APPENDIX D.6
CULTURAL HERITAGE ASSESSMENT REPORT
Cultural Heritage Assessment Report:
Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes

Existing Conditions - Assessment of Impacts Report

Strasburg Road Extension
From 500 m of Stauffer Drive to New Dundee Road
City of Kitchener, Ontario

Prepared for:

SNC-LAVALIN INC.
195 The West Mall
Toronto, Ontario M9C 5K1
Tel: 416-679-6700
Fax: 416-231-5356
Web: www.snclavalin.com
Email: ian.upjohn@snclavalin.com

ASI File 12EA-280

September 2013
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) was contracted by SNC-Lavalin Inc. on behalf of the City of Kitchener to conduct a cultural heritage assessment as part of the Strasburg Road Extension Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Study. The project is located within the City of Kitchener and extends from 500 m north of Stauffer Drive southerly to New Dundee Road.

The cultural heritage assessment was initiated in 2010 and an impact assessment of the technically preferred alignment (TPA; E4 modified alignment) was first submitted to the proponent in April 2012. In anticipation that City Council would not approve the ESR based on the E4 Modified TPA, in the fall of 2012, the City directed SNC-Lavalin Inc. to prepare a detailed scope and cost estimate to investigate an alternative TPA. The result of this subsequent investigation and impact assessment is contained in this report.

Historical research established that the study area features historically surveyed thoroughfares located in an agricultural setting that dates back to the early to mid-nineteenth century. The field review confirmed that this area retains elements evocative of its early agricultural beginnings. A total of seven cultural heritage landscapes were identified within the study area.

The Strasburg Road Extension may have a variety of impacts upon built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes. Impacts can include: direct impacts that result in the loss of resources through demolition or alteration, or the displacement of resources through relocation; and indirect impacts that result in the disruption of resources by introducing physical, visual, audible or atmospheric elements that are not in keeping with the resources and/or their setting.

Following consideration of the seven alternative alignments, the W1 alignment was selected as the TPA for the proposed Strasburg Road Extension. Based on the results of background research and data collection, field survey, and analysis of impacts of the undertaking, the following recommendations have been developed.

1. Road construction should be suitably planned in a manner that avoids any identified, above ground, cultural heritage resource.

2. Indirect impacts to CHL 2 are expected through disruption to the cultivated fields located in the northwest corner of the property. As such, the cultivated fields should be subject to photographic documentation and compilation of a cultural heritage documentation report by a qualified heritage consultant during detail design and in advance of construction activities. Following completion, the report should be filed with cultural heritage planning staff at the City of Kitchener.

3. This report should be presented to the Municipal Heritage Committee and cultural heritage planning staff for comment, and approval by the Director of Planning at the City of Kitchener.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) was contracted by SNC-Lavalin Inc. on behalf of the City of Kitchener to conduct a cultural heritage assessment as part of the Strasburg Road Extension Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Study (Figure 1). The project is located within the City of Kitchener and extends from 500 m north of Stauffer Drive southerly to New Dundee Road.

This cultural heritage assessment was initiated in 2010 and an impact assessment of the technically preferred alignment (TPA; E4 modified alignment) was first submitted to the proponent in April 2012. In anticipation that City Council would not approve the ESR based on the E4 Modified TPA, in the fall of 2012, the City directed SNC-Lavalin Inc. to prepare a detailed scope and cost estimate to investigate an alternative TPA. The result of this subsequent investigation and impact assessment is contained in this report.

The purpose of this report is to present a built heritage and cultural heritage landscape inventory of cultural heritage resources in the study area, an evaluation of the technically preferred alternative and potential impacts on identified cultural heritage resources, and to provide appropriate recommendations. This research was conducted under the project direction of Lindsay Popert, Cultural Heritage Specialist.
2.0 BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT CONTEXT

2.1 Approach and Methodology

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Part 4.5 of the *PPS* states that:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### 2.2 Data Collection

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

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

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

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

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 Kitchener; the Province of Ontario; Canada; or the world heritage list
- It yields, or had the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of: the City of Kitchener; the Province of Ontario, Canada; or the world heritage list
- It demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to: the City of Kitchener; the Province of Ontario; Canada; or the world heritage list

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

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

When identifying cultural heritage landscapes, the following categories are typically utilized for the purposes of the classification during the field review:

Farm complexes: comprise two or more buildings, one of which must be a farmhouse or barn, and may include a tree-lined drive, tree windbreaks, fences, domestic gardens and small orchards.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Cemeteries: land used for the burial of human remains.

Results of data collection and field review are contained in Section 3.0; while Sections 4.0 and 5.0 contain conclusions and present appropriate recommendations with respect to the undertaking.
3.0 BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT

3.1 Introduction

This section provides a brief summary of historic research and a description of identified above ground cultural heritage resources that may be affected by the proposed Strasburg Road Extension, from 500 m north of Stauffer Drive southerly to New Dundee Road. 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 Euro-Canadian settlement and land-use. Historically, the study area is located in the former Township of Waterloo, County of Waterloo.

3.2 Township Survey and Settlement

3.2.1 Township of Waterloo and the Hamlet of Berlin

The land now occupied by the City of Kitchener was once part of a large tract of more than 24,000 hectares of land that was set aside for the Six Nations by the British Crown following the American War of Independence. Between 1796 and 1798, 38,000 hectares were acquired by Colonel Richard Beasley, a United Empire Loyalist. By the end of the 1790s, Pennsylvania German Mennonite farmers, starting with members of the Betzner and Sherk families, settled in the area. By pooling their resources, a group of Mennonites were able to purchase Beasley’s unsold land, forming the German Company Tract. Lands were divided into farms for distribution.

In 1816, the German Company Tract became the Township of Waterloo. Between the 1820s and the 1870s, a steady migration of German-speaking Europeans settled in the area. Population growth and road improvements helped to establish the hamlet of Berlin in 1833. The construction of the Grand Trunk Railway through Berlin in 1856 completely opened up the area to increasing settlement and future industrialization. By the end of the nineteenth century, Berlin was an established industrial centre within the Dominion of Canada, boasting a variety of factories. This extensive industrialization had a significant impact on the urban landscape as large factories and the homes of industrialists and workers replaced many pioneer-era structures.

Following the outbreak of World War I and its associated anti-German sentiment, the newly created City changed its name from Berlin, so named in honour of the first settler’s German heritage, to Kitchener, after the British General Horatio Herbert Kitchener of Boer War fame.

In 1925, the City of Kitchener developed its first City Plan to manage its rapid growth. The Adams-Seymour Plan significantly influenced how the City would develop in the twentieth century by creating a comprehensive zoning by-law that established distinct residential districts and located commercial and industrial areas along primary arterial roads (Kitchener 2009).

3.2.2 Historic Map Review

The 1861 Tremaine Map of Waterloo Township and the 1881 Waterloo Supplement in the Illustrated Atlas of the Dominion of Canada were reviewed to determine the potential for the presence of cultural heritage resources located within the study area. Historically, the study area is located on Lot 5, Beasley’s New Survey, and Lots 9 and 14, Biehn’s Tract, in the former Township of Waterloo, County of Waterloo.
New Dundee Road is a historically surveyed thoroughfare travelling east-west across the township. It currently serves as the boundary between the City of Kitchener and the Township of North Dumfries. Reidel Drive, which travels north-south, and Stauffer Drive, which travels east-west, are also historically surveyed thoroughfares.

Table 1 provides a summary of the study area’s historic location and associated features depicted on the 1861 historic mapping. No property owners or historic features are illustrated on the 1881 historic atlas. It should be noted, however, 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.
### 3.3 Existing Conditions

In order to make a preliminary identification of existing built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes within the study area, a number of sources were consulted, including the following reports and indexes: *Kitchener Scenic Roads Study* (LACAC 1994), *Doon South Community Plan: Scenic Roads Study* (City of Kitchener 1995), *Doon South Community Plan* (Consolidated 2003), *City of Kitchener Official Plan* (City of Kitchener 2005), *Index of Non-designated Properties of Heritage Value or Interest* (City of Kitchener June 2012), *Index of Properties Designated Under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act* (City of Kitchener June 2012), and *Index of Properties Designated Under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act*. 

#### Table 1: Summary of 1861 Property Owner(s) and Historic Feature(s) within the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Property Owner(s)/Resident(s)</th>
<th>Historic Feature(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot 5, Beasley’s New Survey</td>
<td>James Goodfellow</td>
<td>Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 9, Biehn’s Tract</td>
<td>Geo. Hislop</td>
<td>Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 14, Biehn’s Tract</td>
<td>Quinlin Latnar, G. Hislop</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 3: The approximate location of the study area overlaid on the map of Waterloo Township, 1881.](source)
Act (City of Kitchener March 2012). The heritage planner at the City of Kitchener was consulted for additional information in August 2010, and during subsequent meetings with the City in 2011. In March 2013, 500 Stauffer Drive was designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. The City of Kitchener provided a copy of the designation proposal for reference (City of Kitchener 2012).

Both Reidel Drive and Stauffer Drive were identified in the Scenic Roads Study (LACAC 1994) as having high scenic qualities and they were recommended to be considered for designation. In 1995, the Doon South Community Plan: Scenic Roads Study further investigated scenic roads within Doon South and recommended that Stauffer Drive and the northern most portion of Reidel Drive (from Stauffer Drive south to the Blair Creek System) be designated as scenic roads. According to the City of Kitchener Official/Municipal Plan, Stauffer Drive, from Reidel Drive to Tilt Drive was designated as a Scenic-Heritage Road. According to the Doon South Community Plan (2003), the north end of Reidel Drive is presently a candidate for designation as a Scenic-Heritage Road.

A field review was undertaken by Lindsay Popert, ASI in July 2010 to document the existing conditions of the study area. An additional field review was undertaken in August 2011 to complete detailed assessments of the short-listed alternatives. An impact assessment of the technically preferred alignment (TPA; E4 modified alignment) was first submitted to SNC-Lavalin Inc. in April 2012. In anticipation that City Council would not approve the ESR based on the E4 Modified TPA, in the fall of 2012, the City directed SNC-Lavalin Inc. to prepare a detailed scope and cost estimate to investigate an alternative TPA. As a result, a follow-up field review was undertaken in March 2013 to confirm the location and integrity of the seven cultural heritage resources previously identified in the 2012 assessment, and to identify impacts of the seven proposed road alignments on the identified heritage resources.

Field review confirmed that this area retains many elements evocative of its early agricultural roots, mainly in the form of farm complexes and scenic/historic roadscapes along both Reidel Drive and Stauffer Drive. The area features rolling topography, easily experienced while travelling along Reidel Drive, and which contributes to the scenic, rural views from the Reidel and Stauffer Drive roadscapes. New Dundee Road, a major municipal boundary thoroughfare, has been graded and widened to accommodate traffic needs.

Sections 3.3.1 – 3.3.8 present the details of the cultural heritage landscapes identified during the field review, while Section 6.0 provides location mapping of identified cultural heritage resources.
### CHL 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Address</strong></th>
<th>271 Reidel Drive, City of Kitchener</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Lot 5, Beasley's New Survey, Township of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type</strong></td>
<td>Farm complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recognition</strong></td>
<td>Listed on the municipal heritage register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Present Owner</strong></td>
<td>Protection of Privacy Directive – not able to comment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property Description**

The property at 271 Reidel Drive features a farm complex comprised of a one-and-a-half-storey frame farmhouse with Insulbrick siding, a rear one-storey stone structure, and a one-and-a-half-storey stone structure linking the two buildings. The large agricultural property is bounded by Reidel Drive to the east, New Dundee Road to the south, cultivated fields to the west, and Stauffer Drive and cultivated fields to the north. The property is comprised of the farmhouse, a drive shed, the ruins of two concrete silos, barn foundations, mature vegetation around the house, a driveway, cultivated fields, Blair Creek, and a mature woodlot.

**Site History**

Archival research indicates that the subject property is located in Beasley's New Survey (or Beasley’s Tract) on Part Lots 5 and 6. Beasley's New Survey is part of the ‘lower block’ of Block 2 (Waterloo Township). Lot 5, in which the subject farm complex is located, was first sold to Samuel Street in 1822. In 1854, the 200 acre parcel was sold to James Goodfellow.

Historic mapping from 1861 confirms that a farmhouse was at this location by this time and that it was owned/occupied by James Goodfellow, a farmer. The 1861 Census confirms that Goodfellow lived on Lot 5 of Beasley’s New Survey in a one-storey log house, thus indicating that the current stone and frame structure was built post-1861.

In 1879, the Goodfellow farm was purchased by John Wismer. It remained within Wismer family ownership through to the early twentieth century, followed by several different owners in the 1900s. While the fields around the farm complex remain active and cultivated, the subject farmhouse and associated outbuildings/barn remnants are no longer associated with farming activities.

**Summary Statement of Cultural Heritage Value:**

Historically, the subject property is noted as an intact agricultural landscape that retains associations with agricultural development in Waterloo Township in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century.

The design value resides in the frame and stone farmhouse as a representative example of the evolved Ontario Gothic cottage with eclectic ornamentation, and landscape features that reflect continuous agricultural operations.

The contextual value of the property lies in its contribution to the historic and agricultural character of the area and its significant visual and spatial relationship with Reidel Drive. Further, the property features significant views to and from Reidel Drive.

**List of character-defining attributes**

Elements contributing to the historical/associative value of the property include:

- The farm as an intact agricultural landscape, and those elements that together comprise the cultural heritage landscape, including:
  - The cluster of built features, including the farmhouse, drive shed, silos and barn foundations;
Elements contributing to the design value of the property include:

- Elements related to the construction of the late nineteenth-century frame farmhouse as a representative example of the Ontario Gothic cottage, including:
  - The one-and-a-half-storey scale;
  - The three-bay symmetrical front façade with central gabled dormer;
  - The side-facing gable roof with wooden eaves and fascia, decorative brackets, and dentils;
  - The semi-circular arched window; and
  - The window surrounds with pedimented frames and dentils.

- Elements related to the evolved construction of the farmhouse in the mid-to-late nineteenth century, including:
  - All elevations of the farmhouse;
  - The stone construction of the one-storey rear structure and one-and-a-half-storey stone structure linking the rear structure to the frame structure at the front;
  - The H-shaped footprint; and
  - The gable roof of both stone structures, featuring return eaves on the rear structure.

Elements contributing to the contextual value of the property include:

- The siting and orientation of the farm in relation to the historic settlement road, Reidel Drive;
- The siting and arrangement of the farmhouse, drive shed, silos and barn foundations; and
- Views into and out from the property.

Photos

View of farmhouse from Reidel Drive.

South elevation of the farmhouse showing frame and stone sections.
### 3.3.2 CHL 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>500 Stauffer Drive, City of Kitchener</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Lots 8 and 9, Biehn’s Tract, Township of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Farm complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. Note: Much of the information presented in this section is taken from Schedule B of the Designation By-law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Owner</td>
<td>Protection of Privacy Directive – not able to comment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property Description**

The property at 500 Stauffer Drive features a farm complex located on a 45.7 hectare agricultural property bounded by Stauffer Drive to the south, Caryndale Drive to the east, and fields to the north and west. The property is comprised of a one-and-a-storey stone farmhouse, a barn, a drive shed, a pond, agricultural fields, hedgerows, a tree-lined drive, and a mature woodlot. The property currently operates as a bed and breakfast.

**Site History**

Archival research indicates that the subject property is located in the Biehn’s Tract on Part Lots 8 and 9 of Waterloo Township. Biehn’s Tract is part of the ‘lower block’ of Block 2 (Waterloo Township). Lot 9, in which the farm complex is located, was first sold to Samuel Eshelman in 1810. In 1842, Eshelman sold 80 acres located in the southeast part of the 171 acre parcel to John Shirlington. Just over ten years later, in 1853, George Hislop purchased the 80 acre property. In 1890, the Hislop family acquired 41 acres from the adjacent Lot 8 to create the properties current eastern boundary.

Historic mapping and census records from 1861 confirm that the Hislop family lived on Lot 9 of the Biehn’s Tract in a one-storey frame house, thus indicating that the current stone structure was built post-1861.

The Hislop family sold the farm in 1906, which was then occupied by a number of different owners until 1969, when it was purchased by an investment company. In 1984, it was purchased by the current owners. Throughout the ownership history, agricultural cultivation has continued.

**Summary Statement of Cultural Heritage Value:**

Historically, the subject property retains associations with agricultural development in Waterloo Township in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century, and is noted as an intact agricultural landscape with mixed-farming
The design value of the property resides in the stone farmhouse, a representative example of the common Ontario Gothic architectural style, and outbuildings that reflect the continued farming operations of the property. The farmhouse in particular is noted for its high degree of craftsmanship and artistic merit as displayed in its fieldstone construction.

The contextual value of the property lies in its contribution to the historic and agricultural character of the area and its significant visual and spatial relationship with Stauffer Drive and Reidel Drive. Further, the property features significant views to and from Stauffer and Reidel Drive, as well as Caryndale Drive.

**List of character-defining attributes**

**Key attributes that express the historical/associative value of 500 Stauffer Drive Include:**

- The farm as an intact agricultural landscape, and those elements that together comprise the cultural heritage landscape, including:
  - The cluster of built features, including the farmhouse, barn and drive shed;
  - The tree-lined gravel drive with windbreak to the west, oriented towards Stauffer Drive;
  - The mature trees in close proximity to the residence;
  - The cultivated fields, including their rolling topography;
  - The open water pond;
  - The hedgerows located in the agricultural field north of the pond and on the west side of the property; and
  - The mature woodlot.
- The spatial organization and functional relationship between buildings and landscape elements, including circulation patterns.
- Views from the cluster of built features to the surrounding landscape elements, including the cultivated rolling fields, hedgerows and woodlot.

**Key attributes that express the design/physical value of 500 Stauffer Drive include:**

- Elements related to the construction of the nineteenth-century farmhouse as a representative example of the Ontario Gothic style, including:
  - All elevations of the farmhouse;
  - The exterior stone walls of the historic farmhouse, constructed with even-course cut fieldstone, including the former exterior walls enclosed in the contemporary addition;
  - The modified cross-gable plan;
  - The roofline, including:
    - The plain frieze interrupted by exposed rafter ends; and,
    - The decorated wooden bargeboard in the front gable peek;
  - The historic window and door openings with stone voussoirs and sills, including those in the former exterior walls enclosed in the contemporary addition;
  - The organization of the front entrance, including the transom and flanking sidelights;
  - The sharply-pointed Gothic window opening with cloverleaf
- Elements of the contemporary twentieth-century additions, including:
  - The use of local fieldstone in the construction of the exterior walls.

- Elements of the barn related to its evolving agricultural use, including:
  - The north-south orientation and siting of the original bank barn, integrated into a south-facing slope;
  - The massing of the structure, including subsequent additions but excluding the woodshed to the east;
  - The wood framing and timbers;
  - The field stone foundation;
  - The vertical wood sheathing;
  - The cross-gable roof, including its metal cladding;
  - The interior spatial organization of the barn, including the drive floor and hay lofts;
  - The tracked doors on the north elevation;
  - The rack-lifters; and
  - The multi-pan windows with wooden muntins.

- Elements of the drive shed, including:
  - The massing of the structure;
  - The wood framing;
  - The front gable roof; and
  - The vertical wood sheathing.

Key attributes that express the contextual value of 500 Stauffer Drive include:

- The siting and orientation of the farm in relation to the historic settlement roads (Stauffer and Reidel Drive), and to the former settlement road on the property's western boundary;
- Views from the property to Stauffer and Reidel Drive;
- Views to the property from Stauffer and Reidel Drive; and,
- Views to the property from the southern portion of Caryndale Drive.

**Photos**

View of the south elevation of the farmhouse.

View of fields, woodlot and pond located east of the farmhouse (looking north).
3.3.3 CHL 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reidel Drive (from Stauffer Drive southerly to Blair Creek)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Roadscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Listed as a road presently under study for potential designation as a Scenic Heritage Road in the City of Kitchener's Official/ Municipal Plan: Part 2, Section 8.3.3, 10(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Owner</td>
<td>City of Kitchener</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Roadscape Description**

Reidel Drive, from Stauffer Drive southerly to Blair Creek, is a paved road with a posted speed limit of 50km/h. It follows a straight alignment between Lots 4 and 5 of Beasley's New Survey. The road follows an undulating topography that gently slopes down at the Blair Creek crossing. The road is bounded by agricultural lands and a single wood pole hydro line runs parallel to the road on the east side for the length of this section of Reidel Drive.

Sections of the road, particularly at the north end and around the Blair Creek crossing, are enclosed by dense vegetation that closely bounds the road alignment given that there are no shoulders, while other sections of the road open up to clear views of adjacent cultivated fields.

**Roadscape History**

Roads in the Township of Waterloo were not formally laid out during a township survey as in other parts of Upper Canada. Instead, an irregular network of roads developed given that they were typically built after settlers had begun to clear their lots, and the need for roads linking settlements, farms, markets and mills followed.

The road is bounded by Lots 4 and 5 of Beasley's New Survey. A review of 1831 Assessment Rolls revealed that this part of the township was not yet developed, and thus Reidel Drive was not yet in place (Bloomfield 1997:36). The earliest historic map available to show this road is the 1861 Tremaine map (see Figure 2), which indicates that James Goodfellow owned/farmed land to the west, while William Dalgleish owned/farmed land to the east.

A review of twentieth-century topographic mapping and a recent site visit revealed that the surrounding agricultural landscape remains intact. At present, Reidel Drive continues to form part of the local road network.
### Statement of Cultural Heritage Value

Reidel Drive is considered to be of local historical and contextual value given that the road: was built as part of initial settlement activities in the southern part of the Township of Waterloo, forming part of Beasley's New Survey; relates to the development of the Township of Waterloo for agricultural purposes in the nineteenth century; is bounded by cultivated fields and a rural landscape; and continues to form part of the local road network.

### List of character-defining attributes

The following attributes are evocative of the road’s historic and scenic character:

- The narrow two-lane alignment without shoulders;
- The scenic views to surrounding agricultural fields;
- The spatial and visual relationship between the road thoroughfare and Blair Creek, and associated vegetation;
- The diverse roadside vegetation that abuts the roadside providing a defined edge to the road; and
- The undulating topography and original historic alignment.

### Photos

- Reidel Drive, looking south from Stauffer Drive.
- Reidel Drive, looking north towards the creek.

### 3.3.4 CHL 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Stauffer Drive (from Reidel Drive to Tilt Drive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Roadscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Designated as a Scenic-Heritage Road in the City of Kitchener's Official/Municipal Plan: Part 2, Section 8.3.3, 9(x) (from Tilt Drive to Reidel Drive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Owner</td>
<td>City of Kitchener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadscape Description</td>
<td>Stauffer Drive, from Reidel Drive to Tilt Drive, follows a straight alignment between Beasley's New Survey to the south, and Biehn's Tract to the north. The thoroughfare is paved between Reidel Drive and Caryndale Drive, and gravel from Caryndale Drive easterly to Tilt Drive. Adjacent to the study area, it follows an alignment between Lot 4 of Beasley’s New Survey to the south, and Lots 8 to 9 of Biehn's Tract to the north. The road follows a hilly topography and is bounded by vegetation and cultivated fields. More specifically, the section of the road that is located within/adjacent to the study area is bounded by woodlot to the south, and agricultural land to the north that is shielded from the road in some sections by heavy shrubbery and a tree line.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Roadscape History

Roads in the Township of Waterloo were not formally laid out during a township survey as in other parts of Upper Canada. Instead, an irregular network of roads developed given that they were typically built after settlers had begun to clear their lots, and the need for roads linking settlements, farms, markets and mills followed.

The section of Stauffer Drive that is located within/adjacent to the study area is bounded by Lot 4 of Beasley’s New Survey to the south, and Lots 8 to 9 of Biehn’s Tract to the north. A review of 1831 Assessment Rolls revealed that this part of the township was not yet developed, and thus Stauffer Drive was not yet in place at this time (Bloomfield 1997:36). The earliest historic map available to show this road is the 1861 Tremaine map (see Figure 2), which indicates that George Hislop and Joel Good owned/farmed land to the north, while William Dalgleish owned/farmed land to the south.

The road alignment shown on nineteenth-century mapping suggests that Stauffer Drive branched off of Reidel Drive further to the south, and headed towards Tilt drive at a north-easterly angle. The earliest topographic map available dates to 1909 (revised 1916), which illustrates that the current alignment of Stauffer Drive at the northern terminus of Reidel Drive is shown at that time. While the road may have been realigned around the turn of the century, this has not appeared in archival records and it is possible that the alignment shown on nineteenth-century historic maps was an error.

A review of twentieth-century topographic mapping and a recent site visit revealed that the surrounding agricultural landscape remains intact. At present, Stauffer Drive continues to form part of the local road network.

### Statement of Cultural Heritage Value

This section of Stauffer Drive is considered to be of local historical and contextual value given that the road: was built as part of initial settlement activities in the southern part of the Township of Waterloo; relates to the development of the Township of Waterloo for agricultural purposes in the nineteenth century; is bounded by cultivated fields and a rural landscape; and continues to form part of the local road network.

### List of character-defining attributes

The following attributes are evocative of the road’s historic and scenic character:
- The narrow two-lane alignment without shoulders;
- The scenic views to surrounding agricultural fields, particularly when looking north;
- The diverse roadside vegetation, particularly on the south side of the road, providing a defined edge to the road; and
- The undulating topography and original historic alignment.
3.3.5 CHL 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Stauffer Drive (from Reidel Drive westerly to the end of the road)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Roadscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Owner</td>
<td>City of Kitchener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadscape Description</td>
<td>Stauffer Drive, from Reidel Drive westerly to the end of the road, follows a straight alignment between Lot 5 of Beasley's New Survey to the south, and Lot 9 of Biehn's Tract to the north. The road is paved and provides access to the property at 500 Stauffer Drive (CHL 2). The road follows a level topography and is bounded by 500 Stauffer Drive and cultivated fields to the north, and vegetation to the south. The road terminates at a driveway which continues in a westerly direction to a remnant farmstead (CHL 7).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roadscape History

Roads in the Township of Waterloo were not formally laid out during a township survey as in other parts of Upper Canada. Instead, an irregular network of roads developed given that they were typically built after settlers had begun to clear their lots, and the need for roads linking settlements, farms, markets and mills followed.

This section of Stauffer Drive is located between Lot 5 of Beasley's New Survey to the south, and Lot 9 of Biehn's Tract to the north. A review of the 1831 Assessment Rolls revealed that this part of the township was not yet developed, and thus Stauffer Drive was not yet in place at this time (Bloomfield 1997:36). The earliest historic map available to show this road is the 1861 Tremaine map (see Figure 2), which indicates that George Hislop owned/farmed the land to the north, while James Goodfellow owned/farmed land to the south. Historic mapping also indicates that this road formerly linked Reidel Drive, a north-south thoroughfare, to another early north-south thoroughfare that extended north from the western end of Stauffer Drive between the Latner and Hislop farms, linking this area to the historic hamlet of New Aberdeen.

A review of twentieth-century topographic mapping and a recent site visit
revealed that the surrounding agricultural landscape remains intact. However, this section of Stauffer Drive no longer forms part of the local road network and primarily serves as an access road to 500 Stauffer Drive.

**Statement of Cultural Heritage Value**

This section of Stauffer Drive is considered to be of local historical and contextual value given that the road: was built as part of initial settlement activities in the southern part of the Township of Waterloo; relates to the development of the Township of Waterloo for agricultural purposes in the nineteenth century; and is bounded by cultivated fields and a rural landscape.

**List of character-defining attributes**

The following attributes are evocative of the road’s historic and scenic character:

- Narrow alignment without shoulders;
- Scenic views to surrounding agricultural fields, particularly when looking north;
- Spatial and visual relationship between the road thoroughfare and 500 Stauffer Drive, an identified heritage farm complex (see CHL 2);
- Diverse roadside vegetation separating the road from the cultivated fields to the south, providing a defined edge to the road; and
- The original historic alignment.

**Photos**

Stauffer Drive, looking west from Reidel Drive.

Stauffer Drive, looking west towards the end of the road.

### 3.3.6 CHL 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reidel Drive (from Blair Creek southerly to New Dundee Road)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Roadscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Owner</td>
<td>City of Kitchener</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roadscape Description</strong></td>
<td>Reidel Drive, from Blair Creek southerly to New Dundee Road, is a paved road with a posted speed limit of 50 km/h. It follows a straight alignment between Lots 4 and 5 of Beasley’s New Survey. The road follows a gently undulating topography that gently slopes down at the Blair Creek crossing. The road is bounded by agricultural lands and a single wood pole hydro line runs parallel to the road on the east side for the length of this section of Reidel Drive. Sections of the road, particularly at the north end at the Blair Creek crossing, are enclosed by dense vegetation that closely bounds the road alignment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
given that there are no shoulders. Other sections of the road open up to scenic views of the adjacent cultivated fields, particularly looking west from just south of the Blair Creek crossing, and looking west and northwest from just north of New Dundee Road.

### Roadscape History

Roads in the Township of Waterloo were not formally laid out during a township survey as in other parts of Upper Canada. Instead, an irregular network of roads developed given that they were typically built after settlers had begun to clear their lots, and the need for roads linking settlements, farms, markets and mills followed.

The road is bounded to either side by Lots 4 and 5 of Beasley's New Survey. A review of 1831 Assessment Rolls revealed that this part of the township was not yet developed, and thus Reidel Drive was not yet in place (Bloomfield 1997:36). The earliest historic map available to show this road is the 1861 Tremaine map (see Figure 2), which indicates that James Goodfellow owned/farmed land to the west, while William Dalgleish owned/farmed land to the east.

A review of twentieth-century topographic mapping and a recent site visit revealed that the surrounding agricultural landscape remains intact, and one nineteenth-century farmhouse with remnant agricultural buildings remains in situ at 271 Reidel Drive (CHL 1) on the west side of the thoroughfare. At present, Reidel Drive continues to form part of the local road network.

### Statement of Cultural Heritage Value

This section of Reidel Drive is considered to be of local historical and contextual value given that the road: was built as part of initial settlement activities in the southern part of the Township of Waterloo, forming part of Beasley’s New Survey; relates to the development of the Township of Waterloo for agricultural purposes in the nineteenth century; is bounded by a rural and agricultural landscape; and continues to form part of the local road network.

### List of character-defining attributes

The following attributes are evocative of the road's historic and scenic character:

- Narrow two-lane alignment without shoulders;
- Scenic views to adjacent cultivated fields;
- Spatial and visual relationship between the road thoroughfare and 271 Reidel Drive, a recognized heritage farm complex (see CHL 1);
- Along sections of the roadscape, diverse roadside vegetation abuts the roadside providing a defined edge to the road; and
- The undulating topography and original historic alignment.
3.3.7 CHL 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Western terminus of Stauffer Drive, City of Kitchener</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Biehn’s Tract Part Lots 9 &amp; 14, Township of Waterloo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Remnant farm complex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Identified during field review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Owner</td>
<td>Protection of Privacy Directive – not able to comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Description</td>
<td>The remnant farm complex at the western terminus of Stauffer Drive features stone foundations of a former barn, ruins of a concrete silo, a gravel drive/dirt path, and associated cultivated fields. The property is bounded by fields and/or woodlot on all sides. According to twentieth century topographic mapping, the farm complex was orientated towards a historic settlement road, which until the circa 1940s, extended north from the western terminus of Stauffer Drive (formerly the boundary between CHL 2 and CHL 7). This former road linked this former farm complex to the historic hamlet of New Aberdeen to the north.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Site History             | Archival research indicates that the subject property is located within Biehn’s Tract on Part Lots 9 and 14 of Waterloo Township. Biehn’s Tract is part of the ‘lower block’ of Block 2 (Waterloo Township). Lot 9, in which the former farm complex is located, was first sold to Samuel Eshelman in 1810. After selling part of the property to John Shirington in 1842, Eshelman held on to the remainder of this property until 1867, at which time he sold the 50 acre parcel to Quinton Lattner (sometimes Latner or Litner).

Historic mapping from 1861 indicates that the property was owned/occupied by Quinlin Latnar. However, no features such as a farmhouse are shown on this mapping. The 1861 Census confirms that Quinton Lattner lived in a one-storey log house on Lot 8 of Biehn’s Tract, rather than on the subject Lots 9 and 14 of Biehn’s Tract. This indicates that the Lattner’s were likely farming Eshelman’s land until 1867, at which time they purchased and relocated to this property.
The Lattner family sold the farm in the early 1900s, after which it was occupied by a number of different owners through the twentieth century. Throughout the ownership history, field cultivation has continued, although the associated farm complex fell into disuse in the 1970s.

**Summary Statement of Cultural Heritage Value:**

Historically, the subject property retains associations with agricultural development in Waterloo Township in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century. The remnant farm complex is associated with the Lattner family who acquired the property in 1869.

The contextual value of the property lies in its contribution to the historic and agricultural character of the area and its significant spatial relationship with the former historic settlement road on the property's eastern boundary.

**List of character-defining attributes**

Elements contributing to the historical/associative value of the property include:
- The farm as an agricultural landscape, and those elements that together comprise the cultural heritage landscape, including:
  - The cluster of remnant built features, including the silo and barn foundations;
  - The cultivated fields, and their rolling topography; and
  - The circulation routes (gravel lane, driveway).

Key attributes that express the contextual value of this remnant farm complex include:
- The siting and orientation of the former farm complex in relation to the former historic settlement road on the property's eastern boundary.

**Photos**

Concrete silo and barn foundations, looking southwest.

Gravel drive continuing from the western terminus of Stauffer Drive into the subject property, looking northwest.
3.3.8 Condition and Integrity of Identified Cultural Heritage Landscapes

The seven cultural heritage landscapes identified above (CHL 1 – CHL 7) were all found to meet Ontario Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act. However, they were not all found to be equal in terms of integrity of identified heritage attributes. In particular, CHL 2 was identified as the best example of an intact agricultural landscape, while in contrast, CHL 7 was identified as having a low degree of integrity. CHL 1 was also identified as an intact agricultural landscape with a moderate degree of integrity given that the agricultural outbuildings associated with farming operations are no longer in use.

Three of the four identified roadscapes, CHL 3 – CHL 4 and CHL 6, were found to retain moderate-to-high integrity, while CHL 5 was determined to have lower integrity given its isolation from the local road network.

3.4 Detailed Assessment of Short-Listed Alignment Alternatives

In preparation of the detailed assessment of short-listed alignment alternatives, ASI participated in a workshop in early February 2013 with SNC-Lavalin Inc, other sub-consultants, and City Council to develop evaluation criteria and weighting per sub-discipline.

On 11 March 2013, ASI contacted Leon Bensason, Coordinator, Cultural Heritage Planning at the City of Kitchener to discuss the scope and schedule of the subject Cultural Heritage Assessment and Heritage Impact Assessment Report.

In March 2013, ASI provided a comparative assessment of the seven proposed alternatives and participated in a workshop with the Project Team to identify the technically preferred alternative (TPA). The seven alternatives are comprised of: the former TPA (E4 Modified); the five short-listed alignments (E2, E3, E4, C2, W1); and the Developers’ alignment (W2 Modified). A map showing the seven proposed alternatives and seven identified cultural heritage landscapes is presented in Figure 4 and a comparative assessment outlining the impacts of each alignment on identified heritage resources is present in Table 2.
Figure 4: The seven proposed alignments for the Strasburg Road Extension Class Environmental Assessment.
The alignment will result in encroachment along the frontage of the property. However, it will not result in negative impacts to the farmhouses, barn ruins, and associated character-defining elements.

In addition:
- A heritage permit application or amendment to the Designation By-law may be required.
- Designation under the Ontario Heritage Act indicates that a resource should be conserved.

This alignment will negatively impact the following heritage attributes through disruption:
- The cultivated fields.
- Blair Creek.

This alignment will negatively impact the farm complex from the west side, resulting in direct impacts and removal/partial removal of the drive shed, silo and barn foundations. Further, it will encroach upon the following character-defining elements:
- The cultivated fields.
- Blair Creek.

This alignment will not be negatively impacted by this alignment.

In addition:
- A heritage permit application or amendment to the Designation By-law may be required.
- Designation under the Ontario Heritage Act indicates that a resource should be conserved.

This alignment will negatively impact the following heritage attributes through disruption:
- The cultivated fields.
- Blair Creek.

This alignment will result in encroachment along the frontage of the property. However, it will not result in negative impacts to the farmhouses, barn ruins, and associated character-defining elements.

In addition:
- A heritage permit application or amendment to the Designation By-law may be required.
- Designation under the Ontario Heritage Act indicates that a resource should be conserved.

This alignment will negatively impact the following heritage attributes through disruption:
- The cultivated fields.
- Blair Creek.

This alignment will result in encroachment along the frontage of the property. However, it will not result in negative impacts to the farmhouses, barn ruins, and associated character-defining elements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E3</th>
<th>E4</th>
<th>E4 Modified</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>W1</th>
<th>W2 Modified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### CHL 2

This alignment will negatively impact the following heritage attributes:
- Direct obstruction to scenic views from the road to cultivated fields.
- Removal of the southern portion of the roadscape (at Blair Creek).

This alignment will result in the direct obstruction of significant views, as well as disruption of the following heritage attributes:
- Views from the cluster of built features to the surrounding landscape elements, including the cultivated rolling fields, hedgerows and woodlot.
- Views to and from Stauffer and Reidel Drive, and the southern portion of Caryndale Drive.
- Disruption of the cultivated fields, hedgerow, and pond.

This alignment will result in the direct obstruction of significant views, as well as disruption of the following heritage attributes:
- Views from the cluster of built features to the surrounding landscape elements, including the cultivated rolling fields, hedgerows and woodlot.
- Views to and from Stauffer and Reidel Drive, and the southern portion of Caryndale Drive.
- Disruption of the cultivated fields, hedgerow, and pond.

### CHL 3

This alignment will negatively impact this scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes through:
- Direct obstruction to scenic views from the road to cultivated fields.
- Removal of the southern portion of the roadscape (at Blair Creek).

This alignment will negatively impact this scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes through:
- Direct obstruction to scenic views from the road to cultivated fields.

This alignment will negatively impact this scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes through:
- Direct obstruction to scenic views from the road to cultivated fields.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CULTURAL ENVIRONMENT</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>E3</th>
<th>E4</th>
<th>E4 Modified</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>W1</th>
<th>W2 Modified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHL 4</td>
<td>This alignment will negatively impact this scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes through:</td>
<td>This alignment will negatively impact this scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes through:</td>
<td>This alignment will negatively impact this scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes through:</td>
<td>This alignment will negatively impact this scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes through:</td>
<td>This scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes will not be negatively impacted by this alignment.</td>
<td>This scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes will not be negatively impacted by this alignment.</td>
<td>This scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes will not be negatively impacted by this alignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road to cultivated fields.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road to cultivated fields.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road to cultivated fields.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road to cultivated fields.</td>
<td>- Removal of the western tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Removal of the western tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to cultivated fields.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Removal of the western tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Removal of the western tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Removal of the western tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Removal of the western tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Removal of southern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Removal of southern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Removal of southern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Removal of southern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 5</td>
<td>This alignment will negatively impact this scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes through:</td>
<td>This alignment will negatively impact this scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes through:</td>
<td>This alignment will negatively impact this scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes through:</td>
<td>This alignment will negatively impact this scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes through:</td>
<td>This scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes will not be negatively impacted by this alignment.</td>
<td>This scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes will not be negatively impacted by this alignment.</td>
<td>This scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes will not be negatively impacted by this alignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road to cultivated fields.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road to cultivated fields.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road to cultivated fields.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road to cultivated fields.</td>
<td>- Removal of the western tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Removal of the western tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Removal of the eastern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Removal of the eastern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Removal of the eastern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Removal of the eastern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Removal of the entire roadscape alignment.</td>
<td>- Removal of the entire roadscape alignment.</td>
<td>- Removal of the entire roadscape alignment.</td>
<td>- Removal of the entire roadscape alignment.</td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Removal of southern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Removal of southern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Removal of southern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Removal of southern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 6</td>
<td>This alignment will negatively impact this scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes through:</td>
<td>This alignment will negatively impact this scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes through:</td>
<td>This alignment will negatively impact this scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes through:</td>
<td>This alignment will negatively impact this scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes through:</td>
<td>This scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes will not be negatively impacted by this alignment.</td>
<td>This scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes will not be negatively impacted by this alignment.</td>
<td>This scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes will not be negatively impacted by this alignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
<td>- Removal of southern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Removal of southern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
<td>- Removal of southern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Removal of southern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Removal of the entire roadscape alignment.</td>
<td>- Removal of the entire roadscape alignment.</td>
<td>- Removal of the entire roadscape alignment.</td>
<td>- Removal of the entire roadscape alignment.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
<td>- Removal of the eastern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Removal of the eastern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Removal of southern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Removal of southern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Removal of southern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Removal of southern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 7</td>
<td>This cultural heritage landscape and associated heritage attributes will not be negatively impacted by this alignment.</td>
<td>This cultural heritage landscape and associated heritage attributes will not be negatively impacted by this alignment.</td>
<td>This cultural heritage landscape and associated heritage attributes will not be negatively impacted by this alignment.</td>
<td>This cultural heritage landscape and associated heritage attributes will not be negatively impacted by this alignment.</td>
<td>This scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes will not be negatively impacted by this alignment.</td>
<td>This scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes will not be negatively impacted by this alignment.</td>
<td>This scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes will not be negatively impacted by this alignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
<td>- Removal of southern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Removal of southern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Removal of the entire roadscape alignment.</td>
<td>- Removal of the entire roadscape alignment.</td>
<td>- Removal of the entire roadscape alignment.</td>
<td>- Removal of the entire roadscape alignment.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
<td>- Removal of southern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Removal of southern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Partial obstruction to scenic views from the road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Removal of southern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Removal of southern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Removal of southern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Removal of southern tip of this roadscape.</td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
<td>- Obstruction of views to cultivated fields from the road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This cultural heritage road and associated heritage attributes will not be negatively impacted by this alignment.
In summary, the W1 alignment will result in the least number of impacts to identified cultural heritage landscapes and their associated heritage attributes. As such, W1 is the preferred alignment from a cultural heritage point-of-view. The identified impacts to CHL 2, a designated heritage resource, are not expected to compromise the heritage integrity of this resource. Further, the identified impacts to CHL 7 are not considered to be significant given that this resource does not have a high level of heritage integrity as an intact agricultural landscape, particularly in comparison to the adjacent property at CHL 2.

W2 Modified is the next preferred alignment, following the W1 alignment, given the lower number and degree of impacts to identified cultural heritage landscapes. Following, the E3, E4 and E4 Modified are the next preferred alignments. The least preferred alignments are C2 and E2 given that they will result in full removal of the southern segment of Reidel Drive (CHL 6).

3.5 Impact Assessment of the Technically Preferred Alignment

Following consideration of the seven alternatives (see Section 3.4), the W1 alignment was selected as the TPA for the proposed Strasburg Road Extension. In July 2013, the TPA was refined and is presented in Section 6.0.

The following table (Table 3) will consider the impacts of the refined TPA on identified cultural heritage resources, based on the Ministry of Tourism and Culture document entitled Screening for Impacts to Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (September 2010):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHL 1</th>
<th>Description of Potential Impacts</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The farmhouse, outbuildings, agricultural landscape and associated character-defining attributes at 271 Reidel Drive will not be impacted by this alignment.</td>
<td>No further recommendations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHL 2</th>
<th>Description of Potential Impacts</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The farmhouse and outbuildings at 500 Stauffer Drive and associated character-defining elements will not be negatively impacted by this alignment. However, the alignment will negatively impact the following heritage attribute through disruption:  
  • The cultivated fields, including their rolling topography. | The identified impacts to CHL 2, a designated heritage resource, will not compromise the overall heritage integrity and character of this resource.  
  While the TPA will be disrupting the cultivated fields, it should be noted that the TPA has been refined to cross part of the northwest corner of the property at the narrowest section of the property. As a result, land to be taken from CHL 2 is minimized, resulting in overall minimal disruption to the property. To mitigate this impact, photographic documentation of the fields is recommended.  
  Views from the cluster of built features to the cultivated rolling fields will not be impacted given the natural topography of the area which results in reduced visibility of the proposed road from the building cluster, as illustrated by profile... |
Table 3: Analysis of impacts of the W1 TPA on identified cultural heritage resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Potential Impacts</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and elevation drawings for three points from CHL 2 (see Figure 5).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 3 This scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes will not be negatively impacted by this alignment.</td>
<td>No further recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 4 This scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes will not be negatively impacted by this alignment.</td>
<td>No further recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 5 This scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes will not be negatively impacted by this alignment.</td>
<td>No further recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHL 6 This scenic-heritage road and associated heritage attributes will not be negatively impacted by this alignment.</td>
<td>No further recommendations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| CHL 7 This alignment will negatively impact the following heritage attributes through disruption:  
  • The cultivated fields. | The identified impacts to CHL 7 are not considered to be significant given that this resource does not have a high level of heritage integrity as an intact agricultural landscape, particularly in comparison to the adjacent property at CHL 2.  
  No further recommendations. |
Figure 5: Line of sight analysis from the cluster of buildings at CHL 2 towards three points on the proposed road alignment.
4.0 CONCLUSIONS

The results of historical research confirmed that the study area features historically surveyed thoroughfares located in an agricultural setting that dates back to the mid-nineteenth century. The field review confirmed that this area retains elements evocative of its early agricultural beginnings. A total of seven cultural heritage landscapes were identified within the study area. The following provides a summary of field review and data collection findings:

- A total of four cultural heritage resources identified in the study area were previously identified by the municipality: CHL 1 in the Municipal Heritage Register; CHL 2 as a designated heritage resource under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act; and CHL 3 and CHL 4 in the Official Plan (City of Kitchener 2009) and Doon South Community Plan (City of Kitchener 2003). Field review confirmed that the Scenic-Heritage Road attributes for CHL 3 and CHL 4, as cited in the Doon South Scenic Road Study, remain intact;

- Three additional resources were identified during field review (CHL 5, CHL 6 and CHL 7);

- Of the total identified cultural heritage resources, two are farm complexes (CHL 1 and CHL 2), one is a remnant farm complex (CHL 7), one roadscape that is designated as a Scenic-Heritage Road (CHL 4), one roadscape that is a candidate for designation as a Scenic-Heritage Road (CHL 3), and two are scenic/historic roadscape that were identified during field review (CHL 5 and CHL 6); and

- From a cultural heritage point-of-view, the W1 alignment is the preferred alignment in comparison to the other six alignments as it will result in the least number of impacts to identified cultural heritage landscapes and their associated heritage attributes. Impacts are limited to disruption of cultivated fields of CHL 2, and will not compromise the overall heritage integrity and character of this resource. CHL 2 can be conserved provided that the appropriate mitigation measure of photographic documentation is undertaken during detail design and prior to construction activities. Impacts to CHL 7 were also identified. However, the identified impacts to CHL 7 are not considered to be significant given that this resource does not have a high level of heritage integrity as an intact agricultural landscape, particularly in comparison to the adjacent property at CHL 2.

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

The Strasburg Road Extension may have a variety of impacts upon built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes. Impacts can include: direct impacts that result in the loss of resources through demolition or alteration, or the displacement of resources through relocation; and indirect impacts that result in the disruption of resources by introducing physical, visual, audible or atmospheric elements that are not in keeping with the resources and/or their setting.

Based on the results of background research and data collection, field survey, and analysis of impacts of the undertaking, the following recommendations have been developed.

1. Road construction should be suitably planned in a manner that avoids any identified, above ground, cultural heritage resource.
2. Indirect impacts to CHL 2 are expected through disruption to the cultivated fields located in the northwest corner of the property. As such, the cultivated fields should be subject to photographic documentation and compilation of a cultural heritage documentation report by a qualified heritage consultant during detail design and in advance of construction activities. Following completion, the report should be filed with cultural heritage planning staff at the City of Kitchener.

3. This report should be presented to the Municipal Heritage Committee and cultural heritage planning staff for comment, and approval by the Director of Planning at the City of Kitchener.
6.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE LOCATION MAPPING

Figure 6: Location of Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHLs) and the Technically Preferred Alignment (TPA) in the Strasburg Road Extension Class Environmental Assessment Study Area.
Figure 7: Detail showing the location of CHL 2 and the Technically Preferred Alignment (TPA) in the Strasburg Road Extension Class Environmental Assessment Study Area.
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