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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ASI was contracted by MTE Consultants Inc. to conduct a Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment (CHRA) as part of the Main Street and Queen Street Streetscaping Improvements Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA). The study area is defined as Main Street (from Wellington Street to Nelson Street) and Queen Street (from Mill Street to Chapel Street). The study is being undertaken to investigate the feasible streetscape improvements in the study area to improve walkability and pedestrian capacity.

The results of background historic research and a review of secondary source material, including historic mapping, revealed a study area with Indigenous history dating back thousands of years, and urban land use history dating back to the early-nineteenth century. Since the early mid-nineteenth century, the area has been a steadily growing urban centre. The results of preliminary data collection indicate that there are 48 cultural heritage resources within or adjacent to the study area.

Streetscape improvements may have a variety of impacts upon cultural heritage resources. Based on the results of background data collection and a review of the project scope, there is the potential for cultural heritage resources to be negatively impacted as a result of this project. As such, the development of preferred designs should be planned to avoid impacts to identified cultural heritage resources.

Next steps are to undertake a field review to photograph and confirm the location and integrity of previously identify additional heritage resources, to identify any additional cultural heritage resources, and to obtain information to accurately map above-ground cultural heritage resources. The potential impact of the proposed undertaking on identified cultural heritage resources will then be evaluated and appropriate mitigation measures recommended.

To confirm the results of initial data collection and to determine if there are any recent changes to the heritage recognition of properties in this study area, this preliminary desktop report should be submitted to the City of Brampton’s Heritage Planning Office for review and comment.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

ASI was contracted by MTE Consultants Inc. to conduct a Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment (CHRA) as part of the Main Street and Queen Street Streetscaping Improvements Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA). The study area is defined as Main Street (from Wellington Street to Nelson Street) and Queen Street (from Mill Street to Chapel Street) (Figure 1). The study is being undertaken to investigate the feasible streetscape improvements in the study area to improve walkability and pedestrian capacity.

The purpose of this report is to present a built heritage and cultural landscape inventory of cultural heritage resources, identify existing conditions of the Main and Queen Streets study area, identify impacts to cultural heritage resources, and propose appropriate mitigation measures. This research was conducted under the senior project management of Lindsay Graves, ASI.

Figure 1: Location of the study area
Base Map:©OpenStreetMap and contributors, Creative Commons-Share Alike License (CC-BY-SA)
2.0 BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT CONTEXT

2.1 Legislation and Policy Context

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In addition, environment may be interpreted to include the combination and interrelationships of human artifacts with all other aspects of the physical environment, as well as with the social, economic and cultural conditions that influence the life of the people and communities in Ontario. The Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments distinguish between two basic ways of visually experiencing this heritage in the environment, namely as cultural heritage landscapes and as cultural features.
Within this document, cultural heritage landscapes are defined as the following (Section 1.0):

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

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

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

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

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

The Standards and Guidelines provide a series of definitions considered during the course of the assessment:
A provincial heritage property is defined as the following (14):

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Part 4.7 of the PPS states that:

The official plan is the most important vehicle for implementation of this Provincial Policy Statement. Comprehensive, integrated and long-term planning is best achieved through official plans.
Official plans shall identify provincial interests and set out appropriate land use designations and policies. To determine the significance of some natural heritage features and other resources, evaluation may be required.

Official plans should also coordinate cross-boundary matters to complement the actions of other planning authorities and promote mutually beneficial solutions. Official plans shall provide clear, reasonable and attainable policies to protect provincial interests and direct development to suitable areas.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Accordingly, the foregoing guidelines and relevant policy statement were used to guide the scope and methodology of the cultural heritage assessment.
2.2 City of Brampton Municipal Heritage Policies

The City of Brampton provides cultural heritage policies in Section 4.10 of its Official Plan (2015). Cultural heritage policies relevant to this assessment are provided below:

4.10.1 Built Heritage

4.10.1.1 The City shall compile a Cultural Heritage Resources Register to include designated heritage resources as well as those listed as being of significant cultural heritage value or interest including built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes, heritage conservation districts, areas with cultural heritage character and heritage cemeteries.

4.10.1.2 The Register shall contain documentation for these resources including legal description, owner information, and description of the heritage attributes for each designated and listed heritage resources to ensure effective protection and to maintain its currency, the Register shall be updated regularly and be accessible to the public.

4.10.1.3 All significant heritage resources shall be designated as being of cultural heritage value or interest in accordance with the Ontario Heritage Act to help ensure effective protection and their continuing maintenance, conservation and restoration.

4.10.1.4 Criteria for assessing the heritage significance of cultural heritage resources shall be developed. Heritage significance refers to the aesthetic, historic, scientific, cultural, social or spiritual importance or significance of a resource for past, present or future generations. The significance of a cultural heritage resource is embodied in its heritage attributes and other character defining elements including: materials, forms, location, spatial configurations, uses and cultural associations or meanings. Assessment criteria may include one or more of the following core values:

- Aesthetic, Design or Physical Value;
- Historical or Associative Value; and/or,
- Contextual Value.

4.10.1.8 Heritage resources will be protected and conserved in accordance with the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada, the Appleton Charter for the Protection and Enhancement of the Built Environment and other recognized heritage protocols and standards. Protection, maintenance and stabilization of existing cultural heritage attributes and features over removal or replacement will be adopted as the core principles for all conservation projects.

4.10.1.17 The City shall modify its property standards and by-laws as appropriate to meet the needs of preserving heritage structures.
4.10.2 Cultural Heritage Landscape

4.10.2.1 The City shall identify and maintain an inventory of cultural heritage landscapes as part of the City’s Cultural Heritage Register to ensure that they are accorded with the same attention and protection as the other types of cultural heritage resources.

4.10.2.2 Significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be designated under either Part IV or Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act, or established as Areas of Cultural Heritage Character as appropriate.

4.10.2.3 Owing to the spatial characteristics of some cultural heritage landscapes that they may span across several geographical and political jurisdictions, the City shall cooperate with neighbouring municipalities, other levels of government, conservation authorities and the private sector in managing and conserving these resources.

4.10.4 Areas with Cultural Heritage Character

4.10.4.1 Areas with Cultural Heritage Character shall be established through secondary plan, block plan or zoning by-law.

4.10.4.2 Land use and development design guidelines shall be prepared for each zoned area to ensure that the heritage conservation objectives are met.

4.10.4.3 Cultural Heritage Character Area Impact Assessment shall be required for any development, redevelopment and alteration works proposed within the area.

4.10.5 Heritage Cemeteries

4.10.5.1 All cemeteries of cultural heritage significance shall be designated under Part IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act, including vegetation and landscape of historic, aesthetic and contextual values to ensure effective protection and preservation.

4.10.5.3 Standards and design guidelines for heritage cemetery preservation shall be developed including the design of appropriate fencing, signage and commemorative plaques.

4.10.5.4 The heritage integrity of cemeteries shall be given careful consideration at all times. Impacts and encroachments shall be assessed and mitigated and the relocation of human remains shall be avoided.

4.10.8 City-owned Heritage Resources

4.10.8.1 The City shall designate all city-owned heritage resources of merits under the Ontario Heritage Act and shall prepare strategies for their care, management, and stewardship.

4.10.8.2 The City shall protect and maintain all city-owned heritage resources to a good standard to set a model for high standard heritage conservation.

4.10.8.3 City-owned heritage resources shall be integrated into the community and put to adaptive reuse, where feasible.
4.10.9 Implementation

4.10.9.4 The City shall acquire heritage easements, and enter into development agreements, as appropriate, for the preservation of heritage resources and landscapes.

4.10.9.5 Landowner cost share agreement should be used wherever possible to spread the cost of heritage preservation over a block plan or a secondary plan area on the basis that such preservation constitutes a community benefit that contributes significantly to the sense of place and recreational and cultural amenities that will be enjoyed by area residents.

4.10.9.11 The relevant public agencies shall be advised of the existing and potential heritage and archaeological resources, Heritage Conservation District Studies and Plans at the early planning stage to ensure that the objectives of heritage conservation are given due consideration in the public works project concerned.

4.10.9.13 Lost historical sites and resources shall be commemorated with the appropriate form of interpretation.

4.10.9.14 The City will undertake to develop a signage and plaquing system for cultural heritage resources in the City.

2.3 Data Collection

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

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

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

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

Design/Physical Value:
- It is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method.
- It displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.
- It demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
- The site and/or structure retains original stylistic features and has not been irreversibly altered so as to destroy its integrity.
- It demonstrates a high degree of excellence or creative, technical or scientific achievement at a provincial level in a given period.

Historical/Associative Value:
- It has a direct association with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to: the City of Brampton; the Province of Ontario; or Canada.
- It yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of the history of the: the City of Brampton; the Province of Ontario; or Canada.
- It demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to: the City of Brampton; the Province of Ontario; or Canada.
- It represents or demonstrates a theme or pattern in Ontario’s history.
- It demonstrates an uncommon, rare or unique aspect of Ontario’s cultural heritage.
- It has a strong or special association with the entire province or with a community that is found in more than one part of the province. The association exists for historic, social, or cultural reasons or because of traditional use.
- It has a strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organization of importance to the province or with an event of importance to the province.

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

If a resource meets one of these criteria it will be identified as a cultural heritage resource and is subject to further research where appropriate and when feasible. Typically, detailed archival research, permission to enter lands containing heritage resources, and consultation is required to determine the specific heritage significance of the identified cultural heritage resource.

When identifying cultural heritage landscapes, the following categories are typically utilized for the purposes of the classification during the field review:
Farm complexes: comprise two or more buildings, one of which must be a farmhouse or barn, and may include a tree-lined drive, tree windbreaks, fences, domestic gardens and small orchards.

Roadscapes: generally two-lanes in width with absence of shoulders or narrow shoulders only, ditches, tree lines, bridges, culverts and other associated features.

Waterscapes: waterway features that contribute to the overall character of the cultural heritage landscape, usually in relation to their influence on historic development and settlement patterns.

Railscapes: active or inactive railway lines or railway rights of way and associated features.

Historical settlements: groupings of two or more structures with a commonly applied name.

Streetscapes: generally consists of a paved road found in a more urban setting, and may include a series of houses that would have been built in the same time period.

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

Cemeteries: land used for the burial of human remains.

Results of the desktop data collection are contained in Section 4.0. Once fieldwork has been undertaken, the report will be updated with an existing conditions description and with preliminary recommendations with respect to potential impacts of the undertaking on identified cultural heritage resources.

3.0 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

3.1 Introduction

This section provides a brief summary of historic research and a description of identified above ground cultural heritage resources that may be affected by the proposed undertaking. A review of available primary and secondary source material was undertaken to produce a contextual overview of the study area, including a general description of Indigenous land use and Euro-Canadian settlement. Historically, the study area is located in the former Township of Chinguacousy, County of Peel in part of Lots 5 and 6, Concession 1 West of Centre Road and Lots 5 and 6, Concession 1 East of Centre Road.
3.2 Indigenous Land Use and Settlement

Southern Ontario has been occupied by human populations since the retreat of the Laurentide glacier, approximately 13,500 before present (BP) (Ferris 2013: 13). Populations at this time would have been highly mobile, inhabiting a boreal-parkland similar to the modern sub-arctic. By approximately 10,000 BP, the environment had progressively warmed (Edwards and Fritz 1988), and populations now occupied less extensive territories (Ellis and Deller 1990: 62-63).

Between approximately 10,000-5,500 BP, the Great Lakes basins experienced low-water levels, and many sites which would have been located on those former shorelines were then submerged. This period produces the earliest evidence of heavy wood working tools and is indicative of greater investment of labour in felling trees for fuel, to build shelter, or to produce tools, and is ultimately indicative of prolonged seasonal residency at sites. By approximately 8,000 BP, evidence exists for polished stone implements and worked native copper. The source for the latter from the north shore of Lake Superior is evidence of extensive exchange networks. Early evidence exists at this time for the creation of communal cemeteries and ceremonial funerary customs. This evidence is significant for the establishment of band territories. These communal places indicate shared meaning across the community and are reflective of a people’s cosmology (Brown 1995: 13; Holloway and Hubbard 2001: 74; Parker Pearson 1999: 141). Between approximately 4,500-3,000 BP, there is evidence for construction of fishing weirs. These structures indicate not only the group sharing of resources, but also the organization of communal labour (Ellis et al. 1990; Ellis et al. 2009).

Between 3,000-2,500 BP, populations continued with residential mobility harvesting of seasonally available resources, including spawning fish. Exchange and interaction networks broaden at this time (Spence et al. 1990: 136, 138) and by approximately 2,000 BP, evidence exists for macro-band camps, focusing on the seasonal harvesting of resources (Spence et al. 1990: 155, 164). It is also during this period that maize was first introduced into southern Ontario, though it would have only supplemented people’s diet (Birch and Williamson 2013: 13-15). Bands likely retreated to interior camps during the winter.

From approximately 1,000 BP until approximately 300 BP, lifeways became more similar to those described in early historical documents. Populations in the study area would have been Iroquoian speaking though full expression of Iroquoian culture is not recognised archaeologically until the fourteenth century. During the Early Iroquoian phase (1000-1300), the communal site is replaced by the village focused on horticulture. Seasonal disintegration of the community for the exploitation of a wider territory and more varied resource base was still practised (Williamson 1990: 317). By the second quarter of the first millennium BP, during the Middle Iroquoian phase (1300-1450), this episodic community disintegration was no longer practised, and populations now communally occupied sites throughout the year (Dodd et al. 1990: 343). In the Late Iroquoian phase (1450-1649), this process continued with the coalescence of these small villages into larger communities (Birch and Williamson 2013). Through this process, the socio-political organization of the Aboriginal Nations was developed, as described historically by the French and English explorers who first visited southern Ontario.

The study area is located within the Etobicoke Creek watershed. The Credit River (west of the Etobicoke Creek) watershed has a well-documented ancestral Huron-Wendat settlement sequence dating from the beginning of the fourteenth century (Antrex site - ASI 2010) until the mid-sixteenth century (Emerson Springs - Hawkins 2004; Wallace site - Crawford 2003). The Humber River (east of the Etobicoke Creek) watershed exhibits two ancestral Huron-Wendat settlement sequences, one in the middle Humber River area spanning the fifteenth century (Black Creek site - Emerson 1954; Parsons site - Williamson and
Robertson 1998), and one in the area of the Humber River headwaters spanning the mid-fifteenth century (Damiani site - ASI 2012a) to late sixteenth century (Skandatut site - ASI 2012b). The Etobicoke Creek watershed would have been utilized by Aboriginal peoples for settlement and resource extraction however may have been a liminal territory between the former two settlement sequences. By the turn of the seventeenth century, the north shore of Lake Ontario was devoid of permanent settlement, and the Credit River and Humber River populations are believed to have relocated to join either the Huron-Wendat Nation or perhaps more likely the Tionontaté (Petun) Nation (Birch and Williamson 2013: 40). The inhabitants of the Etobicoke Creek watershed likely had a similar trajectory.

By AD 1600, the Five Nations Iroquois, in particular the Seneca, were the principle group using the central north shore of Lake Ontario, in particular for hunting, fishing, and for participation in the fur trade. By AD 1649, the Seneca mainly took over control of the region (Heidenreich 1990: 489; Ramsden 1990). Compared to settlements of the New York Iroquois, the “Iroquois du Nord” occupation of the landscape was less intensive. Only seven villages are identified by the early historic cartographers on the north shore of Lake Ontario, and they are documented as considerably smaller than those in New York State. The populations were agriculturalists, growing maize, pumpkins and squash. These settlements also played the important alternate role of serving as stopovers and bases for New York Iroquois travelling to the north shore of Lake Ontario for the annual beaver hunt (Konrad 1974).

Beginning in the mid-late seventeenth century, the Mississaugas began to replace the Seneca as the controlling Aboriginal group along the north shore of Lake Ontario since the Five Nations Iroquois confederacy had overstretched their territory between the 1650s and 1670s (Williamson 2008). The Five Nations Iroquois could not hold the region and agreed to form an alliance with the Mississauga peoples and share hunting territories with them. The Mississaugas traded with both the British and the French in order to have wider access to European materials at better prices, and they acted as trade intermediaries between the British and tribes in the north.

The eighteenth century saw the ethnogenesis in Ontario of the Métis. Métis people are of mixed First Nations and French ancestry, but also mixed Scottish and Irish ancestry as well. The Métis played a significant role in the economy and socio-political history of the Great Lakes during this time. Living in both Euro-Canadian and Aboriginal societies, the Métis acted as agents and subagents in the fur trade but also as surveyors and interpreters. Métis populations were predominantly located north and west of Lake Superior, however Métis populations lived throughout Ontario (Métis Nation of Canada [MNC] n.d.; Stone and Chaput 1978:607,608).

By 1805, the lands from Burlington Bay to the Etobicoke River north of Eglinton Avenue were known as the “Mississague Tract” (Boulton 1805: 48; Heritage Mississauga 2012: 18; Smith 2002). In 1806, the lands south of Eglinton Avenue from Etobicoke Creek to Burlington Bay, excluding the Brant Tract and reserves along the Twelve Mile Creek, the Sixteen Mile Creek and the Credit River were purchased by the Crown from the Mississaugas as part of the “Head of the Lake Treaty” (Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada [AANDC] 2013b). In 1818, the lands of the Mississauga Tract north of Eglinton Avenue were purchased by the crown from the Mississaugas of the Twelve Mile Creek, the Sixteen Mile Creek and the Credit River as part of the “Ajetance Treaty” (AANDC 2013a). In 1820, the remainder of Mississauga land was surrendered except approximately 81 ha along the Credit River (Heritage Mississauga 2012: 18). In 1825-26, the Credit Indian Village was established as an agricultural community and Methodist mission near present day Port Credit (Heritage Mississauga 2009; MNCFN n.d.). By 1840, the village was under significant pressure from Euro-Canadian settlement so that plans were formulated to relocate the settlement. In 1847, the Credit Mississaugas were made a land offer by the Six Nations Council to relocate at the Grand River. In 1847, 266 Mississaugas settled at New Credit,
approximately 23 km southwest of Brantford. The majority of the former Mississague Tract had been ceded from the Mississauga by 1856 (Gould 1981).

### 3.3 Historical Euro-Canadian Land Use: Township Survey and Settlement

Historically, the study area is located in the Former Township of Chinguacousy, County of Peel in part of Lots 5 and 6, Concession 1 West of Centre Road and Lots 5 and 6, Concession 1 East of Centre Road. In 1788, the County of Peel was part of the extensive district known as the “Nassau District”. Later called the “Home District”, its administrative centre was located in Newark, now called Niagara. After the province of Quebec was divided into Upper and Lower Canada in 1792, the Province was separated into nineteen counties, and by 1852, the entire institution of districts was abolished and the late Home Districts were represented by the Counties of York, Ontario and Peel. Shortly after, the County of Ontario became a separate county, and the question of separation became popular in Peel. A vote for independence was taken in 1866, and in 1867 the village of Brampton was chosen as the capital of the new county (Armstrong 1985; Pope 1877).

#### 3.3.1 Township of Chinguacousy

The land now encompassed by the Township of Chinguacousy has a cultural history which begins approximately 10,000 years ago and continues to the present. The study area is located within lands of the 1818 “Ajetance Treaty” between the Crown and the Mississauga Nation of the River Credit, Twelve and Sixteen Mile Creeks (Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development Canada [AANDC] 2013a). This treaty, however, excluded lands within one mile on either side of the Credit River, Twelve Mile Creek and Sixteen Mile Creek. In 1820, Treaties 22 and 23 were signed which acquired these remaining lands except a 200 acre parcel along the Credit River (Heritage Mississauga 2012:18).

The township is said to have been named by Sir Peregrine Maitland after the Mississauga word for the Credit River meaning “young pine.” Other scholars assert that it was named in honour of the Ottawa Chief Shinguacose, which was corrupted to the present spelling of ‘Chinguacousy,’ “under whose leadership Fort Michilimacinae was captured from the Americans in the War of 1812” (Mika 1977:416; Rayburn 1997: 68). The township was formally surveyed in 1818, and the first legal settlers took up their lands later in that same year. The extant Survey Diaries indicate that the original timber stands within the township included oak, ash, maple, beech, elm, basswood, hemlock, and pine. It was recorded that the first landowners in Chinguacousy included settlers from New Brunswick, the United States, and also United Empire Loyalists and their children (Pope 1877:65; Mika 1977:417; Armstrong 1985:142).

Due to the small population of the newly acquired tract, Chinguacousy was initially amalgamated with the Gore of Toronto Township for political and administrative purposes. In 1821, the population of the united townships numbered just 412. By 1837, the population of the township had reached an estimated 1,921. The numbers grew from 3,721 in 1842 to 7,469 in 1851. Thereafter the figures declined to 6,897 in 1861, and to 6,129 by 1871 (Walton 1837:71; Pope 1877:59). Chinguacousy Township was the largest in Peel County and was described as one of the best settled townships in the Home District. It contained excellent, rolling land which was timbered mainly in hardwood with some pine intermixed. Excellent wheat was grown here. The township contained one grist mill and seven sawmills. By 1851, this number had increased to two grist mills and eight sawmills (Smith 1846:32; Smith 1851:279). The principal crops grown in Chinguacousy included wheat, oats, peas, potatoes, and turnips. It was estimated that the only
township in the province which rivaled Chinguacousy in wheat production at that time was Whitby. Other farm products included maple sugar, wool, cheese, and butter (Smith 1851:279).

Chinguacousy was originally included within the limits of the Home District until 1849, when the old Upper Canadian Districts were abolished. It formed part of the United Counties of York, Ontario and Peel until 1851, when Peel was elevated to independent county status under the Provisions 14 & 15. A provisional council for Peel was not established until 1865, and the first official meeting of the Peel County council occurred in January 1867.

In 1974, part of the township was amalgamated with the City of Brampton, and the remainder was annexed to the Town of Caledon (Pope 1877:59; Mika 1977:417-418; Armstrong 1985:152; Rayburn 1997:68).

### 3.3.2 City of Brampton

The land of Brampton was originally owned by Samuel Kenny. Kenny sold this land to John Elliot who cleared the land, laid it out into village lots, and named it Brampton. By 1822 Brampton began to be populated but in 1845 the settlement gained a large influx of Irish immigrants leading to its incorporation as a village in 1852. At this point Brampton had spread across Etobicoke Creek with three bridges spanning it, had seven churches, five schools, a distillery, a cooperage, and a potashery. In 1858 Brampton was connected with the Grand Trunk Railway. This allowed the founding of two major industries in Brampton, the Haggert Foundry and the Dale Estate Nurseries; Dale Estate Nurseries remained the largest employer in the city until the 1940’s. By the 1860s, Brampton had a population of 1627 and became the County Town. In 1867 a courthouse was constructed. In 1873 Brampton was incorporated as a town and the population remained fairly static until the 1940’s. In the late 1940s and into the 1950s rapid urban growth in Toronto helped to change the landscape as population rose steadily. New subdivisions developed during this time and in the 1950s Bramalea was created. Called “Canadas first satellite city”, Bramalea was a planned community built to accommodate 50,000 people by integrating houses, shopping centres, parks, commercial business, and industry. In 1974 the City of Brampton was formed as a result of the amalgamation of Chinguacousy Township, Toronto Gore Township, the Town of Brampton, and part of the Town of Mississauga. In the 1980s and 1990s development spread further with large subdivisions developed on lands formerly used for farming (City of Brampton 2017, Mika and Mika 1977: 250-251).

### 3.4 Review of Historic Mapping

The 1859 Map of the County of Peel and the 1877 Illustrated Atlas of the County of Peel were examined to determine the presence of historic features within the study area during the nineteenth century (Figures 2 to 4). The study area is located on Lots 5 and 6, Concession 1 West of Centre Road and Lots 5 and 6, Concession 1 East of Centre Road.

It should be noted that not all features of interest were mapped systematically in the Ontario series of historical atlases, given that they were financed by subscription, and subscribers were given preference with regard to the level of detail provided on the maps. Moreover, not every feature of interest would have been within the scope of the atlases.
A review of nineteenth-century mapping (Figures 2-4) reveals that Main Street and Queen Street, and the Grand Trunk railway corridor appear on 1859 historic mapping. The intersections of Main Street with California and John Streets, and Queen Street with Elizabeth and George Streets are established and illustrated on the 1859 map as well. This map illustrates a number of buildings on the lots fronting both Main and Queen Streets as well (Figure 3). The Credit Valley railway corridor first appears on the 1877 mapping (Figure 4). The urban centre of the City of Brampton can be seen as expanding between 1859 and 1877.

Figure 2: The study area overlaid on the 1859 map of the County of Peel

Source: Tremaine 1859
Twentieth-century mapping (Figures 5-9) provides a more detailed illustration of dwellings, roads, settlements, and other features such as bridges, trails, and public buildings such as schools.
Figure 5: The study area overlaid on the 1909 map of the County of Peel
Source: Department of Militia and Defense 1909

Figure 6: The study area overlaid on the 1942 map of the County of Peel
Source: Department of National Defense 1942
Figure 7: The study area overlaid on the 1963 map of the County of Peel
Source: Army Survey Establishment, R.C.E. 1963

Figure 8: The study area overlaid on the 1973 map of the County of Peel
Source: Department of Energy, Mines and Resources 1973
Figure 9: The study area overlaid on the 1985 map of the County of Peel  
Source: Department of Energy, Mines and Resources 1985

Figure 10: The study area overlaid on the 1994 map of the County of Peel  
Source: Department of Energy, Mines and Resources 1994
4.0 **DESKTOP DATA COLLECTION RESULTS**

The preliminary identification of existing cultural heritage resources within the study corridor was undertaken by consulting the following resources:

- The City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Designated Under the Ontario Heritage Act (2014) as well as the Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources ‘Listed’ Heritage Properties (2014);
- City of Brampton’s Brampton Interactive Maps;
- The City of Brampton’s Heritage Planner was contacted by email (10 April 2017);
- The Ontario Heritage Trust’s *Ontario Heritage Plaque Guide*;
- *Ontario’s Historical Plaques* website;
- Park’s Canada’s *Canada’s Historic Places* website: available online, the searchable register provides information on historic places recognized for their heritage value at the local, provincial, territorial and national levels; and

A review of available federal, provincial and municipal heritage registers and inventories revealed that there are 48 cultural heritage resources previously identified by the City of Brampton, within and/or adjacent to the study area. Table 1 lists the previously identified cultural heritage resources within and/or adjacent to the study area and Section 7 provides location mapping of these features.

It should be noted that a number of historic structures and features are depicted on late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century mapping for the study area. Accordingly, it is anticipated that additional cultural heritage resources will be identified during the field review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Location/Name</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHR 1, 147 Queen Street West – Old Brampton Schoolhouse</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>Nineteenth-century schoolhouse.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 2, 127 Queen Street West</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>Nineteenth-century residence converted into commercial space.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 3, 104 Queen Street West</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>Nineteenth-century residence converted into commercial space.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 4, 100 Queen Street West</td>
<td>Designated property on the</td>
<td>Nineteenth-century intact Tudor Revival style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Communication with Cassandra Jasinski, Heritage Planner, City of Brampton, indicated one cultural heritage resource at 47 Queen Street East that has been listed but not yet added to the database available online (10 and 13 April 2017), this has been included in our report.
Table 1: Summary of cultural heritage resources (CHRs) within and/or adjacent to the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Location/Name</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West – John Howard Society Building</td>
<td>City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory, Part IV Designation (By-law 72-2009)</td>
<td>residence associated with O.T. Walker, an Optometrist, Master of the Masonic Lodge, and a soldier in WWI.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 5</td>
<td>4 Elizabeth Street North – Christ Anglican Church</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>c. 1885 church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 6</td>
<td>93 Queen Street West</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>Late nineteenth-century house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 7</td>
<td>89 Queen Street West – Former Thompson Funeral Home</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>Late nineteenth-century house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 8</td>
<td>81 Queen Street West</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>Early twentieth-century commercial building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 10</td>
<td>75 Queen Street West</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>Early twentieth-century commercial building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 10</td>
<td>69 Queen Street West</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>Early twentieth-century commercial building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 11</td>
<td>8-28 Queen Street West – Bartlett Block</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>Early twentieth-century commercial building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 12</td>
<td>2 Wellington Street West</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>City hall and Cenotaph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 13</td>
<td>17-21 Queen Street West –</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal</td>
<td>Early twentieth-century commercial building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 According to Brampton’s Build Heritage Resource Inventory, this building was approved for demolition in 2014. Satellite imagery shows the structure to be still standing as of October 2016.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Location/Name</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Golding Block</td>
<td></td>
<td>Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 14</td>
<td>8 Queen Street East – The Dominion Building</td>
<td>Designated property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory, Part IV Designation (By-law 26-79), location of City of Brampton Heritage Plaque</td>
<td>Three storey Romanesque Revival style building designed by the Government of Canada’s Chief Architect Thomas Fuller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 15</td>
<td>12 Queen Street East – Walsh Block</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>Early twentieth-century commercial building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 16</td>
<td>14 Queen Street East – Walsh Block</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>Early twentieth-century commercial building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 17</td>
<td>23-27 Queen Street East – Hosties Bakery/Robinson Block</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>Early twentieth-century commercial building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 18</td>
<td>29-35 Queen Street East – Wilkinson Block</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>Early twentieth-century commercial building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 19</td>
<td>41-45 Queen Street East – Dr. Stirk Property</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>Early twentieth-century commercial building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 20</td>
<td>51 Queen Street East – McCulla Building</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>Early twentieth-century mixed use commercial and residential building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 21</td>
<td>55 Queen Street East – Carnegie Library</td>
<td>Designated property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory, Part IV Designation (By-law 9-82), location of City of Brampton Heritage Plaque</td>
<td>Rare example of classical Beaux Arts style building in Brampton. Associated with Scottish-American philanthropist Andrew Carnegie who financed 156 libraries across Canada. Is considered a cultural and architectural landmark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 22</td>
<td>2 Chapel Street –</td>
<td>Designated property on the</td>
<td>Brampton’s first municipal building, built in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1: Summary of cultural heritage resources (CHRs) within and/or adjacent to the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Location/Name</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Old Fire Hall</td>
<td>City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory, Part IV Designation (By-law 10-82), location of City of Brampton Heritage Plaque</td>
<td>1854, it is a representative example of an early fire hall and stands as a landmark.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 23</td>
<td>19 Church Street – Former CNR Station</td>
<td>Designated under the Heritage Railway Stations Protection Act</td>
<td>A one-and-a-half storey brick railway station built by the Grand Trunk Railway in 1907.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 24</td>
<td>122-130 Main Street North – Farr Garage Building</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>Early twentieth-century commercial building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 25</td>
<td>82 Main Street North – Heritage (Capitol) Theatre</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>Commercial theatre built in 1922, considered to be an unusually large theatre for its location outside of a major city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 26</td>
<td>70-74 Main Street North – Robinson Block</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>Early twentieth-century commercial building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 27</td>
<td>50-52 Main Street North</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory, location of City of Brampton Heritage Plaque</td>
<td>Early twentieth-century mixed use commercial and residential building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 28</td>
<td>42-48 Main Street North</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>Early twentieth-century mixed use commercial and residential building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 29</td>
<td>75 Main Street North</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>Early twentieth-century mixed use commercial and residential building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 30</td>
<td>73-77 Main Street North</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>Early twentieth-century mixed use commercial and residential building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 31</td>
<td>63-71 Main Street North – Haggert Block</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>Early twentieth-century mixed use commercial and residential building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Location/Name</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Description/Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 32</td>
<td>45 Main Street North</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton's Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>Early twentieth-century mixed use commercial and residential building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 33</td>
<td>41 Main Street North</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton's Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>Early twentieth-century mixed use commercial and residential building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 34</td>
<td>33 Main Street North</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton's Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>Early twentieth-century mixed use commercial and residential building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 35</td>
<td>31 Main Street North</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton's Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>Early twentieth-century mixed use commercial and residential building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 36</td>
<td>19-25 Main Street North – Blain’s Block</td>
<td>Designated Property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory, Part IV Designation (By-law 63-2009)</td>
<td>One of the oldest surviving nineteenth century commercial blocks in Brampton. Exhibits Italianate architecture and classical features. This property is associated with Richard Blain, a local merchant and politician.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 37</td>
<td>15 Main Street North – Blain’s Block</td>
<td>Designated Property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory, Part IV Designation (By-law 62-2009), location of City of Brampton Heritage Plaque</td>
<td>One of the oldest surviving nineteenth century commercial blocks in Brampton. Exhibits Italianate architecture and classical features. This property is associated with Richard Blain, a local merchant and politician.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 38</td>
<td>15-23 Main Street South – Capital Block</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory, location of City of Brampton Heritage Plaque</td>
<td>Early twentieth-century mixed use commercial and residential building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 39</td>
<td>8 Main Street South – Heggie Block</td>
<td>Designated Property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory, Part IV Designation (By-law 323-</td>
<td>Second Empire Style commercial building associated with Dr. David Heggie who used the building as both a residence and office for his medical practice during the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century. It was sold in 1923 and became the first home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Location/Name</td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Description/Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 40</td>
<td>16-20 Main Street South – Torrence Store</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton's Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>2013), location of City of Brampton Heritage Plaque of the Brampton Hydro-Electric Commission. It is associated with the “Four Corners”. Late nineteenth-century mixed use commercial and residential building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 41</td>
<td>24 Main Street South and 2A John Street – Harmsworth Paints</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton's Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory, location of City of Brampton Heritage Plaque</td>
<td>Early twentieth-century mixed use commercial and residential building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 42</td>
<td>30 Main Street South – St. Paul's United Church</td>
<td>Designated Property on the City of Brampton's Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory, Part IV Designation (By-law 132-85), location of City of Brampton Heritage Plaque</td>
<td>Late nineteenth-century stone church designed by Mallory and Sons and built by local builder Jesse Perry. Associated with the early congregation of the Primitive Methodist Church, established by the founders of Brampton, William Lawson and John Elliot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 43</td>
<td>44 Main Street South – The Boyle House</td>
<td>Designated Property on the City of Brampton's Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory, Part IV Designation (By-law 109-95)</td>
<td>Rare example of a residence influenced by the French Second Empire architectural style. The property is associated with the Boyle family, a long established family in the community, and contributes to one of the most impressive streetscapes in Brampton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 44</td>
<td>48 Main Street South – First Baptist Church</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton's Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory, location of City of Brampton Heritage Plaque</td>
<td>c.1875 church.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 45</td>
<td>45 Main Street South – Gage Park</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton's Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory, National Historic Site, location of Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada plaque</td>
<td>Plaque commemorating Sir William James Gage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 46</td>
<td>Main Street South Corridor</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton's Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>Main Street South corridor between Wellington Street and Harold Street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Summary of cultural heritage resources (CHRs) within and/or adjacent to the study area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Location/Name</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHR 47</td>
<td>1-3, 7, and 9 Wellington Street East – Peel County Court House</td>
<td>Designated Property on the City of Brampton’s Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory, Part IV Designation (By-law 38-78), location of Ontario Heritage Trust plaque as well as City of Brampton Heritage Plaque</td>
<td>Nineteenth-century eclectic civic buildings including an old court house, jail, and Peel registry office, all exhibiting elements from various architectural styles. The buildings are associated with the inception of Peel as an autonomous county and are a landmark in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHR 48</td>
<td>47 Queen Street East -</td>
<td>Listed property on the City of Brampton's Municipal Register of Cultural Heritage Resources Inventory</td>
<td>C. 1840 Primitive Methodist church which was converted to commercial space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER WORK

The results of background historic research and a review of secondary source material, including historic mapping, revealed a study area with Indigenous history dating back thousands of years, and urban land use history dating back to the early-nineteenth century. Since the early mid-nineteenth century, the area has been a steadily growing urban centre. The results of preliminary data collection indicate that there are 48 cultural heritage resources within or adjacent to the study area.

Streetscape improvements may have a variety of impacts upon cultural heritage resources. Based on the results of background data collection and a review of the project scope, there is the potential for cultural heritage resources to be negatively impacted as a result of this project. As such, the development of preferred designs should be planned to avoid impacts to identified cultural heritage resources.

Next steps are to undertake a field review to photograph and confirm the location and integrity of previously identify additional heritage resources, to identify any additional cultural heritage resources, and to obtain information to accurately map above-ground cultural heritage resources. The potential impact of the proposed undertaking on identified cultural heritage resources will then be evaluated and appropriate mitigation measures recommended.

To confirm the results of initial data collection and to determine if there are any recent changes to the heritage recognition of properties in this study area, this preliminary desktop report should be submitted to the City of Brampton’s Heritage Planning Office for review and comment.
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7.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE LOCATION MAPPING

Figure 11: Location of Cultural Heritage Resources within and/or Adjacent to the Study Area
Figure 12: Location of Cultural Heritage Resources within and/or Adjacent to the Study Area