



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: July 14, 2014

re: Review of the Report "Cultural Heritage Assessment Review for the proposed Hidden Quarry, Part Lot 1 W ½ 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 Guelph/Eramosa to participate in the review of a the above-mentioned cultural heritage assessment review report.

This Memorandum has been prepared to provide information with regard to perceived information gaps in the report submitted in June 2013 by Peter Stewart, Architect, of George Robb Architect, Toronto, Ontario, for the Hidden Quarry site in the Township of Eramosa.

Cultural Heritage Report Gaps

The subject report states its intent is the preparation of an assessment of the built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes on or adjacent to the proposed Hidden Quarry site and to determine the cultural heritage value or interest of the identified cultural heritage resources. The report contains an historical review of the site and the study area based on local and regional historical sources, aerial photography, historical mapping and current photographs to inform the observations made during a site visit and to support the report assessment.

The subject report includes a site assessment based primarily on existing conditions. The identified heritage resources were not evaluated using criteria for "Determining Cultural Heritage Value" set out in the O. Reg. 09/06 under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Based upon our review of the subject report, there appear to be 'information gaps' related to historical research, the lack of detailed mapping for the site and adjacent lands and no municipal consultation. The following 'information gaps' are identified.

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 is 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).