



UNTERMAN McPHAIL ASSOCIATES
HERITAGE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT CONSULTANTS
540 RUNNYMEDE ROAD
TORONTO ONTARIO M6S 2Z7
T 416 766 7333
F 416 763 4082
E umcarubm@pathcom.com

memorandum

to: Liz Howson, Principal
Macaulay Shiomi Howson Ltd., Toronto, ON

from: Richard Unterman, Principal

date: August 26, 2015

re: Review of September 8, 2014 Revised "Cultural Heritage Assessment Review for the proposed Hidden Quarry, Part Lot 1 W1/2, Concession 6, Township of Eramosa, County of Wellington."

Introduction

Macaulay Shiomi Howson Ltd. retained Unterman McPhail Associates, Heritage Resource Management Consultants, on behalf of the Township of Eramosa to participate in the review of the study report for the above-mentioned project.

This Memorandum is presented to provide information relating to the "revised" Cultural Heritage Technical report submitted by Peter Stewart, Architect, George Robb Architect, Toronto, Ontario.

Cultural Heritage Report Gaps

The report states the intent of the Cultural Heritage Assessment Review was the preparation of an assessment of the built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes on or adjacent to the proposed Hidden Quarry site. The intent of the report was the determination of the cultural heritage value or interest of resources within the study area. The author completed a historical review of the site and study area using local and regional sources including aerial photography, historical mapping and photographs to support the analysis. The historical research informed the observations made during the site visit.

Based upon our review of the original study report we confirmed the existence of 'information gaps' related to the level of historical research, the survey, as well as a need for more detailed mapping of the site and abutting lands. The following gaps were identified in the original cultural heritage assessment report:

1. The subject report does not refer to the existing MTCS Checklist (Screening for Impacts to Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes, November 2010) as a tool to provide a basis to scope the requirements of the assessment.
2. The subject report does not include a detailed history on the Hopkins, Ramshaw, Johnson or Shaw families and their roles, influence or importance to local settlement and the community as related to property.
3. An summary of the history of the earlier quarry operations on site, the role the quarry played in local history, who ran the extraction business, and duration of time the industry operated on site would provide contextual history to assist in the assessment of historical and associative value.
4. Section 4.0 notes three (3) properties located along Sixth Line to the 'north of the site', namely, the Day property (4963), the Ferries property (4958) and the Dryden property (5006). There is no mention of the consultant contacting the local municipality to confirm if the three buildings are listed on a municipal register, municipally designated under the OHA or included on a municipal inventory of non-registered heritage property of local interest or merit.
5. As well the subject report does not include a map showing the location of the three (3) properties, i.e., the Day property at 4963 Sixth Line, the Ferries property at 4958 Sixth Line and the Dryden property at 5006 Sixth Line in relation to the quarry site. A map would provide better reference for the proximity of the identified properties to the development site. As well it would assist in assessing potential impacts to the heritage character of the three properties resulting from an operating quarry with regard to changes resulting from the introduction of new audible, visual or atmospheric conditions that may affect the properties.
6. Section 5.2 of the subject report identifies five (5) properties located within a '120 m off-site zone', and describes all properties as 'unremarkable'. There is no mention of the consultant contacting the local municipality to confirm if the five buildings are listed on a municipal register, municipally designated under the OHA or included on a municipal inventory of non-registered heritage property of local interest or merit. The five properties should be identified as non-heritage resources for clarity purposes rather than 'unremarkable'.
7. The five (5) properties mentioned in Section 5.2 should be identified on a map contained in the subject map that shows the relationship of the '120 m off site zone' to the quarry site.
8. Appendix B - Site Photography of the subject report does not include a photo key plan/map to identify the location of the images within the context of the quarry site location.

It was recommended the 'information gaps' described above be included in the subject report, "Cultural Heritage Assessment Review for the proposed Hidden Quarry, Part Lot 1 W ½ Concession 6, Township of Eramosa, County of Wellington" (June 2013).

The revised September 8, 2014 study document does address most 'information gaps'. However, there are still some areas of weakness in the report. It would be of benefit to the overall study if more information on the family histories were provided. This is not a major issue and can be completed in the future, if deemed necessary to enhance any commemorative history relating to the study area.

No further research or information on the quarrying activities was introduced in the revised document as mentioned in Point #3. We presume this information was not found through more detailed research, as the quarrying activity may have been of a temporary nature and not documented.

To better understand the conceptual site design and the mitigation measures discussed in the Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment, it is recommended that when the final site plan drawing is available, it be appended to the report. Showing the identified properties in reference to the conceptual site plan design would enhance the community understanding of the cultural heritage resources in relation to the planned quarry site.