



# APPENDIX TSD#1-F

## Cultural & Heritage Resources Component

February 2013

Cultural & Heritage Resources Component  
Appendix TSD#1-F

COMPARATIVE EVALUATION OF  
ALTERNATIVE SITES



# Table of Contents

**INTRODUCTION** ..... 1

**1.0 ASSESSMENT CRITERIA, INDICATORS AND DATA SOURCES** ..... 1

**2.0 PRELIMINARY DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING ENVIRONMENT** ..... 2

    2.1 North Russell Road Site ..... 2

        2.1.1 Summary of Conditions at NRR Site ..... 4

    2.2 Boundary Road Site ..... 4

        2.2.1 Summary of Conditions at BR Site ..... 5

**3.0 SITE COMPARISON – CULTURAL & HERITAGE RESOURCES** ..... 5

    3.1 Comparison of Sites ..... 5

    3.2 Results of Site Comparison ..... 6

**TABLES**

Table 2.1-1: Summary of Site Considerations on the NRR Site ..... 4

Table 2.2-1: Summary of Site Considerations on the BR Site ..... 5

**ATTACHMENTS**

**ATTACHMENT TSD#1-F-1**  
Archaeological Assessment, North Russell Road Site

**ATTACHMENT TSD#1-F-2**  
Archaeological Assessment, Boundary Road Site

**ATTACHMENT TSD#1-F-3**  
Cultural Heritage Overview Report, Capital Regional Resource Recovery Centre Environmental Assessment (EA)

## INTRODUCTION

Two properties that are owned or have been optioned by Taggart Miller have been identified for the proposed Capital Region Resource Recovery Centre (CRRRC) (the Alternative Sites). The Alternative Sites are described below:

- **North Russell Road Site (NRR Site)** – located in the northwest part of the Township of Russell about three kilometres east of the boundary with the City of Ottawa, and about five kilometres south of Provincial Highway 417 between the Boundary Road and Vars exits. The property consists of about 193 hectares (476 acres) of contiguous lands on Part of Lots 18 and 19, Concessions III and IV, Township of Russell.
- **Boundary Road Site (BR Site)** – located in the east part of the City of Ottawa, in the former Township of Cumberland and just southeast of the Highway 417/Boundary Road interchange. The property is on the east side of Boundary Road, east of an existing industrial park, north of Devine Road and west of Frontier Road. The property consists of about 175 hectares (430 acres) of land on Lots 23 to 25, Concession XI, Township of Cumberland.

The CRRRC is proposed to provide facilities and capacity for recovery of resources and diversion of material from disposal generated by the industrial, commercial and institutional (IC&I) and construction and demolition (C&D) sectors primarily in Ottawa and secondarily a portion of eastern Ontario, for management and utilization of surplus and contaminated soils, as well as landfill disposal capacity for material that is not diverted.

## 1.0 ASSESSMENT CRITERIA, INDICATORS AND DATA SOURCES

The cultural & heritage resources component compared the Alternative Sites using the following criterion:

- Which Site is preferred for the protection of archaeological and heritage resources, and cultural heritage landscapes?

The indicators for the criterion are:

- Number and significance of known archaeological and heritage features, and cultural heritage landscapes on-Site; and
- Area of on-Site lands with moderate to high potential for undiscovered archaeological sites.

The data sources used were published data sources including: literature; historic maps, land registry data, assessment rolls and census records; Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee and/or municipal heritage building/district listings; review of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's (MTCS) updated database; Site reconnaissance, Stage 1 archaeological and cultural/heritage assessments; consultation with Aboriginal communities and organizations, historical societies and institutes (all unresponsive); consultation with other government agencies as appropriate; and applicable provincial guidance documents.

For the Cultural Heritage Overview Report, the following heritage inventories and registers were examined:

- Parks Canada – Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada (HSMBC)
- Parks Canada – Federal Heritage Buildings Review Office (FHBRO)
- Infrastructure Ontario (IO)
- Ontario Heritage Trust
- City of Ottawa
- United Counties of Prescott Russell
- Township of Russell

The relevant heritage planning policies from the following agencies were also examined:

- National Capital Commission (NCC)
- City of Ottawa
- United Counties of Prescott Russell
- Township of Russell

This research was augmented by air photo analysis to determine any pre-1973 resources as per MTCS requirements for the identification of any structures older than 40 years. Two Site visits were carried out to document identified and potential cultural heritage resources.

## **2.0 PRELIMINARY DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING ENVIRONMENT**

The following sections describe the existing environmental conditions for the cultural & heritage resources component at each of the Alternative Sites based on the preliminary investigations and assessments.

### **2.1 North Russell Road Site**

The section below contains a synopsis of the Archaeological Assessment conducted on the NRR Site; details are provided in the complete report in Attachment TSD#1-F-1. This section also includes a synopsis of the findings of the Cultural Heritage Overview report conducted for the NRR Site. A description of the existing cultural heritage environment is provided in the complete report in Attachment TSD#1-F-3.

There is evidence of human occupation in Eastern Ontario dating at least 9,000 Before Present (B.P.) following the retreat of the Champlain Sea. Although open to habitation at this time, Russell Township would have been very sparsely populated throughout the Paleo-Indian period before experiencing a gradual increase in population during the subsequent Archaic and Woodland periods. Even with this increase, the highly mobile and seasonal nature of habitation ensured that the region would remain lightly populated until European colonization and agricultural intensification during the early nineteenth century.

Significant European settlement of the region did not occur until the nineteenth century. The Township of Russell was first surveyed in 1821 in preparation for eventual settlement, with the western half of the township attracting settlers of British decent, and then of eastern French and Irish decent. The closest rural community to the study area was the village of Russell, itself formed in 1900 by the amalgamation of two earlier mid-nineteenth century villages of Duncanville and Luxemburg.

A search of the MTCS *Archaeological Sites Database* indicates that the NRR Site does not contain any known or registered archaeological Sites, nor are there any registered archaeological Sites within a three-kilometre radius of the Site (study area).

Based upon the criteria laid out in the 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consulting Archaeologists*, there is a moderate potential for pre-contact archaeological resources within the NRR Site based upon the prevalence of wet areas and watercourses within the study area. This would have been ideal hunting grounds but not necessary desirable for lengthy habitation by pre-contact populations due to seasonal flooding.

There is a moderate to high potential for post-contact archaeological resources within the NRR Site based upon documentary evidence from land registry records, census records and historic mapping. Crown Patents were issued for the various Lots within the study area between 1834 and 1841. It is likely that the study area was first settled by between 1840 and 1860. Historical mapping indicates the presence of five houses within the study area by 1862. School House No3 was located in close proximity to the southwest corner the study area, and a pioneer cemetery was established within an adjacent concession.

Air photography indicates that by 1945 buildings possibly related to at least two of these early homes had disappeared from the landscape, and that quarrying had already begun in the site of the present day quarry. It is anticipated that the remains of these early farmsteads would be identified by further detailed archaeological assessment of the NRR Site, possibly leading to further archaeological work to fully assess the heritage value of these resources.

As part of the Cultural Heritage Overview report, in conjunction with the NRR Site, a total of 29 identified and potential cultural heritage resources (including both individual properties and cultural landscapes) were identified. There are no properties within the NRR Site or within the area around it that was studied that have been identified as possessing cultural heritage value or interest by either the Township of Russell or the United Counties of Prescott Russell. These 29 potential heritage resources were identified as pre-1973 structures as per MTCS guidelines; 20 of these potential heritage resources are current or former farmsteads with multiple buildings and landscape features. These properties will need to be treated as potential cultural heritage landscapes. In addition, the quarry itself (which predates 1945) is a potential industrial heritage Site, and would need to be examined as such. In addition, there is an active historic cemetery, a former school located at 456 North Russell Road and a former church located at 587 Route 100. There is also a brick building located at 499 North Russell Road whose original purpose could not be determined. There are four properties which are being used only as residences. Lastly, the area studied surrounding the NRR study area is a potential cultural heritage landscape. These potential cultural heritage resources, including a former cemetery, church and school, would need to be further assessed to determine if there is cultural heritage value as a larger landscape unit.

## 2.1.1 Summary of Conditions at NRR Site

Table 2.1-1: Summary of Site Considerations on the NRR Site

Environmental Component	Summary of Site Considerations
<p><b>Cultural &amp; Heritage Resources</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ No registered archaeological Sites within study area.</li> <li>■ Based on the 2011 <i>Standards and Guidelines for Consulting Archaeologists</i>, approximately 90% of on-Site lands are of medium to high archaeological potential, with the remaining 10% having low or no archaeological potential.</li> <li>■ The NRR Site and area around it that was studied was found to have 29 identified and potential cultural heritage resources, including 20 potential cultural heritage landscapes, a potential industrial heritage Site (the quarry), a cemetery, a former school and a former church. Because of these features, further assessment is required to determine if the area as a whole is potentially a larger scale cultural heritage landscape unit.</li> </ul>

## 2.2 Boundary Road Site

The section below contains a synopsis of the Archaeological Assessment conducted on the BR Site; details are provided in the complete report in Attachment TSD#1-F-2. This section also includes a synopsis of the findings of the Cultural Heritage Overview report conducted for the BR Site. A description of the existing cultural heritage environment is provided in the complete report in Attachment TSD#1-F-3.

There is evidence of human occupation in Eastern Ontario dating at least 9,000 B.P. following the retreat of the Champlain Sea. Although open to habitation at this time, Cumberland Township would have been very sparsely populated throughout the Paleo-Indian period before experiencing a gradual increase in population during the subsequent Archaic and Woodland periods. Even with this increase, the highly mobile and seasonal nature of habitation ensured that the region would remain lightly populated until European colonization and agricultural intensification during the early nineteenth century.

The Township of Cumberland was first surveyed in 1791 in advance of settlement; although a large number of Lots were granted at an early date to United Empire Loyalists, only a small number adjacent to the Ottawa River were occupied. The lack of interior access roads proved to be a hindrance to settlement of the area well into the early twentieth century, especially towards the south of the Township away from the Ottawa River. The arrival of the Grand Trunk Railway in 1882, and Canadian National Railway in 1899 helped open up the final areas of the Township for settlement.

A search of the MTCS *Archaeological Sites Database* indicates that the BR Site does not contain any known or registered archaeological Sites, nor are there any registered archaeological Sites within a three-kilometre radius of the Site.

Due to the flat topography, poorly drained soils and lack of natural water courses, the study area contains low pre-contact archaeological potential.

The area studied also contains low historic archaeological potential. This is based upon documentary records indicating that the Crown patent for the land within the study area were issued relatively late in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, with no settlement indicated on historical mapping until the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Despite the arrival of the

railways at the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the area within which the BR Site is located remained partially isolated until the construction of Frontier Road in 1923. Air photography indicated that all suitable land had mostly been cleared for agricultural purposes by 1945, though cultivation has since declined and the majority of the Site has reverted to secondary growth.

No further archaeological assessment would be required prior to development.

As part of the Cultural Heritage Overview report, in relation to the BR Site, a total of four cultural heritage resources (including both individual properties and cultural landscapes) were identified. Near the BR Site, there were three properties identified as having cultural heritage value: the NCC Greenbelt (identified by NCC), 6086 Frontier Road (identified by the City of Ottawa) and 9341 Mitch Owens Road (identified by the City of Ottawa). All three properties are in excess of 500 metres from the study property and are not included in the report inventory.

A total of four potential heritage resources (identified as pre-1973 structures as per MTCS guidelines) were identified. Only one, the farmstead located at 5508 Frontier Road, is a potential cultural heritage landscape. The other three properties are located in an area of transition, and are often already isolated by recent land-use changes. Two of the properties include mixed uses including residential and commercial components (5409 Boundary Road and 5329 Boundary Road). The property located at 5329 Boundary Road appears to be residential use only, but it shares a civic address with a commercial business (Alpine Auto Parts) immediately adjacent. The specific use of what appears to be a former farmhouse located at 5507 Boundary Road (Inventory O-08) could not be determined, although it is located in an area dominated by industrial uses.

### 2.2.1 Summary of Conditions at BR Site

Table 2.2-1: Summary of Site Considerations on the BR Site

Environmental Component	Summary of Site Considerations
<b>Cultural &amp; Heritage Resources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ No registered archaeological Sites within study area.</li> <li>■ All of the on-Site lands contain no or low archaeological potential.</li> <li>■ Four potential cultural heritage resources (identified as pre-1973 structures as per MTCS guidelines) were identified.</li> </ul>

## 3.0 SITE COMPARISON – CULTURAL & HERITAGE RESOURCES

### 3.1 Comparison of Sites

The NRR Site and the BR Site do not contain any registered archaeological Sites, although in both cases this is in part due to a lack of previous archaeological assessment and/or recent development within the respective study areas. In the absence of any registered archaeological Sites, archaeological potential is used as an indicator for the presence of undiscovered archaeological Sites.

Only the NRR Site contains areas of archaeological potential that would trigger further Archaeological assessment in advance of any development. These areas of archaeological potential are identified using criteria outlined by the 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consulting Archaeologists* and are based upon physical attributes such as water courses and landforms, in addition to documentary and historical research.



The NRR Site contains areas of high archaeological potential, primarily associated with the documented locations of early historic homesteads, in addition to moderate archaeological potential associated with watercourses and wet areas that may have been utilized by pre-contact populations.

The BR Site does not possess any archaeological potential regarding historic homesteads. The area within which the BR Site is located does not possess any archaeological potential regarding pre-contact populations.

The BR Site is preferred from a Cultural & Heritage Resources perspective due to the lack of archaeological potential compared to the NRR Site. The absence of registered archaeological Sites does not favour one Site over the other.

As part of the Cultural Heritage Overview Report process, in reviewing the identified and potential properties (based on the review of inventories, Site visits, and air photo analysis) at both locations, the area with which the NRR Site is located was found to have approximately seven times the number of potential cultural heritage resources.<sup>1</sup> The heritage resources within the area of the NRR Site also appear to be more complex, as illustrated by the number of farmsteads present. Further, the area of the NRR location could be a potential cultural heritage landscape. In contrast, the potential cultural heritage resources at the BR Site location are located in an area that has already been heavily modified by commercial and industrial activities. Further, the majority of the potential cultural heritage resources near the Boundary Road Site are single buildings. Some of the potential heritage resources have already isolated by previous interventions, such as the house located at 5507 Boundary Road.

### **3.2 Results of Site Comparison**

Following a comparison of the two Sites, it is considered that the BR Site is preferred overall for the protection of archeological and cultural heritage resources. The BR Site has low archaeological potential and therefore a much smaller possibility of impacting any undiscovered resources. It also has fewer potential cultural heritage resources that, in general, are already located within an area that has seen significant interventions.

---

<sup>1</sup> The BR area has 4 identified or potential cultural heritage resources, while the NRR area has 29 identified or potential cultural heritage resources.