.



Plate 21: Detail of the late-19th to early 20th-century photograph of the house.



Plate 22: Overhanging eaves and paired bracket detail



Plate 23: Main block window example



Plate 24: Cut stone foundation



Plate 25: South elevation box bay window



Plate 26: Detail of box bay side windows



Plate 27: Main entrance doorway (south elevation)



Plate 28: Main entrance porch



Plate 29: Side porch



Plate 30: Stone foundation of the front and side porches



Plate 31: Bellcast roof of the side porch



Plate 32: Decorative porch accents



Plate 33: Decorative porch accents



Plate 34: Second entrance to the house adjacent to the bay window on the east elevation



Plate 35: Bay window of east elevation



Plate 36: Enclosed porch of east elevation



Plate 37: Upper storey windows of main block west elevation showing possible later replacements of some decorative element such as brick arch heads



Plate 38: Basement access on west elevation



Plate 39: East elevation with former external chimney visible on original main block (highlighted in yellow)

4.2.3.2 REAR TAIL

Connecting the north elevation of the main block to the rear and side addition is the one-storey rear tail with a shed roof (Plate 40). This is probably the same rear addition seen in the historical photo, but has been reclad and the east elevation window in-filled (Plate 21). The structure may have been a summer kitchen for the main block and, like the latter structure, its stretcher bond brickwork indicates either brick-clad frame or double-wythe brick walls connected with masonry ties. The brickwork matches that of the rear and side addition and visible foundations appear to be cement block.



Plate 40: East elevation of rear tail, with rear addition visible on the right

4.2.3.3 REAR AND SIDE ADDITION

The rear and side addition is comprised of two segments, both built in modern red brick laid in stretcher bond on cement block foundations. Based on their similar style, materials, and condition, these rear and side structures were likely constructed at the same time and so are discussed together. The rear structure has a square footprint and hipped roof while the side portion has a shed roof and extends along the west sides of the rear addition, rear tail, and main block (Plate 41).

On the rear addition are canted bay windows on the north and east elevations, each of which has three windows with soldier course, buff-brick voussoirs laid in a flat arch at their head, painted stone lug sills, and buff brick niches below the windows (Plate 42 to Plate 44). A brick chimney is located inside the southwest corner.

Two entrances are on the north elevation, one for both the rear and side segments. Both entrances feature wood double doors with the same buff brick heads as the bay windows (Plate 42). A third entrance on the south elevation of the side addition is similar to the north elevation entrances, with the buff brick heads arched rather than flat (Plate 45). The south entrance also has a single-leaf door flanked by two side lights. Four square-shaped and sliding sash windows are on the west elevation of the side addition, also with buff brick heads but with stone lug sills that are bush hammered with chiselled margins (Plate 46). A bay window, similar in style to north and east elevations of the rear addition, is positioned on the south elevation, next to the entrance.



Plate 41: Perspective view of the north and west elevations of rear/side addition



Plate 42: North elevation of rear/side addition



Plate 43: Detail of north elevation bay window



Plate 44: Detail of east elevation bay window



Plate 45: South entrance to side addition



Plate 46: Example of west elevation windows on side addition

4.2.4 INTERPRETATION

Background research indicates that the main block of the farmhouse in the Study Area was constructed for George Cameron in the final decade of the 19th century. The historical photo from the early 20th century show that the rear tail, likely a summer kitchen, was constructed by this point, either contemporaneous with the main block or an early addition. The final, and most recent, addition to the house is represented by the rear and side addition, which was likely constructed in the second half of the 20th century. The main block is relatively unaltered and its later additions are sympathetic and compatible as they have a smaller massing, and a similar accented red brick and fenestration as the main block.

The main block is typical of the Italianate architectural style. Some authors have conservatively estimated the style rose to prominence by the 1850s or 60s and was falling out of fashion between 1890 and the turn of the century (Blumenson 1990; Mikel 2004), while others have traced the style's history to span from the 1830s to 1920s, with a height of popularity in the 1870s coincident with a preference for the Picturesque (Ricketts *et al.* 2011). This style may have become popular in Ontario after it was featured in the 1865 edition of the *The Canadian Farmer* (Plate 47).

Generally, the Italianate style used or reworked elements of Tuscan architecture. It placed an emphasis on stylized or exaggerated Classical features, often repeating a motif several times across a building. Buildings following this architectural style typically feature: dichromatic effects around windows, at corners, or as a banded course; exaggerated or moulded window cornices, often topped with stilted or segmental arches; deep projecting eaves and ornately decorated cornice brackets; a prominent entrance, projecting frontispiece, or corner tower; cupolas or belvederes; and wooden arcaded porches. The Italianate style was seen as flexible and adaptable with no rigid proportions to constrain creativity. Mikel notes that:

One of the most common Italianate forms was the simple square hipped-roof house. It was generally rectangular with the narrow side fronting the street. The façade was usually symmetrical, except for the front door, placed to one side and forming a side hall plan.

(Mikel 2004:66)




Plate 47: Italianate style model house from 1865 The Canada Farmer Journal (Blumenson 1990)

The house in the Study Area displays some architectural features characteristic to the Italianate style, such as the simple form with hipped roof, symmetrical façade with offset entrance, projecting frontispiece on the side elevation, projecting eaves with brackets, brick and stone accents (window cornices, sills, foundation) which create a dichromatic effect, carved stone window heads with keystones, and wooden arcaded porch.

The barn, which remains today as foundation ruins, is visible in the early 20th-century photograph that shows the barn as a timber frame structure with a gable roof. This style of barn was being replaced across southern Ontario by those built with a gambrel roof in the first decade of the 20th century (McIlwraith 1997). In this case we know from the engraving on the stone foundation that the barn dates to the first decade of the 20th century, at the latest.

4.2.5 ANALYSIS OF PHYSICAL CONDITIONS AND HERITAGE INTEGRITY

4.2.5.1 PHYSICAL CONDITION

Table 3 provides a summary of the physical conditions of the house in the Study Area using criteria adapted from a checklist developed by Historic England (Watt 2010: 365-361) and listed in Fram’s 2003 *Well-Preserved: The Ontario Heritage Foundations Manual of Principles and Practice for Architectural Conservation* (Fram 2003). Note that these observations are based on surficial inspection only and should not be considered as a structural engineering assessment.

Table 3: Analysis of Physical Conditions

ELEMENT	OBSERVED CONDITIONS
General Structure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall, the farmhouse appears to be in good condition.
Roof	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lifting of some asphalt shingles was observed during the site visit. The 2022 Home Inspection notes that the roof is “nearing the end of useful life” (Home to Home Inspection 2022: 6).
Rainwater Disposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All gutters appear to be in good condition.
Exterior Elements (Walls/Foundations/Chimneys, etc.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Painted wood trim on both porches showed evidence of flaking. Exterior brick veneer appears to be in good condition. Some cracking and flaking of mortared joints observed, but minimal and commensurate with age.
Windows and Doors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several windows of the main block appear to be recent replacements (including those at the foundation level on the west elevation). Original windows could not be assessed from exterior only. Decorative elements (stone arches, lug sills and wooden frames) all appear to be in good condition. South elevation (main) entrance transom window, door frame, and decorative stone accents all appear to be in good condition. East elevation entrance door is in good condition, though some cracking and peeling of the paint observed. Door frame and decorative stone accents all appear to be in good condition. Transom window was covered at the time of site visit and unobservable.
Internal Roof Structure/Ceiling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Physical condition of internal roof structure unknown as access to the interior of the house was not permitted. The 2022 Home Inspection report notes that all ceilings inspected (basement, main floor, second floor) and attic space were acceptable (Home to Home Inspections Ltd. 2022).
Floors	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unobservable during the site visit as the property inspection assessed the exterior of property structures only. The 2022 Home Inspection report notes poured concrete flooring in the basement and hardwood flooring present throughout the main and second floors, all in acceptable condition (Home to Home Inspections Ltd. 2022).
Stairways/Galleries/Balconies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unobservable during the site visit as the property inspection assessed the exterior of property structures only. The 2022 Home Inspection report provides notes on the basement stairs (wooden, acceptable) and exterior access (poured concrete, acceptable) (Home to Home Inspections Ltd. 2022).
Interior Decorations/Finishes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unobservable during the site visit as the property inspection assessed the exterior of property structures only. The 2022 Home Inspection does not specifically discuss finishes and an assessment could not be made based on the photos contained within.
Fixtures & Fittings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unobservable during the site visit as the property inspection assessed the exterior of property structures only.

ELEMENT	OBSERVED CONDITIONS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 2022 Home Inspection does not specifically discuss fixtures and fittings and an assessment could not be made based on the photos contained within.
Building Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The house is currently inhabited, and services were active at the time of site visit.
Site & Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vegetation around the house generally well kept and unlikely to be physically affecting the structure. No areas of standing water observed.

4.2.5.2 HERITAGE INTEGRITY

In the 2006 *Heritage Property Evaluation: A Guide to Listing, Researching, and Evaluating Cultural Heritage Property in Ontario Communities*, the MCM stresses that a property need not be in its original condition to have CHVI though stresses the concept of integrity:

“Integrity is a question of whether the surviving physical features (heritage attributes) continue to represent or support the cultural heritage value or interest of the property.”

(MCM 2006a: 26)

The MCM expands on this concept of integrity in their 2014 Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties, Heritage identification & Evaluation Process to include landscape features and references the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit and the 2008 US National Park Service Info Bulletin: VIII. How to Evaluate the Integrity of a Property as potential guidance documents (MCM 2014, USDI 2008). The latter source identifies integrity as “the ability of a property to convey its significance” (2008: 1-2) and defines this within the seven aspects of integrity: Location, Design, Setting, Materials, Workmanship, Feeling, and Association. Based on this definition, integrity can only be judged once the significance of a place is known (USDI 2008: 1-2).

Other guidance documents reviewed as part of this assessment define integrity as the “wholeness” or “honesty” of a place and examines the subsequent effects of time and change on the site’s cultural heritage value (Drury and McPherson 2008:45). Similarly, Kalman’s 1979 *Evaluation of Historic Buildings* criteria for “Integrity” (“Site”, “Alterations”, and “Condition”) are less specifically linked to significance, so have been used here to determine the Study Area’s level of heritage integrity (Table 4). This analysis was also considered when evaluating the Study Area for CHVI. The associated survival percentage and rating is based on the following scale:

- Poor = 0-20%
- Fair = 21-40%
- Good = 41-60%
- Very Good = 61-80%
- Excellent = 81-100%

4.2.5.3 RESULTS

Based on the analysis of physical conditions and heritage integrity presented in Table 3 and Table 4, it was found that the main block of the farmhouse is in very good physical condition and has a “very good” (77%) level of heritage integrity.

Table 4: Analysis of Heritage Integrity

ELEMENT	ORIGINAL MATERIAL/TYPE	ALTERATION	SURVIVAL (%)	RATING	COMMENT
Setting	Property located within an agricultural context, bounded by Charleston Sideroad on the south and formerly associated agricultural fields on all remaining sides. Original adjacent properties include 18722 Main Street, 18667 Mississauga Road (both to the north) and 18501 Mississauga Road (to the west).	Minimal alterations to the general setting.	95	Excellent	The area retains most of its original agricultural and rural character. The Listed properties which would have historically shared boundaries with the farmscape at 1420 Charleston Road are unaltered. The only change to the original setting of the farmscape is the severing and redrawing of the Study Area's boundaries.
Site Location	Set back from Charleston Sideroad by approximately 85 m.	Parcel boundaries have been redrawn as the Study Area was severed in the 1970s from the 150 acres the farmhouse would have originally been associated with.	75	Very Good	The parcel severed in the late 20th century contain all of the built features of the farmscape.
Footprint	Original structure has an irregular footprint.	20th-century additions on the original structure have expanded its footprint but these are compatible and reversible.	85	Excellent	While additions to the rear of the house have expanded the footprint to the north, the original footprint is easily identifiable and delineated. The front façade, visible from the ROW, remains unaltered.
Wall	Original main block is of frame construction with red brick veneer laid in a stretcher bond pattern.	No alterations to the original red brick veneer of the main block. The rear tail/summer kitchen has been re-clad with modern brick and siding. The rear and side addition is of sympathetic materials, with red brick walls and buff brick accents.	75	Very Good	The use of materials other than brick on the exterior of the rear tail (very small portion of siding on the south elevation where the tail meets the original main block) is minimal. The use of red and buff coloured brick on the rear and side addition is sympathetic to the original materials.
Foundation	Cut stone foundations.	No alterations visible from exterior aspect. Later additions feature concrete block foundations.	90	Excellent	Original foundations of main block appear to be intact. Foundations of rear tail appear to be cement block.
Exterior Doors	Main entrance on south elevation features double doors with double storm doors, wooden frame with same decorative arched head and stone arch and sills as the windows. Secondary entrance on east elevation is a single door entryway following a similar style as main entrance, storm door, wooden frame with same decorative arched head and stone arch and sills as the windows.	Storm doors on main entrance are 20th century replacements, though maintain the original configuration of the entrance. The storm door on the secondary entrance is likely original, though altered to install a window. The interior doors for both entrances could not be assessed from the exterior.	70	Very Good	Though some alterations have taken place to both entrances, the alterations are sympathetic in that they maintain the original configuration of the entrances. The original decorative elements (carved wooden arch, segmental stone arch, and stone lug sills) have been retained and are in remarkably good condition.
Windows	Wooden hung windows in wood frames.	Observations during the site visit indicated that all windows have been replaced with modern hung windows. The second storey window openings of the west elevation have been altered by replacement of the stone arches with buff brick arched heads. The original wooden frames also appear to have been replaced but the decorative wooden arched head remains in situ for both windows, though the southern window has possibly been narrowed.	80	Excellent	The 2022 Home Inspection Report notes that "the older windows are covered by storm windows and are protected", indicating that some original windows may be present. Some decorative elements (wooden arch heads) have been retained on all windows of the original main block, including those on the west elevation that have been altered, while other decorative elements (segmental stone arches and lug sills) have been retained on all windows of the original main block.
Roof	Truncated hipped roof with projecting eaves and metal cresting.	Original roof shape maintained. Metal cresting has been removed.	95	Excellent	No additional comments
Chimneys	Original internal brick chimneys located on the east, north, and west sides of the house (visible in historical photographs).	All original chimneys have been removed.	0	Poor	No additional comments
Water Systems	Unknown, probably square copper or tin	All original water systems removed.	0	n/a	No additional comments
Exterior Decoration	Original decorative architectural elements including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decorative brackets present along eaves of main block roof, bay windows, and side porch; Paired segmental arched windows; Stone arch heads, wooden frames and stone lug sills seen on window and door openings; Top course of foundation stone finished with same pattern as seen on lug sills; Porches with decorative scrollwork, filigree accents, and bellcast and mansard roofs; Projecting bay windows with recessed buff brick panels. 	Minimal alterations to the original elements on all elevations. It's possible that alterations to the second storey windows of the north half of the west elevation of the original main block have taken place, including replacement of the segmental stone arch heads with buff brick and possible narrowing of the more southern window. Original elements (window with similar decorative elements to main block) on the east elevation of the rear tail have been obscured by later re-cladding.	85	Excellent	Retention of original elements of almost all window and door openings of the original main block is notable, especially the decorative accents carved into the wooden window frame heads.
Exterior Additions	Original main block likely constructed between 1891 and 1901.	20th century additions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rear tail/summer kitchen (likely a very early addition to the main block) Rear and side addition 	80	Excellent	While additions to the rear of the house have expanded the footprint to the north and west, the original main block is easily identifiable and delineated. The south (front), east, and a large portion of the west elevations are intact and unaltered. The rear tail and side

ELEMENT	ORIGINAL MATERIAL/TYPE	ALTERATION	SURVIVAL (%)	RATING	COMMENT
		All are compatible in scale, materials, fenestration, and decoration to the main block			addition are both single storey additions to the north and west elevation, leaving the second storey unaltered and visible.
Interior Plan	Unknown.	Unknown.	n/a	n/a	No additional comments
Interior Walls/Floors	Unknown.	Unknown.	n/a	n/a	No additional comments
Interior Trim	Unknown.	Unknown.	n/a	n/a	No additional comments
Interior Features	Unknown.	Unknown.	n/a	n/a	No additional comments
Landscape features	Long tree-lined driveway, low fieldstone wall, mature vegetation throughout the property.	Minimal alterations to the mature landscape features.	95	Excellent	No additional comments
Average of Rate of Change/Heritage Integrity			77	Very Good	Rating of very good is based on original element survival rating between 61-80%

5 EVALUATION OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST

5.1 ONTARIO REGULATION 9/06

The criteria for determining CHVI of a property at a local level are set out in O. Reg. 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. A property may be worthy of listing under the *Ontario Heritage Act* if it meets one or more of criteria of O. Reg. 9/06, and designation under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* if it meets two or more criteria.

The Study Area was evaluated using the criteria for CHVI prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06. Table 5 provides a summary of the evaluation, and a discussion of the evaluation is provided below.

Table 5: Evaluation of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest

CRITERIA	EVALUATION OUTCOME
1. Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method	✓
2. Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit	✓
3. Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.	✗
4. Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community.	✗
5. Yields or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture	✗
6. Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community	✗
7. Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area	✓
8. Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings	✓
9. Is a landmark	✗

5.1.1 DESIGN OR PHYSICAL VALUE

The main block of the farmhouse is a representative example of a late 19th-century Italianate style farmhouse and together with the Study Area's barn foundations, the low fieldstone wall, and mature vegetation lining the driveway is a representative example of a 19th century farmstead in the Town of Caledon (Criterion 1).

While the core of the farmstead is a representative example of an Italianate style farmhouse and a late 19th century farm complex, the main block of the farmhouse shows a high degree of craftsmanship in its detailing, including the stone window heads and chiselled detailing in the stone sills and foundation (Criterion 2). However, there is no evidence that any of the built or landscape components on the property display a high degree of technical or scientific achievement (Criterion 3).

Accordingly, the Study Area meets Criteria 1 and 2 of O. Reg. 9/06 and has design/physical value related to the Italianate farmhouse. The farmhouse is a representative example of this architectural style and exhibits a high degree of craftsmanship.

5.1.2 HISTORICAL OR ASSOCIATIVE VALUES

The property does not have historical value or associative value. The Study Area is historically linked with the Cameron family, who farmed Lot 16 from the early 19th century to 1968. While they are an early farming family in the community, no significant contributions to the community were identified. Background research has demonstrated that this structure has no direct association with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to a community (Criterion 4).

There is no evidence to suggest the structure yields or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture (Criterion 5).

There is no documentary evidence that indicates a specific architect, artist, builder, or designer was involved in the design or construction of this structure. As such, the property does not demonstrate or reflect the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a community (Criterion 6).

Accordingly, the Study Area does not meet Criteria 4-6 of O. Reg. 9/06 and does not have known historical/associative value.

5.1.3 CONTEXTUAL VALUE

The house in the Study Area is closely tied, both physically and historically, to the surrounding properties. The Study Area is one of several 19th-century farm complexes in the area that are either listed on the Town of Caledon's heritage register or identified on the Town's Built Heritage Resource Inventory of Pre-1946 Structures. Similar to other properties in the vicinity, the Study Area has a long driveway leading to a small complex of structures that includes a farmhouse, barns and outbuildings, and mature vegetation. These properties collectively create a rural landscape that retains something of its 19th-century agricultural land use. As a 19th century farmstead, the spatial organization and mix of structural elements in the Study Area maintain and support the rural agricultural character of the wider area (Criterion 7).

The Study Area is historically connected to other properties in the immediate vicinity that were owned by members of the Cameron family through the 19th and early 20th centuries. These properties are 18501 Mississauga Road (built for George Cameron's grandfather John), 18667 Mississauga Road (built for George's uncle Duncan), and 18772 Main Street (built for George's cousin James). The Study Area is particularly linked to the latter as the house at this address is in the same Italianate style and was likely built around the same time as the main block (Criterion 8).

The property is not known to be a landmark in the community given its rural location, setback from the ROW, and low massing in the surrounding rural landscape (Criterion 9).

Accordingly, the Study Area meets Criteria 7 and 8 of O. Reg. 9/06 and has contextual value related to the connections to nearby heritage properties that are also historically linked with the Cameron family.

5.1.4 SUMMARY

Based on a review of background documents, community engagement and property inspection it was determined that the Study Area meets four criteria of O. Reg. 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (Criteria 1, 2, 7, and 8), indicating that this property has CHVI at a local level and is eligible for designation under Part IV of the *Act*. The Study Area was not found to be a CHL since the heritage attributes of the property are substantially related to the farmhouse. Based on this evaluation, WSP has drafted a Statement of CHVI.

5.2 STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST

5.2.1 DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY

The farmhouse at 1420 Charleston Sideroad in the Town of Caledon is a two-storey red brick Italianate style house, constructed between 1891 and 1901 and altered through 20th-century additions.

5.2.2 PROPOSED STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST

Built between 1891 and 1901 for George Cameron, the red brick farmhouse at 1420 Charleston Sideroad is representative of the Italianate architectural style with its two-storey massing, hipped roof with wide overhanging eaves and decorative brackets, buff brick and stone accents including segmental stone eyebrow arches, buff brick arches, and carved lug sills on window and door openings, wood frames with arched head accents on window and door openings, and decorated wooden arcaded front and side porches. The farmhouse is setback from the road, accessed by a long driveway lined with mature trees. Mature trees are located throughout the property. At the rear of the farmhouse are the fieldstone foundation ruins of the original barn, likely constructed at the same time as the main block of the house, and a low fieldstone wall extends from Charleston Sideroad to the rear of the property, on the southwest side of the driveway and house.

As a 19th century farmstead, the spatial organization and mix of structural elements at 1420 Charleston Sideroad maintain and supports the rural agricultural character of the wider area. The property is one of several 19th-century farmsteads in the area, most of which are listed on the Town of Caledon's Heritage Register.

5.2.3 HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES

Identification of heritage attributes is based on exterior examination of the structure. Heritage attributes should be confirmed with interior inspection during preparation of the Heritage Conservation Plan. At present, heritage attributes that contribute to the CHVI of the property:

- Residence:
 - Two-storey Italianate style main block with red brick exterior.
 - Cut stone foundations with top stones with chiselled margins.

- Truncated medium hip roof with projecting eaves and paired brackets.
- Symmetry of architectural elements such as paired windows, decorative brackets, and double door entrance.
- Decorative accents such as the keystone eyebrow arches above windows and doors, bush hammered with chiselled margins lug sills, cut stone foundation, and recessed buff brick panel accents on bay windows.
- Decorative accents carved into the arched wooden window frame heads.
- Porches on the south and east elevations:
 - Wooden arcades and square posts with decorative scrollwork and filigree accents.
 - Mansard roof of the portion on the south elevation, bellcast roof on the east elevation.
 - Stone foundations.
 - Original second porch on east elevation.
- Bay windows on south and east elevations:
 - mansard roof with decorative brackets, the same carved stone window heads and lug sills as the rest of the main block windows and recessed buff brick decorative panels below the windows.
- Barn foundation ruins.
- Mature vegetation:
 - Deciduous and coniferous trees lining the driveway.
- Dry laid fieldstone wall.

6 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The MCM InfoSheet #5 provides guidance on how to complete impact assessments for provincial heritage properties (MCM 2006b). This assessment considers two categories of impacts:

- **Direct Impact:** A permanent or irreversible negative affect on the CHVI of a property that results in the loss of a heritage attribute. Direct impacts include destruction or alteration.
- **Indirect Impact:** An impact that is the result of an activity on or near a cultural heritage resource that may adversely affect the CHVI and/or heritage attributes of a property. Indirect impacts include shadows, isolation, direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas, a change in land use, or land disturbances.

It should be noted that land disturbances, as defined in MCM InfoSheet #5, apply to archaeological resources (MCM 2006b). An archaeological assessment is beyond the scope of this study since recommendations regarding archaeological resources must be made by a professional archaeologist licensed by the MCM.

6.1 DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED WORK

It is WSP's understanding that the proposed development includes the extraction of limestone resources, including blasting to a depth between 8 to 27 m, and associated activities and construction for supporting works (i.e., construction of perimeter berms and laydown areas). This work will be confined to the license area (261.2 hectares), which will encompass the extraction areas but also areas required for setbacks and supporting works, defined for the project as the limit of extraction.

As recommended in the Cultural Heritage Report (WSP 2022), the limit of extraction proposed in April 2023 has been adjusted to provide a buffer of 50 m from the farmhouse and is subject to the requirement to complete this study (Figure 1). The 50 m buffer established to support the Project reflect research (i.e. Carmen *et al.* 2012 and Randl 2001) and consultation with WSP vibration specialists, which determined a 50 m buffer adequate for capturing potential vibration impacts to physical heritage attributes such as built structures. The proposed license area encompasses the entire Study Area. Within the limit of extraction and license area, proposed construction activities will include:

- Stripping topsoil and overburden to create a perimeter berm. Excess soil will be temporarily stored within the license area or used for progressive rehabilitation of the site.
- Extraction of limestone (involving blasting) and sand and gravel below the water table. This will require dewatering to allow for operations in a dry state.
- The possible use of temporary workspaces/laydown areas, vegetation removal, and heavy machinery/traffic.
- Rehabilitation, the goal of which is to create a landform that represents an ecological and visual enhancement and provides future opportunities for conservation, recreational, tourism and water management. This will ultimately include the creation of lakes, vegetated shorelines, islands, wetlands, upland forested areas, riparian plantings adjacent to the existing watercourse, nodal shrub and tree planting on upland areas grassland meadows and specialized habitat features for bats and turtles.

It should be noted that the lands within the limit of extraction will be maintained in their current state and agricultural uses until they are required for preparation for aggregate extraction.

6.2 ASSESSMENT OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS

Based on the above understanding of the proposed work, Table 6 provides an assessment of the potential impacts resulting from the Project.

Table 6: Assessment of Potential Impacts to 1420 Charleston Sideroad

IMPACT TYPE	DISCUSSION
Direct Impacts	
Destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features.	<p>The preliminary extraction area, proposed in April 2023, of which the proposed construction activities include extraction (blasting) as well as the possible use of temporary workspaces/ laydown areas, vegetation removal, and heavy machinery/ traffic, encroaches into the northwest portion of the Study Area, encompassing a portion of the fieldstone barn ruins.</p> <p>The location of the proposed construction activities suggests the possible demolition/destruction of the fieldstone barn ruins, which will result in a change in land use and permanent removal of some CHVI and heritage attributes identified for the property.</p> <p>As proposed, the work is anticipated to result in destruction-related impacts that will directly impact the Study Area, adversely affecting its CHVI and heritage attributes. See Section 7 for mitigation recommendations.</p>
Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance.	<p>The proposed work, without mitigation measures or conservation planning, could result in altering the heritage attributes and appearance of the identified built heritage attributes and their contextual heritage value. See Section 7 for mitigation recommendations.</p>
Indirect Impacts	
Shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden.	<p>No shadow-related impacts to the heritage resource are anticipated since the proposed work will be ground disturbing rather than new building construction.</p> <p>Accordingly, no negative impacts relating to shadows are anticipated.</p>
Isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment context or a significant relationship.	<p>The location of the proposed construction activities suggests the possible demolition/destruction of a portion of the Study Area and/or the surrounding farmsteads, to which the Study Area is historically and physically linked.</p> <p>The proposed construction activities suggest the possible demolition/destruction of the fieldstone barn ruins, an identified heritage attribute of the Study Area.</p> <p>Therefore, alterations that may indirectly impact the property through isolation of heritage attributes are a possibility without mitigation measures in place. See Section 7 for mitigation recommendations.</p>
Direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features.	<p>No significant views or vistas to or from the Study Area were identified as a heritage attribute. Therefore, no negative impacts to views are anticipated.</p>
A change in land use such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new development or site alteration to fill in the formerly open spaces.	<p>A proposal to change the land use of a portion of the Study Area and surrounding area to be licenced under the <i>Aggregate Resources Act</i> and designated/zoned under the <i>Planning Act</i> to permit the proposed quarry has been submitted and is in progress.</p> <p>Therefore, the proposed change in land use may indirectly impact the Study Area, adversely affecting its CHVI and heritage attributes. See Section 7 for mitigation recommendations.</p>
Land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect a cultural heritage resource.	<p>The proposed mineral aggregate operation activities will result in significant changes to the grade and drainage patterns of the land within the project, including the Study Area.</p> <p>Without mitigation measures, the proposed activities will result in land disturbances which will negatively affect the CHVI and heritage attributes identified for the Study Area.</p> <p>As proposed, the work is anticipated to result in land disturbances that will directly impact the property, adversely affecting the Study Area's CHVI and heritage attributes. See Section 7 for mitigation recommendations.</p>

6.3 SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS

The proposed work will involve the extraction of limestone resources, requiring stripping topsoils and overburden, extraction (blasting), vegetation removal, creation of temporary workspaces/laydown areas, use of heavy machinery/traffic, and ultimate rehabilitation. Overall, this is anticipated to have a negative impact on the CHVI and identified heritage attributes of the Study Area. If conservation and mitigation measures aren't developed and implemented, the proposed work has potential for direct and indirect negative impacts to the Study Area related to destruction, alteration, isolation, and land disturbances.

Section 7 provides recommendations on conservation and mitigation measures that should serve to mitigate any potential negative impacts of the proposed work.

7 CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVES

Since the impact assessment identified the potential for adverse impacts to the CHVI and heritage attributes of the Study Area, alternatives have been considered following Section 3.3.3.3.3 of *Town of Caledon's Official Plan* (2018) and MCM (2006b) InfoSheet#5 of the *Ontario Heritage Tool Kit*. These are:

- 1 Retention of the building on-site in its original use
- 2 Retention of the building on-site in an adaptive re-use
- 3 Relocation of the building
 - a on the development site
 - b to a sympathetic site
- 4 Preserve by Record and Commemorate

7.1 OPTION 1: RETENTION OF THE BUILDING ON-SITE IN ITS ORIGINAL USE

Retention of the building on-site in its original use.

Advantages: The approach adheres to the conservation principle of minimal intervention. This approach allows for the property to retain its heritage attributes in situ and preserves the integrity and authenticity of the resource.

Disadvantages: While minimum intervention is the most preferred approach, this can prove detrimental to long-term sustainability without sufficient preventative mitigation measures. Given the nature of the proposed mineral aggregate operation activities and the location of the Study Area as partially within the limit of extraction, the farmhouse would not be a desirable or viable place to live. Adjusting the limit of extraction to avoid the heritage attributes of the Study Area while still allowing access to as much of the aggregate as is realistically possible would still result in a residential structure bordered on three sides by mineral aggregate operation activities, rendering the farmhouse an undesirable place to live as evidenced by the potential sale of nearby properties. As such, it is unlikely that the farmhouse will remain occupied for the duration of the work. Rehabilitation work would not begin until quarrying activities are complete, which may be 40-50 years. Should the residence become uninhabited during the quarrying operations, the structure could fall into disrepair and its heritage attributes could rapidly deteriorate.

Overall feasibility: This option is not feasible because of the:

- High potential for lack of an active use for the Study Area.
- Challenges for long term sustainability.

7.2 OPTION 2: ADAPTIVE REUSE

Retention of the building on-site and an adaptive re-use, such as using the building as an office for the quarry site.

Advantages: This approach would conserve the identified heritage attributes in their current location within the property. Rehabilitation can 'revitalize' a historic place (Canada's Historic Places 2010). Adaptive re-use would serve to retain the farmhouse's heritage attributes in their original location, while allowing for change to take place in the immediate area. Adaptive re-use presents an opportunity for the house to retain a 'progressive authenticity', or 'successive adaptations of historic places over time (Jerome 2008:4). Adaptive re-use projects are generally more cost-effective, socially beneficial, and environmentally sustainable than new builds, even though they may require

more specialized planning to undertake. The Client has indicated that there is need for a site office or laboratory and as Option 1 is not feasible the adaptive re-use of the farmhouse as an office or laboratory would serve best to conserve the identified heritage attributes in their current location.

Disadvantages: Conservation of the farmhouse without similar conservation of the greater property and surrounding properties would diminish the authentic rural and context and sever the contextual value for the farmhouse. Given the nature of the proposed mineral aggregate operation activities and the location of the Study Area as partially within the limit of extraction, the farmhouse would not be a desirable or viable place to live or work due to noise and vibrations. Adaptive re-use of heritage buildings for office or laboratory work is a commonly explored alternative and one explored as an option for this project. Using the farmhouse as an office or laboratory site for the quarry operations would require changes to convert the structure to an office, which may negatively impact the identified CHVI and heritage attributes and would still only be a temporary measure.

Overall feasibility: This option is feasible because of the:

- Retention of the farmhouse in its original location and the good physical condition of the main block of the house.
- Continued use of the farmhouse in a contentious and sympathetic way during the proposed work and revitalization of the heritage attributes of the farmhouse once the work is complete.

7.3 OPTION 3: RELOCATION AND REHABILITATION

Option 3a discusses relocation of the buildings to a new location within the development site while Option 3b discusses relocation of the buildings to a sympathetic site within the Town. Both options are discussed in detail below.

Option 3a: Relocation of the building on the development site. A heritage building, if of significant historical, architectural or contextual importance, could be relocated to another location within the proposed development.

Advantages: As with Option 2, relocation and rehabilitation can ‘revitalize’ a historic place, and when adapted to a new location, a valued place can be more easily maintained and protected and its heritage attributes widely understood, recognized, and celebrated. Also as above, relocation and rehabilitation projects are generally more cost-effective, socially beneficial, and environmentally sustainable than new builds, even though they may require more specialized planning to undertake.

This option would conserve the physical connection of the farmhouse to its original land parcel, maintaining much of the contextual linkages. Relocation presents an opportunity for the house to retain a ‘progressive authenticity’, or ‘successive adaptations of historic places over time (Jerome 2008:4). Relocating the farmhouse within the development could potentially allow for a thoughtful integration of the farmhouse into the rehabilitation efforts while maintaining the historical relationship of the Study Area with the area.

Disadvantages: Relocating the farmhouse is in opposition to MTCS *Guiding Principle* for “original location”. This principle states that buildings should not be moved “unless there is no other means to save them since any change in site diminishes heritage value considerably”. The nature of the work within the proposed extraction area may not provide for a site with sufficient space and buffer to protect the CHVI of the farmhouse. Moreover, relocation of the farmhouse could result in total loss of CHVI if an accident occurs during the process or planning is insufficient.

Overall feasibility: This option is not feasible because of the:

- Nature and scope of the proposed adjacent mineral aggregate operation activities do not allow for sufficient space and buffer to relocate the farmhouse within Lot 16.

Option 3b: Relocation of the building to a sympathetic site within the Town.

Advantages: As with Option 2, relocation and rehabilitation can ‘revitalize’ a historic place, and when adapted to a new location, a valued place can be more easily maintained and protected and its heritage attributes widely

understood, recognized, and celebrated. Also as above, relocation and rehabilitation projects are generally more cost-effective, socially beneficial, and environmentally sustainable than new builds, even though they may require more specialized planning to undertake.

This option would conserve the physical attributes of the farmhouse. Relocating the farmhouse to an available lot at a sympathetic site within the Town could potentially allow for a thoughtful integration of the farmhouse into the plans for the new site.

Disadvantages: Relocating the farmhouse is in opposition to MTCS *Guiding Principle* for “original location”. This principle states that buildings should not be moved “unless there is no other means to save them since any change in site diminishes heritage value considerably”. The effort to transport the farmhouse on a public road would be substantial and may require consideration of such actions as taking down overhead lines, reinforcing culverts and crossings, and police escort. Relocation of the farmhouse could result in total loss of CHVI if an accident occurs during the process or planning is insufficient.

Overall feasibility: This option is not feasible because:

- The opportunity to retain the house in situ is available
- The effort required to relocate the farmhouse would be substantial and introduce unnecessary risk to the heritage attributes.

7.4 OPTION 4: SALVAGE AND COMMEMORATION

Preserve by Record and Commemorate.

Under this option all the property’s heritage attributes would be documented through photographs, measured drawings, and written notes prior to demolition. This option allows for salvage of notable heritage artifacts that contribute to the CHVI of the property for donation during and consult with the Town of Caledon regarding the potential inclusion and development of commemorative plaques or place naming strategies.

Advantages: This option would conserve the historical connection of the farmhouse and landscape features to the community and original land parcel through commemoration while salvage of notable artifacts would retain some physical link to the farm complex’s intangible historical or associative value. This option is both cost effective and acknowledges the farm complex’s historical importance within the community. Through detailed investigations, the construction, architecture, and history of the property would become an example for comparative studies and inform both future heritage assessments and academic study of the area.

Disadvantages: Preservation by salvage or record is the least desirable conservation option. Through demolition, all CHVI and heritage attributes would be removed from the Study Area, and a tangible reminder of the late 19th-century farmhouse and landscape features would be lost, resulting in further attrition of heritage property building stock in the municipality and province. Even if some materials are salvaged, there is potential that their connection with the farmhouse and its historical or associative value will eventually be lost. Demolition of a viable building also means the unnecessary addition of building material to a landfill.

Overall feasibility: Despite the disadvantages, this option is feasible for the landscape components of the Study Area because:

- It preserves the barn foundation ruins on the property.

7.5 SUMMARY

Option 2 is identified to be that which best balances the economic viability of the Study Area and the long-term sustainability of the original farmhouse as a valued historic structure with intact heritage attributes. Option 4 is feasible for the landscape elements (the barn foundation ruins).

Option 2 will:

- Preserve a tangible element of the Town’s architectural and agricultural history;
- Retain understanding of the property within its specific historical and land use setting; and
- Encourage public understanding and appreciation of the Town’s built and agricultural heritage.

Option 4 will:

- Preserve the barn foundation ruins of the farm complex.

UPDATE No. 1 (September 2025): The below text and Table 7 have been added to illustrate that the preferred conservation strategy is aligned with the requirements of the Ontario Heritage Act, PPS 2024, Aggregate Resources Act, and Regional and Municipal Official Plan policies. .

The alternatives selected as the preferred conservation strategy for the Study Area are aligned with the requirements of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, PPS 2024, Region of Peel Official Plan, and Town of Caledon Official Plan. The heritage evaluation (Section 5) and impact assessment (Section 6 and 7) satisfy the requirements for cultural heritage under the Aggregate Resources Act. All recommendations contained in this report follow applicable Official Plan policies in effect by the Region of Peel and Town of Caledon. Monthly discussions between WSP’s Cultural Heritage Specialists and Heritage Planning staff at the Town, initiated June 2024, are ongoing.

Table 7: Policies and Guidelines met as part of this HIA

POLICY / GUIDANCE	MET
<i>Aggregate Resources Act</i> (Ontario Regulation 244/97)	✓
Provincial Planning Statement (2024)	✓
<i>Ontario Heritage Act</i> (Ontario Regulation 9/06, Bill 23, Bill 200)	✓
Region of Peel Official Plan	✓
Town of Caledon Official Plan	✓
Town of Caledon Terms of Reference for Heritage Impact Assessments	✓
MCM’s Heritage Property Evaluation: A Guide to Listing, Researching, and Evaluating Cultural Heritage Property in Ontario Communities	✓
MCM’s Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process, InfoSheet #5, Heritage Impact Assessments and Conservation Plans	✓
MCM’s Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties: Heritage Identification & Evaluation Process	✓

Provided that the recommendations contained in this report are implemented, the applicable *Ontario Heritage Act*, PPS 2024, *Aggregate Resources Act*, and Regional and Municipal Official Plan policies are satisfied.

UPDATE No. 1 (September 2025): The below text has been added to reflect ongoing conversations between WSP and the Town and acknowledges that a ‘Notice of Intention to Designate’ the subject property, 1420 Charleston Sideroad, was issued by the Town of Caledon on March 12, 2024 (Town of Caledon 2024b and 2024c).

Note that in the time since the original submission (2023), the Town presented a staff report at the Heritage Caledon Committee meeting on February 5, 2024 and issued a NOID for 1420 Charleston Sideroad on March 12, 2024 (Town of Caledon 2024b and 2024c) with the following description:

The property is located on the north side of Charleston Sideroad, west of Main Street/Cataract Road, being Part of Lot 16, Concession 4 WHS, within the former geographic Township of Caledon.

Built between 1891 and 1901 for George Cameron, the red brick farmhouse at 1420 Charleston Sideroad on the lands is representative of the Italianate architectural style with its two-storey massing, hipped roof with wide overhanging eaves and decorative brackets, dichromatic stone accents including segmental stone eyebrow arches and carved lug sills on window and door openings, wood frames with arched head accents on window and door openings and decorated wooden arcaded side porch. The farmhouse is setback from the road, accessed by a long driveway lined with mature trees. Mature trees are located throughout the property. At the rear of the farmhouse are the fieldstone foundation ruins of the original barn, likely constructed at the same time as the main block of the house, and a low fieldstone wall extends from Charleston Sideroad to the rear of the property, on the southwest side of the driveway and house.

The property is historically linked with the Cameron family, who farmed Lot 16 from the early 19th century. A direct relative of the subject Cameron family is believed to be James Francis Cameron, an internationally celebrated Canadian filmmaker.


As a 19th century farmstead, the spatial organization and mix of structural elements on the property maintains and supports the rural agricultural character of the wider area.

(Town of Caledon, 2024c)

Additionally, WSP facilitated production of a draft Reference Plan (R-Plan) to further support Option 2 by identifying the portion of the parcel containing the property's heritage attributes. This R-Plan will be used to define the future Part IV Designation limits and the current draft is presented in Appendix F.

As a result of the meetings with the Town, CBM made two updates to the Project to respect the heritage value of the property. The updates include widening the proposed berm along Charleston Sideroad so that views of the heritage attributes of the property are unobstructed and adjusting the proposed Reference Plan (R-Plan) boundaries to retain the barn ruins at the rear of the property.

At the time of updated report submission, the Part IV Designation has not yet been approved by Council.



SCALE 1:150,000

LEGEND

- PROPOSED 50 m BUFFER
- CIRCULATION ROUTE
- BARN
- BARN FOUNDATION RUINS
- DRIVEWAY
- FARMHOUSE
- FIELDSTONE WALL
- HOCKEY RINK
- MATURE TREES
- OUTBUILDING
- TREES
- VEGETATIVE WINDBREAK



NOTE(S)

1. ALL LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE

REFERENCE(S)

1. CONTAINS INFORMATION LICENSED UNDER THE OPEN GOVERNMENT LICENCE - ONTARIO
2. IMAGERY CREDITS: SOURCES: ESRI, HERE, GARMIN, INTERMAP, INCREMENT P CORP., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GEOBASE, IGN, KADASTER NL, ORDNANCE SURVEY, ESRI JAPAN, METI, ESRI CHINA (HONG KONG), (C) OPENSTREETMAP CONTRIBUTORS, AND THE GIS USER COMMUNITY
3. COORDINATE SYSTEM: NAD 1983 UTM ZONE 17N

CLIENT

CBM AGGREGATES, A DIVISION OF ST. MARYS CEMENT INC.
(CANADA)

PROJECT

CULTURAL HERITAGE IMPACT STATEMENT, 1420 CHARLESTON SIDEROAD,
TOWN OF CALEDON, REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF PEEL, ONTARIO

TITLE

PROPOSED 50 M BUFFER

CONSULTANT



YYYY-MM-DD	2023-07-31
DESIGNED	SD
PREPARED	SD
REVIEWED	HS
APPROVED	HM

PROJECT NO.
19129150

CONTROL
0047

REV.
0

FIGURE
12

8 SUMMARY STATEMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

WSP was retained by CBM to complete a HIA for 1420 Charleston Sideroad in the Town of Caledon, Regional Municipality of Peel, Ontario (the Study Area). The Study Area is a rectangular-shaped, 1.4-hectare (3.4-acre) property located on the northwest side of Charleston Sideroad, between Cataract Road/Main Street and Mississauga Road. In the Study Area is a two-storey red brick Italianate style residence constructed for George Cameron between 1891 and 1901. The farmhouse was subsequently altered through additions built in the 20th century. The Town of Caledon issued a Notice of Intention to Designate (NOID) for the Study Area under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* on March 12, 2024. The Study Area is not identified as a Cultural Heritage Landscape in the Town's Cultural Heritage Landscape Inventory (Scheinman 2009).

CBM proposes to develop the Study Area as part of a quarry site, with the proposed work including removing the surface vegetation and overburden, creating temporary workspaces or laydown areas, extracting the limestone resources, and ultimately rehabilitating the site.

An evaluation of the Study Area for this HIA determined that the Study Area has CHVI because it meets four criteria prescribed in O. Reg 9/06 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (1, 2, 7, and 8). The Study Area's CHVI is principally linked to its farmhouse, which has physical value as a well-preserved representative example of an Italianate style farmhouse with a high degree of craftsmanship in its detailing and contextual value for its physical and historical connections to its surroundings, and since it is important in defining, maintaining, and supporting the agricultural and rural character of the area.

An impact assessment of the proposed work determined that the Study Area will be subject to both direct and indirect negative impacts. To avoid or reduce these effects, WSP recommends:

- Adaptive re-use of the farmhouse as an office/laboratory site for the quarry operations, to be converted back to its original use after extraction operations are complete.

UPDATE No. 1 (September 2025): *As part of the updated report submission, the following recommendations have been updated to respond to comments received from Town of Caledon Heritage Planning staff, regulatory updates, and project progression since the July 2023 submission. In particular, the status of the property's designation process under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, the preparation of a draft reference plan to delineate limits of heritage attributes and the proposed details and timing of conservation measures have been updated and included to reflect monthly meetings with the Town, ongoing since June 2024, and comments received on the July 2023 submission on March 18, 2025.*

UPDATE No. 2 (February 2026): *As part of the updated report submission, recommendation #9 has been added to guide heritage conservation recommendations that must be included on the ARA Site Plan Technical Recommendations.*

To achieve this conservation strategy, the following mitigation measures are recommended:

- 1 If the property is vacated before the site-specific mitigation measures are implemented, a qualified specialist shall develop a mothball plan for the farmhouse, with a maintenance and inspection schedule, to conserve the structure until further action is implemented.
- 2 The limit of extraction has been revised as shown on Figure 12 and Appendix B to accommodate the 50 m buffer to protect the heritage attributes of the property from potential adverse impacts as a result from construction related activity. This no-go zone shall be indicated on all project mapping and communicated to project personnel.

- a Prior to site preparation, erect fencing around the property and clearly identify the area on project mapping and via signage as a ‘no-go zone’ during adjacent mineral aggregate operation activities to reduce the risk of accidental damage from vehicles, heavy equipment operation, or other activities of the mineral aggregate operation.
- 3** Vibration impacts:
- a Implement the recommendations of the blast impact assessment (WSP 2022b) to ensure the structural integrity of the farmhouse is maintained.
 - b Vibration from blasting activities will potentially impact the heritage attributes identified for this property. To avoid or reduce the risk of vibrations resulting in adverse impact and ensure the structural integrity of the heritage attributes is maintained, the vibration monitoring protocol developed by a qualified vibration specialist shall be implemented during the activities of the mineral aggregate operation. Should the vibration threshold be exceeded, blasting designs which are affecting the receptors must be reassessed to determine appropriate next steps.
- 4** Fugitive dust impacts:
- a The application has been designed to meet provincial blasting limits and air quality guidelines. CBM has conducted air quality monitoring in the vicinity of the site. Overall the air quality is consistently below provincial guidelines, taking into account the existing aggregate operations and the existing truck traffic in the area. With the addition of the proposed CBM Caledon Pit / Quarry operations, including emissions from aggregate trucks accessing the site, the air quality is still predicted to be below provincial guidelines at surrounding residences.
 - b Implement the recommendations of the Air Quality Impact Assessment (WSP 2023), Best Management Practices Plan for the Control of Fugitive Dust (WSP 2025a), and Air Quality Monitoring Plan (WSP 2025b).
- 5** A Heritage Documentation Report and Salvage Plan shall be conducted for the property with a focus on the barn foundation ruins on the property.
- a Options should be explored which retain the barn foundation ruins. If the barn foundation ruins are retained in situ, a Heritage Documentation Report and Salvage Plan is not required.
- 6** Develop a Heritage Conservation Plan for the farmhouse prior to use of the farmhouse as office or laboratory space to guide the adaptive re-use efforts and outline how the heritage attributes of the structure will be conserved, protected, and enhanced during the rehabilitation program and into the future.
- 7** Once adjacent mineral aggregate operation activities are complete, during final rehabilitation of the site, remove any protective measures implemented during the time the farmhouse is used as an office/laboratory site (Recommendation 2a) and rehabilitate the farmhouse for a compatible existing or new use.
- 8** As the evaluation of the farmhouse and its associated parcel determined that the property meets two or more criteria under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, it is eligible for designation under Part IV. Consider designating the farmhouse and a portion of the parcel associated with the heritage attributes under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.
- a *It is acknowledged as part of this updated report (September 2025) that the Town has issued a NOID for the property. Accordingly, WSP has facilitated the development of a Draft Reference Plan (R-Plan) to guide the limits of the future Part IV Designation (Appendix F)*
- 9** Add the following notes to the ARA Site Plan Technical Recommendations to establish required conservation measures for 1420 Charleston Sideroad that shall be tracked by the Ministry of Natural Resources as part of the CBM Caledon Pit / Quarry site license:

In order to conserve the heritage attributes located at 1420 Charleston Sideroad the licensee shall:

1. During operations, the farmhouse shall be adaptively re-used as an office/laboratory site for the quarry operations. Prior to the surrender of the license, the building shall be converted back to its original use.
2. To conserve the farmhouse at 1420 Charleston Sideroad, the following mitigation measures shall be implemented:
 - a. If the property is vacated prior to converting the farmhouse to an office/laboratory a qualified specialist shall develop a mothball plan for the farmhouse, with a maintenance and inspection schedule, to conserve the structure until further action is implemented.
 - b. The limit of extraction shall include a 50 m buffer from the farmhouse to protect the heritage attributes of the property.
 - c. Prior to site preparation, the licensee shall erect fencing at the 50 m buffer to identify a 'no-go zone' to reduce the risk of accidental damage from vehicles, heavy equipment operation, or other activities of the mineral aggregate operation.
 - d. Implement the recommendations of the blast impact assessment to ensure the structural integrity of the farmhouse is maintained.
 - e. A Heritage Conservation Plan shall be prepared for the farmhouse prior to use of the farmhouse as an office or laboratory space to guide the adaptive re-use efforts and outline how the heritage attributes of the structure will be conserved, protected, and enhanced during the rehabilitation phase and into the future.
 - f. Prior to the surrender of the license, remove any temporary protective measures implemented during the time the farmhouse is used as an office/laboratory site and rehabilitate the farmhouse back to its original use.

Provided that the recommendations contained in this report are implemented, the applicable Ontario Heritage Act, PPS 2024, Aggregate Resources Act, and Regional and Municipal Official Plan policies related to built heritage are satisfied.

9 ASSESSOR QUALIFICATIONS

This report was prepared and reviewed by the undersigned, employees of WSP. The qualifications of the assessors involved in the preparation of this report are provided in Appendix C.

10 BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Archives of Ontario (2022). *Early Districts and Counties 1788-1899*. Available online: <http://www.archives.gov.on.ca/en/maps/ontario-districts.aspx>. Last accessed November 10, 2022.
- Armstrong, F. H. (1985). *Handbook of Upper Canada Chronology*. Toronto: Dundurn Press.
- Army Survey Establishment (1952). *Orangeville (East), Ontario. Sheet 040P16*. Available online: https://geo.scholarsportal.info/#r/details/_uri@=NTS50K040P16_1952ed1ETIFF. Last accessed February 17, 2023.
- Blumenson, John (1990). *Ontario Architecture: A Guide to Styles and Building Terms, 1784-present*. Toronto: Fitzhenry and Whiteside.
- Caledon Heritage Foundation (2024). Welcome to Coulterville. Available online: <https://caledonheritagefoundation.com/ghost-settlement-coulterville/>. Last accessed April 24, 2025.
- Canada's Historic Places (2010). *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada*. Available online: <https://www.historicplaces.ca/media/18072/81468-parks-s+g-eng-web2.pdf>. Last accessed February 16, 2023.
- Canadian Museum of History (2023). *The Covenant Chain, Royal Proclamation and Treaty of Niagara*. Available online: <https://www.historymuseum.ca/history-hall/covenant-chain-royal-proclamation-treaty-niagara/>. Last accessed March 22, 2023.
- Carmen, R.A., Buehler, D., Mikesell, S., and C.L. Searls (2012). Current Practices to Address Construction Vibration and Potential Effects to Historic Buildings Adjacent to Transportation Projects. Wilson, Ihrig and Associates, ICF International, and Simpson, Gumpertz and Heger, Incorporated for the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), Washington, DC.
- City of Niagara Falls (2023). *Public Art Details: James Cameron*. Available online: https://niagarafalls.ca/living/arts-and-culture/public-art/vmt_00046_james-cameron.art. Last accessed March 2, 2023.
- Chapman, L.J. and D. F. Putnam (1984). *The Physiography of Southern Ontario. Second Edition. Ontario Geological Survey, Special Volume 2*. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources: Toronto University Press, Toronto.
- Credit Valley Conservation (2022). *Credit Valley Watershed – Key Facts*. Available online: <https://cvc.ca/our-watershed/?msclkid=16b41333bb2211ecae743e1505df479a>. Last accessed February 17, 2023.
- Department of Energy, Mines and Resources Canada (1973). *Orangeville 40P/16*. Available online: https://geo.scholarsportal.info/#r/details/_uri@=NTS50K040P16_1973ed2mceTIFF&_add:true_nozoom:true. Last accessed February 17, 2023.
- Department of Energy, Mines and Resources Canada (1994). *Orangeville 40P/16*. Available online: https://geo.scholarsportal.info/#r/details/_uri@=NTS50K040P16_1994ed5TIFF&_add:true_nozoom:true. Last accessed February 17, 2023.

Department of National Defence (1937). *Topographic Map of Ontario, Orangeville Sheet, 40P/16*. Available online: http://geo.scholarsportal.info/#r/details/_uri@=HTDP63360K040P16_1937TIFF. Last accessed February 17, 2023.

Department of National Defence (1952). *Topographic Map of Ontario, Orangeville Sheet, 40P/16*. Available online: https://geo.scholarsportal.info/#r/details/_uri@=NTS50K040P16_1952ed1ETIFF&_add:true_nozoom:true. Last accessed February 17, 2023.

Drury, Paul and Anne McPherson (2008). *Conservation Principles Policies and Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment*. English Heritage

Ecological Framework of Canada (2014). *Mixedwood Plains Ecozone*. Available online: <http://www.ecozones.ca/english/zone/MixedwoodPlains/index.html>. Last accessed February 23, 2023.

Ellis, Chris J and Ferris, Neal (1990). *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650*. London Chapter OAS, London, Ontario.

Engelbrecht, William (2003). *Iroquois: The Development of a Native World*, Syracuse University Press; Annotated Addition.

Environmental Registry of Ontario (ERO) (2023). Proposed Changes to the Ontario Heritage Act and its regulations: Bill 23 (Schedule 6) - the Proposed More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022. Available online: <https://ero.ontario.ca/notice/019-6196>. Last accessed: April 24, 2025.

Find a Grave (2010a). *Andrew George Cameron, August 1 1906, Alton Cemetery*. Available online: https://www.findagrave.com/memorial/59053637/andrew-george-cameron?_gl=1*_9kgwut*_ga*NTM5Njk3MTIxLjE2NzZmZnJlU1NTk.*_ga_4QT8FMEX30*MTY3NzI1OTM5MS44LjEuMTY3NzI2MDcwMi4yNC4wLjA.*_ga_B2YGR3SSMB*N2I0MDIkNWEtNDM1My00M2U5LWE0MzMtMjJhNzlmZWZmMDBkLjcuMS4xNjc3MjYwNzAzLjZlLjAuMA. Last accessed February 27, 2023.

Find a Grave (2010b). *George Andrew Cameron, 5 August 1932, Alton Cemetery*. Available online: https://www.findagrave.com/memorial/59053355/george-andrew-cameron?_gl=1*_w6ahtc*_ga*NTM5Njk3MTIxLjE2NzZmZnJlU1NTk.*_ga_4QT8FMEX30*MTY3NzI1OTM5MS44LjEuMTY3NzI2MTIwNC42MC4wLjA.*_ga_B2YGR3SSMB*N2I0MDIkNWEtNDM1My00M2U5LWE0MzMtMjJhNzlmZWZmMDBkLjcuMS4xNjc3MjYxMjYwNzAzLjZlLjAuMA. Last accessed February 27, 2023.

Find a Grave (2010c). *Charlotte "Lottie" McClellan Cameron, 7 November 1951, Alton Cemetery*. Available online: https://www.findagrave.com/memorial/59053163/charlotte-cameron?_gl=1*_qqf5c3*_ga*NTM5Njk3MTIxLjE2NzZmZnJlU1NTk.*_ga_B2YGR3SSMB*N2I0MDIkNWEtNDM1My00M2U5LWE0MzMtMjJhNzlmZWZmMDBkLjcuMS4xNjc3MjYxMjYwNzAzLjZlLjAuMA..*_ga_4QT8FMEX30*MTY3NzI1OTM5MS44LjEuMTY3NzI2MTE0Ni41Ny4wLjA. Last accessed February 27, 2023.

Find a Grave (2020). *Pte. John Harold Cameron, 11 November 1973, Forest Lawn Cemetery*. Available online: https://www.findagrave.com/memorial/219189477/john-harold-cameron?_gl=1*_198t35b*_ga*NTM5Njk3MTIxLjE2NzZmZnJlU1NTk.*_ga_4QT8FMEX30*MTY3NzI1OTM5MS44LjEuMTY3NzI2MTYwOS40Mi4wLjA.*_ga_B2YGR3SSMB*N2I0MDIkNWEtNDM1My00M2U5LWE0MzMtMjJhNzlmZWZmMDBkLjcuMS4xNjc3MjYxNjEwLjQxLjAuMA. Last accessed February 27, 2023.

- Fram, Mark (2003). *Well-Preserved: The Ontario Heritage Foundation's Manual of Principles and Practice for Architectural Conservation*. Boston Mills Press.
- Garvin, James L. (2001). *A Building History of Northern New England*. New Hampshire: University Press of New England.
- Gardiner, Herbert Fairbairn (1899). *Nothing But Names, an Inquiry into the Origin of the Names of the Counties and Townships of Ontario*. George N. Morand and Company Limited. Toronto, Ont.
- Government of Canada (2016). *Ajetance Treaty No. 19*. Available online: <https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1370372152585/1581293792285#ucls17>. Last accessed February 16, 2023.
- Government of Ontario (1990). *Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, Chapter O.18*. Last amendment: July 1, 2019. Available online: <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/statute/90o18>. Last accessed February 16, 2023.
- Government of Ontario (2006). *O. Reg. 10/06: Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest*. Available online: <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/regulation/060010>. Last accessed February 16, 2023.
- Government of Ontario (2022a). Bill 23, More Homes Built Faster Act. Available online: <https://www.ola.org/en/legislative-business/bills/parliament-43/session-1/bill-23>. Last accessed April 24, 2025.
- Government of Ontario (2022b). *Map of Ontario Treaties and Reserves*. Available online: <https://www.ontario.ca/page/map-ontario-treaties-and-reserves>. Last accessed February 16, 2023.
- Government of Ontario (2023). *O. Reg. 9/06: Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest*. Available online: <https://www.ontario.ca/laws/regulation/060009>. Last accessed February 16, 2023.
- Government of Ontario (2024). *Bill 200, Homeowner Protection Act*. Available online: <https://www.ola.org/en/legislative-business/bills/parliament-43/session-1/bill-200>. Last accessed April 24, 2025.
- Home to Home Inspections Ltd. (2022). Home Inspection Report, 1420 Charleston Sdrd, Alton, Ontario, L7K 1N1. On file with report author.
- Historica Canada (2006). *Seven Years' War*. Available online: <https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/seven-years-war>. Last accessed March 22, 2023.
- Historica Canada (2021). *Treaties in Canada: Educational Guide*. Available online: https://www.historicacanada.ca/sites/default/files/PDF/Treaties_English.pdf. Last accessed February 16, 2023.
- Hunting Survey Corporation Limited (1954). Digital Aerial Photographs, Southern Ontario. Photo Available Online: <https://mdl.library.utoronto.ca/collections/air-photos/1954-air-photos-southern-ontario/index>. Accessed November 10, 2022.
- Jerome, Pamela (2008). *An introduction to authenticity in preservation*. APT Bulletin 39 (2/3): 3-7.
- Julien, Donald M., Bernard, Tim, and Leah Morine Rosenmeier, with review by the Mi'kmawey Debert Elders' Advisory Council (2010) Paleo Is Not Our Word: Protecting and Growing a Mi'kmaw Place. In *Indigenous*

- Archaeologies: A Reader in Decolonization*. Margaret Bruchac, Siobhan Hart, and H. Martin Wobst, eds. Pp. 163-170. Left Coast Press, Walnut Creek California.
- Kalman, Harold (1979). *The Evaluation of Historic Buildings*. Ottawa : Environment Canada, Parks Service. Available online: https://publications.gc.ca/collections/collection_2017/pc/R64-98-1979-eng.pdf. Last accessed March 1, 2023.
- McIlwraith, Thomas (1997). *Looking for Old Ontario*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Mika, Nick, and Mika, Helma (1977). *Places in Ontario Vol. 1 A-E*. Mika Publishing: Belleville.
- Mikel, R. (2004). *Ontario House Styles*. James Lorimer & Company Ltd., Toronto.
- Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) (1997). *Eight Guiding Principles in the Conservation of Built Heritage Properties*. Available online: <https://www.ontario.ca/page/eight-guiding-principles-conservation-built-heritage-properties>. Last accessed February 16, 2023.
- MCM (2006a). *Heritage Property Evaluation: A Guide to Listing, Researching, and Evaluating Cultural Heritage Property in Ontario Communities*. Available online: http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/publications/Heritage_Tool_Kit_HPE_Eng.pdf. Last accessed February 16, 2023.
- MCM (2006b). *Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology Policies of the Ontario Provincial Policy Statement, 2005. Info Sheet # 5, Heritage Impact Assessments and Conservation Plans*. Available online: http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/publications/Heritage_Tool_Kit_Heritage_PPS_infoSheet.pdf. Last accessed February 16, 2023.
- MCM (2007). *Heritage Conservation Principles for Land Use Planning*. Available online: http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/publications/InfoSheet_Principles_LandUse_Planning.pdf. Last accessed February 16, 2023.
- MCM (2014, September 1). *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties: Heritage Identification & Evaluation Process*. Available online: http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/heritage/MTCS_Heritage_IE_Process.pdf. Last accessed February 16, 2023.
- Ontario Land Registry (n.d.). *Abstract/Parcel Registry Book: Peel County (43), Caledon; Concession 4, West Hurontario Street*. Onland, Ontario Land Property Records Portal: Teranet Inc., 2022. Available online: <https://www.onland.ca/ui/>. Last accessed February 17, 2023.
- Peel Art Gallery Museum and Archives (PAMA) (1897). *Assessment Roll: Municipality of Caledon. E. N. Delaney, Assessor*. Peel Art Gallery, Museum, and Archives: Brampton, Ontario.
- PAMA (2014). *Heritage Property Research Guide*. [online] Available online: <https://pama.peelregion.ca/en/pamascollection/resources/Heritage%20Property%20Research%20Guide%20-%20Draft%2019%20-%20Final.pdf>. Last accessed 27 February 2023.
- PAMA (2023). *About Peel*. Available online: <https://peelarchivesblog.com/about-peel/>. Last accessed 16 February 2023.
- PAMA (n.d.). *William Perkins Bull Fonds: Family Files. Peel Art Gallery, Museum, and Archives*. Brampton, Ontario.

- Pope, J.H. (1877). *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Peel, Ontario*. Toronto: Walker & Miles.
- Randl, C. (2001). Temporary Protection No. 3: Protecting a Historic Structure during Adjacent Construction. U.S. Department of the Interior National Parks Service Cultural Resources Tech Notes. <https://www.nps.gov/orgs/1739/upload/tech-note-temporary-protection-03-during-construction.pdf>. Last accessed April 4, 2025.
- Region of Peel (2022). *Region of Peel Official Plan, April 2022*. Available online: <https://peelregion.ca/business/planning/official-plan/download-official-plan> Last accessed April 30, 2025.
- Region of Peel (2023). *Population from 1971 to 2011*. Available online: <https://www.peelregion.ca/planning/pdc/data/census/population-1971-2006.htm>. Last accessed February 24, 2023.
- Ricketts, S., Maitland, L., and Hucker, J. (2011). *A Guide to Canadian Architectural Style, Second Edition*. University of Toronto Press: Toronto.
- Schmalz, Peter, S. (1991). *The Ojibwa of Southern Ontario*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Ontario.
- Scheinman, Andre (2009). Town of Caledon Cultural Heritage Landscapes Inventory. Available online: <https://www.caledon.ca/en/living-here/resources/Documents/recreation-leisure/Cultural-Heritage-Landscapes-Inventory.pdf>. Last accessed February 24, 2023.
- Statistics Canada (2022). *Population and dwelling counts: Canada, provinces and territories, census divisions and census subdivisions (municipalities)*. Available online: <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/tv.action?pid=9810000203&geocode=A000235>. Last accessed February 24, 2023.
- Surtees, R.J. (1984). *Indian Land Surrenders in Ontario, 1763-1867*. Indigenous Services Canada, Ottawa.
- Tourism Niagara (2023). *James Cameron: My Niagara Experiences*. Available online: <https://www.visitniagaracanada.com/james-cameron-my-niagara-experience/>. Last accessed March 2, 2023.
- Town of Caledon (1985). Air Photo 1985 L8 175. Provided by Town of Caledon Heritage Planning Staff.
- Town of Caledon (1996). Air Photo 1996 L13 388. Provided by Town of Caledon Heritage Planning Staff.
- Town of Caledon (2018). Official Plan. Available online: <https://www.caledon.ca/en/town-services/official-plan.aspx>. Last accessed February 23, 2023.
- Town of Caledon (2019). *Terms of Reference for Heritage Impact Assessment*. On file with report authors.
- Town of Caledon (2022). *Indigenous Reconciliation*. Available online: <https://www.caledon.ca/en/living-here/indigenous-reconciliation.aspx#Town-of-Caledon-Land-Acknowledgement>. Last accessed 17 February 2023.
- Town of Caledon (2023). Heritage Register. Available online: <https://www.caledon.ca/en/living-here/heritage-designation.aspx#Properties-designated-under-Part-IV-of-the-Heritage-Act>. Last accessed February 23, 2023.

- Town of Caledon (2024b) *Notice of Intention to Designate* - 1420 Charleston Sideroad, 18722 Main Street, 18501 Mississauga Road and 18667 Mississauga Road, Ward 1. Staff Report 2024-0056. Available online: <https://pub-caledon.escribemeetings.com/filestream.ashx?DocumentId=37089>. Last accessed September 18, 2024.
- Town of Caledon (2024c) *Notice of Intention to Designate* - 6 Properties (CBM & Tim Hortons). Available online: <https://www.caledon.ca/en/news/notice-of-intention-to-designate-6-properties-cbm-tim-horton.aspx>. Last accessed September 18, 2024.
- Tremaine, G. R. (1859). *Map of the County of Peel, Canada West*. Toronto: G.R. & G.M. Tremaine.
- Trigger, Bruce G. (2000). *Children of the Aataesentsic: A History of the Huron People to 1660*. McGill Queen's University Press, Montreal, Quebec.
- U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service (USDI) (2008). *VIII. How to Evaluate the Integrity of a Property*. National Register of Historic Places Bulletin (NRB 15). Available online: http://docs.ppsmixeduse.com/ppp/NOP_and_DEIR_Comment_References/2018_1002_usdi_criteriaforeval-physicalfeatures.pdf. Last accessed February 28, 2023.
- Walker and Miles (1877). *Historical Atlas of Peel County, Ontario*. Toronto, Ont.
- Watt, D. (2010). *Surveying Historic Buildings. Second Edition*. Donhead: Shaftsbury, UK
- WSP (2022). Cultural Heritage Report: Existing Conditions and Preliminary Impact Assessment, Caledon Pit/Quarry. On file with report author.
- WSP (2022b). Blast Impact Assessment, Proposed Caledon Pit / Quarry. (Submitted by Golder Associates Ltd., now WSP). On file with report author.
- WSP (2023). Air Quality Impact Assessment. (Submitted by Golder Associates Ltd., now WSP). On file with report author.
- WSP (2025a). Best Management Practices Plan for the Control of Fugitive Dust. On file with report author.
- WSP (2025b). Air Quality Monitoring Plan. On file with report author.

**Appendix A:
Part of the East
Half of Lot 16, Plan
43R-4021**

4021

PLAN MATERIAL


Plastic Material - Mylar
Gauge. 0-003
Process - Photographic
Ink. Special T

I require this plan to be deposited under PART II of the Registry Act.

RECEIVED AND DEPOSITED AS
PLAN 43R-4021

Date. May 18, 1976. Date. MAY 20, 1976

Jan B. Belmise
DEPUTY
Land Registrar for the Registry
Division of Peel No. 43
11:09 AM





Appendix B: Site Plan (May 2025)





- A. General**
- This site plan is prepared under the Aggregate Resources Act for a Class "A" licence for a pit and quarry over the ground water table.
 - Area Calculations:
Main Area: 151.5 hectares
North Area: 30.3 hectares
South Area: 79.4 hectares
 - Northing and easting coordinates have been provided for select corners of the licence boundaries and at the centre point of every entrance and exit that intersects the licence boundaries on the plan view of this drawing.
- B. References**
- Contours were obtained from First Base Solutions and are displayed in one metre intervals. Elevations shown are in metres above sea level (MASL).
 - Topographic information was obtained from numerous sources including First Base Solutions, Land Information Ontario and field investigations for technical reports.
 - All topographic features and structures are shown to scale in Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) with North American Datum 1983 (NAD83), Zone 17 (West), Central Meridian 81 degrees west coordinate system.
 - The Main Area licence boundary was established based on a completed plan of survey completed by Delph 4 Jenkins North Limited (Delph 4) on February 14, 2023 which defined the following information: Plan: 43R-39633, 43R-29007, 43R-22255, 43R-16017, 43R-17782, 43R-4021, 43R-21423, 43R-21424, and instruments R0114881 and R01914021. The North and South Area licence boundaries are based on the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation's parcel fabric.
 - Existing zoning on and within 120 metres of the licence boundaries are from the Town of Caledon Zoning By-law 2008-05, Schedule "A", Zone Major "M" (last updated August 21, 2019), 74 (last updated March 24, 2016) and 75 (last updated August 21, 2019). The Main Area is currently zoned Agricultural Zone (A1) and Environmental Policy Area 2 Zone (EPA2) while the North and South Areas are currently zoned Agricultural Zone (A1).
 - Existing land use designations within 120 metres of the licence boundaries are from the Niagara Escarpment Plan, Part 4, dated June 1, 2017.
 - Land use information and structures identified on and within 120 metres of the licence boundaries were determined using aerial photography captured in the spring of 2021 from First Base Solutions.
- C. Drainage**
- Surface drainage on and within 120 metres of the licence boundaries is by overland flow in the directions shown by arrows on the plan view, or by infiltration.
- D. Groundwater**
- The maximum predicted groundwater table, based on groundwater levels monitored over a 12 month period from January to December 2021, are as follows:
1.1. Main Area - Ranges from 420.7 to 393.5 masl (north to south)
1.2. North Area - Ranges from 407.3 to 392.0 masl (northwest to southeast)
1.3. South Area - Ranges from 405.3 to 391.0 masl (northwest to southeast)
2. The maximum predicted groundwater table elevations are shown in each cross section on drawing 1 of 4 of this drawing.
- E. Site Access and Fencing**
- The Main Area has four existing access points (two on Mississauga Road and two on Charleston Sidewalk), the North Area has two existing access points (one on Main Street and one on Charleston Sidewalk), and the South Area has four existing access points (one on Messissauga Road and three on Charleston Sidewalk). None of the existing access points are gated.
 - Post and wire fencing (unless noted otherwise) exists in the location shown on the plan view.
- F. Significant Natural and Human-Made Features and Within 120 Metres**
- There is a pond and Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) identified unevaluated wetlands within the Main Area licence boundary.
 - There is a Significant Wildlife Habitat and habitat for endangered and threatened species within the Main and South Area licence boundary.
 - There are Significant Woodland, Significant Wetland, Habitat for endangered and threatened species and MNRF identified evaluated wetlands (non-significant) outside of the licence boundaries within 120 metres.



- Table 1: On-Site Groundwater and Surface Water Monitoring Program**
- | Name | Type | Northing | Easting | Monitoring Scope |
|------------|----------|----------|---------|---|
| MW20-01 AB | Mon Well | 4852268 | 577459 | Water level ¹ |
| MW20-02 AB | Mon Well | 4852250 | 578300 | Water level ¹ |
| MW20-03 AB | Mon Well | 4852375 | 578210 | Water level, water quality ^{1,2} |
| MW20-04 AB | Mon Well | 4854157 | 578344 | Water level, water quality ^{1,2} |
| MW20-05 AB | Mon Well | 4854487 | 578372 | Water level, water quality ^{1,2} |
| MW20-06 AB | Mon Well | 4853921 | 577872 | Water level ¹ |
| MW20-07 AB | Mon Well | 4854321 | 577272 | Water level, water quality ^{1,2} |
| MW20-08 AB | Mon Well | 4853100 | 577578 | Water level ¹ |
| MW20-09 AB | Mon Well | 4853250 | 578617 | Water level, water quality ^{1,2} |
| MW20-10 AB | Mon Well | 4853444 | 578677 | Water level ¹ |
| MW20-11 AB | Mon Well | 4853007 | 578785 | Water level ¹ |
| MW20-12 AB | Mon Well | 4852966 | 578252 | Water level ¹ |
| MW20-13 AB | Mon Well | 4852659 | 577058 | Water level ¹ |
| MW20-14 AB | Mon Well | 4853445 | 578682 | Water level ¹ |
| MW20-15 AB | Mon Well | 4854211 | 577778 | Water level ¹ |
| MW20-16 AB | Mon Well | 4852814 | 577872 | Water level ¹ |
| MW20-17 AB | Mon Well | 4852119 | 577793 | Water level ¹ |
| MW20-18 AB | Mon Well | 4852000 | 578682 | Water level & temperature ¹ |
| MW20-19 AB | Mon Well | 4852000 | 578682 | Water level & temperature ¹ |
| MW20-20 AB | Mon Well | 4852000 | 578682 | Water level & temperature ¹ |
| MW20-21 AB | Mon Well | 4852000 | 578682 | Water level & temperature ¹ |
| MW20-22 AB | Mon Well | 4852000 | 578682 | Water level & temperature ¹ |
| MW20-23 AB | Mon Well | 4852000 | 578682 | Water level & temperature ¹ |





Table 2: Off-Site Groundwater and Surface Water Monitoring Program

Name	Type	Northing	Easting	Monitoring Scope
MW20-01	Mon Well	4852138	577900	Water level ¹
MW20-02	Mon Well	4851907	578244	Water level, water quality ^{1,2}
MW20-03	Mon Well	4852313	578255	Water level, water quality ^{1,2}
MW20-04	Mon Well	4852713	578252	Water level, water quality ^{1,2}
MW20-05	Mon Well	4852973	578474	Water level, water quality ^{1,2}
MW20-06	Mon Well	4854173	578673	Water level ^{1,2}
MW20-07	Mon Well	4854473	578673	Water level ^{1,2}
MW20-08	Mon Well	4852000	578682	Water level ^{1,2}
MW20-09	Mon Well	4852000	578682	Water level ^{1,2}
MW20-10	Mon Well	4852000	578682	Water level ^{1,2}
MW20-11	Mon Well	4852000	578682	Water level ^{1,2}
MW20-12	Mon Well	4852000	578682	Water level ^{1,2}
MW20-13	Mon Well	4852000	578682	Water level ^{1,2}
MW20-14	Mon Well	4852000	578682	Water level ^{1,2}
MW20-15	Mon Well	4852000	578682	Water level ^{1,2}
MW20-16	Mon Well	4852000	578682	Water level ^{1,2}
MW20-17	Mon Well	4852000	578682	Water level ^{1,2}
MW20-18	Mon Well	4852000	578682	Water level ^{1,2}
MW20-19	Mon Well	4852000	578682	Water level ^{1,2}
MW20-20	Mon Well	4852000	578682	Water level ^{1,2}
MW20-21	Mon Well	4852000	578682	Water level ^{1,2}
MW20-22	Mon Well	4852000	578682	Water level ^{1,2}
MW20-23	Mon Well	4852000	578682	Water level ^{1,2}



- Legal Description**
Part of Lots 15-1746, Concession 4 WSCR and Part of Lot 16, Concession 3 WSCR (former geographic Township of Caledon)
Township of Caledon
Regional Municipality of Peel
- Legend**
- Licence Boundary
 - Additional Land Owned by Licensee
 - Limit of Extraction
 - Contours with Elevation
 - 120m Offset From Draft Licence Boundaries
 - Public Road
 - Lots and Concessions
 - Driveway
 - Parcel Fabric
 - Railway
 - Easement
 - Overhead Hydro
 - Watercourse
 - Pipeline
 - Watercourse
 - Fence
 - Water Feature
 - Entrance / Exit
 - Wooded Area
 - Direction of Surface Drainage
 - Wetland
 - Building/Structure
 - Wetland - Other
 - Wetland - MNRF - Unvaluated
 - Cross Sections

- Legend - Cross Sections**
- Licence Boundary
 - Limit of Extraction
 - Existing Grade
 - Maximum Predicted Water Table
 - Maximum Depth of Excavation
 - Topsoil and/or Overburden
 - Aggregate Available for Extraction

- Site Plan Acronyms**
- ARA - Aggregate Resources Act
 - MECP - Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks
 - MCCS - Ministry of Government and Consumer Services
 - DFO - Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada
 - MNRF - Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry
 - MCM - Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism
 - TSSA - Technical Standards and Safety Authority
 - MTC - Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport
 - ECA - Environmental Compliance Approval
 - BMP - Best Management Practices Plan
 - WWIS - Water Well Information System
 - HIA - Heritage Impact Assessment
 - CVC - Credit Valley Conservation
 - MASL - Metres above sea level
 - PTTW - Permit to Take Water
 - NTS - Not to Scale

Site Plan Amendments

No.	Date	Description	By

Site Plan Revisions (Pre-Licensing)

No.	Date	Description	By
4	May 2025	Update the site plan to address agency and public comments	C.P.
3	March 2025	Update the site plan to address agency and public comments	C.P.
2	August 2024	Updated the site plan to address the MNRF comments from their letter dated January 11, 2024 and the Town of Caledon comments from their letter dated February 15, 2024	C.P.
1	August 2023	Revised drawing to incorporate updated technical report recommendations	C.P.

MHBC Stamp

PLANNING URBAN DESIGN & LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
MHBC
113 COLLIER STREET, BARRE, ON, LAM 1H2 | P: 705.728.0405 | F: 705.728.2010 | WWW.MHBCAN.COM

MHBC Stamp
Brian Zeman
Is authorized by the Ministry of Northern Development, Natural Resources and Forestry pursuant to Subsection 0.2(3)(f) of the Ontario Regulation 244/97 to prepare and certify site plans.

MHBC Stamp
Christopher Poole
Is authorized by the Ministry of Northern Development, Natural Resources and Forestry pursuant to Subsection 0.2(3)(f) of the Ontario Regulation 244/97 to prepare and certify site plans.

Applicant

cbm CBM Aggregates a Division of St. Marys Cement Inc. (Canada)
55 Industrial Street
Toronto, Ontario
M4G 3W9

VOTORANTIN Geotecnias

Project
Caledon Pit & Quarry
18722 Main Street, Caledon, Ontario

MNRF Licence Reference No.
626600

Applicant's Signature

Plan Scale: 1:5000 (Arch E)

Date: August 2023 May 2025

Drawn By: C.P. **File No.:** 8816AF

Checked By: B.Z.

File Name
Existing Features

Drawing No.
1 of 4

File Path
N:\8816AF - CBM - Caledon Quarry\Drawings\Site Plan\CAD\8816AF - Site Plan.dwg

Site Plan Changes

The redline revisions shown on this drawing represent all of the changes that have been made since the August 2023 Aggregate Resource Act site plan.

A. General

1. Area Calculations
1.1. Licence (Total) 261.2 hectares
1.2. Limit of Extraction (Total) 126.6 hectares

Table with 4 columns: Building, Width, Length, Area. Rows include Scale House, Quality Control Lab, Maintenance Shop, Office.

- 4. The licensee intends to retain ownership or control of additional land containing a house to the northwest of the Main Area during the construction period...
5. The licence boundaries are within the Credit Valley Source Protection Area but are not located within a wellhead protection area...

- B. Hours of Operation
1. Activities to prepare the Site, such as the shipping of topsoil, construction of the berm, or activities related to the rehabilitation of the Site after the extraction is completed...

- C. Site Access and Fencing
1. The existing access point on Charleston St and the southern access point on Mississauga Road for the Main Area (as shown on drawing 1 of 4) shall be removed during site preparation of the Main Area...

- 4. The main operational entrance/walk shall be accessed in the location shown on the plan view of this drawing, subject to an agreement with the Region of Peel...
5. The North and South Areas shall be accessed by tunnels beneath Main Street and Charleston St...

- 7. Pile and/or in-situ micropiles shall be installed in a minimum 1.2 metres in height, shall be erected along the licence boundaries and the perimeter of the cell tower area (see Cell Tower Detail on drawing 1 of 4) in a phased approach...

- 9. All fencing shall be maintained for the life of the licence.
A sign at least 0.5 metres in size shall be erected and maintained at the operational entrance/walk that says in legible words: "This site is licensed under the Aggregate Resource Act license # 026007"

D. Drainage and Station Control

- 1. Drainage of unlandfilled areas will conform to the directions shown on drawing 1 of 4.
2. Silt fencing shall be installed in a phased approach. Prior to site preparation commencing in the Main, North or South Areas, all fencing shall be installed on the exterior side of the perimeter berm and along the perimeter of adjacent woodlands...

E. Site Preparation

- 1. Existing structures within the licence boundary not located to have cultural heritage potential outside of the Cultural Heritage Potential Area shall be demolished or removed prior to extraction within each Area. Structures with cultural heritage potential within the Cultural Heritage Potential Area shall be demolished or removed prior to extraction within each Area...

F. Berms and Screening

- 1. Berms shall not be located within three metres of the licence boundary or cell tower area.
2. Berms shall be a minimum of 0.6 metres in height, except for a section of the berm along the western extent of the Main Area, which shall be a minimum of 0.9 metres in height (see plan view for details).

G. Site Dewatering

- 1. Refer to the water technical recommendations in Section O on drawing 3 of 4 for information regarding site dewatering.

H. Extraction Sequence

- 1. This plan depicts a preliminary operation for the property based on the best information available at the time of preparation.
2. Extraction shall occur in eight phases (Phases 1, 2A, 2B, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7) as shown on the plan view.

I. Infrastructure, Operations and Rehabilitation Sequence

- 1. Infrastructure, operations and rehabilitation sequence: demolition for certain portions or blasting of materials may require minor excavation for extraction and rehabilitation sequence. Any major deviations from the operations sequence shown shall require approval from the MHBC.

J. Phases

- 1. Prepare Phase 1 for extraction and ensure all requirements in Sections "C" through "G" of this drawing are met.
2. Strip Phase 1 and use the material to construct the perimeter berm for the Main Area or temporarily stockpile the material in the topsoil and overburden stockpile area.

3. Phases 2A

- 3.1. Strip Phase 2A and use the material to construct the perimeter berm for the North Area, for progressive rehabilitation in Phase 1 or temporarily stockpile the material in the topsoil and overburden stockpile area.
3.2. Extract pit and quarry in a northeasterly direction before proceeding in a southeasterly direction.

4. Phase 2B

- 4.1. Strip Phase 2B and use the material for progressive rehabilitation in Phases 1 and 2A or temporarily stockpile the material in the topsoil and overburden stockpile area.
4.2. Create linking cut to establish lateral bench Main Street to connect with Phase 2A.

5. Phase 3

- 5.1. Use the topsoil and overburden stockpiled in Phase 3, as well as the existing material, for progressive rehabilitation in Phases 2A and 2B.
5.2. Construct a slurry wall / grout zone in the southwest setback of the Main Area prior to extraction in Phase 3.

6. Phase 4

- 6.1. Use the topsoil and overburden stockpiled in Phase 4, as well as the existing material, for progressive rehabilitation in Phases 2A, 2B, 3, 4 and backfilling the tunnel beneath Main Street.
6.2. Construct infiltration trenches in the southwest setback of the Main Area prior to extraction in Phase 4.

7. Phase 5

- 7.1. Strip Phase 5 and use the material for progressive rehabilitation in Phases 4 and 5 and any other area requiring backfilling with the Main Area. Any remaining topsoil and overburden shall be used for the future progressive rehabilitation in Phases 6 and 7.
7.2. Extract pit and quarry in a southeasterly direction.

8. Phase 6

- 8.1. Strip Phase 6 and use the material to construct the perimeter berm for the South Area or temporarily stockpile for future use with progressive rehabilitation.
8.2. Construct slurry wall / grout zone and infiltration trenches in the southwest and southeast setback of the South Area prior to extraction in Phase 6.

9. Phase 7

- 9.1. Strip Phase 7 and use the material for progressive rehabilitation in Phases 6 and 7.
9.2. Extract pit and quarry in a southeasterly direction before proceeding in a southeasterly direction.

9. Phase 7

- 9.1. Strip Phase 7 and use the material for progressive rehabilitation in Phases 6 and 7.
9.2. Extract pit and quarry in a southeasterly direction before proceeding in a southeasterly direction.

I. Extraction Details

- 1. All trees within five metres of the excavation face inside the limit of extraction shall be removed.
2. The maximum height of a lift within the pit shall not be greater than 1.5 metres above the highest reaching excavating equipment being utilized on-site.
3. The maximum height of a lift within the quarry shall be 25 metres.

J. Equipment and Processing

- 1. Equipment used on-site may include jaw crushers, excavators, bulldozers, sleds, steamers, screeners, conveyors, hoppers, mobile cone crushers, drill rigs, generators, front loaders, shipping loaders, shipping trucks, haul trucks, and water trucks.
2. Processing equipment shall remain a minimum of 30 metres from the licence boundary and 90 metres from a property with a residential use.

K. Fuel Storage

- 1. Fuel storage tanks shall be located in close proximity to the maintenance shop. Fuel storage tanks shall be installed and maintained in accordance with the Technical Standards and Safety Act and Liquid Fuels Regulation (2103).
2. All fuel tanks shall be double sided or placed in containment facilities large enough to hold the tanks maximum volume.





L. Scrap and Recycling

- 1. Scrap may be stored on-site within the Facility Pad, Building Location and Recycling Area identified on the plan view of this drawing (see note 3 on this drawing for additional information) and shall be removed on an ongoing basis.
2. Scrap shall only include material generated directly as a result of the aggregate operation such as rebar, debris, scrap metal, lumber, discarded machinery, equipment and motor vehicles.

- 1. The maximum disturbed area is 95.0 hectares. Disturbed areas shall include active extraction areas, stockpile areas, internal haul routes, areas being progressively rehabilitated and berms until they are vegetated. Areas that have been side-sloped and vegetated, and the adjacent on-registered or flooded wooded quarry floor (eg. stockpiles and equipment removed), shall not constitute disturbed areas.

N. Variations from Control and Operation Standards

Table with 3 columns: Section O.13 Standard, Variation, Rationale. Rows include variations for gate installation, excavation, aggregate, and stockpile areas.



Site Plan Changes
The redline revisions shown on this drawing represent all of the changes that have been made since the August 2023 Aggregate Resource Act site plan.

Legal Description
Part of Lots 15-1746, Concession 4 WSCR and Part of Lot 16, Concession 3 WSCR (former geographic Township of Caledon)
Township of Caledon
Regional Municipality of Peel

Legend section containing symbols for Licence Boundary, Limit of Extraction, Contours with Elevation, Public Road, Driveaway, Railway, Entrance / Exit, Tunnel Crossing, Gate, Watercourse, Water Feature, Wooded Area, Wetland, Visual Planting Area, and various fence types.

Site Plan Acronyms
1. ARA - Aggregate Resources Act
2. MECP - Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks
3. MGCS - Ministry of Government and Consumer Services






Site Plan Amendments table with columns: No., Date, Description, By.

Site Plan Revisions (Pre-Licensing) table with columns: No., Date, Description, By.

MHBC logo and contact information for Planning Urban Design & Landscape Architecture.

Applicant information for cbm (CBM Aggregates) and VOTORANTIN Geotechnics.

Project information for Caledon Pit & Quarry, including licence reference number 626600, plan scale, date, and file name.



PROGRESSIVE REHABILITATION

A. General

- Area Calculations:

1.1. Licence (total)	261.2 hectares
Main Area	151.5 hectares
North Area	30.3 hectares
South Area	79.4 hectares
- Limit of Extraction (total):

1.2. Limit of Extraction (total)	199.6 hectares
Main Area	123.6 hectares
North Area	16.0 hectares
South Area	59.9 hectares
- Final rehabilitation within licence (total):

1.3. Final rehabilitation within licence (total)	261.2 hectares
Gradual grade / island	7.8 hectares
Grassland	29.3 hectares
Lakes	17.0 hectares
Meadow	7.8 hectares
Wetland	1.6 hectares
Woodland	48.2 hectares
Existing conditions	14.2 hectares

- B. Phasing**
- As excavation reaches the limit of extraction or maximum depth, progressive rehabilitation shall commence. See note M.1 on drawing 2 of 4 for the maximum classified area requirement for rehabilitation of the site.
 - Progressive rehabilitation shall follow the general direction and sequence of extraction identified on the plan view and described in the notes on drawing 2 of 4.
 - Minor deviations in operational and rehabilitation sequence shall be permitted in order to adjust for any variable resource or market conditions.
 - Each phase of extraction shall undergo progressive rehabilitation, prior to proceeding to the next phase of extraction.
 - Progressive rehabilitation activities shall include sloping and grading, placement of overburden and topsoil, tree and shrub planting.

- C. Slopes and Grading**
- Progressive rehabilitation shall consist of backfilling the quarry faces (where appropriate), tunnels and quarry floors to establish the final elevations and grades depicted on the plan view of the drawing using topsoil and overburden available on-site. A portion of the extraction face in the southeast corner of Phases 5 and 7 (as shown on the plan view) shall remain vertical (see notes H3.5 and H11.7 on drawing 2 of 4 for additional information).
 - Upon completion of extraction in Phase 7, the slurry wall adjacent to the infiltration trenches in the southeast and southwest corner of the South Area shall be excavated and backfilled with sand.
 - Soil slaking provide will range from 2:1 to 4:1 as well as gradual grades (see Section N Variations from Control and Operation Standards on drawing 4 of 4).
 - No excess soil shall be imported on-site for rehabilitation purposes.
 - Prior to the placement of subsoil and topsoil in locations where the quarry floor has been backfilled to establish gradual grades, islands and wetlands, the quarry floor shall be ripped and tilled to alleviate compaction, if required.

- D. Drainage**
- Final surface drainage will follow the rehabilitated contours and directional arrows shown on the plan view of the drawing.
 - Clear operations in the North Area, South Area and Main Area have been completed and the rehabilitated landscape has been established, pumping shall cease, and the bed allowed to flood and form the Main, North and South ponds. The Main, North and South pond water levels post-rehabilitation are predicted to reach a level of approximately -400, -399 and -393.5 masl, respectively.
 - The South pond will be self-contained and not require an overflow outlet.
 - The Main pond overflow shall be directed via a culvert under Main Street (as shown on the plan view of this drawing) to the North pond with its outlet invert at -400 masl.
 - The North pond overflow shall be directed via main outlet to the Chesney Valley Golf Course integration pond system with its outlet invert at -399 masl.
 - All rehabilitated pond levels and outlets will be passive and not require pumping.

- E. Natural Environment**
- Lake Shoreline - Main, North and South Area
 - The shoreline of the lakes shall be contoured where possible to create convoluted or irregular shoreline gradients.
 - Where sloping and excavation depths allow, shoals or islets shall be created to increase habitat diversity.
 - Stumps and logs shall be placed along the shoreline as wildlife habitat structure. Boulders and rock rubble from the extraction shall also be used for wildlife habitat structure.
 - Woodland - Main Area
 - The woodland in the Main Area, as shown on the plan view, shall be planted with tree species representative of the woodland communities that will be removed, such as high steeple, American beech, paper birch, white ash, white cedar, balsam fir, eastern hemlock, red maple, trembling aspen, black cherry, alternate-leaved dogwood, grey dogwood, red-osier dogwood.
 - Trees shall be planted at approximately 2.5 m spacing to achieve a density of 1,600 seedlings per hectare. Two years after planting, the target density shall be 1,200 seedlings per hectare with a survival rate of 75%. Plantings shall be completed, if required, in year two after planting.
 - Habitat for eastern small-footed myotis and little brown myotis - Main Area
 - Rock piles shall be placed in the locations shown on the plan view to create habitat for eastern small-footed myotis. Rock piles shall vary in size and height between 0.5 m and 2 m. Coverages shall be created through stacking rocks of flat rock varying in size from several centimetres to one meter long.
 - Bat boxes shall be installed in the same location as the rock piles to provide habitat for little brown myotis.

- 4. Setback areas / Slopes - Main, North and South Area**
- All slopes located above the final water level shall be seeded with an appropriate native, non-invasive seed mix to prevent erosion during operation.
 - Nodal plantings shall be expanded naturally through seed rain.
 - Along the setback to significant Woodland B, as shown on drawing 1 of 4, plant species representative of the existing woodland, such as sugar maple (Acer saccharum), American beech (Fagus grandifolia), paper birch (Betula papyrifera), American elm (Ulmus americana), white cedar (Thuja occidentalis), balsam poplar (Populus balsamifera), white pine (Pinus strobus), red maple (Acer rubrum), trembling aspen (Populus tremuloides), black cherry (Prunus serotina), alternate-leaved dogwood (Cornus alternifolia), grey dogwood (Cornus rostrata), red-osier dogwood (Cornus sericea), shall be planted.
 - Along the setback to significant Woodland D, as shown on drawing 1 of 4, plant species representative of the existing woodland, such as sugar maple (Acer saccharum), American beech (Fagus grandifolia), red oak (Quercus rubra), paper birch (Betula papyrifera), black maple (Acer glabrum), American elm (Ulmus americana), alternate-leaved dogwood (Cornus alternifolia), shall be planted.
 - On north-facing slopes and wetlands which are expected to be cooler and moister, plant species such as white cedar (Thuja occidentalis), white spruce (Picea glauca), Norway spruce (Picea abies), red maple (Acer rubrum), paper birch (Betula papyrifera), American hemlock (Tsuga canadensis), shall be planted.
 - Within the setback and slope areas shrubs shall also be planted to add diversity and increase wildlife/habitat diversity, such as secondary (Amelanchier spp.), nannyberry (Viburnum lentago), redbud (Physocarpus opulifolius), dogwood (Cornus spp.), highbush cranberry (Viburnum opulus), elderberry (Sambucus spp.), choke cherry (Prunus virginiana).

- 5. Shoreline Wetland - Main, North and South Area**
- Organic material shall be placed in shallow water areas to promote the establishment of shoreline and aquatic vegetation and to create habitat for aquatic fauna and amphibians. Slumps and trees of non-commercial value shall be avoided during clearing operations and used as habitat structure. Boulders and rock rubble from the extraction operation shall also be used to increase habitat diversity along the shoreline area.
 - In the shoreline wetland areas, shallow emergent marsh vegetation shall be planted in the water with species that may consist of, but are not limited to: red-osier dogwood (Cornus sericea), slender willow (Salix pediculus), and herbaceous plants such as water plantain (Alisma plantago-aquatica), lake sedge (Carex lasiocarpa), swamp milkweed (Asclepias incarnata), softstem bulrush (Scirpus americanus), and common cattail (Typha latifolia).

- 6. Riparian Plantings - Main Area**
- Riparian plantings along Tributary #1, as shown on drawing 2 of 4, shall include a variety of native species including, but not limited to, white cedar (Thuja occidentalis), balsam poplar (Populus balsamifera), prairie willow (Salix discolor), slender willow (Salix pediculus), red-osier dogwood (Cornus sericea), nannyberry (Viburnum lentago), elderberry (Sambucus canadensis), meadowfoam (Sagina sp.), low Sillago (Poa glauca), lake sedge (Carex lasiocarpa), fox sedge (Carex vaginulata), blue vervain (Veronica hastata), and spike rush species (Eleocharis spp.).

- 7. Turtle Habitat - North Area**
- Turtle habitat shall be created in the North Area in the location shown on the plan view.
 - The turtle habitat pond shall include sediment on the pond bottom to provide a growing medium for plants, and provide habitat for turtles (e.g., overwintering).
 - Plant emergent macrophytes shall include species such as pickereweed (Pontederis cordata), broad-leaved arrowweed (Sagittaria latifolia), water plantain species (Alisma spp.), cattail (Typha sp.), common arrowweed (Sagittaria latifolia), and greater water dock (Rumex crispus).
 - Plant submergent macrophytes shall include species such as eelgrass (Zostera marina), broad waterweed (Elodea canadensis), slender reed (Phragmites australis), common hornwort (Ceratophyllum demersum).
 - Banking features such as logs or rocks shall be placed throughout the shallow shoreline areas.
 - Areas of suitable nesting substrate shall be constructed along or adjacent to the shoreline.
 - Meadow in North Area
 - Meadow habitat for eastern meadowlark and bobolink shall be created in the North Area outside of the limit of extraction at the location shown on the plan view.
 - A minimum of 60-80% of the meadow shall be covered by at least three different grass species, such as poverty oatgrass (Dactyloctenium aegyptium), common panic grass (Panicum capillare), big bluestem (Andropogon gerardii), Canada wild rye (Elymus canadensis), switch grass (Panicum virgatum), wood grass (Sorghum nutans), Virginia wild rye (Elymus virginicus).
 - At least one of the grass species shall be taller than 50 cm, which shall include at least one of the following: bottlebrush grass (1.3 m), big bluestem (2.0 m), Canada wild rye (1.3 m), switch grass (1.3 m).
 - Remaining 20-40% of the meadow shall be covered by forbs or legumes such as Canada anemone (Anemone canadensis), black-eyed susan (Rudbeckia hirta), common evening primrose (Oenothera biennis), common milkweed (Asclepias syriaca), yarrow (Achillea millefolium), New England aster (Symphyotrichum novae-angliae), and wild bergamot (Monarda filidifolia).
 - Meadow seed mixes shall be sown at a rate of 25kg/ha.

FINAL REHABILITATION

- A. General**
- All equipment and buildings/structures on the quarry floor shall be removed from the site. The buildings/structures located at 1420 Charleston Boulevard (located at the north end and quality control lab during operations) may remain on-site.
 - No internal fire roads shall remain.
 - The anticipated final use will be naturalized open spaces with the creation of lakes, vegetated shorelines, islands, vertical faces, wetlands, upland forested areas, riparian plantings adjacent to the existing watercourse, nodal shrub and tree planting on upland areas, grassland meadows and specialized habitat features for bats and turtles.
 - The long term average lake levels are:
 - Main - 400.0 masl
 - North - 399.0 masl
 - South - 393.5 masl
 - All plantings completed as part of rehabilitation will be audited two years after planting to assess planting survival rates and additional plantings shall be completed if required to create the habitat conditions as specified on this page.

Site Plan Acronyms

- ARA - Aggregate Resources Act
- MECP - Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks
- MGCS - Ministry of Government and Consumer Services
- DFO - Department of Fisheries and Oceans Canada
- MNR - Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry
- MCM - Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism
- TSSA - Technical Standards and Safety Authority
- MTCS - Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport
- ECA - Environmental Compliance Approval
- BMPP - Best Management Practices Plan
- WWIS - Water Well Information System
- HIA - Heritage Impact Assessment
- CVC - Credit Valley Conservation
- PTTW - Permit to Take Water
- NTS - Not to Scale

Site Plan Changes

The drawing revisions shown on this redline represent all of the changes that have been made since the August 2023 Aggregate Resource Act site plan.

Legal Description
 Part of Lots 15-1716, Concession 4 WSCR and Part of Lot 16, Concession 3 WSCR
 (former geographic Township of Caledon)
 Township of Caledon
 Regional Municipality of Peel

Legend

	Licence Boundary		Additional Land Owned by Licensee
	Limit of Extraction		120m Offset From Licence Boundary
	Contours with Elevation		Easement
	Watercourse		Pipeline
	Watercourse		Main Discharge
	Water Feature		Secondary Discharge
	Wooded Area		Fence
	Wetland		Extraction Face
	Wetland		Public Road
	Gradual Grade / Island		Driveway
	Grassland		Railway
	Woodland		Gate
	Wetland		Building/Structure
	Lake		Proposed Floor Elevation
	Meadow		Proposed Final Grade
	Rock Pile & Bat Box Locations		Cross Sections

Legend - Cross Sections

	Licence Boundary
	Limit of Extraction
	Existing Grade - Removed / Altered
	Existing Grade - Undisturbed
	Maximum Predicted Water Table
	Quarry Floor
	Backfilled
	Lake

Site Plan Amendments

No.	Date	Description	By

Site Plan Revisions (Pre-Licensing)

No.	Date	Description	By
4	May 2025	Update the site plan to address agency and public comments	C.P.
3	March 2025	Update the site plan to address agency and public comments	C.P.
2	August 2024	Updated the site plan to address the MNR's comments from their letter dated January 11, 2024 and the Town of Caledon's comments from their letter dated November 12, 2022	C.P.
1	August 2023	Revised drawing to incorporate updated technical report recommendations	C.P.

MHBC
 PLANNING
 URBAN DESIGN
 & LANDSCAPE
 ARCHITECTURE
 113 COLLEGE STREET, BARRE, ON, CAN. L4G 1P1 | P: 705.728.0405 | F: 705.728.2010 | WWW.MHBCAN.COM

MHBC Stamp
 Brian Zeman
 Is authorized by the Ministry of Northern Development, Forestry and Agriculture pursuant to Subsection 0.2(3)(f) of Ontario Regulation 244/97 to prepare and certify site plans.

MHBC Stamp
 Christopher Pooie
 Is authorized by the Ministry of Northern Development, Forestry and Agriculture pursuant to Subsection 0.2(3)(f) of Ontario Regulation 244/97 to prepare and certify site plans.

Applicant

cbm
 CBM Aggregates a Division of
 St. Marys Cement Inc. (Canada)
 55 Industrial Street
 Toronto, Ontario
 M4G 3W9

VOTORANTIN
 Geotechnics

Project
Caledon Pit & Quarry
 18722 Main Street, Caledon, Ontario

MNR Licence Reference No.
 626600

Applicant's Signature

Plan Scale: 1:5000 (Arch E)

Date
 August 2023 May 2025

Drawn By
 C.P. File No. 8816AF

Checked By
 B.Z.

File Name
 Rehabilitation Plan

Drawing No.
 4 of 4

File Path
 N:\bin\8816AF - CBM - Caledon Quarry\Drawings\Site Plan\CAD\8816AF - Site Plan.dwg

Appendix C: Assessor Qualifications



Assessor Qualifications

Heidy Schopf, MES, CAHP – Built and Landscape Heritage Team–Lead - Heidy Schopf the Built and Landscape Heritage Team Lead at WSP. She has over ten years' experience in Cultural Resource Management. She is a professional member of the **Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP)** and is **MTO RAQs certified** in archaeology/heritage. She has worked on a wide variety of projects throughout Ontario, including: cultural heritage resources assessments, heritage impact assessments, documentation reports, cultural heritage evaluations, strategic conservation plans, heritage conservation district studies and plans and archaeological assessments. Ms. Schopf has extensive experience applying local, Provincial, and Federal heritage guidelines and regulations to evaluate protected and potential cultural heritage properties. She is skilled at carrying out impact assessments and developing mitigation measures to conserve the heritage attributes of properties where changes are proposed.

Henry Cary, Ph.D., CAHP, RPA, Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist - Dr. Henry Cary has over 20 years of public and private-sector experience directing archaeological and cultural heritage projects in urban, rural, Arctic and Sub-Arctic environments in Canada as well as the Republic of South Africa, Italy, and France. His career has included positions as project archaeologist and cultural resource management specialist for Parks Canada's Fort Henry National Historic Site Conservation Program and Western Arctic Field Unit, Heritage Manager for the Town of Lunenburg UNESCO World Heritage Site, and senior-level archaeologist and cultural heritage specialist for CH2M and Golder Associates. He currently holds a **Professional Archaeology Licence (P327)** issued by the Ontario MCM, is MTO RAQs certified in Archaeology/Heritage and is a member of the **Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP)** and **Register of Professional Archaeologists (RPA)**. His education includes a B.A. in Prehistoric Archaeology and Anthropology from Wilfrid Laurier University, a MA in Historical Archaeology from Memorial University, and a Ph.D. in War Studies from the Royal Military College of Canada. Henry is also an Adjunct Professor of Anthropology at Saint Mary's University and over the past five years has taught archaeology courses in the Anthropology, Classics, and Visual & Material Culture departments at Mount Allison University.

Johanna Kelly, M.Sc. – Cultural Heritage Specialist- Ms. Kelly has worked in the field of Cultural Resource Management since 2007. She is skilled in the identification and evaluation of built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes and mitigation of proposed impacts on heritage resources. She has worked on a wide variety of projects throughout Ontario, including cultural heritage resources assessments, heritage impact assessments, cultural heritage evaluations, documentation reports, strategic conservation plans, heritage conservation district studies and plans, and archaeological assessments. Ms. Kelly has extensive experience applying local, Provincial, and Federal heritage guidelines and regulations to evaluate protected and potential cultural heritage properties. Ms. Kelly has completed cultural heritage projects under a variety of processes, including: the *Environmental Assessment Act*, *Planning Act*, *Ontario Heritage Act*, and the *Transit Project Assessment Process*. Ms. Kelly holds a **Professional Archaeological License (P1017)** issued by the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism.

Robert Pinchin, B.A. Hons, CAHP Intern - Cultural Heritage Technician - Mr. Pinchin holds an Honours, B.A. Degree in Canadian History from McMaster University and is currently working towards a Post-Graduate Certificate in Geographic Information Systems from Toronto Metropolitan University. Mr. Pinchin has experience working in cultural heritage preservation and conducting heritage assessments in a wide range of projects. He has experience conducting Environmental Assessments and authoring Cultural Heritage Resource Assessments, Archaeological Assessments, Heritage Impact Assessments, and Cultural Heritage Evaluation Reports. Mr. Pinchin has experience with conducting cultural heritage work for public and private clients in support of infrastructure development, oil and gas projects, utility upgrades, residential development, and more. Mr. Pinchin has experience interpreting and applying municipal, provincial, and federal legislation within the heritage context. He is an intern member of the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP). Mr. Pinchin has experience as an archaeologist during which he conducted stage 1-4 archaeological assessments, identified, and catalogued artifacts, and worked with GIS technologies to map units and site boundaries. In these endeavours Mr. Pinchin has worked closely with First Nation community members across the country in order to develop heritage framework in a comprehensive and compassionate manner.

Appendix D: Limitations



Limitations

- 1 The work performed in the preparation of this report and the conclusions presented are subject to the following:
 - a The Standard Terms and Conditions which form a part of our Professional Services Contract;
 - b The Scope of Services;
 - c Time and Budgetary limitations as described in our Contract; and
 - d The Limitations stated herein.
- 2 No other warranties or representations, either expressed or implied, are made as to the professional services provided under the terms of our Contract, or the conclusions presented.
- 3 The conclusions presented in this report were based, in part, on visual observations of the Site and attendant structures. Our conclusions cannot and are not extended to include those portions of the Site or structures, which are not reasonably available, in WSP's opinion, for direct observation.
- 4 The environmental conditions at the Site were assessed, within the limitations set out above, having due regard for applicable environmental regulations as of the date of the inspection. A review of compliance by past owners or occupants of the Site with any applicable local, provincial or federal bylaws, orders-in-council, legislative enactments and regulations was not performed.
- 5 The Site history research included obtaining information from third parties and employees or agents of the owner. No attempt has been made to verify the accuracy of any information provided, unless specifically noted in our report.
- 6 Where testing was performed, it was carried out in accordance with the terms of our contract providing for testing. Other substances, or different quantities of substances testing for, may be present on-site and may be revealed by different or other testing not provided for in our contract.
- 7 Because of the limitations referred to above, different environmental conditions from those stated in our report may exist. Should such different conditions be encountered, WSP must be notified in order that it may determine if modifications to the conclusions in the report are necessary.
- 8 The utilization of WSP's services during the implementation of any remedial measures will allow WSP to observe compliance with the conclusions and recommendations contained in the report. WSP's involvement will also allow for changes to be made as necessary to suit field conditions as they are encountered.
- 9 This report is for the sole use of the party to whom it is addressed unless expressly stated otherwise in the report or contract. Any use which any third party makes of the report, in whole or the part, or any reliance thereon or decisions made based on any information or conclusions in the report is the sole responsibility of such third party. WSP accepts no responsibility whatsoever for damages or loss of any nature or kind suffered by any such third party as a result of actions taken or not taken or decisions made in reliance on the report or anything set out therein.
- 10 This report is not to be given over to any third party for any purpose whatsoever without the written permission of WSP.
- 11 Provided that the report is still reliable, and less than 12 months old, WSP will issue a third-party reliance letter to parties that the client identifies in writing, upon payment of the then current fee for such letters. All third parties relying on WSP's report, by such reliance agree to be bound by our proposal and WSP's standard reliance letter. WSP's standard reliance letter indicates that in no event shall WSP be liable for any damages, howsoever arising, relating to third-party reliance on WSP's report. No reliance by any party is permitted without such agreement.

**Appendix E:
Summary of
Responses to
Town Comments**



(CBM-Caledon Quarry Proposal) HERITAGE COMMENT SUMMARY TABLE RESPONSE 1420 CHARLESTON SIDEROAD

Colour Code	Description
Resolved	Resolved
Resolved subject to additional information being provided to Town Reviewers (e.g, Implementation Guide, Report Addendums)	Resolved subject to additional information being provided to Town Reviewers (e.g, Implementation Guide, Report Addendums)
(no colour)	Response provided, but no further action taken or required by Project Team

All HIAs

Town Comment No.	Initial Town Heritage Comments (March 18, 2025)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (September 18, 2025)	Town Response (December 21, 2025)	Applicant Response (Date)	Town Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: Comments for ALL HIAs		Author: WSP					
1.	3. The Town is in agreement regarding the following principal conservation measures being proposed for the five properties within the subject lands identified as having cultural heritage resources: iii. 1420 Charleston Sideroad: 1. retention in situ of farmhouse and landscape elements 2. adaptive re-use of farmhouse as site office/laboratory for duration of operation. 3. Designation under Part IV of the OHA	Heritage Comments Doc	Acknowledged. Note that designation under Part IV of the OHA will be applied to a portion of the property as defined by the agreed upon R Plan.	Accepted			
2.	4. Further to receipt of the HIAs and pursuant to the recommendations, the Town issued Notices of Intention to Designate the following four properties: i. 18667 Mississauga Road ii. 18501 Mississauga Road iii. 1420 Charleston Sideroad iv. 18722 Main Street	Heritage Comments Doc	Acknowledged	Accepted			

Town Comment No.	Initial Town Heritage Comments (March 18, 2025)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (September 18, 2025)	Town Response (December 21, 2025)	Applicant Response (Date)	Town Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: Comments for ALL HIAs		Author: WSP					
3.	5.	The Town has subsequently entered into a Heritage Designation By-law Extension Agreement with the Owner for each of these properties to continue conservation strategies and extend timing for passing of the designation by-laws.	Heritage Comments Doc	Acknowledged	Accepted		
4.	6.	The Town has been meeting regularly with GSAI and the applicant's heritage consultants regarding implementation processes and timelines for the proposed heritage conservation measures. Among other things, these meetings have identified the need for preparation of reference plans and Heritage Easement Agreements for the four properties to be designated, and Heritage Permits for implementation of the Heritage Conservation Plan work and building relocations.	Heritage Comments Doc	Note that reference to these discussions has been included in the updated HIA.	Accepted		
5.	7.	A draft Heritage Easement Agreement (HEA) template, prepared by the Town, is under review by the applicant's legal team . It is anticipated that the HEAs will be entered into upon completion of the reference plans.	Heritage Comments Doc	Acknowledged	Accepted		
6.	8.	Please revise the five HIAs based on the comments below and on the attached PDFs	Heritage Comments Doc	Updated as discussed below	Accepted		
7.	9.	Identify the proposed extraction phase in which each Study Area is located, as it is understood that the phasing will affect timing of implementation of conservation recommendations.	Heritage Comments Doc	The May 2025 site plan has been added to the reports as an appendix. Short-, medium-, and long-term conservation strategies are discussed in the associated forthcoming HCPs	Accepted		
8.	10.	<p>Figures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise list of figures in Indexes, as not all are included (typically missing Figs 10-12) • Figure numbers and titles are hard to find/read (especially Fig 2 onwards). Please revise figure layout to place the figure number and title closer together and make them more prominent. • Figure 1 – on legend, revise 'Limit of Extraction' to 'Proposed Limit of Extraction' as the aggregate application is not yet approved • Figure 3 – revise title to '1859 Tremaine Map of the County of Peel' • Figure 4 – revise title to '1877 Historical Atlas of Peel County' 	Heritage Comments Doc	<p>Table of contents in all reports have been updated to ensure all figures are captured.</p> <p>Figure frames are standard for the project and are being used across disciplines.</p> <p>Sources for maps and photographs are included in the bibliography as well</p>	Accepted		

Town Comment No.	Initial Town Heritage Comments (March 18, 2025)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (September 18, 2025)	Town Response (December 21, 2025)	Applicant Response (Date)	Town Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: Comments for ALL HIAs		Author: WSP					
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figure 5 – revise title to ‘1937 Topographic Map’ and include source • Figure 7 – revise title to ‘1954 Aerial Photograph’ and include source • Figure 8 – revise title to ‘1973 Topographic Map’ and include source • Figure 9 – revise title to ‘1994 Topographic Map’ and include source o revise additional figures in similar fashion where necessary • Add Figures using selections from the 1980s-1990s aerial photographs provided by the Town. The site information provided in these aerial photographs is pertinent to revisions requested in the HIAs regarding dating of some site structures. • Add Figure showing proposed extraction phasing plan to help illustrate timing of anticipated impacts to the individual Study Areas. 		as in text. As such, figures have been left unchanged. Photos provided from the 1980s and 1990s have been added to the reports where applicable. Site Plan has been added to the reports as an appendix.				
9.	11.	Section 2.1 Regulatory Requirements: add reference to Aggregate Resources Act requirements for cultural heritage assessments, as had been identified in section 3.2.1 of the Cultural Heritage Report.	Heritage Comments Doc	Updated	Accepted		
10.	12.	Section 2.1.1 Provincial Policy Statement: update to PPS 2024	Heritage Comments Doc	Updated	Accepted		
11.	13.	Section 2.1.2 OHA: update to reflect more recent OHA amendments regarding Bill 23 and Bill 200	Heritage Comments Doc	Updated	Accepted		
12.	14.	Section 2.1.4 Town of Caledon Official Plan: add reference to Future Caledon Official Plan policies where appropriate as this new OP was approved by Council in May 2024 and approval by the Province is expected imminently.	Heritage Comments Doc	Future Caledon was adopted by Caledon Council in March 2024 and has not yet been approved by MMAH. Since the Planning Act Applications were submitted in Dec 2022, the Future Caledon Official Plan is not applicable.	Accepted		

	Town Comment No.	Initial Town Heritage Comments (March 18, 2025)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (September 18, 2025)	Town Response (December 21, 2025)	Applicant Response (Date)	Town Response (Date)	Applicant Response
		Report: Comments for ALL HIAs	Author: WSP					
13.	15.	Section 2.3 Background Research: at end of first paragraph, revise 1858 date to 1859 to reflect correct date of Tremaine's Map of the County of Peel.	Heritage Comments Doc	Updated	Accepted			
14.	16.	Section 2.6 Cultural Heritage Evaluation: review and revise the last sentence regarding the section of the report in which the results are provided, as every report identifies the incorrect section.	Heritage Comments Doc	Updated	Accepted			
15.	17.	Table 2: revise title to include 'Aerial Photographs' and revise table to include selected 1980s90s air photos.	Heritage Comments Doc	Updated	Accepted			
16.	18.	See editorial comments made in the following sections of the 18667 Mississauga Road report that are common to these sections in all of the HIA reports: a. Section 2.8 Mitigation Measures b. Section 3.1 Physiography c. Section 3.2 Indigenous Land Use d. Section 3.3.2 Town of Caledon and Former Township of Caledon e. Section 4.2.1 Location Context	Heritage Comments Doc	Updated	Accepted			
17.	19.	Section 4.2.3: review description of the orientation of the farmhouses for consistency. All HIAs note the orientation will be described as north-south 'for ease of description', which makes sense, however this is then applied differently. For 18501 Mississauga, 1055 Charleston and 1420 Charleston north-south is aligned with the concession roads (i.e. Mississauga Rd), whereas for 18667 Mississauga and 18722 Main Street it is aligned with the sideroad (Charleston).	Heritage Comments Doc	This is defined individually for each property and not meant to be defined across reports	Accepted			
18.	20.	Section 5.2.4 summary statement that the study areas 'do not meet criteria for consideration as CHLs' is not substantiated by any CHL evaluation, apart from an earlier statement that these properties were not identified in the Town's CHL Inventory. The Town's CHL Inventory report acknowledges that the inventory was done at a high level and speaks to additional potential CHLs being identified through further evaluation of individual properties or areas; farmsteads are often described in CHERs as CHLs.	Heritage Comments Doc	The evaluation of the Study Area under 9/06 included an evaluation for consideration of a CHL. The evaluation found that the criteria for a CHL were not met.	Accepted			

Town Comment No.	Initial Town Heritage Comments (March 18, 2025)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (September 18, 2025)	Town Response (December 21, 2025)	Applicant Response (Date)	Town Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: Comments for ALL HIAs		Author: WSP					
19.	21.	Table 6: Indirect Impact re change in land use: Town disagrees with 'no impact' conclusion since the proposed land use requires rezoning and will result in a clear change in land use. Table 3 of the CHR also concludes that isolation is anticipated for the subject properties.	Heritage Comments Doc	Updated to reflect impacts from change in land use	Accepted		
20.	22.	Further to comment 2b) above, provide explanation for 50 metre no-go buffer as being an appropriate protection distance for cultural resources for construction activities related to blasting quarry.	Heritage Comments Doc	Updated	Accepted		
21.	23.	Further to comment 2e) above, provide explanation of a blast impact assessment prior to inclusion of this measure in Section 8. a. What is it, who undertakes it, timing and frequency of testing over duration of operation, monitoring, requirement for results to be shared with Town etc.	Heritage Comments Doc	This information is contained in the Blast Impact Assessment for the project. Updated to direct readers to this report.	Accepted		
22.	24.	Provide explanation of a vibration monitoring plan prior to inclusion of this measure in Section 8. a. What is it, who undertakes it, timing and frequency of testing over duration of operation, how are outcomes communicated/recorded, monitoring, requirement for results to be shared with Town etc. b. Further to comment 2c) above, explain/substantiate appropriateness of 60 m zone for vibration monitoring noted in Cultural Heritage Report	Heritage Comments Doc	a) This information is provided by the vibration specialist and reports have been updated to direct to the Blast Impact Assessment b) As referenced in the Cultural Heritage Report, 60 m was established in Carmen et al 2012 as an appropriate buffer for heritage structures. This has been refined to 50 m in the HIA's based on the experience of WSP's vibration specialists	Accepted		
23.	25.	Further to comment d) above, address fugitive dust impacts noted in Cultural Heritage Report and identify potential mitigation measures for 18667 Mississauga Road, 18501 Mississauga Road, 1420 Charleston Sideroad, 18722 Main Street.	Heritage Comments Doc	This information is contained in the Air Quality Impact Assessment and associated management and monitoring plans for the project. Updated to direct readers to this report.	Accepted		

Town Comment No.	Initial Town Heritage Comments (March 18, 2025)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (September 18, 2025)	Town Response (December 21, 2025)	Applicant Response (Date)	Town Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: Comments for ALL HIAs		Author: WSP					
24.	26.	Update/reorganize Section 8 to reflect outcomes of the on-going discussion between the Town and the applicant regarding status/timing of conservation measures and individual comments made on attached PDFs: a. Status of designation process under Part IV of the OHA for 18667 Mississauga Road, 18501 Mississauga Road, 1420 Charleston Sideroad, 18722 Main Street and when to be completed. b. Preparation of reference plans for above-noted properties denoting property boundaries to which the designation by-laws will apply and relocation sites. c. Requirement for Heritage Easement Agreements to be registered on title for the abovenoted properties until: i. relocations completed ii. properties inhabited iii. designation by-laws passed d. Heritage Conservation Plans for above-noted properties shall be completed in accordance with scope of work approved by the Town. e. Acknowledgement that relocation of farmhouses at 18501 and 18667 Mississauga Road shall not occur until aggregate license and planning approvals are in place. f. Requirement of Heritage Permits for implementation of approved Heritage Conservation Plans, relocation of buildings, salvage/dismantling of outbuildings.	Heritage Comments Doc	Updated	Accepted		
25.	27.	Provide all photographs of the cultural heritage resources to the Town in digital format.	Heritage Comments Doc	Completed	Accepted		
26.	28.	The statements of cultural heritage value and interest and list of heritage attributes will require some minor revisions, as noted, prior to passing of the designation by-laws.	Heritage Comments Doc	Noted however there is no requirement for the proposed SCHVI and list of attributes in the designation by-laws to match exactly with the proposed SCHVI and list of attributes in consultant reports.	Accepted		

1420 Charleston Sideroad HIA

Town Comment No,	Initial Town Heritage Comments (March 18, 2025)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (September 18, 2025)	Town Response (December 21, 2025)	Applicant Response (Date)	Town Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: 1420 Charleston Sideroad		Author: WSP					
36	See comments on marked-up PDF copy of HIA, attached	General	Updated where applicable	Accepted			
36	replace 'subject property' with 'Study Area' throughout table	15/3.4.1	Updated	Accepted			
36	include a copy of this plan in the report .	15/3.4.1	Updated	Accepted			
36	2 x 200 acre lots would actually account for 400 acres .	16/3.4.1	Footnote added	Accepted			
36	if calculating from 1877 Atlas, then it'd be 20 years. 1877-1897	16/3.4.1	Updated	Accepted			
36	what change? George didn't get ownership of the property until 1901.	16/3.4.1	Updated for clarity	Accepted			
36	for all, despite James Jr. owning the western 50 acres?	16/3.4.1	Updated for clarity	Accepted			

Town Comment No,	Initial Town Heritage Comments (March 18, 2025)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (September 18, 2025)	Town Response (December 21, 2025)	Applicant Response (Date)	Town Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: 1420 Charleston Sideroad		Author: WSP					
36	the full 200 acres or just 150 acres?	17/3.4.1	Updated	Accepted			
36	either add District after Cochrane or delete, or replace with Ontario	17/3.4.1	Updated	Accepted			
36	revise to reflect strong local oral history and Cameron's own interviews wherein he mentions spending summers at his grandfather's farm prior to it being sold in 1968. This connection was noted in Town's revised SCVI.	17/3.4.1	Revised wording to acknowledge this association. However we do not agree that this meets the threshold for a significant connection and typically caution commemorating a person until 50 years after their death, when their legacy (positive or negative) is better understood.	Accepted			
36	add 1980s-90s air photos as necessary.	18/3.4.2	Updated	Accepted			
36	need to qualify this by noting that the apparent L-shape of this outbuilding does not appear on any subsequent topo map or air photo nor align with the c.1900 historic photo.	18/3.4.3	Updated	Accepted			
36	it's basically straight	28/4.2.2	Updated	Accepted			

Town Comment No,	Initial Town Heritage Comments (March 18, 2025)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (September 18, 2025)	Town Response (December 21, 2025)	Applicant Response (Date)	Town Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: 1420 Charleston Sideroad		Author: WSP					
36	dry	28/4.2.2	Updated	Accepted			
36	revise to 1980 - see air photos	28/4.2.2	Updated	Accepted			
36	insert (Figure 10) for visual reference	28/4.2.2	Updated	Accepted			
36	add that the barn complex burned down in July 1964 and include colour photo	28/4.2.2	Added photo and date of fire to the land use history (Section 2.4.2) and included reference to the fire in this section as well.	Accepted			
36	expand to note that it faces Charleston Sideroad	32/4.2.3	Updated	Accepted			
36	expand to note it's the rear elevation of the rear and side addition.	33/4.2.3	Updated	Accepted			

Town Comment No,	Initial Town Heritage Comments (March 18, 2025)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (September 18, 2025)	Town Response (December 21, 2025)	Applicant Response (Date)	Town Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: 1420 Charleston Sideroad		Author: WSP					
36	revise outlines of rear tail and rear/side addition, as what is shown as rear tail here is actually part of the rear addition.	35/4.2.3	The purpose of this figure is to show a general approximate location of the house sections. Floorplans and measured drawings will be provided in the HCP that show the full extent of each section of the house.	Accepted			
36	Here's the north/rear limit of the main block. The shadow of the main block roof falls over the one-storey rear tail.	35/4.2.3	The purpose of this figure is to show a general approximate location of the house sections. Floorplans and measured drawings will be provided in the HCP that show the full extent of each section of the house.	Accepted			
36	truncated hip, originally with metal cresting	36/4.2.3.1	Updated	Accepted			
36	delete 'and'	36/4.2.3.1	Updated	Accepted			
36	insert 'of' and change 'are' to 'is'	36/4.2.3.1	Updated	Accepted			
36	review sentence. 'On the foundation is..' is awkward phrasing	36/4.2.3.1	Updated	Accepted			

Town Comment No,	Initial Town Heritage Comments (March 18, 2025)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (September 18, 2025)	Town Response (December 21, 2025)	Applicant Response (Date)	Town Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: 1420 Charleston Sideroad		Author: WSP					
36	recessed [here and in next paragraph]	36/4.2.3.1	Updated	Accepted			
36	projects from the east elevation of the two-storey...	36/4.2.3.1	Updated	Accepted			
36	links? consider replacing with 'set between the tower element and the rear tail...'	36/4.2.3.1	Updated	Accepted			
36	storms yes, but what indicates the double doors are not original?	36/4.2.3.1	Updated	Accepted			
36	replace 'to the bay window' with 'of the tower element'	36/4.2.3.1	Updated	Accepted			
36	Disagree. Plate 18 shows a screen door, not a window. Also, no sill visible as seen on adjacent front window	36/4.2.3.1	Agreed, updated	Accepted			

	Town Comment No,	Initial Town Heritage Comments (March 18, 2025)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (September 18, 2025)	Town Response (December 21, 2025)	Applicant Response (Date)	Town Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: 1420 Charleston Sideroad			Author: WSP					
	36	is basement access original or modern?	36/4.2.3.1	Updated	Accepted			
	36	plural as one is evident on west side elevation too. See Plate 17.	36/4.2.3.1	Updated	Accepted			
	36	and 17	36/4.2.3.1	Updated	Accepted			
	36	revise description to include original chimney	37/4.2.3.1	Updated	Accepted			
	36	identify elevation	38/4.2.3.1	updated	Accepted			
	36	such as?	41/4.2.3.1	Updated	Accepted			

Town Comment No,	Initial Town Heritage Comments (March 18, 2025)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (September 18, 2025)	Town Response (December 21, 2025)	Applicant Response (Date)	Town Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: 1420 Charleston Sideroad		Author: WSP					
36	expand to note its flat roof	41/4.2.3.2	Updated	Accepted			
36	for clarity revise sentence to say east window in-filled and east elevation reclad	41/4.2.3.2	Updated	Accepted			
36	delete	41/4.2.3.2	Updated	Accepted			
36	please expand to identify the tail's foundation material and if the brick cladding matches that of rear and side additions.	41/4.2.3.2	Updated	Accepted			
36	and rear addition	42/4.2.3.3	Updated	Accepted			
36	insert 'modern' [as described in Table 4]	42/4.2.3.3	Updated	Accepted			

Town Comment No,	Initial Town Heritage Comments (March 18, 2025)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (September 18, 2025)	Town Response (December 21, 2025)	Applicant Response (Date)	Town Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: 1420 Charleston Sideroad		Author: WSP					
36	no, it's different, with a rounded top, not flat.	42/4.2.3.3	updated	Accepted			
36	replace with 'addition'	42/4.2.3.3	Updated	Accepted			
36	of the side addition	42/4.2.3.3	Updated	Accepted			
36	-separate the descriptions of the rear and side additions for clarity. - add description of roof line of side addition -note bay window on south facade of side addition	42/4.2.3.3	Updated where necessary	Accepted			
36	add photo showing full south elevation of side addition.	42/4.2.3.3	Updated	Accepted			
36	what supports this? why not contemporaneous with main block?	43/4.2.4	Updated	Accepted			

Town Comment No,	Initial Town Heritage Comments (March 18, 2025)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (September 18, 2025)	Town Response (December 21, 2025)	Applicant Response (Date)	Town Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: 1420 Charleston Sideroad		Author: WSP					
36	are there additional historic photos?	43/4.2.4	Updated	Accepted			
36	on the stone foundation	44/4.2.4	Updated	Accepted			
36	Is this correct use of the term? Dichromatic means two colours, not two different materials . At minimum, should delete 'red'	44/4.2.4	Updated	Accepted			
36	listed	45/4.2.5.1	Updated	Accepted			
36	all? Section 4.2.3.1 suggests some are original with storms while others are vinyl replacements	45/4.2.5.1	Updated	Accepted			
36	what about rear tail?	47/4.2.5.2	Updated	Accepted			

Town Comment No,	Initial Town Heritage Comments (March 18, 2025)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (September 18, 2025)	Town Response (December 21, 2025)	Applicant Response (Date)	Town Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: 1420 Charleston Sideroad		Author: WSP					
36	Section 4.2.3.1 states eastern entrance storm door is original.	47/4.2.5.2	Updated	Accepted			
36	and west	47/4.2.5.2	Updated	Accepted			
36	truncated; metal cresting	47/4.2.5.2	Updated	Accepted			
36	no evidence of this on brickwork. Internal room layout may explain its narrowness.	47/4.2.5.2	Noted	Accepted			
36	see comment above	47/4.2.5.2	Updated	Accepted			
36	and mansard	47/4.2.5.2	Updated	Accepted			

Town Comment No,	Initial Town Heritage Comments (March 18, 2025)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (September 18, 2025)	Town Response (December 21, 2025)	Applicant Response (Date)	Town Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: 1420 Charleston Sideroad		Author: WSP					
36	also, projecting bays with recessed buff brick panels/niches	47/4.2.5.2	Updated	Accepted			
36	and west	47/4.2.5.2	Updated	Accepted			
36	spelling	47/4.2.5.2	Updated	Accepted			
36	do you mean outbuildings?	50/5.2.1	Built or landscape components is referring to any of the built or landscape features in the Study Area	Accepted			
36	until 1968	50/5.2.2	Updated	Accepted			
36	? 18501 HIA states it was built for his grandfather John	50/5.2.3	Updated	Accepted			

Town Comment No,	Initial Town Heritage Comments (March 18, 2025)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (September 18, 2025)	Town Response (December 21, 2025)	Applicant Response (Date)	Town Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: 1420 Charleston Sideroad			Author: WSP				
36	replace with 'buff brick and...'	51/5.5	Updated	Accepted			
36	what about the front porch?	51/5.5	Updated	Accepted			
36	truncated	52/5.6	Updated	Accepted			
36	delete as per previous comments on meaning of the word	52/5.6	Updated	Accepted			
36	? the word 'chiseled' had been used in s.4.2.3.1	52/5.6	Updated	Accepted			
36	insert 'recessed'	52/5.6	Updated	Accepted			

Town Comment No,	Initial Town Heritage Comments (March 18, 2025)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (September 18, 2025)	Town Response (December 21, 2025)	Applicant Response (Date)	Town Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: 1420 Charleston Sideroad		Author: WSP					
36	Dry	52/5.6	Updated	Accepted			
36	perimeter berms	53/6.1	Updated	Accepted			
36	no, Figure it shows it going around the Study Area.	53/6.1	Updated	Accepted via email (January 6 2026): <i>“revisions to the first sentence in the affected paragraph regarding the limit of extraction have satisfied the intent of Comment 76. Accordingly, all comments on the Sept 2025 HIA for 1420 Charleston Sideroad have been addressed.”</i>			
36	see previous comment	54/6.2	Updated	Accepted			
36	expand to address barn foundations, stone wall	54/6.2	Updated	Accepted			

Town Comment No,	Initial Town Heritage Comments (March 18, 2025)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (September 18, 2025)	Town Response (December 21, 2025)	Applicant Response (Date)	Town Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: 1420 Charleston Sideroad		Author: WSP					
36	review / update	56/7.1	Update	Accepted			
36	their	56/7.2	Updated	Accepted			
36	review per earlier comment	57/7.2	Updated	Accepted			
36	review broken sentence	57/7.2	Updated	Accepted			
36	Bold this section as done in other reports	57/7.3	Updated	Accepted			
36	update as all to be retained within amended buffer zone	58/7.4	Updated	Accepted			


Town Comment No,	Initial Town Heritage Comments (March 18, 2025)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (September 18, 2025)	Town Response (December 21, 2025)	Applicant Response (Date)	Town Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: 1420 Charleston Sideroad		Author: WSP					
36	update given agreement to expand buffer area and retain barn foundation, tree rows and stone wall	58/7.5	Updated	Accepted			
36	update to reflect agreed upon extension of buffer limits to north; also determine where best to illustrate that perimeter berm is to be pulled back to edge of parcel frontage on Charleston, and not extending to driveway opening.	60/7.5	This has been produced for the HCP and will be provided in that report. The retention of the barn ruins and the extended berm opening along Charleston Sideroad are noted in Section 7.5 of the HIA.	Accepted			
36	review statement as earlier summary stated main block was unaltered	61/8	Updated	Accepted			
36	the	61/8	Updated	Accepted			
36	delete as barn foundation now to be retained.	62/8	This has been produced for the HCP and will be provided in that report. Retention of barn is noted in Section 7.5 of the HIA.	Accepted			
36	- clarify if these as measures identified in 2a) - How can they be temporary if site operations expected to last 40-50 years?o	62/8	Updated.	Accepted			

Town Comment No,	Initial Town Heritage Comments (March 18, 2025)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (September 18, 2025)	Town Response (December 21, 2025)	Applicant Response (Date)	Town Response (Date)	Applicant Response
Report: 1420 Charleston Sideroad		Author: WSP					
36	add direction that perimeter berm to leave road frontage of property clear.	62/8	This has been produced for the HCP and will be provided in that report. The retention of the barn ruins and the extended berm opening along Charleston Sideroad are noted in Section 7.5 of the HIA.	Accepted			
37	Additional information provided by the Town: a. 1964 photo of barn fire from Answering the Call: A History of Firefighting in the Town of Caledon b. Caledon Heritage Foundation history of ghost hamlet of Coulterville, page 19: note comment in oral history from Carol Coulter Crews [lived on adjacent farm at 18473 Main Street] that from the Cameron barn fire they only managed to save the tractor, which was in the garage. https://caledonheritagefoundation.com/ghost-settlement-coulterville/	Heritage Comments Doc	Updated	Accepted			
38	Through on-going discussions, the applicant has agreed to the following: a. Revision of the limit of extraction to allow retention of the barn foundations b. Termination of the proposed perimeter berm along Charleston Sideroad at the edges of the property to keep the road frontage and site lines to the farmhouse clear.	Heritage Comments Doc	This has been produced for the HCP and will be provided in that report. The retention of the barn ruins and the extended berm opening along Charleston Sideroad are noted in Section 7.5 of the HIA.	Accepted			

Town Comment No.	Town Heritage Comments (December 21, 2025)	Page / Section	Applicant Response (February 23, 2026)	Town Response (Date)	Applicant Response (Date)	Town Response (Date)	Applicant Response
94 4.	The Town appreciates the inclusion of a comment response matrix as an appendix to each updated HIA.	n/a	Acknowledged				
95 5.	It is noted that following submission of the updated HIAs CBM advised Heritage staff that a further addendum to them may be required to ensure language within the reports is suitable to Ministry of Natural Resource governance through the Aggregate Resources Act process.	n/a	Acknowledged				
96 6.	It is further noted that, subsequent to submission of the updated HIAs, on-going discussions between CBM/WSP and Heritage staff have resulted in changes to the proposed heritage conservation strategies for the properties at 1420 Charleston Sideroad and 18722 Main Street. These changes were noted in WSP's CBM Caledon Pit / quarry Cultural Heritage Deliverable List Update, dated November 24, 2025, and include: a. 1420 Charleston Sideroad: a Documentation Report and Salvage Plan is no longer needed as CBM has adjusted the proposed site plan limits to retain the barn ruins.	n/a	Acknowledged. This approach is discussed further in the forthcoming HCP produced for the property.				
97 7.	The Town's comments applicable to all HIAs have been satisfactorily addressed in the updated HIAs.	n/a	Acknowledged				
98 10.	All but the following comment have been satisfactorily addressed: a. Comment 76 (per comment number in Appendix E Summary of Responses to Town Comments)	n/a	Discussed and accepted via email (January 6 2026): Sally Drummond confirmed via email that revisions to the first sentence in the affected paragraph regarding the limit of extraction have satisfied the intent of Comment 76. Accordingly, all comments on the Sept 2025 HIA for 1420 Charleston Sideroad have been addressed. No further updates necessary.				

Appendix F: Draft Reference Plan

PART 2
PLAN 43R-24507
P.I.N. 14273-0561(LT)



L O T 1 6


P.I.N. 14273-0561(LT) P.I.N. 14273-0094(LT) P.I.N. 14273-0561(LT)

PART 1


C O N C E S S I O N 4

PART 2 PLAN 43R-24507 PART 1 PLAN 43R-4021 PART 2 PLAN 43R-24507

WEST OF HURONTARIO STREET



(LOCALLY KNOWN AS) CHARLESTON SIDEROAD/REGIONAL ROAD 24
(TRANSFERRED BY ORDER-IN-COUNCIL 2385-98,(P-2981-039A), INST. R01180167)
P.I.N. 14273-0564(LT)



I REQUIRE THIS PLAN TO BE DEPOSITED UNDER THE LAND TITLES ACT

PLAN 43R-42250

RECEIVED AND DEPOSITED

DATE Nov 27, 2025 DATE December 3, 2025

Jansky T C Lau
JANSKY T C LAU
Ontario Land Surveyor

K. Polunin
REPRESENTATIVE FOR LAND REGISTRAR FOR THE LAND TITLES DIVISION OF PEEL (No.43)

METRIC DISTANCES AND COORDINATES SHOWN ON THIS PLAN ARE IN METRES AND CAN BE CONVERTED TO FEET BY DIVIDING BY 0.3048

SCHEDULE				
PART	PART OF LOT	CONCESSION	PIN	AREA(m ²)
1	16	4 WHS	ALL OF 14273-0094(LT)	11554.7
2				473.2

PLAN OF SURVEY OF
PART OF LOT 16
CONCESSION 4
WEST OF HURONTARIO STREET
(GEOGRAPHIC TOWNSHIP OF CALEDON)
TOWN OF CALEDON
REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF PEEL



- LEGEND**
- DENOTES SURVEY MONUMENT FOUND
 - DENOTES SURVEY MONUMENT SET
 - CM DENOTES CONCRETE MONUMENT
 - ⊙IB DENOTES ROUND IRON BAR
 - IB DENOTES IRON BAR
 - SIB DENOTES STANDARD IRON BAR
 - WT DENOTES WITNESS
 - 826 DENOTES MINOS B. WONG, O.L.S.
 - 1575 DENOTES J. R. FINNIE, O.L.S.
 - P1 DENOTES PLAN 43R-4021
 - P2 DENOTES PLAN 43R-24507
 - P3 DENOTES EXPROPRIATION PLAN CA24799 (P-2981-33)
 - WHS DENOTES WEST OF HURONTARIO STREET

NOTE

PROPERTY LINES ARE UNFENCED UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED.

BEARINGS SHOWN HEREON ARE UTM GRID BEARINGS AND ARE DERIVED FROM OBSERVED REFERENCE POINTS ① AND ② BY REAL TIME CANNET NETWORK OBSERVATIONS AND REFERRED TO THE 6° UTM COORDINATE SYSTEM, ZONE 17, CENTRAL MERIDIAN 81° WEST LONGITUDE (NAD 83, CSRS 2010).

DISTANCES SHOWN ON THIS PLAN ARE ADJUSTED GROUND LEVEL DISTANCES, AND CAN BE CONVERTED TO GRID DISTANCES BY MULTIPLYING THE DISTANCE BY COMBINED SCALE FACTOR 0.9996120.

FOR BEARINGS COMPARISONS, THE FOLLOWING ROTATION WAS APPLIED.
P1 - 0°39'05" COUNTER CLOCKWISE
P2 - 0°38'55" COUNTER CLOCKWISE
P3 - 0°40'20" COUNTER CLOCKWISE

THE COORDINATES SHOWN ON THIS PLAN, IN THEMSELVES, CANNOT BE USED TO RE-ESTABLISH THE CORNERS OR BOUNDARIES SHOWN ON THIS PLAN.

COORDINATES SHOWN ON THIS PLAN ARE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE SURVEYORS ACT, URBAN ACCURACY PER O.REG. 216/10, SECTION 14(2).

OBSERVED REFERENCE POINTS UTM(NAD83, CSRS 2010)		
PLAN COORDINATES	NORTHING	EASTING
1	4853341.162	577764.037
2	4853542.371	577920.458

SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE

I CERTIFY THAT:

- THIS SURVEY AND PLAN ARE CORRECT AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SURVEYS ACT, THE SURVEYORS ACT, THE LAND TITLES ACT, AND THE REGULATIONS MADE UNDER THEM.
- THE SURVEY WAS COMPLETED ON THE 12TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 2024

DATE Nov 18 2025 Jansky T C Lau
JANSKY T C LAU - ONTARIO LAND SURVEYOR

THIS PLAN OF SURVEY RELATES TO AOLS PLAN SUBMISSION FORM NUMBER V-79025

Delph & Jenkins North Ltd.
Ontario Land Surveyors
220 Industrial Parkway S., Unit 6, Aurora, Ontario L4G 3W6
www.djsurveyors.com info@djsurveyors.com
Tel. 905-841-8528

22213-9

DRAWN : JL CHECKED : JL