A. Recommendations

THAT the Sustainability Committee receive Staff Report PDS.19.100 Renewable Energy Regulations; for Information.

B. Overview

The purpose of this report is to provide information to the Sustainability Committee to help start the discussion on the creation of Renewable Energy Regulations in the Town of The Blue Mountains.

C. Background

At the January 14, 2019 Committee of the Whole, a report was presented by Planning Staff about the repeal of the Green Energy Act through Bill 34 (PDS.19.08 Green Energy Act Repeal (Bill 34) Information Report is attached this report as Attachment #1). Through that report Planning Staff outlined the changes to renewable energy legislation through the Green Energy Act repeal and some of the implications. The repeal of the Green Energy Act means that local municipalities once again have the power to regulate the siting of Renewable Energy Facilities in their jurisdiction.

That report also recommended that Council authorize Planning Staff to begin the process in 2019 to initiate public and agency consultation, and create draft Official Plan policies and Zoning Provisions for Council’s review. The exact timing and amount of consultation had not yet been determined and it was anticipated that staff would create a consultation plan as part of this project, with regular reporting back to Council at major project milestones.

It should be noted that this report refers only to renewable energy facilities as defined under the Electricity Act, 1998, which are subject to a “Renewable Energy Approval”. Within the Electricity Act the renewable energy facility must generate electricity from a renewable energy source, such as Wind, Solar and Bio-energy (anaerobic digestion, biofuel, biogas, thermal treatment facilities). A facility that generates fuel, such as bio-diesel, or bio-solids for fertilizers, which are not used for electricity generation, are not the subject of this report. Hydroelectric or water
power facilities are also not subject to Renewable Energy Approvals; rather, they continue to be subject to an Individual or Class Environmental Assessment process and subject to a separate process.

Prior to the Green Energy Act 2009, the Town undertook several reports concerning Renewable Energy Facilities, to be used to inform decision-making for siting of these facilities. Two of these reports are attached in Attachments #2 and #3 for the Committee’s review:

- Constraints Analysis – Renewable Energy Review April 24, 2007 (Jones)
- Cultural Heritage Landscape Assessment Report 2009 (Envision)

These reports were commissioned to create mapping of areas that could be excluded consideration of a new facility based on set criteria (protected areas, proximity to sensitive receptors and so on).

D. Analysis

At this time, Planning Staff are seeking feedback on the types of Renewable Energy Facilities that might be desired in the Town under the Renewable Energy Approvals - Wind, Solar and Bio-energy, and seeking to open the discussion on siting considerations for those facilities.

Table 1: Renewable Energy Projects and Siting Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Examples of Siting Considerations (proximity to other uses, features or lands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wind projects</strong></td>
<td>• Potential Noise or other Nuisance impacts (near sensitive receptors such as residential uses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Class 2 facilities over 3 kW but less than 50 kW</td>
<td>• Ecological siting considerations (for example: near drinking water sources, significant habitats, provincial parks, Niagara Escarpment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Class 3 facilities equal or greater than 50 kW with sound power level less than 102 dBA</td>
<td>• Preservation of Significant Landscapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Class 4 facilities equal to or greater than 50 kW with sound power level greater than or equal to 102 dBA</td>
<td>• Protection Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interference with Airports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Existing Infrastructure (near Electricity Corridor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Protection of Aggregates Supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interference to Telecommunications Towers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solar</strong></td>
<td>• Ecological siting considerations (as noted above)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Class 3 ground-mounted solar facilities with a name plate capacity greater than 10 kW</td>
<td>• Aggregates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Preservation of Significant Landscapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Protection Agricultural Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Existing Infrastructure (near Electricity Corridor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of Siting Considerations (proximity to other uses, features or lands)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bio-energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• anaerobic digestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• biofuel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• biogas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• thermal treatment facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential Noise, Odour or other Nuisance impacts (near sensitive receptors such as residential uses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Safety (fuel storage)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing Infrastructure (near Electricity Corridor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ecological siting considerations (as noted above)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Considerations:
Other matters which could be used in the formation of policies in consideration of potential projects are Community acceptance of the project, Energy needs within the Province, Costs/responsibility of decommissioning, Long Term Benefits, Innovation, Town’s other Guiding Documents.

Feedback on the information in this report will be used to create the follow up report to the Committee of the Whole in the fall of 2019.

### E. The Blue Mountains Strategic Plan

Goal #1: Create Opportunities for Sustainability
Objective #2 Attract New Business

Goal #3: Support Healthy Lifestyles
Objective #4 Commit to Sustainability

### F. Environmental Impacts

None

### G. Financial Impact

None

### H. In consultation with

Nathan Westendorp, Director of Planning and Development Services.

### I. Public Engagement

The topic of this Staff Report has not been subject to a Public Meeting and/or a Public Information Centre as neither a Public Meeting nor a Public Information Centre are required. However, any comments regarding this report should be submitted to Denise Whaley at the contact information below.
J. Attached

1. PDS.19.08 Green Energy Act Repeal (Bill 34) Information Report
2. Constraints Analysis – Renewable Energy Review April 24, 2007 (Jones)
3. Cultural Heritage Landscape Assessment Report 2009 (Envision)

Respectfully submitted,

______________________________
Denise Whaley
Denise Whaley, MSc MCIP RPP
Planner II

______________________________
Nathan Westendorp
Nathan Westendorp, RPP, MCIP
Director of Planning and Development Services

For more information, please contact:
Denise Whaley
planning@thebluemountains.ca
519-599-3131 extension 262
A. Recommendations

THAT Council receive Staff Report PDS.19.08 Green Energy Act Repeal (Bill 34) Information Report;

AND THAT Council authorize staff to initiate the process, including public and agency consultation, to update the Town’s Official Plan policies and Town’s Zoning By-law to guide development of renewable energy undertakings in the Town.

B. Overview

The purpose of this report is to inform Council about recent changes to renewable energy legislation resulting from the repeal of the Green Energy Act 2009, through Bill 34.

C. Background

The provincial government recently introduced and passed Bill 34, an Act to repeal the Green Energy Act, 2009 and to amend the Electricity Act, 1998, the Environmental Protection Act, the Planning Act, and various other statutes. The repeal of the Green Energy Act now provides a framework for municipal consultation and approvals of renewable energy projects. Bill 34 was passed and received Royal Ascent on December 6, 2018. Note that a portion of the Bill is not yet in effect and requires proclamation of the Lieutenant Governor (date not yet determined).

The Green Energy Act was enacted in 2009 in order to facilitate the creation of renewable energy projects in the province and to provide economic and employment benefits through the creation of these projects. Green energy, by the Act’s definition, included wind, solar, biomass and biogas, where these energy sources were used to create electricity. Provisions in the Green Energy Act also supported energy conservation through energy efficiency, small energy projects through Microfit programs, and aimed to remove red tape by removing local municipal approvals for energy projects.
As part of removing “red tape”, the Green Energy Act did not allow municipalities to pass by-laws that would restrict green energy projects, such as using the zoning by-law to prohibit wind turbines or solar farms. While some supporters of this legislation approved of removing politics from the decision making, others criticized the lack of municipal input.

The changes under Bill 34 amended several provisions of the Planning Act that will now empower the province and municipalities to allow or restrict these applications through the Planning Act application tools.

In addition, some of the decision making authority of the Municipality would be sheltered from appeals to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT):

- There is no right to appeal to the LPAT regarding a refusal or failure by a municipality to adopt or approve requested amendments to an official plan that proposes to authorize a renewable energy generation facility, project, testing facility or testing project.
- There is no appeal in respect of all or any part of an application for an amendment to a zoning by-law if the amendment or part of the amendment proposes to permit a renewable energy undertaking.

Although some municipalities had previously developed Official Plan policies and Zoning restrictions on renewable energy projects, most of these were removed from Planning documents after the introduction of the Green Energy Act, since these policies and/or provisions then had no effect. The lack of Official Plan Policies and Zoning restrictions has left a vacuum after the repeal of the Green Energy Act, where municipalities do not have any legislative authority to restrict locations and/or parameters for development of renewable energy projects.

D. Analysis

The repeal of the Green Energy Act provides an opportunity for the Town to engage its citizens in the development new policies to help evaluate renewable energy proposals, such as wind, solar, biogas and so on.

The framework for evaluating renewable energy proposals could include matters such as:

- Where appropriate places might be for such projects
- Criteria to be used to review and identify environmental, social, economic impacts
- Size or scale considered appropriate
- Priorities (including landscapes, natural environment, public safety and so on)

Creating this framework will inform the development of policies within the Town’s Official Plan. The policies would then need to be implemented through the Zoning By-law by inserting zoning restrictions for the location of renewable energy projects. For example, if the zoning by-law does not allow any renewable energy projects in a property’s zone category, the applicant for a renewable energy project would need to apply for rezoning. The zoning application would be evaluated against the Town’s Official Plan policies and would need to be consistent with the
intent and direction of these policies. The Official Plan policies would need to include the specific criteria that must be satisfied in order for a zoning amendment to be supported.

Developing the framework, policies and zoning provisions requires significant public and agency consultation (as required by the Planning Act). As part of this report, staff are requesting Council authorization to move forward to engage the public and create draft documents for Council’s review.

If the Town does not create policy direction in the Town’s Official Plan, when projects are brought forward, there will be no set evaluation criteria to review them; and with no policy framework in the Town’s Official Plan, the Town could not create Zoning Provisions to control the location, scale or other parameters. Waiting until a renewable energy project is proposed would mean Council would not have all the Planning Act tools available to the municipality. The ability to effectively engage the public would also be lost.

Based on the above, staff recommend Council authorize Planning Division Staff to initiate the process in 2019 to initiate public and agency consultation, and create draft Official Plan policies and Zoning Provisions for Council’s review. The exact timing and amount of consultation has not be determined, however staff would create a consultation plan as part of this project, with regular reporting back to Council at major project milestones.

E. The Blue Mountains Strategic Plan

The recommendations in this report support the following goals and objectives of the Town’s strategic plan:

Goal #1: Create Opportunities for Sustainability, Objective #3 Promote a Diversified Economy

Goal #2: Engage Our Communities & Partners, Objective #1 Improve External Communication with our Constituents

Goal #3: Support Healthy Lifestyles, Objective #4 Commit to Sustainability

F. Environmental Impacts

None at this time.

G. Financial Impact

Moving ahead with drafting policies will result in the typical financial costs of public consultation processes as associated with the Planning Act, including any advertising and staff resources.

H. In consultation with

Nathan Westendorp, Director of Planning and Development Services.
I. Public Engagement

The topic of this Staff Report has not been subject to a Public Meeting and/or a Public Information Centre as neither a Public Meeting nor a Public Information Centre are required. Moving forward with the recommended process will require extensive consultation with internal staff, agencies and the public.

Comments regarding this report should be submitted to Denise Whaley, Planner planning@thebluemountains.ca.

J. Attached


Respectfully submitted,

Denise Whaley, MSc MCIP RPP
Planner II

Nathan Westendorp, RPP
Director of Planning and Development Services

For more information, please contact:
Denise Whaley
planning@thebluemountains.ca
519-599-3131 extension 262
Ontario Repeals Green Energy Act, 2009

By Zoë Thoms and Jonathan Yantzi

The Ontario Minister of Energy, Northern Development and Mines recently introduced legislation to repeal the Green Energy Act, 2009 and its regulations. The Green Energy Act, 2009 was enacted ten years ago to expand renewable energy production, encourage energy conservation and create jobs in the renewable energy sector. In addition to repealing the Green Energy Act, 2009, Bill 34, Green Energy Repeal Act, 2018, also includes changes to the Planning Act and Environmental Protection Act that increase the power of the province and municipalities to reject renewable energy projects.

The repeal of the Green Energy Act, 2009 will eliminate the Renewable Energy Facilitation Office located within the Ministry of Energy to help proponents navigate renewable energy project approvals. Also repealed will be the requirement that government facilities be constructed, acquired, operated and managed in an environmentally-responsible way, including the use of renewable energy sources, energy and water efficient planning and design, and the transparent reporting of energy and water use and GHG emissions.

Bill 34 re-enacts a limited number of provisions of the Green Energy Act, 2009 in the Electricity Act, 1998 that permit the government to create regulations in a number of areas. Until such regulations are enacted under the Electricity Act, 1998, however, these re-enacted provisions will have little effect. These sections provide for the creation of regulations:

- To allow for the designation of renewable energy projects, sources and testing projects for the purposes of removing barriers to, and to promote opportunities for, the use of renewable energy sources, and to promote access to transmission systems and distribution systems for proponents of renewable energy projects;

- To require an electricity, natural gas or water distributor to make data available with respect to the consumption or use of electricity, gas or water to persons required to report on energy consumption and water use;

- To allow for the use of designated goods, services and technologies in such circumstances, despite any restriction imposed at law (i.e., the “clothesline law”); and

- To require a public agency to prepare and submit an energy conservation and demand management plan and to achieve targets and meet energy and environmental standards, including standards for energy conservation and demand management.

Bill 34 amends several provisions of the Planning Act that will empower the province and municipalities to reject renewable energy projects by:

- Adding a new clause that provides that there is no appeal to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT) in respect of a refusal or failure by a municipality or planning board to adopt or approve requested amendments to an official plan that proposes to authorize a renewable energy generation facility, project, testing facility or testing project;

- Adding a new clause that provides that there is no appeal to the LPAT in respect of an application for an amendment to a zoning by-law if the amendment proposes to permit a renewable energy undertaking;

- Ending exemptions from subdivision control and part-lot control for certain transactions entered into for the purposes of renewable energy generation facilities or renewable energy projects; and
• Ending exemptions for renewable energy undertakings from a number of other requirements, including the application of policy statements, provincial plans, official plans, demolition control by-laws and others.

In addition, Bill 34 amends the *Environmental Protection Act* to enable the government to refuse to approve renewable energy projects where demand for the electricity that would be generated by the project has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the government.

Bill 34 is currently awaiting second reading in the Ontario legislature.
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1.0 Introduction

The purpose of this report is to summarize land use constraints for large scale wind energy systems in order to provide the Town of The Blue Mountains with a baseline as part of their policy review for renewable energy facilities. This constraint analysis provides a starting point for determining the land use constraints for large scale wind energy facilities and identify at a higher level likely areas of potential development that may require a specific planning policy framework. An analysis of the mapping also confirmed that identified land use constraints do not effectively prohibit large scale wind energy facilities which are otherwise supported in the Provincial Policy Statement.

This report will provide the background information for the next Public Information Session. Comments received from the public at the next session will be used to verify local constraints and help direct how the various constraints will translate into specific land use policies for large scale wind energy facilities and the broader renewable energy facilities planning framework.

2.0 Methodology

Using Geographic Information System mapping, Town staff have prepared a series of map overlays that depict land use constraints within the Town. Identified constraints were based on discussions with Town staff and other renewable energy policy work undertaken by Jones Consulting. Constraints were considered at the local level based on physical characteristics, existing land use polices/designations at the Town and County of Grey, and applicable Provincial Policies. As a result, constraints used for this analysis include:

- Settlement Areas;
- Topography;
- Natural Heritage;
- Niagara Escarpment Plan;
- Wind Speeds;
- Residential & Settlement Buffers;
- Trails;
- Special Agriculture
3.0 Analysis

Based on the identified constraints, the Jones Consulting Group Ltd. completed an analysis of each of the constraints and overlaid them with wind speed mapping to provide a summary map of potential areas where large scale wind energy turbines may be able to locate. The overlay process for the constraints resulted in the differentiation of Primary Constraints and Secondary Constraints.

Primary constraints are those that could fundamentally preclude or prohibit large scale wind turbines and include:

- The Niagara Escarpment area;
- Provincially Significant Wetlands/Habitats of Endangered and Threatened Species;
- Special agricultural activities;
- Settlement Boundaries;
- Residential and Road Setbacks.

Secondary constraints are those constraints that would not necessarily preclude large scale wind energy development but would need to be considered and addressed as part of the planning application process and include:

- Topography;
- Natural heritage features including features such as hazard lands, deer wintering areas, local wetlands and Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest;
- Aggregate potential;
- Trail systems.

For the purposes of this exercise, a Large Scale Wind Energy System was considered to be a renewable energy system utilizing a single turbine or multiple turbines that are greater than 80 metres in height to the turbine hub, which generally translates to 120 metres to the tip of the blade at its highest point. This size of turbine was used in the analysis as it is a good representation of what is currently being used by the wind industry in Ontario.

It is important to note that what may be a constraint for a large scale wind generation facility may not be a constraint for smaller types of facilities. As an initial policy exercise it is a simpler process, to identify constraints for large scale wind turbines which are more likely to have a greater land use impact. The siting of smaller wind energy facilities are likely to have a reduced and/or more localized land use impact and therefore potential constraints are best assessed at a site/project specific level. The following sections summarize our findings.
3.1 Settlement Boundaries

Map 1 identifies the settlement areas within the Town of The Blue Mountains including Thornbury, Craigleith, Camperdown, larksburg, Ravenna, Banks, Gibralter, Redwing, Slabtown and Heathcote.

Particular settlement areas within the Town are proposed to develop on full municipal services and thus accommodate the majority of future growth consistent with the Town’s Official Plan. These settlements are identified in Appendix Map “H” – Service District Boundaries of the Town’s Official Plan and include Craigleith, Camperdown, Thornbury, Clarksburg, and Lora Bay. Other Service Districts are identified above the escarpment but are considered to be specifically or historically approved developments that are unlikely to expand ahead of established settlements along the shore of Georgian Bay.

In addition, there are several other settlement areas within the municipality which have historical recognition as hamlets in the Official Plan but which are not intended for accommodating the Town’s future growth including Loree, Victoria Corners, Duncan and Little Germany. However, some limited development is recognized within the existing settlement boundaries of Heathcote, Slabtown, Banks, Gibraltar, and Ravenna.

In addition to these settlement areas, the Official Plan also recognizes major residential and resort future development areas. These areas/districts include Craigleith, Camperdown, Castle Glen, Swiss Meadows, Lora Bay and Osler. These are areas where major forms of resort residential development are already approved. Some major resort residential areas are identified within Service District Boundaries since they were approved on municipal services. However, these settlements were approved as specific developments and are unlikely to expand ahead of established settlements along the shore of Georgian Bay.

Section 1.8.3 of the Provincial Policy Statement 2005 (PPS) states that Alternative energy systems and renewable energy systems shall be permitted in settlement areas, rural areas and prime agricultural areas in accordance with provincial and federal requirements. In rural areas and prime agricultural areas, these systems should be designed and constructed to minimize impacts on agricultural operations. It is our opinion that this clause should not be interpreted as permitting all forms and all scales of renewable energy at any density in any location. As a result, this constraint analysis has assumed that large scale wind energy facilities are not generally suited in settlement areas where there are concentrations of sensitive residential uses and lack of large, contiguous areas of commercial and industrial areas.

At the same time, the PPS recognizes that healthy, livable and safe communities are sustained by avoiding land use patterns that would prevent the efficient expansion of settlement areas in those areas which are adjacent or close to settlements areas. On this basis, larger buffers to primary settlement areas expected to accommodate growth should be applied to allow for future expansion.

In consideration of the above, the following buffers have been applied:

i. Urban Areas and Hamlets – a minimum and initial buffer of 300 metres should be applied to the settlement boundary.

To recognize the future growth potential of the service district boundaries, a one kilometer buffer is proposed for Craigleith, Camperdown, Thornbury, Clarksburg, and Lora Bay instead of 300 metres. However, large scale wind energy systems may locate within the 1 km buffer if they are able to demonstrate through an amendment to the Official Plan that they will not impact on growth and the efficient expansion of the Town’s serviced settlement areas.

ii. Historical Hamlets – a minimum and initial buffer of 300 metres should be applied to each residence; and

iii. Major Residential and Resort Future Development – a minimum and initial buffer of 300 metres should be applied to the major residential and resort future development areas.

For the purposes of the constraint mapping process, a 300 metre buffer is considered the absolute minimum buffer that a large scale wind turbine could locate near residential/sensitive land uses. This 300 metre buffer is what can be typically required for a large scale wind energy system to meet Ministry of Environment noise guidelines. However, it is not uncommon that greater setbacks are required to address other noise scenarios, potential nuisance, and health/safety issues. The 300 metre buffer has been applied initially to identify what areas are possible for large scale wind energy development as opposed to what areas are likely for development once other land use considerations are applied.

### 3.2 Topography

Map 2 identifies the contour mapping within the Municipality between 180 metres and 540 metres above sea level. Significant topographical features within the Municipality are for the most part contained within the Niagara Escarpment Plan and include the Pretty River Valley, Beaver Valley and Nipissing Ridge. The adopted position of the Niagara Escarpment Commission effectively prohibits large scale wind energy...
facilities from anywhere within the Niagara Escarpment Plan. Accordingly, topography is not considered to be a primary constraint but would have to be examined on a site specific basis to determine what impacts topography has on issues such as visual impact and slope stability.

The visual acceptability or impact of wind turbines of any size is for the most part dependent upon the values and subjectivity of the individual. For this reason, visual impacts are the most controversial yet the least understood of many land use issues.\(^4\) The landscape character of an area is linked to a variety of attributes including topography, vegetation, diversity and focus points (i.e. Landmarks).\(^5\)

The visual character of a local area provides a guide for further assessment such as:

i. **Visual Sensitivity** – Unaltered landscape, dominant topographic features, heritage attributes or those viewed by large numbers of people will be more sensitive to visual change. The degree of sensitivity will be influenced by view angles, adjacent land uses, visual absorption capacity, local land use policies, and recognized scenic features, routes or viewpoints.

ii. **Visual Absorption Capacity (VAC)** – VAC is the ability of a landscape to absorb change without resulting in a significant change to visual character or reduction in visual quality. VAC is subject to such factors as vegetation, land forms and existing development. Large, uninterrupted views to naturalized/rural area will have less capacity to absorb the visual change of prominent wind turbines.\(^6\)

A review of the topographical mapping for the Municipality identifies the Niagara Escarpment Plan areas as generally the most sensitive and distinctive, depicting the greatest topographical diversity. Our assessment is an initial estimate and is not based on public values, opinions and perceptions. One method of identifying sensitive landscape units is to collect data regarding public preferences around areas of local scenic value (i.e scenic routes) in the context of a particular large scale wind energy proposal where actual turbine locations and characteristics are better understood.

In summary, many of the Town’s topographic features are contained within the Niagara Escarpment Plan area that already controls the development of wind turbines and considers visual impact. Other topographic features are considered a secondary constraint that can be more accurately assessed in the context of an actual


\(^6\) Ibid.
application. Therefore, no areas have been precluded from large scale wind energy developments based on topography.

### 3.3 Natural Heritage

Map 3 depicts the natural heritage features identified within the Town of The Blue Mountain Official Plan. These environmentally sensitive areas include provincially significant wetlands, areas of natural and scientific interest, deer wintering yards, and hazard lands. Primary aggregate areas, as identified in County of Grey mapping, have also been added to this map. These features represent potential constraints to the development of renewable energy facilities, and specifically large scale wind energy facilities.

i. **Wetlands** – Provincially Significant Wetlands (PSWs) are protected from development under the Provincial Policy Statement. Therefore, PSWs are a primary constraint where large scale wind energy facilities will not be permitted. Should other wetlands (LSW) be identified at the local level, these shall be considered secondary constraints and should be assessed at the planning application stage.

ii. **Hazard lands and Deer Wintering Yards** – Areas of hazard lands are identified within the Official Plan and are afforded a certain level of protection, however, hazard lands are considered a secondary constraint since a particular wind energy facility may be able to site itself in an appropriate manner consistent with a site specific environmental impact report.

iii. **Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI)** – ANSI’s have been identified within the Official Plan due to their natural and scientific significance. Development in these areas would require site specific evaluations to ensure that a particular project does not have a negative impact on the particular ANSI. On this basis, ANSI’s are considered secondary constraints.

iv. **Rare Species** – Potential locations for rare species have been identified using the Towns’ mapping. While these areas may not be a primary constraint, development proposals in the vicinity of these areas would require an Environmental Impact Study to specifically address potential impacts on these features. If the wind proposal were to have an unacceptable impact, then the location of any rare species would be a primary constraint and preclude development.

v. **Aggregate/Pits** – While this feature is a resource rather than a natural heritage feature, primary aggregate and designated pits and quarries are identified within the Official Plan and are considered of provincial interest. As such, these limited areas within the Town are afforded
protection. As defined in Sections 2.4 and 2.5 of the Provincial Policy Statement, in areas adjacent to or in known mineral deposits, petroleum resources and mineral aggregate resources, development and activities which would preclude or hinder the establishment of new operations or access to the resources shall only be permitted if the proposed land use or development serves a greater long-term public interest and issues of public health, public safety and environmental impact are addressed. Future developments near these areas would need to consider the need and quality of the aggregate resource against the need for using the wind resources at that location.

Consistent with Provincial Policy, primary natural heritage constraints will be limited to Provincially Significant Wetlands and Areas of Endangered and Threatened Species. Large scale wind energy facilities should be precluded from these areas. Other secondary constraints regarding natural hazards are best assessed at the site specific level in light of a particular project.

### 3.4 Niagara Escarpment Plan

Map 4 identifies the Niagara Escarpment Plan Area and the Development Control Area. This Map also depicts the four main NEP classifications including:

- Escarpment Natural;
- Escarpment Protection;
- Escarpment Rural;
- Escarpment Recreational.

The most environmentally and visually sensitive of the NEP classifications are generally lands within the Escarpment Natural and Escarpment Protection designations.

Planning Staff and Commission Members of the Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC) have considered the issue of commercial wind turbine development (including large scale wind energy facilities) through the preparation and review of Policy Papers on this subject in October 2003 and again in October 2004. As noted in the 2004 report, “the Commission has been consistent in determining that highly visible human-made structures are generally not compatible with the purpose and objectives of the Niagara Escarpment Plan (NEP), despite other benefits they may offer.”

---

The NEC’s resolution on October 20, 2004 regarding wind energy facilities resulted in a stronger position than that contained in the Staff Policy Paper dated the same. This resolution is summarized as follows:

- NEC supports the concept of wind power but not as a large scale industrial development within the NEP;
- The NEP be amended to prohibit large scale industrial-type wind power within the Niagara Escarpment;
- Small scale wind turbines be considered on a case by case basis as an accessory to existing uses;
- NEC should review and comment on wind power proposals in areas adjacent to the NEP in terms of visual impact;
- The issue of large scale wind power facilities be reviewed at an appropriate future time once the industry further advances and legislative and regulatory changes occur.

This resolution clearly speaks to the Commission not accepting the escarpment as a test case during the early days of wind developments and that protecting the natural environment is paramount. The Commission’s opinion considers the fact that there are other opportunities for wind energy facilities in other sites outside of the NEC jurisdiction. At the same time, the Commission has identified the need for review of wind power proposals in areas adjacent to the NEP to ensure that their physical presence does not have a visual impact on prominent Escarpment features and landscapes.

We have spoken previously with Lynne Richardson, a Senior Planner for the Niagara Escarpment Commission, who confirmed that the proposed amendment to the Niagara Escarpment Plan has not yet been implemented due to staffing limitations and other project commitments.

Based on the Commission paper, an amendment is required to the Niagara Escarpment Plan. Section 2.15 permits utility facilities, which by definition, includes the generation, transmission and distribution of electric power, subject to siting and design guidelines. This Section will require amendment in order to implement the Commissions formal position on large scale wind turbine facilities.

NEC staff, along with the authors of this report, have participated as members of a working committee for renewable energy in the Town of The Blue Mountains. This will help ensure that the interests and policies of the NEC are considered in the Town’s renewable energy policy development process.

In consideration of the above, the Niagara Escarpment Plan is considered to be a primary constraint that currently would not permit large scale wind energy facilities within the Plan area.

No additional buffers beyond the NEP area have been considered as part of the constraint analysis for two reasons:
• No landscape character/visual impact/cultural heritage assessment has been carried out in the Town of the Blue Mountains to identify and justify the need for an additional buffer to the NEC. The potentially subjective interpretation of landscape values and visual impact makes it difficult to establish defensible and specific setbacks to visual features. The character of the NEC and the mix of NEP designations within the Town may warrant a specific policy approach.

• The land available in the Town for large scale wind energy facilities is much less than the Municipality of Grey Highlands due to the Town’s much smaller size, unique character, extent of land within the NEP, and specialty agricultural lands. Any additional buffer to lands within the NEP would significantly reduce access to good wind resources and potentially preclude large scale wind energy facilities contrary to the PPS.

It should be noted that any applications with potential impact on NEP lands can be referred to the NEC for their full review and comment. To justify an additional buffer specific for the NEP lands would require a professional and defensible assessment prepared by a qualified individual. This assessment could consider existing NEP Rural and Recreational designations that may already have some function as a buffer to more sensitive NEP designations.

### 3.5 Wind Speed

Wind Speeds have been mapped by the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) to a 100 metre by 100 metre resolution to provide a basis for and to encourage wind energy projects in Ontario. The wind resource map referred to in this section is used by the wind industry as an initial prospecting tool to locate areas warranting further local investigations. While the wind mapping may be used to approximate the local resource in a given region, MNR recommends a professional more detailed assessment of local meteorological conditions and technical feasibility before proceeding with any wind turbine installation. On this basis, wind speeds should not be considered constraints but rather a tool to ensure that good wind resources in the Town are potentially available for large scale wind energy facilities as a means to be consistent with Provincial Policy regarding renewable energy facilities. The consideration of wind speeds will ensure that the best wind resources are not inappropriately restricted.

---

3.5.1 Wind Speed at 80 metres

Map 5a identifies wind speeds within the Town of The Blue Mountains at 80 metres in height (the hub height of many large scale turbines) that range between “Marginal” (5.0 metres/second to 6.0 metres/second) to “Acceptable” (6.0 metres/second to 6.5 metres/second). “Very Good” wind speeds (range from 7.0 metres/second to 8.0 metres/second) and are found within three significantly sized blocks in close proximity to the escarpment. These areas are located in the easterly half of the Municipality running diagonally along the ridge of the Escarpment. The following blocks depict “Very Good” wind speeds:

i. North of Loree - The most northerly block is located north of the settlement area of Loree and southwest of the Nottawasaga Bay shoreline within Lots 22 to 25, Concessions 6 and 7.

ii. North East of Banks - The second block is located east of Banks and is a larger, more elongated area, following the escarpment topography. This areas spans from Lots 13 to 21 within Concessions 3 and 4, surrounding the Swiss Meadows development and traveling south east.

iii. East of Gibraltar - The third block is in the south east quadrant of the Municipality, east of Gibraltar. The block is located within Lots 6 to 8, Concession 1 and slightly consuming Concession 2 as well. This area traverses Grey Road No. 31 and the Bruce Trail both existing and proposed trail systems.

According to MNR, wind speeds of 5 to 6 metres per second are required for small scale development while wind speeds in excess of 6.0 metres/second are required for large scale facilities. No further definitions of “large” and “small” scale are provided in the wind atlas. Map 5a illustrates there are “Very Good” wind areas in the Town, while winds over much of the Municipality are fairly uniform and within the “Marginal” range.

3.5.2 Wind Speed at 30 metres

Map 5b identifies wind speed levels at a height of 30 metres. At 30 metres in height (a typical hub height for many smaller scale facilities), the Town has a relatively uniform “Marginal” wind speed of 5.5 metres/second, sufficient for small scale facilities. Map 5b continues to depict significant wind resources at a height of 30 metres.

This generalization should be understood to be a guide for viability. As wind turbines continue to evolve and more efficient better technology driven turbines become available, previously marginal projects may become more acceptable and ultimately more viable.

3.5.3 Wind Speed Summary

A review of wind speed mapping allows consideration of wind resources in the context of other constraints that may preclude wind development allowing for a more effective balance between existing land uses and the realization of wind resources. The identification of good wind resource areas is important in order to focus large scale wind energy facilities to these more appropriate areas.

3.6 Road Setbacks

Map 6 identifies all local, collector and arterial roads within the Municipality and provides a 140 metre setback. A setback of 140 metres from the centerline of local, collector and arterial roads aids in containing potential impacts from turbine failure, ice throw and visual impacts. There may be impacts that would require larger setbacks depending on the particular circumstance of a project and its location, however, this setback is sufficient to determine a baseline for initial policy considerations and is consistent with previous comments from MTO in other municipalities. The concession and side road transportation network and grid lot fabric are effective at maximizing potential areas for renewable energy development at the rear of existing farms/residences which are primarily located at the front of lots in close proximity to road access.

In summary, 140 metres has been applied as a primary constraint since it is unlikely that large scale wind energy turbines would be sited any closer for safety, visual and land use factors.

3.7 Residential and Settlement Buffers

The rational for a 300 metre setback to residences and settlement boundaries is fully discussed in Section 3 of this report. Map 7 identifies residences and settlement areas where a 300 metre buffer has been applied. This setback would generally reflect the absolute minimum required buffer for noise purposes at the time of a Ministry of the Environment Certificate of Approval issuance for turbine operations. Additional setbacks beyond 300 metres would address other noise concerns not specifically identified in MOE noise guidelines, as well as other potential health, safety and nuisance issues such as ice throw and shadow flicker.

3.8 Trails and Pathways

Map 8 depicts existing and proposed within the Town including the Bruce Trail, Georgian Trail, Snowmobile Trail and Superbuild Trail Project. The most important trails from a natural heritage, visual impact and tourism point of view are generally contained within areas already covered by a primary constraint. In the
case of the Bruce Trail, large scale wind energy facilities are unlikely to be located in close proximity because of the trails location within higher order designations of the Niagara Escarpment Plan. A similar situation applies to the Georgian Trail along Georgian Bay that is contained within a settlement/service district boundary and in close proximity to collector and arterial roads.

Other trails outside of primary constraint areas are considered lower order and less sensitive since they are primarily associated with snow mobile and mountain bike routes. These trails, and possible safety concerns, could be considered as a secondary constraint at the time of a particular application.

The degree to which a trail is a constraint for the siting of wind energy systems is dependent upon its potential visual impact for trail users. Seeing a turbine from a trail is not necessarily a constraint and it is not reasonable to expect that all views from existing trails will be protected. Specific siting principles to offset impacts on trails would require a specific visual impact assessment at the time of an application and the necessary conditions implemented as part of any future approval.

3.9 Special Agriculture

Map 9 depicts the Special Agriculture designation within the Official Plan. Specialty Crop Areas are specifically identified and offered the highest order of protection in the Provincial Policy Statement because of their limited availability in Ontario and their historic loss due to population growth. In the Town, Specialty Crop Areas are considered to include areas currently or historically used for fruit orchards. These areas occupy the majority of lands in the northwest quadrant of the Municipality and are roughly bordered by Grey Road No. 19 to the south, municipal boundary to the west, Grey Road No. 113/Thornbury to the north, and Victoria Corners to the east. There are currently extensive and active orchards within these areas that need to be considered as a constraint for large scale wind turbine facilities because of the potential loss of a very finite land resource, not only within the Town, but also the Province.

The location of Specialty Crop Areas will impact the siting of proposed wind energy facilities based on these lands being considered a provincial interest. These areas are protected with the Provincial Policy Statement in order to avoid the loss of these valuable lands for food production. Based on this provincial interest, Special Agriculture lands are considered a Primary Constraint. However, it is recognized that single installations of large scale wind turbines may offer the opportunity for existing agricultural operations to supplement their operations and make them more sustainable for the longer term. On this basis, single large scale turbines could be considered in areas of Specialty Agricultural lands where it is demonstrated that land loss may be minimized. The exclusion of multiple large scale wind energy facilities (i.e. wind farms) from these areas could be considered as they would result in a potentially larger loss of Specialty Agriculture lands.
4.0 Summary

Responsible policy seeks to balance land use constraints with good wind resources. The purpose of the constraint analysis has been to determine if the application of primary constraints (those where large scale wind energy facilities are not permitted) would preclude this form of renewable energy in the Town. Overly restrictive constraints would potentially put local policies for renewable energy at odds with Provincial Policy seeking to establish renewable energy facilities. While it is recognized that there are many forms of renewable energy, large scale wind energy facilities represent the most likely form of commercial energy generation, particularly in the Town where good wind resources exist.

After our review of land use constraints, we have confirmed that Primary constraints that could fundamentally exclude large scale wind turbines in the Town include:

- The Niagara Escarpment Plan area;
- Provincially Significant Wetlands and the Habitats of Endangered and Threatened Species;
- Specialty Crop Lands;
- Settlement Boundaries;
- Residential and Road Setbacks.

Secondary constraints are those constraints that would not necessarily preclude large scale wind energy development but are constraints that would require consideration and the submission of supporting technical documents to address the issue as part of the planning application process. These secondary constraints include the following:

- Topography;
- Natural heritage features including features such as hazard lands, deer wintering areas, local wetlands and Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest;
- Aggregate potential;
- Trail systems;
- Other – local noise, electromagnetic interference, shadow flicker, safety, etc.

Our assessment of the combined constraints is included on Maps 10, 11, 12 and 13. Map 10 is the most descriptive map as it clearly depicts the application of Primary Constraints and identifies the areas that will still permit large scale wind energy sites, subject to a review of the secondary constraints. On this basis, it becomes clear that the Town needs to develop renewable energy policies specifically addressing large scale
wind energy facilities. The main goal of these policies will be to appropriately site large scale wind energy facilities in areas outside of primary constraint areas while recognizing secondary constraints.

Areas not covered by Primary Constraints have also been overlaid with the MNR wind speed mapping (Maps 12 and 13). This report and the mapping show that areas with good wind resources are potentially available for large scale wind turbines if they are appropriately sited to minimize land use conflicts. The identification of areas potentially available for large scale wind energy facilities is not to promote their development, but to direct proposed developments to areas suited for these types or projects. Projects intending to locate in these areas will be subject to specific policies of the Town developed to ensure orderly and proper planning.

The goal of any land use planning policy is to balance social, economic, physical and environmental interest to minimize conflicts between various land uses. The attached series of constraint maps graphically summarize land use constraints according to existing land use policies or by our experiences with modern large scale wind energy facilities.

Respectfully submitted,

The Jones Consulting Group Ltd.

Tim Cane, MES, MCIP, RPP
Partner
Senior Planner
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

The pastoral countryside, dramatic escarpment terrain, and expansive views of Georgian Bay combine to create the outstanding scenic landscapes in the Town of The Blue Mountains, which have long established it as an attractive area to live in and for recreational enjoyment. These qualities, combined with a unique First Nations heritage and Euro-Canadian settlement history create the setting for landscapes that are culturally significant, and embody the history and evolution of the Town. Against the backdrop of ancient natural features, these man-made landscapes are a rich tapestry of orchards, fields, hedgerows, rock cut roadways, stone fences, and ruins, set amongst the more recognizable heritage houses and farm complexes.

The inclusion of the surrounding landscape has long been recognized as integral to the conservation of heritage buildings, and is widely accepted in the form of urban heritage districts. This thinking has now extended to rural heritage landscapes and it is now better appreciated that the preservation of a larger geographic area affords an opportunity for maintaining an area’s distinctive historic character and for the continued portrayal of its cultural evolution.

Although measures for conserving cultural heritage landscapes are now entrenched in the Ontario planning and policy framework, the practice of identifying and applying conservation tools is still not widespread at the municipal level. The Town of The Blue Mountains is at the forefront in considering the inclusion of cultural heritage landscapes amongst its inventory of heritage assets, and in the development of policies and measures to promote their conservation.
2.0 STUDY PURPOSE

The Town of The Blue Mountains is committed to maintaining and enhancing its agricultural, rural and tourism industries. As a result, development needs to be designed and sited in a manner which enhances the cultural, visual, and ecological qualities of the environment.

This assessment of cultural heritage landscapes was initiated in response to the Town’s interests in, and intent to develop a Renewable Energy Facility strategy that considers appropriate locations for wind energy facilities as permitted and encouraged by the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). However, the establishment of large wind energy facilities can potentially impact the integrity of cultural heritage landscapes, the conservation of which is now required by the same PPS.

The original purpose of this study was to undertake an evaluation of areas of the Town of The Blue Mountains that had previously identified as ‘unconstrained for wind energy facilities’, as identified in Figure 1, to determine the presence of any Cultural Heritage Landscapes, and to recommend measures for their conservation.

However, in May 2009, at the near conclusion of this study, the Province legislature passed the Ontario Green Energy and Green Economy Act which addresses initiatives to combat climate change, with an emphasis on the use of renewable energy sources such as wind, solar, hydro, biomass and biogas. Implementation under the Act is subject to the Renewable Energy Approval Regulation (in draft at time of writing) which outlines Ministry of the Environment requirements for review and decision-making. The intent of the Regulation is to provide a streamlined and coordinated provincial approval process for proposed renewable energy facilities. Notwithstanding that the process by which renewable energy facility approvals will be obtained has changed since the onset of the cultural heritage landscape study, the (draft) Regulation, dated June 9, 2009, provides specific guidance on cultural heritage, requiring that there be demonstration that any cultural heritage resource considerations are assessed and mitigated, if applicable. The requirements of the (draft) Regulation are therefore considered in the findings and recommendations of this report. As well, the identification of built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes within the Town is a useful exercise to help inform other planning matters not associated with renewable energy facilities.
Study Areas for CHLs

Figure 1
3.0 DEFINING THE CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPE

Origins

Cultural landscape preservation has a deep-rooted international history with relatively recent policy measures in North America. The definition, categorization, and the guidelines for the identification of cultural landscapes set out by United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) have been widely used as the basis for defining cultural heritage landscapes by national organizations including Parks Canada and the U.S. National Park Service- National Register of Historic Places.

Cultural landscapes have for some time been identified by UNESCO as “illustrative of the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal. They should be selected on the basis both of their outstanding universal value and of their representativity in terms of a clearly defined geo-cultural region and also for their capacity to illustrate the essential and distinct cultural elements of such regions”.

In Ontario, Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHL) have been further defined and acknowledged through changes in Ontario’s Provincial Policy Statement and the Ontario Heritage Act that strengthen the protection of heritage resources. A detailed look of the existing planning framework is discussed in Section 4.

The following timetable illustrates the origins and progression of cultural heritage landscape preservation measures:

1920s: Carl Sauer, cultural geographer (University of California, Berkeley) introduced the idea that cultural landscapes are about people living within the landscape

1962: An emerging global issue, recognized by UNESCO in its “Recommendation Concerning the Safeguarding of the Beauty and Character of Landscapes and Sites”

1972: UNESCO World Heritage structure, adopted the Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage

1992: UNESCO develops guidelines to include 3 types of cultural landscapes:
- designed landscapes (intentionally designed or planned);
- evolved landscapes (human activities have directly shaped the landscape);
- associative landscapes (strong religious, spiritual, or cultural associations).

1994: Parks Canada includes cultural landscapes in National Historic Sites System

Also in 1996, CHLs are formally recognized by the Province of Ontario in the Provincial Policy Statement (a policy framework for the Planning Act)

2005: Provincial Policy Statement is updated/ strengthened: “Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.”

2006: Ontario Heritage Act is updated/ strengthened; conservation of cultural heritage landscapes is imbedded in Section 4 (designation of individual sites), and Section 5 (designation of Heritage Conservation Districts)

Ontario Regulation 9/06 establishes ‘Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest’

Inventory and Evaluation Approach

The identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHL) is still a fairly new heritage conservation measure in Ontario along with its emerging inventory and evaluation methodologies. As with other evaluation processes such as natural heritage assessments the methods that stand out as being the most credible are consistent with ones endorsed by higher tier levels of government.

In reviewing the practices in place in other jurisdictions, as well as the guidelines established within the Ministry of Culture Ontario Heritage Toolkit (prepared to clarify the policies of the PPS with respect to cultural heritage conservation), there are a number of common elements within the methodologies. In general terms and most notably, these are: the undertaking of historical research to identify the historic themes of the area and the community context, a general survey of area to determine eligible candidates that are closely associated with the historic themes and which demonstrate heritage attributes; an inventory process that examines historic evolution; elements, context and boundaries of the candidate CHL; and finally a confirmation of both significance and demonstration of integrity.

The Ministry guidelines support the 'listing' of heritage sites as a first step toward evaluation and protection, and based on generally known information and limited investigation. This primary identification of a CHL can serve to heighten community interest and awareness of cultural heritage values for both heritage conservation and economic benefit; alert interested parties in the site’s potential, either for the purposes of pre-screening prior to designation, or to flag sites during the development approval process that will require further investigation. In the case of the latter, and to satisfy a formal designation process, a second stage of more detailed evaluation would be needed to confirm the presence of a CHL, and to establish any guidelines or parameters to direct appropriate conservation measures in conjunction with development or land-use change.

In developing an appropriate inventory and evaluation process for Cultural Heritage Landscapes, the following concepts were incorporated:

- The initial candidacy of a CHL is based on its association with one of the identified historic themes;
- The areas being considered must, by virtue of their quality, integrity and/or historic importance, be of municipal/local significance to be recognized as significant;
• The study methodology/process is based on similar ones proven in other jurisdictions to properly examine and inventory a candidate CHL, and is consistent with Ministry of Culture guidelines;
• The initial pre-screening through a primary identification process can be used to establish the candidacy of a potential CHL, for the purposes of ‘listing’ but a more detailed inventory and evaluation process is needed to conclude the presence of a CHL for the purposes of designation or protection using other conservation tools; and,
• In its final determination, to be consistent with the provincial policy, a cultural heritage landscape must be valued by the community.

### Types of Cultural Heritage Landscapes

Cultural Heritage Landscapes are typically categorized into three main types, as first identified by UNESCO World Heritage Committee in the Operational Guidelines in 1992, and now widely recognized in contemporary planning work. The categories are:

- **Designed Landscape** - the “clearly defined landscape designed and created intentionally by man”, such as an estate, park, or square.

- **Evolved Landscape** – “the results from an initial social, economic, administrative, and/or religious imperative and has developed in its present form in response to its natural environment”. Within this category two sub-categories are identified:
  - Relict landscape, “in which an evolutionary process came to an end at some time in the past”, and for which “significant distinguishing features, are, however still visible in material form”, such as an abandoned mill or industrial site.
  - Continuing landscape, which “retains and active social role in contemporary society closely associated with the traditional way of life, and which the evolutionary process is still in progress”, such as a neighbourhood.

- **Associative cultural landscape** – which is “justifiable by virtue of the powerful religious, artistic, or cultural associations of the natural element rather than material cultural evidence, which may be insignificant or even absent”, such as sacred sites and battlefields.

### Criteria for Identifying Cultural Heritage Landscapes

The Ontario Heritage Act provides direction on the identification of significant cultural heritage resources, including cultural heritage landscapes through Ontario Regulation 9/06. For the purposes of this study, and for any subsequent detailed assessments, the following criteria are the basis for evaluating areas under consideration as cultural heritage landscapes:

1. The property has design value or physical value, i.e.
   - is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method;
   - displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit; or,
   - demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
2. The property has historical value or associative value, i.e.
   • has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community;
   • yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture; or,
   • demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.

3. The property has contextual value, i.e.
   • is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area;
   • is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings; or
   • is a landmark.

The majority of CHLs that were examined in the Town of The Blue Mountains are evolved or associative, and subsequently Criteria 2 and 3 were primarily applied in identifying candidate areas.
4.0 PLANNING CONTEXT

Provincial Policy Statement

The current Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) which provides direction to the Planning Act and the Heritage Act came into effect in March, 2005. The policies with respect to cultural heritage resources are set out in Part IV Vision and Part IV, Section 2.6 Cultural Heritage and Archaeology.

Section 2.6.1 of the PPS requires that: “significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved”.

Section 3 of the Planning Act requires that land use decisions by municipalities and approval authorities shall be consistent with the PPS, 2005.

“Cultural heritage landscapes” are defined within the PPS as:

“a defined geographical area of heritage significance which has been modified by human activities and is valued by a community. It involves a grouping(s) of individual heritage features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites and natural elements, which together form a significant type of heritage form, distinctive from that of its constituent elements or parts. Examples may include, but are not limited to, heritage conservation districts designated under the Ontario Heritage Act; and villages, parks, gardens, battlefields, main streets and neighbourhoods, cemeteries, trailways and industrial complexes of cultural heritage value.”

“Conserved” within the PPS means “the identification, protection, use and/or management of cultural heritage and archaeological resources in such a way that their heritage values, attributes and integrity are retained. This may be addressed through a conservation plan or heritage impact assessment.”

Section 2.6.3 of the PPS further states that:
“Development and site alteration may be permitted on adjacent lands to protected heritage property where the proposed development and site alteration has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved.

Mitigative measures and/or alternative development approaches may be required in order to conserve the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property affected by the adjacent development or site alteration”.

A heritage impact assessment may be used as an immediate measure to evaluate a proposed development plan or site alteration, to ensure that a significant heritage resource will be conserved. A conservation plan may be used to establish a strategy for future protection and management of the resource, over the longer term.

Section 3 of the Planning Act requires that land use decisions by municipalities and approval authorities shall be consistent with the PPS, 2005.
Green Energy and Green Economy Act for Ontario

The Green Energy and Green Economy Act (GEGEA) passed on May of 2009 in the Ontario Provincial Legislature, contains guiding principles through which to expand and improve the Province’s commitments and initiatives in combating climate change. The emphasis on the use of renewable energy sources, such as wind, solar, hydro, biomass and biogas, is expected to greatly reduce air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions, while developing and ensuring Province’s future prosperity and green economy lead in North America. The GEGEA holds great legislative stature mandating amendments to the Planning Act, Environmental Protection Act and Ministry of Energy Act, along with other Act amendments and repeals1.

A formal Renewable Energy Approval application process, which (at time of writing) is currently under Provincial review, outlines requirements for the approval of renewable energy facilities. The application form has eleven (11) requirements, including a description of the project, site plan, and cultural and natural heritage considerations.

Specific to cultural heritage requirements, the Ministry of Environment (MOE) must review and approve a proponents’ renewable energy generation facility prior to development if:

   a) a self-assessment of the property identifies known or potential negative effects to undesigned archaeological or heritage resources; and

   b) it is a land-based wind turbine facility with sound power greater than 120dBA (and name plate capacity greater than 3kW).

Points a) and b) would require an archaeological and/or heritage assessment.

   c) the renewable energy facility is proposed on a cultural heritage property protected by Part II, IV and V of the Ontario Heritage Act.

Point c) does not require an archaeological and/or heritage assessment, however, local council or agreement holder(s) need to approve and provide written consent to property modification.

A proponent’s land-based wind turbine facility with wind sound power rating of less than 102dBA (even if greater than 3kW) does not require a heritage assessment or approval from the MOE.

Although not specifically related to cultural heritage considerations, the following aspects of the Regulation are interrelated, and also of interest to this study:

- Land-based wind turbine facilities are subject to a minimum 550m setback from the closest point of reception and require noise setbacks that are dependant on the facility size (number of turbines) and their sound power levels in decibels.

- Natural heritage features, such as significant wetlands and significant areas of natural and scientific interest, must conform to a 50-120m minimum setback requirement. If the facility does not conform to the minimum setbacks, the proponent needs to complete an Environmental Impact Study.

Ontario Heritage Act

The Ontario Heritage Act (OHA) is the principal piece of legislation governing the protection and preservation of cultural heritage resources in the Province. The Act enables municipalities to identify, list and protect properties of cultural heritage value or interest.

In 2005 the OHA was updated through Bill 60, to strengthen policies pertaining to the conservation of heritage resources. The OHA now more broadly addresses and treats equally all property that is of cultural heritage value or interest, which is defined as follows:

“Cultural heritage property is generally understood as encompassing real property that is of aesthetic, historic, architectural, scientific, archaeological, social, spiritual or other cultural significance for past, present or future generations.”

The Ministry subsequently released the Ontario Heritage Toolkit, in 2006. This comprehensive series of documents provides guidance on the conservation of all types of heritage resources in Ontario including built heritage features, archaeological sites, and cultural heritage landscapes. It provides guidance on the establishment of heritage committees; methodologies for the evaluation of heritage resources; guidelines for designation under the Ontario Heritage Act, and other planning and conservation tools available to municipalities and policy makers. The Toolkit specifically addresses the significance of cultural heritage landscapes, and includes them in all aspects of its recommended tools for evaluation, conservation and protection.

Municipalities must now keep a register of properties that are of cultural heritage value or interest. The register must include all properties designated under the Ontario Heritage Act, but can also include properties that are deemed to be of cultural heritage value or interest, otherwise commonly referred to as 'listed'. The register is intended to be periodically updated as new information about properties is uncovered, or as new properties are added.

The Ontario Heritage Toolkit notes that while non-designated heritage properties are not afforded the protection of the policies of the Ontario Heritage Act, they are nonetheless noted in the policies of the Provincial Policy, which proposes that:

“Resources may be identified through designation or heritage conservation easements under the Ontario Heritage Act, or listed by local, provincial, or federal jurisdictions.”

The OHA provides regulatory tools for the protection of heritage resources. Pursuant to Regulation 9/06 cultural heritage landscapes can be designated as individual sites, under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, or as heritage conservation districts under Part V.

County of Grey Official Plan

The County’s Official Plan, currently undergoing a 5-year review (anticipated for approval/adoption in early 2009), presents the framework that guides and manages the county’s social, economic and infrastructure development to the year 2016. The Plan encourages local preservation, conservation and maintenance of natural, cultural or man-made historical or heritage features.

Town of the Blue Mountains: Cultural Heritage Landscape Assessment Study
Section 1.5.2 of the Plan states the county’s objective in maintaining and enhancing scenic value of the river corridors, the valleys, and Georgian Bay shoreline by a strategy which emphasizes both conservation and protection of the landscape.

Further, the Heritage Policies under Section 3.1 emphasize the importance of its cultural heritage resources, such as buildings and structural remains of historical, architectural and contextual value and the rural, village and urban districts of landscapes of historic and scenic interests, and encourages municipalities to develop local policies towards conservation and development of an inventory of the heritage resources.

Lastly, the Plan indicates that any planning and development of new transportation and utility corridors by the County and local municipalities shall be based on guidelines provided in Section 5.1.2.5, which includes the avoidance, if possible, and/or minimum disruption of the unique landforms, archaeological or heritage areas.

**Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan**

The Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan is the guiding document setting policy framework for the land-use and development of the amalgamated Township of Collingwood and Township of Thornbury, as of January 1st, 1998. The policies of this Plan encompass the physical, environmental, social and economic aspects of development, as well as the location of specific land uses, natural resources, agriculture, environmental constraints, and potentials within various policy areas. The Town’s policy framework enables the management, protection, conservation and preservation of the very distinct and rich natural areas and cultural heritage values within the municipality, as identified below.

**Section 2.2: The Environment**

Goal - To protect, preserve, conserve and enhance the highly scenic, natural, cultural and heritage amenities of the Town.

Objectives:
- (a) To ensure minimal conflict between incompatible land uses by establishing policies for development and by providing separated land use designations designed to promote the protection, preservation, conservation, maintenance and sustainability of the natural, cultural and man-made components of the environment.
- (h) To promote the preservation, conservation and maintenance of natural or cultural heritage resources.
- (k) To promote the protection, preservation, conservation and maintenance of the Natural Heritage Systems and to encourage the sound management of the existing woodland resources.
- (m) To maintain and enhance the open landscape character of the Niagara Escarpment and land in its vicinity, substantially as a continuous natural environment and to ensure only such development occurs as is compatible with the natural environment and the natural scenery, while providing
adequate opportunities for outdoor recreation, compatible resort development, and adequate public access to the Niagara Escarpment.

Section 2.4 Agriculture

Goal - To protect the agricultural industry and its land base resource in recognition of its contribution to the economy and the overall character of the Town.

2.5 Recreation and Tourism

Goal - To enhance the opportunities for tourism and recreational uses and related development.

Objectives:
(a) To encourage the maintenance of quality natural and cultural landscapes.

(g) To encourage recreational or cultural functions, events and activities which will facilitate four-season occupancy and attract additional tourism.

Section 3.2.3 Rural Areas

(2) Within the rural areas of the municipality, distinct Rural, Special Agriculture and Agricultural designations are established under the Plan, as well as other designations such as Hazard Lands, Escarpment and Public Open Space, each of which comprise an essential component of the rural open landscape character. These designations incorporate natural and cultural heritage features which need to be protected, including wetlands, wildlife habitat, aggregate resources, ANSI areas and the Nipissing Ridge, as identified under the environmental constraints considerations under Section 8.

(4) The rural open landscape character is also directly related to the existing lot pattern of the rural areas. Based on the original township survey, the rural areas are divided into large lots approximately 80 hectares in area. In many cases, the original township lots have been further divided into 40 and 20 hectare farm parcels. For specialty crop purposes, farm parcels are often smaller. A number of smaller non-farm parcels have also been created throughout the rural areas, primarily within the Rural designation. This existing base lot fabric, or lot pattern, with its variety of parcel sizes and the resulting distribution of rural land uses, and natural areas, can be viewed collectively as a rural lot mosaic which possesses the open landscape character of the rural areas. The policies of the Rural and Special Agriculture designations permit only limited additional development and lot creation potential in order to generally maintain the existing rural lot mosaic and rural open landscape character. Where lot creation is permitted, large lots and separation distances shall be encouraged, and new lots shall be designed to generally follow natural and cultural features such as the top of steep banks and hedgerows, where appropriate, with suitable setbacks for lot lines and buildings in order to direct development away from these features and to maintain the visual landscape pattern. Natural and cultural features should be retained separately within large contiguous blocks and development shall be directed away from these areas, where possible.

Section 3.2.5 Major Residential and Resort Areas

(2) Special attention shall be given to maintain and enhance the open landscape character of the resort residential areas, as further provided under Section 3.10...Natural and cultural features shall be considered...
an essential component of the open landscape character and priority shall be given to the preservation of these areas...Development shall be directed to appropriate locations away from the Niagara Escarpment and the Nipissing Ridge in order to minimize the physical and visual impacts, except as may otherwise be specifically permitted under this Plan, and buffers to these features may also be required.

Section 3.10 Open Landscape Character

(1) Landscape amenities shall be preserved and enhanced wherever possible to ensure maintenance of the visual quality and open landscape character of the municipality. This shall be a major factor in the consideration of new development proposals. It is the intent of this Plan to protect the natural and cultural heritage features which comprise the open landscape character, to recognize the balance between open and wooded areas, and to encourage the maintenance of the contrast in landscape patterns in a sustainable manner, with particular regard for the distinct open landscape character of the rural areas and the resort residential areas.

(2) There are numerous policies and provisions contained in this Plan which are designed to ensure that the development of permitted uses will maintain and enhance the open landscape character of the municipality. The nature and extent of permitted uses is to be restricted in order to blend with the surrounding open landscape character, with minimal intrusion or disruption. Development of permitted uses shall be encouraged where it is considered compatible with the visual landscape. Priority is to be given to the protection of the natural environment and the natural scenery. Development shall be discouraged in locations where it may detract from the visual quality of the open landscape character. Particular regard shall be given:

(a) to maintain the rural open landscape character, as further provided under Section 3.2.3;

(b) to promote the resort residential open landscape character, as further described under Section 3.2.5;

(c) to protect the quality of the landscape along the Nipissing Ridge, as further provided under Section 8;

(d) to preserve the quality of the landscape of the Niagara Escarpment, with particular regard for the prominent Escarpment slopes, as further described under Section 4.6.4 and 14.2.1(3).

(3) Wooded areas, ravines, valleys, wetlands, steep slopes, shoreline, floodplains and other similar natural features shall be considered essential components of the open landscape character. Development shall be generally prohibited within these areas, except as further provided under the environmental constraints considerations contained in Section 8. Special encouragement shall be given to the clustering of development and the preservation of wooded areas and other natural features within open space blocks in order to ensure maximum retention of existing landscape amenities, especially for development under a plan of subdivision and high intensity land extensive uses such as golf courses.
Section 8.11 Cultural Heritage Resources

(1) It shall be the policy of this Plan to ensure, wherever possible, the protection, preservation, and enhancement of cultural heritage features through the use of the provisions of the Ontario Heritage Act, and other applicable government legislation and programs.

(2) Cultural heritage resources comprise those man-made features either on their own or in a man-made or natural setting which are indicative of past human activities, events or achievements. Such resources may include:

   (a) archaeological sites or areas of archaeological potential;
   (b) lands, buildings and structures of historical value;
   (c) buildings and structures of architectural value;
   (d) man-made or modified rural landscapes and their distinguishing features.

(7) It is the intent of the Plan to encourage the preservation of cultural heritage features within the Town. In an attempt to inventory, interpret, evaluate, maintain and conserve such features, where possible, the following measures are also encouraged:

   (b) Existing heritage features, areas and properties should be retained and reused. To determine whether such actions are feasible, consideration shall be given to both economic and social benefits and costs.

Niagara Escarpment Plan

A large area of the Town of The Blue Mountains is included in the Niagara Escarpment Plan (NEP). Although this area is excluded from the areas evaluated for constraints to Wind Energy Facilities, and as such were not included in their entirety in the detailed survey of cultural heritage landscapes, the escarpment lands comprise some of the most ecologically and culturally significant areas of the Town. In proposing boundaries for the identified CHLs based on their cultural and natural attributes, no differentiation was made with respect to lands contained within or outside the NEP area.

The Niagara Escarpment Plan makes specific note of the need for conservation of cultural heritage features and landscapes and scenic values, within the Escarpment Natural Areas, the Escarpment Protection Areas, and the Escarpment Rural Areas.

Similar to the PPS, the NEP defines Cultural Landscapes as:

“The product of human activity over time in modifying the landscape for their own purpose, and is an aggregation of human-made features such as a village, farmland, waterways, transportation corridors, and other artifacts.”

Many of the unique landscape features, significant archaeological sites and built heritage elements of the Town, that have been previously documented or were noted anecdotally by residents are located in or adjacent to the Escarpment lands.
The Town of The Blue Mountains Renewable Energy Review

In 2005 Jones Consulting Group prepared a report for the Town of The Blue Mountains that examines renewable energy options and a policy framework for renewable energy facilities including wind energy and biomass.

With respect to wind energy, the study recommended consideration of policies to permit wind energy facilities in certain locations, subject to detailed policies and submission requirements which would be intended to minimize land use impacts.

It was recognized that further detailed studies and assessment should be conducted to determine the location and zoning of the wind energy facilities. Consequently, an analysis was undertaken of primary constraints to the development of wind energy facilities, which included land use considerations, significant natural areas, and proximity to roads and settlement areas. The net result was the identification of areas that were relatively 'unconstrained' to wind energy facility development.

This cultural heritage landscape assessment study was intended to be an additional layer in the determination of areas that may be sensitive to the development of wind energy facilities, and focusing on the areas previously identified as 'unconstrained' and which represent the study area for the cultural heritage landscape assessment.

Although the Province's Green Energy and Green Economy Act and its associated regulatory approval process may have pre-empted some of the Town's thinking and authority with respect to broadly identifying areas that are 'unconstrained' for wind energy facilities, the need to assess potential impacts to cultural heritage resources remains a requirement of the Act.
5.0 LANDSCAPE CHARACTERISTICS

Landform and Physiography

The Niagara Escarpment dominates the landscape of Collingwood Township. The east finger of the Escarpment (sixth concession) offers a steepened face along the eastern edge, and at Georgian Bay. The west slopes of the Escarpment are more gradual, comprising the valley of the Beaver River with the prominent western ridge of the Escarpment forming the west slope of the river valley and continuing into Euphrasia Township (see Figure 2). One of Ontario’s most outstanding physiographic features, the Escarpment has been designated a World Biosphere Reserve by United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). There are only eleven World Biosphere Reserves in Canada, and the designation places the Escarpment globally on a par with the Florida Everglades, the Galapagos Islands, and the Serengeti Plains.

The Escarpment gives rise to a number of prominent and unique landmarks including the well-known ‘Blue Mountain’, the highest elevation in Southern Ontario at 1425 feet, and Metcalfe Rock, a popular rock-climbing destination, along the escarpment near 10th Line.

The Scenic Caves, located just east of Banks along the Escarpment, represent one of the area’s most significant natural and cultural features. Once covered by deep waters, the limestone formations were created over the course of hundreds of millions of years as a result of the ice movement of the Glacial Ages. The earliest written records of this area were by Samuel de Champlain and the Jesuit missionaries in the early 1600s. The Petuns and Hurons were the largest First Nations tribe in North America at that time. The Petuns used the rock formations as a fortress for protection from their enemies around the time of 1650, retreating to it for the last time just prior to their move southward into what is now the United States mid-west.

The forested Lake Nipissing Ridge, the former shoreline of glacial Lake Nippissing, extends east-west through the Town, creating another distinctive landform roughly parallel to the existing shoreline of Georgian Bay.
**Water Bodies**

The boundary of the Town of The Blue Mountains (former Thornbury and Collingwood Townships) terminates on the north at Georgian Bay, which is characterized through this area by the irregular shoreline of Nottawasaga Bay.

Two rivers cut through the Escarpment terrain: the Beaver River and the Pretty River. Steep-sided, with limestone cliffs further to the north, the Beaver River valley through most of the Town is a broad, fertile till plain with gradual side slopes as it progresses to its outlet at Georgian Bay. On the eastern side, the Pretty River comprises a rough, craggy river valley with limestone formations, more characteristic of the Escarpment terrain seen elsewhere in Ontario. These river systems and their associated creeks and tributaries carve their way through well-defined valleys in the highlands, creating rolling terrain and dramatic views and vistas along the sideroads and concession lines of the Town.

**Climate**

Climate and physiography played an important role in shaping agricultural practices in the Town. The modifying influence of Georgian Bay and the protected shelter of the Beaver Valley provide a micro-climate in the north-west quadrant of cooler summers, and warmer mid-winter temperatures, with longer frost-free periods. As a result of this combination of good soils and mild climate, apples are widely grown in the Beaver Valley and escarpment side slopes near Thornbury. This area is recognized by the Town, Province and the County as a specialty crop growing area. In the southern area of the Township, atop the Escarpment, the weather is more extreme, and combined with thinner soils, making it less supportive of agriculture. The lake effect typically produces higher than average snowfall in the area, which combined with the slopes of the Escarpment, supports a thriving, downhill ski industry.

**Soils**

The Canada Land Inventory for Agriculture rates the lands in the Town of The Blue Mountains as predominantly Class 3. Soils in Class 3 have moderately severe limitations that restrict the range of crops or require special conservation practices. However, small areas of Class 1 through Class 7 are found in which soils range from no-limitations in use for crops, to no-capacity, to arable culture or permanent pasture. The soils are restricted due to adverse topography, stoniness, inundation, low natural fertility, and excess water.
6.0 HISTORICAL CONTEXT / THEMES

Similar to other heritage resources, one of the fundamental considerations in identifying a potential cultural heritage landscape is its connection to the major historical themes, trends or patterns associated with the area’s development. These may include features or values at the scope of local, provincial and national interests.

The following themes influenced the development patterns and trends of the Town of The Blue Mountains.

**Early Use and Settlement**

About 350 years ago, the Petun, or Tionontati First Nations people lived in a chain of villages on the slopes of the escarpment between Creemore and Craigleith. They lived in longhouses and planted corn, beans, pumpkins, squash and tobacco.

The Native village of Ekarenniondi, 'the rock that stands out', home of the Hurons (Petun Tribe), was located near what is now known as the Scenic Caves. In 1649, the Seneca warriors killed most of the Petun. The survivors fled into the Beaver Valley and eventually into Kansas and Oklahoma, where they eventually formed the Wyandot Nation.

The Town of The Blue Mountains has over 85 archeological sites. The most significant are: Haney-Cook, the Plater-Martin, and the Plater-Fleming. The Haney Cook (Bc-Hb-27) site once consisted of two First Nations villages located south of the Scenic Caves, dating back to 1600 A.D. The site location is interpreted as the location where Samuel de Champlain met the Odawa Kiskakon in 1616 A.D.

Subsequently the two villages moved south of the Scenic Caves to Craigleith to sites now referred to as the Plater-Martin and Plater-Fleming archeological sites. The Plater-Martin (BdHb-1) site was occupied between the 1630s-1650s and was the capital of the Petun Deer Nation. The village functioned as the trading hub between Petun, Huron, Odawa, Neutral and Algonquin peoples. St. Matthew, the name given to this village by the Jesuits, was the location of the formation and starting point of the south migration of the Wyandot Nation. Nearby, the village of St. Simon and St. Jude, as named by the Jesuits, was occupied between 1630-1650s by Petun and Odawa tribes, and later on provided shelter for Huron refugees from Ossasane. This village is now referred to as the Plater-Fleming (BdHb-2) archeological site.

The Ekarenniondi Villages, discovered by Samuel de Champlain in 1616 were distinguished by the French and the earliest stories of Ekarenniondi were recorded in 1636.

The Town of The Blue Mountains also has traces of Ojibwa history in the Craigleith area. The Ojibwa settled in the early 1700s prior to the encroachment by European settlers who forced them to move further east and west.

The Jesuit missionaries conducted early studies of the Huron-Petun culture, lead by Father Jean de Brebeuf. The mission was established at Ekarenniondi from 1840 to 1850.
**Settlement Patterns**

The Township of Collingwood was surveyed by Charles Rankin in 1833 to the ‘double front’ system of township lay-out (which was typical after 1818) and was made available for settlement a year later. Collingwood and Euphrasia were initially one Township, subdivided in 1853.

The Township was originally known as Alta, but according to historical records was changed to Collingwood in 1834, ostensibly to honour Admiral Collingwood, one of Lord Nelson’s commanders at the battle of Trafalgar.

*When the plans were all sent in, the new Township was called by the Governor "Alta," from the great height of land within it. Capt. Moberly, a retired Naval officer drawing his grant of land in the Township, disliked the name "Alta," and prevailed on Sir John Colborne to change it to "Collingwood," as well as the other Township from "Zero," to St. Vincent, after those two Naval heroes.*

Settlement within the Township was initially very slow and its general pattern determined by several key factors.

The dramatic steep face of the escarpment inhibited settlement through the northeast, both in terms of establishing farms and as a barrier to roads. Concession roads 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 all terminate at the escarpment, rendering a number of lots inaccessible and undevelopable.

The extent of land which was reserved by the Crown, and/or was taken up by absentee owners for the purpose of speculation, also greatly slowed the pace of true permanent settlement. The isolation of the original settlers meant as well that the typical concession roads were a long time being developed, though a network of informal paths through the mountains and along the lakeshore had existed from well before European settlement. The establishment of the Government Road (what has come to be known as the ‘Old Mail Road’) diagonally northwest across the area, likely initially following one of these early trails, was a great spur to settlement.

Heathcote (originally Williamstown) already had the benefit of being on the Beaver River and surrounded by good arable land but became an ‘urban node’ due to this road, while Ravenna, later the seat of Township Council, probably owed its relatively early ascendancy to its location at the center of the Township along the Government Road. Though superseded within a few decades by the ‘Mountain Road’ and the eventual development of key concessions roads, e.g.10th Line and several side roads, its influence is still visible today.

The Directory of the County of Grey for 1865-66 provides the following insights into the progress of settlement in the Township:

*There are three Villages in Collingwood; Thornbury, Clarksburg, and Williamstown [Heathcote]. The Township is rapidly improving and filling up, as may be evidenced by the fact that the number of acres held in 1864 is 14,000 more than in 1860.*

---

2 Directory of the County of Grey, 1865-1866, transcribed for ancestry.com by W.J. Martin

**Town of the Blue Mountains: Cultural Heritage Landscape Assessment Study**
The natural outlet of the traffic of the western half of Collingwood, down the Beaver Valley to Clarksburg and Thornbury while the Eastern or Mountain half of the Township find their market and outlet Easterly toward Collingwood Town and the villages and Stations of Nottawasaga.

Hence there are two interests in the Township, almost as distinct as if there were two Townships. The Council meet somewhat centrally in the Township, and try to reconcile these conflicting interests as best they can.

Figure 3: Collingwood Township Historic Map, 1851

Town of the Blue Mountains: Cultural Heritage Landscape Assessment Study
Early and Prominent Families

There are many early pioneering families and their descendants who made significant contributions to the opening and subsequent settlement of Collingwood Township, and whose names are documented in various historical records and writings. The following are only a few of the most well-known.

The early establishment of Collingwood Township is credited primarily to Charles Rankin. His contributions are commemorated in a historic plaque, the text of which is noted below:

Charles Rankin, Thornbury, 1797-1886

This pioneer surveyor was the pathfinder who opened much of this region to settlement. Born in Enniskillen, Ireland, Rankin came to Upper Canada with his family at an early age. He was appointed a deputy provincial surveyor in 1820 and at first worked in the southwestern section of the province. In 1833 he began surveying the Nottawasaga Bay area and settled on some 200 acres of land west of the present town of Thornbury. His more important surveys included; several townships in the present county of Grey; the Garafraxa Colonization Road; the town plot of Sydenham (Owen Sound); the Toronto-Owen Sound Road; the Muskoka Road; and the town plot of Southampton.

Major Charles Stuart is another notable historical figure, also commemorated in one of the Town’s historic plaques, as follows:

Major Charles Stuart, Thornbury, 1783-1865

Son of a British army officer, Stuart was born in Jamaica. After fourteen years service as a commissioned officer in the service of the East India Company, he came to Upper Canada in 1817. Devoutly religious, Stuart found an outlet for his humanitarian zeal in vigorous anti-slavery activity. Although most of his written works are polemical tracts denouncing slavery, his “The Emigrants Guide to Upper Canada” is a useful summary of the progress of areas most suited to settlement. In 1851 he moved to this area where he encouraged the establishment of a small settlement at Lora Bay. On his death in 1865 he was buried at Lora Bay but was later removed to the nearby Thornbury-Clarksburg cemetery.

Sir Sanford Fleming

Andrew Craig Fleming was one of the Craigleith area’s earliest settlers. The Fleming family had a railway spur built to service its sawmill and furniture factory in Craigleith. After the local supply of timber was exhausted, the Flemings bought bush on the north shore of Georgian Bay near Killarney, rafting logs down the lake to their mill. Andre’s son Sanford also bought property to open and run a quarry upon which he built the ‘Craigleith House’, named after the Edinburgh quarry, marking the early origins of the village. By 1864, the Fleming’s stretch of today’s Highway 26 boasted of several stores, a post office, and an inn known as the Collingwood House near the railway station (the new Craigleith Heritage Depot).
Figure 4: Collingwood Township Historic Map, 1872

Town of the Blue Mountains: Cultural Heritage Landscape Assessment Study
Sanford also became one of the Town's most renowned citizens, first as a well-known civil engineer for the CPR. Retiring from the railroad in 1880, he became a strong advocate of a telecommunications cable from Canada to Australia, helping lay an underwater wire in 1902, and contributed to the establishment of standard time earning him the title of "The Father of Standard Time". Honoured for his many achievements, Sir Sanford Fleming was granted his knighthood by Queen Victoria in 1897.

Other families and individuals who had directly influenced the settlement and growth patterns of the Town include, but are not limited to:

- John Brasure, built the first house (log cabin) in a cleft of the Ridge at Craigleith and is considered to be the first Craigleith settler;
- John Moberley, former commandant of the Royal Naval establishment at Penetanguishene named the Collingwood Township;
- John Eaton, first settler of Heathcote, built his log cabin in 1844;
- James Dawson Stephens, built the first Hurontario mill on the Pretty River outlet at what is now Collingwood;
- Marsh family, Clarksburg 1850, who established a woolen mill;
- Thomas Small and 3 brothers, from Isle of Islay, Scotland, settled on 6th Line in 1851;
- Henry Walters, 200 acres, Lot 15. Concession 6 (from father in law James Lunan, who was allotted 800 acre as a war veteran); and
- John Johnson, 1867.

**Transportation**

The Town of The Blue Mountains has many historic transportation routes. Prior to the first European survey, the area was traversed from east to west by several First Nations trails that followed the escarpment and the ancient lake shorelines. These became the basis for early pioneer trails into the area. Later in the 19th century the railroads were developed, the routes of which, along with the organized road grid, are still evident today.

The Old Lakeshore Road was the original First Nations trail surveyed by Charles Rankin, running through John Brasure’s farm parallel to the lake. It became a gravel road in 1860 and the railway corridor in 1872. The Georgian Trail marks the route of the former North Grey Railway (Collingwood-Meaford, 1872).

The first Government Road through the area (the Old Mail Road) likely followed a First Nations trail, and extended from near Duntroon to Griersville. The section from Griersville and Heathcote is still in use as part of the modern-day road system.

The road is described in a historical plaque along the remaining section:

**Old Mail Road, Heathcote, 1846**

> For some years prior to the by-law which established it as a public road in 1846, this route had been travelled by settlers destined for the newly-opened townships of Osprey, Collingwood, Euphrasia and St. Vincent. From its junction near Duntroon with an extension of the Sunnidale Road, it ran some 21 miles northwesterly to Griersville. Though it was entitled to maintenance by
statute labour, the road was chronically in poor repair. Nevertheless, it remained an official road until its usefulness ended when the Ontario, Simcoe and Huron Railway reached Collingwood in 1855. Save for this five-mile section still in use between Griersville and Heathcote, little evidence remains of the pioneer road.

**Agriculture & Farming**

The open landscape pattern in the rural areas of the Town is primarily characterized by rolling topography with open views and vistas across vast natural features and wooded areas, valley and streamcourses, and farmland with orchards, hedgerows and agricultural fields and pastures.

The earliest agriculture type was subsistence farming, and later cash crops and livestock (i.e., sheep and cattle). Apple orchards farms became prominent by 1860s in the Beaver Valley and still remains as the predominant agriculture industry of the area due to unique micro-climate. With about 8,000 acres in orchard, the Beaver Valley produces more than a quarter of all the apples grown in Ontario. Horse farming became prominent as well in the 20th Century, as well as silver fox ranching (specifically in Camperdown from 1920-1950).

The rugged lands of the escarpment limited agricultural activities in the southern portion of the Township, which remained largely subsistence farming long after the Beaver Valley became a prosperous agricultural area. Although many of the escarpment farms still remain, much of the lands are returning to a natural state. However, the field patterns, hedgerows, and stone walls of the 19th century are still evident in many of these areas.

**Early Industry**

The Town had a logging/lumber industry in mid to late 1800s, until hardwood forests were cleared. Other early industry in the area included a stone quarry operations near Craigleith, including attempts to extract oil from shale of the Escarpment; mills along the Beaver River Clendenan mill site (Lot 30 Concession 11); Slabtown; Heathcote; Clarksburg (grist mill, woolen mill, foundry and planning mill), Thornbury (grist and saw mills); and a mill on the Mill Creek.

The early and revolutionary discovery of a method to distil oil from the local shale is described in the text of a local historic plaque erected to commemorate this piece of the Town’s history.

**Town of the Blue Mountains:** Cultural Heritage Landscape Assessment Study
Craigleith Shale Oil Works, Craigleith, 1859

A growing demand for artificial light led to the establishment, in 1859, of a firm headed by William Darley Pollard of Collingwood. He erected a plant here to obtain oil through the treatment of local bituminous shales. The process, patented by Pollard, involved the destructive distillation of fragmented shale in cast-iron retorts heated by means of wood. The 30 to 35 tons of shale distilled daily yielded 250 gallons of crude oil, which was refined into illuminating and heavy lubricating oils. The enterprise, the only one of its kind in the province’s history, failed by 1863. The inefficiency of its process made its products uncompetitive after the discoveries of “free” oil at Petrolia and Oil Springs, near Sarnia.

Recreation

The Town has been well known for its recreational uses since the late 1800s with its summer resort areas and health retreats in the Georgian Peaks and Delphi Inn. The sulfur mineral springs, first appearing on the Jesuit map dating back to 1651, were the base of the present-day Georgian Peaks Ski Club. William Wensley opened the Blue Mountain Mineral Springs between 1875-1900. The area is also known for its early ski resorts: Alpine, Craigleith and Blue Mountain. Joe (Jozo) Weider, Czech ski enthusiast, emigrated to the area in 1940, founding the Blue Mountain ski resort on 100 acres.

The Town is now considered one of the Province’s leading four-seasons recreational areas, known for its prominent natural features and scenic qualities of the rural landscape. It has a well developed network of trails: Bruce Trail, Georgian Trail, Kolapore Trail, Snowmobile Trail, Delphi Park Trail, and others.

Natural Heritage Conservation

The Nipissing Ridge is an ancient shoreline of Lake Nipissing, a post-glacial lake that existed 7,000 years ago. Today, it is the foothill in front of the Niagara Escarpment, a World Biosphere Reserve.

Craigleith Provincial Park is a 66 acre park established in the 1970s that contains fossils displaying local geology and history dating back to Ordovician period; approximately 475 million years old.

The Provincial land acquisitions and reforestation in the southern and eastern portions of the Township is in association with the Pretty River and its valley.
Historic Events

The Town of The Blue Mountains had two large fires in late 1880s and in 1906 along the top of The Blue Mountains. Another notable event was the sinking of the Mary Ward steamer off Craigleith, as described below in the text of the erected historic plaque:

Sinking of the “Mary Ward” Steamer, Craigleith, 1872

On the night of November 24, 1872, the steamer "Mary Ward" ran aground on Milligan’s Reef, two kilometers offshore. Recently purchased by five Owen Sound men, the vessel was making the trip from Sarnia to her new home port of Collingwood with twenty-seven aboard, including a Canadian Pacific Railway survey party when the accident occurred. The first lifeboat safely reached shore, then a fierce gale sprang up, delaying rescue operations. After a perilous journey the second lifeboat succeeded in landing but the third capsized and all eight aboard drowned. A group of local fishermen, led by Frank Moberly and Captain George Collins, later rescued those remaining on the wreck, and they were subsequently recognized by the Canadian government for their heroic actions.
7.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPE INVENTORY

The study areas within the Town to which the cultural heritage assessment was primarily confined were based on the Town’s identification of areas of interest as derived from the 2005 Renewable Energy Review. These areas are the focus of the findings of the study. Information on other areas of the Town was also collected during the study and is described in Section 8 to build and strengthen the historical context and assist the Town in the establishment of a cultural heritage inventory and list of heritage properties.

Within the study lands, ten (10) candidate Cultural Heritage Landscape (CHL) areas were identified primarily through a windshield survey and inventory of features, as well as through research of secondary resources, such as books, reports and web-based material. Limited consultation with area residents was undertaken at a workshop and a public open house. The on-site inventory and assessment process was somewhat restricted by limited visibility of potential historic properties due to the topography, long and tree-lined driveways, and vegetation growth fronting the property. Though a thorough analysis was conducted for the purpose of this study, there may be additional individual historic properties that were not identified in this report. As well, individual properties should be further investigated to determine their specific historical associations, and relative significance and value both to the CHL and for the purposes of establishing a built heritage inventory (which was not the focus of this study).

The following sections describe areas of the study lands with high concentrations of built heritage and landscape heritage features and which are proposed as Cultural Heritage Landscapes (refer to Figure 10, following). The areas primarily relate to the rural historic hamlets and settlement areas which are referred to by historic journals and are still well recognized by the community.

The CHLs can be primarily categorized as ‘evolved, continuing landscapes’ which “retain an active social role in contemporary society closely associated with the traditional way of life, and which the evolutionary process is still in progress”.

The identified CHLs contain historic attributes that meet the identified evaluation criteria discussed in Section 3.0 as follows:

- having historical value, in that they demonstrate ‘information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture’; and,

- having contextual value, in that they ‘define, maintain or support the character of an area’, and are ‘physically, functionally and visually or historically linked to their surroundings’; and/or are a ‘landmark’.

Further in-depth research into individual properties would likely reveal additional information on their specific values and associations with individuals, organizations or events that are significant to the community.
1. **Blue Mountains- Euphrasia Townline & The Beaver Valley**

The Beaver River valley dominates the western half of the Town of The Blue Mountains, with the river meandering northeast through what are now lush agricultural lands and orchard farms, terminating in Georgian Bay at Thornbury. Early settlers called the upper area of the valley Cuckoo Valley\(^3\) because of the large number of cuckoo birds nesting in the area. It is also believed that a large number of beavers lived in the area from which the area got its name and had a role in the selection of the beaver as Canada’s emblem. The Beaver Valley is framed by the western arm of the Escarpment along which the Township line was established. The rich soils, milder climate and access to water power along the Beaver River led to the establishment of a productive agricultural base, milling industries and centres of commerce along the Beaver River.

The development of communities in Collingwood Township along the western Townline was very closely linked to that of the neighbouring Townships such that early schools served both sides and later a number of the formal School Districts encompassed both.

Historically, several communities emerged as the western area of the Township was settled. These form sub-areas within a broader cultural heritage landscape unit which encompasses both The Blue Mountains- Euphrasia Townline and the Beaver Valley.

These community areas are described below based on their historical associations and distinctive characteristics.

**Heathcote**

Heathcote’s first settler was John Eaton who built a log cabin in 1844 at Lot 24, Concession 1 (although some records say Lot 25, Concession 2), in Euphrasia Township as a rest stop for travelers along the Old Mail Road. He was also the first councilor sent to the District Council, and the first Reeve of the amalgamated townships of Collingwood and Euphrasia. Located on the Government Road, midway between Ravenna and Griersville, and situated on the Beaver River which was a ready source of transportation and water power, it was not long before this location became established as a community. During the mid 1800s, Thomas Waring of Prince Edward County bought Lot 24, Concession 12 and parts of Lot 23 with the intention to develop water power at the rapids below the village.

William Rorke’s was the second settler to the area, joining John Eaton around 1847, and the first postmaster serving both Collingwood and neighbouring Euphrasia Townships. William’s brother, Richard, from Tecumseh Township in Simcoe County, conducted the first census of Collingwood Township in 1851, was the first teacher in Williamstown in 1854 and became the clerk of the township. William Fleming settled in the area shortly after Rorke, and it is said that the town was initially called Williamstown after him\(^4\). The name Heathcote was adopted in 1861, ostensibly when another Williamstown was discovered in the postal system.

It was not long before Williamstown had two stores, a tavern and was the seat of government for the combined Collingwood-Euphrasia Township first council.

---

\(^3\) Directory of the County of Grey, 1865-1866, transcribed for ancestry.com by W.J. Martin

Initially, Heathcote was defined in the early 1850s to be between lots 12 and 30 in the Town’s 12th concession. As other schools were built, the southern boundary of Heathcote was changed to the 18-19th Sideroad.

By the end of the 19th century, Heathcote had two merchants, three blacksmiths, two undertakers, two painters, two physicians, a hotel keeper, veterinary and a clerk. It was a flourishing town filled with various mills along the Beaver River, and was the “scene of one of the earliest fairs of the district.”\(^5\) held in 1856, just a decade after its first inhabitants broke ground.

By 1863, Heathcote became the village of churches in the township as four churches were built to accommodate the rapid congregation development, including Anglican, Episcopal Methodist, Friends, Presbyterian, and Wesleyan Methodist.

Heathcote Hall began life as the Society of Friends (Quakers) meeting hall in 1862. It was moved to its pretty location beside the Beaver River some years ago and is still used for community event.

In addition to the village itself, there is a collection of heritage properties at the intersection of The Blue Mountains- Euphrasia Townline and 25th Sideroad including the former schoolhouse on the west side in Euphrasia Township.

**Noted properties with historic buildings**

- Euphrasia Townline
  - **Old Mail Road**-existing section from Heathcote to Griersville in Euphrasia
  - 236421 Euphrasia Townline
  - 236761 Euphrasia Townline

---
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• 236787 Euphrasia Townline, intersection of Euphrasia Townline and Grey Road 13, 2 dormer red brick house
• 236698 Euphrasia Townline, Pioneer cemetery
• 356601 Euphrasia Townline, farmhouse
• 356675 Euphrasia Townline, with landscaped ponds, views to south and west
• 356691 Euphrasia Townline, 4 square red-brick
• 356769 Euphrasia Townline, red-brick house (front dormer arched window); mature sugar maple

Church Street
• 108 Church Street and 112 Church Street, two churches that have been converted to residences

21st Sideroad
• 727413 21st Sideroad
• 727410 21st Sideroad

Noted historic properties in adjacent Township
• 356598 Euphrasia Townline, schoolhouse

The Tenth Line Community

The Tenth Line Community was the second most populated community, after Heathcote, in the early days of settlement in Collingwood Township, circa 1850. Good quality of land and close proximity to the Old Mail Road made it a good settlement location. The 1851 Census lists 13 settlers in this area including the family of William White who arrived from Lincolnshire in 1848 settling on Lot 18, Conc. 10 (416139). Collingwood Township’s first church was built on the farm of Samuel White at north half of Lot 18, Conc. 15 in 1851; at least eight years before any other church was erected in the Township. It was a Wesleyan Methodist Church, known as Ebenezer, and the first of several. Two other churches were built in 1878 and 1902. The Primitive Methodist Church occupied the site where now only the graveyard remains.

The Loughheeds from Ireland were another important family in this community (728056) and the first school. The Primitive Methodist Church occupied the site where now only the graveyard remains. S.S. 5 was the schoolhouse for the community; now a designated heritage property.
Though it was mainly based on agricultural practices, the community had a sawmill at Slabtown, a cheese factory (1894) and an apiary (1918). The three White brothers and three Lougheed brothers are the earliest recorded settlers of the area.

It is believed that The Tenth Line Community’s log school structure, built in 1851, was the first school in Collingwood Township, located in the north-west corner of Lot 21, Concession 10. It was located on property of the Lougheeds, a pioneer family in the community that came from Ireland. The school burned down in 1871 and a new frame school building was built on the west side of the 10th Line on Lot 21, Concession 11.

Noted properties with historic buildings

10th Line
- 416048 10th Line
- 416078 10th Line, stone gateposts, red-brick
- 416093 10th Line
- 416138 10th Line
- 416139 10th Line, centre-gable house
- 416151 10th Line, former Methodist Church (Ebenezer), now a residence
- 416181 10th Line, south of 18th Sideroad; cemetery
- 416249 10th Line
- 416338 10th Line
- 416403 10th Line

24th Sideroad
- 808054 24th Sideroad
- 808116 24th Sideroad

21st Sideroad
- 728103 21st Sideroad, farmhouse
- 728085 21st Sideroad, white siding
- 728056 21st Sideroad, small red-brick, centre-gable, previously the Loughheed family residence
- 727503 21st Sideroad, house and farm on hill

Grey Road 119
- 628035 Grey Road 119
Designated heritage building (Part IV of section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act)

- Former School Building S. S. No 5, 416350 10th Line

Slabtown

Slabtown is an historic hamlet situated on the Beaver River, off Grey Road 13, just south of Clarksburg. The 1851 census records four families living in the area at the time, and at that time was the location of Wilton’s sawmill which was operated variously as a sawmill, grist mill and an alfalfa mill into the 20th century.

Due to the importance of the Wilson Mill, the Township council opened up a ‘blind line’ between Concession 11 and 12 across lots 25, 26, 27 to provide easier access to the mill from Heathcote, the main population center at that time.

Brick was manufactured at the Lougheed farm adjacent to the mill and river at the beginning of the 20th century and provided the material for many of the local brick buildings.

Historically, Slabtown had no definite boundaries and was considered part of the Tenth line School Section. Although the mill is long gone, the enduring qualities of the community can still be seen today. A narrow road winds through the village, crossing the Beaver River as a single lane bridge. Although altered some of the original homes still stand among the few newer residences in the area, creating a village atmosphere which gives way to rural farmland as Slabtown Road dead-ends to the west. Community pride is evident in the flower baskets on the bridge and attractively landscaped properties. The picturesque mill pond and dam is popular as a local swimming area, and offers a parking lot and scenic vantage point along the Beaver River for travelers through the area.

Landscape characteristics

- Picturesque mill pond and dam, set along a winding, wooded section of the Beaver River

Noted properties with historic buildings

10th Line

- 788201 10th Line
- 188190 10th Line
- 788113 10th Line
- 788114 10th Line, Ontario cottage style
- 788096 10th Line
Blue Mountains - Euphrasia Townline

Andrew and John Dinsmore arrived in 1863 from Donegal Ireland, gradually bringing over the rest of their nine siblings. Andrew settled on Lot 34 Con 12 and in 1867 Abraham and John purchased all of Lot 33. The family has played an important role in the development of that area since that time and descendants are still living in the area. Supposedly the largest elm tree ever taken down in Canada was from the farm of W.S. Dinsmore.

George Ruthven, who is supposed to have assisted Rankin in the original survey settled on the north half of Lot 31 Concession12 (possibly at 027366 30th Sideroad as the property still apparently extends across the road) and at the time of Bill Shannon’s book: History of Collingwood Township, his grandson was still farming on Lot 30, Concession12.

Magnificent, panoramic views north to the lake and west to The Blue Mountains are seen from Euphrasia Townline and along 33rd Sideroad. The quintessential view of Georgian Bay and The Blue Mountains celebrated in the Town’s logo, was taken in this area.

With the surviving concentration of 19th century structures this area a particularly good cultural heritage landscape.

Landscape characteristics

- Panoramic views along the ridge north to Georgian Bay and west to The Blue Mountains, as seen from Euphrasia Townline and 7th Sideroad, north of 33rd Sideroad, and along 33rd Sideroad
- Steep hills leading to Grier Creek on EuphrasiaTownline, from 30th Sideroad to Grey Road 40, and bridge
Orchards on Euphrasia Townline from 33rd Sideroad to 30th Sideroad, and along 33rd Sideroad
- Horse farms along Euphrasia Townline and 7th Sideroad, north of 33rd Sideroad
- Mature tree rows along 33rd Sideroad

Noted properties with historic buildings

Euphrasia Townline
- 357151 Euphrasia Townline, red-brick centre gable
- 357113, 357093 Euphrasia Townline
- 357093 Euphrasia Townline
- 356819 Euphrasia Townline, brick house, barn complex
- 356883 Euphrasia Townline, farmhouse

33rd Sideroad
- 067310 33rd Sideroad, red-brick house
- 067366 33rd Sideroad, red-brick house with white quoin detailing
- 067518, 33rd Sideroad & Duncan Street West (SE corner), dichromatic brick, centre gable (Ontario Cottage style); mature trees along road

30th Sideroad
- 027536 30th Sideroad
- 027383 30th Sideroad
- 027366 30th Sideroad

Historic properties in adjacent Township
- Earl Bunt’s Cemetery on Euphrasia Townline between 33rd Sideroad to 30th Sideroad
- 087241 7th Sideroad, red-brick house
- 357080 Euphrasia Townline
- 357032 Euphrasia Townline
- 356824, Euphrasia Townline, centre-gabled gingerbread trim, pine along the front of the property; old foundation ruins used as a garden
2. Victoria Corners (Victoria)

Victoria Corners was settled by farmers on the 8th Line (now Grey Road 2), at the junction of 21st to 22nd Sideroad. It never attracted an industry base, or even a store, as it was mainly a good farming community. The first two settlers of Victoria Corners were Andrew Shore and John Wilson.

Andrew Shore settled on Lot 20, Concession 8 in 1851 (now possibly 496359 or 496277 Grey Road 2) and the family remained on the property for over 100 years. It is believed that John Wilson settled Lot 22, Conc. 8 well before 1850. The Carscadden family owned much of the property between 18th and 21st along 8th Line by 1872, and descendants have remained in the area.

All that remains of Victoria Corners today is the old schoolhouse that was built in 1919, the Anglican Church, and farms. It is at the centre of the apple-producing area of the town, north of Ravenna.

Noted properties with historic buildings

Grey Road 2
- 496532 Grey Road 2
- 496487 Grey Road 2, ‘perennial farm’
- 496448 Grey Road 2, church
- 496445 Grey Road 2, Oakland Orchard
- 496434 Grey Road 2, cemetery
- 496430 Grey Road 2, former Holy Trinity Church
- 496373 Grey Road 2, schoolhouse built on Carscadden property
- 496359 Grey Road 2, brick, gabled farmhouse (possibly on Shore property)
- 496277 Grey Road 2, brick, gabled farmhouse
- 496259 Grey Road 2
- 496235 Grey Road 2
- 496199 Grey Road 2

21st Sideroad
- 728345 21st Sideroad
- 728253 21st Sideroad
- 728196 21st Sideroad
- 728177 21st Sideroad
Located at the intersection of 8th Line (now Grey Road 2) and Grey Road 119, Ravenna was first settled in the late 1840s as a waystop for travelers using the Government Road (Old Mail Road). George Walter was an early settler to Ravenna, located on Lot 15 in the 9th Concession. He took an active part in community life and public affairs, and his family remained on the family farm up until the mid 1960s. Other early settlers include: James Smith and two settlers by the same name, Henry Collins.

As settlers arrived in the 1850s taking up land along the surveyed concessions, Ravenna became an important commercial and service centre, much like Heathcote. In 1865, it was described in the Gazetteer as “…an old and settled part of the Parish.” The first post office opened in 1864. Until that time mail was carried daily from Williamstown (Heathcote), a distance of about 5 miles, along the Government Road.

As the centre of the Township, Ravenna early on became the meeting place of the township Councils with the first meeting taking place in the home of George Walter. This role as Township seat continued from approximately 1855 to 1960. In 1872, a meeting hall was constructed of stone on part of Lot 16, Concession 8 facing onto Grey Road 119.

The first school was built mid-way between Ravenna and Kolapore on Lot 12, Concession 9, and was also used as a church. In 1874 a frame and brick building was erected on the 8th Line (now Grey Road 2) on Lot 15. This school was used up until 1927, when the new school was built with brick outhouses and a slate roof.

In the 1860s there were a number of commercial businesses in Ravenna including: blacksmiths, shoemakers, a dress maker and merchants, hotels, taverns, a wagon, sleigh and buggy
manufacturer and a large sawmill on Mill Creek south of Ravenna. James Wilson moved his influential tavern from Heathcote to Ravenna perhaps anticipating the added business associated with its becoming the ‘seat’ of municipal government. Over its history Ravenna has had a very active community life with sport teams and community events, many organized by the Ravenna Women’s Institute.

Although Ravenna is now primarily a crossroads hamlet there is enough of the former village fabric to retain the sense of what it once was. The former Township Hall remains just to the east on Grey Road 119, and is a designated heritage building. It continues to be used by the community for social events. The former brick school, now a residence, can be seen at 45917 Grey Road 2. The Ravenna General Store and post office on the southwest corner is a local landmark, still serving local residents and passersby. It is situated beside the ‘Ravenna Forge’ the former blacksmith shop and a designated heritage building. Across the road is a park purchased in 1920 by the Township for a war memorial. The panoramic views to the north-west over the farms of the Beaver Valley are stunning. Grey Road 2 is lined with the heritage farms and orchards which relay the story of this prosperous community, extending northward to Victoria Corners and blurring the historic boundaries of the two communities.

Noted properties with historic buildings

- 496102 Grey Road 2
- 496100 Grey Road 2
- 496081 Grey Road 2
- 496074 Grey Road 2
- 495972 Grey Road 2, Ravenna General Store
- 495935 Grey Road 2
- 495917 Grey Road 2, former School (now a residence)
- 495827 Grey Road 2
- 495803 Grey Road 2

Designated heritage buildings (Part IV of section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act)

- Ravenna Forge; blacksmith shop
- Alex Brown House; early log residence
- Former Collingwood Township Hall at 628299 Grey Road 119
4. **Loree & Environs**

Loree, dates at least back to the late 19th century, as shown on the 1880 Map of Grey County. Historically it was considered to have extended between the 7th Line and 5th Line on Victoria Sideroad (21st Sideroad) and southwards on 6th Line to 18th Sideroad. Though the community received its name after the Loree brothers, John, William, and George, the first noted settlers were Hugh and Donald Beaton. Other early families residing in Loree were that of Joseph Gibson, Joseph Lougheed, Benjamin Draper, Samuel Sinnamon, Neil McCaffrey, and Robert Shore.

Loree had a post office in the mid-1880s, whose third postmaster was John Sheridan. The post office was kept in the family for two generations.

Loree had a close connection to the neighbouring Victoria community to the west. A school, located on Lot 23, Concession 8, and later on Lot 22, Concession 7 served the communities of Victoria and Loree, and at certain times Sandhill and Camperdown. It wasn’t until 1911 that a brick school was built on the north side of Victoria Sideroad on Lot 22, Concession 6, for the community of Loree. It burned down in 1937 and the school was re-built on the same grounds. The building remains as a residence, and, although altered and added to, still has its bell tower.

**Landscape characteristics**
- atop ‘The Blue Mountains’, Loree Forest with recreational trails to the north.
- 6th Line descends southward steeply into valley, with long views from the intersection south and west to the escarpment
- Rolling terrain along 21st Sideroad, known as a Scenic Road for views to the western escarpment
- Ski trails in the area; Indian Brook through this area is part of a provincial fish sanctuary.

**Noted properties with historic buildings**
- 729005 21st Sideroad, former schoolhouse
- 556341 6th Line, major farm complex at the base of the valley on property originally belonging to William Kerr, one of the early settlers in the area
- Heritage farms along 6th Line old stone foundations are said to remain in valley
Banks is situated at the intersection of 15th Sideroad and 4th Line and is perhaps the highest elevated community in the Town of The Blue Mountains. The hamlet was named by the first postmaster, William Johnson, after a village in England. The post office was established in William Johnson’s house, on the south-east quarter of Lot 16 Concession 5. Other early settlers to this area include: William George Lunan, Thomas Shaw, Frederick Delisle, Joseph Skelton and Hugh Beaton.

By the mid-1870s, most of the farms were occupied and the village core started developing with the construction of Johnson’s general store and post office at the crossroad, and the Knox Presbyterian Church on Joseph Skelton’s property at Lot 17 Concession 4. The first school was located between Banks and Ravenna ¼ mile from 4th Line. Later, a second school was built by Richard Carroll who was a respected Thornbury contractor. The post office closed in 1915, the school in 1967, and the church in 1970.

St. Stephen’s Anglican Church, built in the late 1880s, was located across from the Knox Presbyterian Church. The church lasted for a very short period of time and was torn down.
Banks had three sawmills in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The first mill is believed to have been built by the McKean family of Gibraltar on Lot 13, Concession 4. The second mill, owned by John Deer and William Babcock, was located south of the first mill and was in operation in the early 1900s. The third mill, located across the other two mills across the 4th line, was owned by Randall Taylor.

Banks was known for its recreational ice rink, housed in a steel arena which operated before 1900s through to 1920s, and again in the 1940s. It had a skating rink on the south half of Lot 16, Concession 4 – the Harris farm property c.1900 and later moved across the road to the Shaw property where it was operated as a grist mill. The rink was later re-opened in 1942 for several years. The Banks rink was a major winter social activity and feature in the area for many years.

Banks still retains the sense of a former ‘urban’ node with the former store at the crossroads, and the schoolhouse and cemetery to the north. A number of heritage farms extend north on both the east and west sides of 4th Line to where it terminates at 21st Sideroad and the Escarpment.

**Landscape characteristics**

- Hilly terrain, views over open pasture to woodlots and west to escarpment beyond
- Pond and creek on west side of road at 596258 4th Line
- Long views north to the lake at 4th Line and 18th Sideroad
- Remnant mature trees along south side of 15th Sideroad, west of Banks
- Rolling hills to south and west of intersection of 15th Sideroad and 4th Line with long views to ridge
- Long views west over valley and to escarpment beyond at 4th Line and 21st Sideroad

**Noted properties with historic buildings**

4th Line
- Former store on the north-east corner of 4th Line and 15th Sideroad – brick with buff detailing, altered roof and second storey
- Banks Cemetery at 4th Line and 15th Sideroad
- Barn and pond on north-west corner of 4th Line and 15th Sideroad
• 596006 4th Line, SE corner of lot 16, Concession 5; ‘cottage’ style with centre gable; William Johnson’s house constructed circa 1875; location of post office
• 596015 4th Line, pressed metal clad early schoolhouse (possibly moved to this location)
• 596030 4th Line frame structure – red with white trim, cedar rail fences, east side
• 596040 4th Line
• 596042 4th Line, white stucco house
• 596065 4th Line
• 596093 4th Line, brick centre gable
• 596150 4th Line, brick, centre gable
• 596166 4th Line
• 596197 4th Line, east side
• 596224 4th Line, west side – Brick, centre gable plus barns and outbuildings
• 596250 4th Line, brick residence
• 596258 4th Line, ‘Heritage Farms’ and eclectic collection of structures, pond to the north, with adjacent creek and small waterfall along road frontage
• 596287 4th Line, house and barns on east side, dichromatic brick

Grey Road 119
• 629093 Grey Road 119
• 629295 Grey Road 119
• 629468 Grey Road 119

3rd Line
• 615908 3rd Line

5th Line
• 576092 5th Line
6. The Sixth Line Community

The area known as the Sixth Line Community is described as historically extending from Lots 10 to 18 on either side of the 6th Line. Physically restricted by the steep terrain of the escarpment rock, the area was cut off from other parts of the Township. This isolation has contributed to the unique identity and strong community spirit.

A key component is the crossroads of 6th Line and 15th Sideroad settled early by the Small and McArthur families, likely due to the small creek tributaries running through the properties and the proximity to the creek itself. The first school was taught on Thomas Small’s property (Lot 15 Concession 7) and his wife was the first teacher. The McArthur brothers, Duncan, Finlay and John settled around lots 14 through 16 on Concession 6.

By 1872 William Small was on the north half of Lot 16 and James Wilson, who had moved his legendary tavern from Heathcote to Ravenna, was on the south half. A modest three bay wood frame house (628561 6th Line) remains at the corner and may relate to the Wilson years. To the north the fine stone centre gable residence ‘Goodeview’, seemingly built c.1875 may relate to the William Small period.

When you extend this area to the 12th Sideroad with the McKinlay properties (Lot 13, Concession 6, is originally the property of early settler Dugald Carmichel), the neighbouring James property at Lot 12 Concession 7, and the Rock Union Church on the southeast corner, this is a substantial area with a good level integrity. Both the McKinlay’s and James are long-standing families in the Sixth Line Community, with descendants still on the historic family properties.

The annual Sunday School summer picnic at McKinlay’s Grove on the home farm of the McKinlay farm was the biggest social event of the community with special entertainment contraptions, such as the California Swing (a timber ferris wheel).

Lots 12 and 16 on Concession 7, as well as the Francis McKinlay farm on Lot 13, Concession 6, were considered asheries producing potash leached from the ashes of wood fires. Sixth Line Community also had two lime kilns, another early industry for settlers in the lime-rich areas of Southern Ontario.
The unity of Sixth Line Community is best illustrated in the construction of the Rock Union Church in the late 1880s, located on Lot 12, Concession 7. The idea for a union church was believed to have been discussed first at the home of Mrs. Walter Buchanan, who is given credit for the name Rock Union Church. The logs were cut from James’ farm, sawn at Blair’s mill on the 8th Line and the building stone was brought from Malcolm McArthur’s farm. The church closed in 1962 and in 1997 the walls and foundations were restored by a local contractor paid by the generous donations from community members and a church bank fund. The Rock Union Church continues to hold a reunion service annually for all denominations.

A white clap board church of the Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, located on Lot 13, Concession 7 (south-east corner of Malcolm McArthur’s farm) was opened in 1916, but had closed down in the mid-1950s, and moved to the Nottawasaga Township to be used as a residence.

The concentration of remaining historic properties around 12th and 15th Sideroads, together with the still gravel-surfaced roads, blind lines (6th Line north of the 15th Sideroad (Grey Road 119), and 12th Sideroad east of 6th Line) and the natural setting afforded by the Escarpment and many creeks through the area, makes for a particularly fine combination of features.

Landscape characteristics

- 12th Sideroad and 15th Sideroad are still narrow, gravel surface roads through this area
- Grey County Managed Forest on the south-east corner of the 6th Line and 12th Sideroad
- Gravel, tree-lined road, rolling topography, 12th Sideroad to 15th Sideroad
- Long views to west over pasture and woodlots, 12th Sideroad to 15th Sideroad
- Part of the Bruce Trail and attracts many visitors in hiking season
**Noted properties with historic buildings**

**6th Line / 12th Sideroad**
- 555853 6th Line, substantial brick residence with dichromatic detailing
- 555742 6th Line ‘Rock Union Church’, stone building c. 1898, framed by backdrop of cedar bush, at intersection with 12th Sideroad
- 555715 6th Line, stucco house, barn, with mature trees along laneway, set on slight rise (James property)
- Foundation ruins of Buchanan homestead, said to still be existing west of 6th Line and 12th Sideroad
- 608477 12th Sideroad
- 609027 12th Sideroad ‘Silver Spring Farm’ at dead-end of 12th Sideroad (McKinlay property)

**6th Line / Grey Road 119 (15th Sideroad)**
- 556036 6th Line
- 628536 Grey Road 119
- 628561 Grey Road 119
- 629007 Grey Road 119
- 629031 Grey Road 119
- 629038 Grey Road 119

---

**Wetlands along Sixth Line**

---
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7. McKean's Mills

Initially a farm community, McKean’s Mills became known for its steam-powered sawmills and accompanying logging operations along the 6th Line, from Lots 1 to 9. It is believed that the community’s first settler was George Brock who, along with his wife and step-daughter, led an isolated life within the deep forest. The community received its name from a Scotsman, Archibald McKean, who built a sawmill at Kolapore in the 1870s. The McKeans built other sawmills in the area, including one at Lot 4, Concession 7 which burned down. In 1905, Archibald’s son, Albert, built another mill on the north half of Lot 7, Concession 7, as a replacement of one that was located 3 miles north of 8th Line. The Leggatt family operated another sawmill on the east half of Lot 7, Concession 6.

The community had a log school that burned down and was rebuilt out of stone in the early 1890s and which remained open until 1962. It is still present at 555245 6th Line, converted to a residence. The Maple Grove Baptist Church, built in 1908 and located on the corner of Lot 1, Concession 6 was the only church in the community. The church was in a circuit together with Pretty River Valley Church and Second Line Church, and was joined by Rock Union in 1918 after Second Line Church closed.

Landscape characteristics
- Forested up to 3rd Sideroad on 6th Line
- Cedar swamp as approaching 3rd Side Road
- Mixed woodlands north of 3rd Sideroad
- Rubble stone walls along 6th Line (west side) approaching 6th Sideroad

Noted properties with historic buildings
- 555245 / 555249 6th Line, stone schoolhouse, converted to a residence.
- 529003 6th Line, former Maple Grove Baptist Church; converted to residence
- 555077 6th Line
- 555091 6th Line
- 555262 6th Line
- 555279 6th Line
- 555281 6th Line
- 555325 6th Line
- 528289 Osprey-The Blue Mountains Townline
8. Gibraltar

Gibraltar historically referred to the first nine or ten lots in Concessions 4 and 5, with the centre of a once thriving farming community between Lots 5 and 6 in the 5th Concession. At the end of the 19th century, the community had two churches, a post office, a school and a black-smith shop. It is believed that John Glenn, who operated the first post office in 1872, named the community Gibraltar. Some of the earliest families living in Gibraltar, dating back to the mid-1850s, are Hugh Campbell, John McEachern, Donald McAlister, John Chamberlain, Thomas Smith, and John Cooper.

John Cooper’s wife had given the land in the south-east corner of Lot 4, Concession 5, for the construction of the Presbyterian Church in 1880. The last service was held in 1962 and the church moved to the Nottawasaga Township. John’s Cooper son or nephew built the Carmel Methodist Church on the north half of Lot 4, which was torn down in the mid-1920s. The cemetery across the road still remains.

The first school, built in 1866 on the south-west corner on the north half of Lot 5, Concession 4, had burned down and a second school was built on Lot 6, Concession 5, in 1883.

595144 4th Line is of interest as a property with a vacant, but once substantial brick farmhouse c.1900, large ruined barn with stone foundation, and unusual stone pumphouse with windmill which apparently was the home, since the late 19th and much of the 20th of the Fletcher family (as recorded in Shannon’s book). James Fletcher Sr. had originally built the log house for the family on the lot directly across. This later became a blacksmith shop. The property at 595144 is currently for sale and deserves further examination and proper recording, as it is vulnerable to further damage/destruction.

There is also another pump house, no longer with a windmill further to the north at 595224 4th Line on an excellent farmstead originally associated with the early settling Cooper family (both the Presbyterian and the Carmel Methodist Churches were on the Cooper properties.

The pumphouses are interesting local vernacular, seen also in parts of the Beaver Valley (outside of Town of The Blue Mountains) and associated with the general exploration of wind power for agricultural uses beginning in the late 19th century. Any remaining ones should be conserved.
The boundaries of the Gibraltar cultural heritage landscape unit are extended north past the historic Lots 9 and 10 to the 12th Sideroad to encompass heritage properties in this area. This includes a unique stone farmhouse with brick window trim at 609388 12th Sideroad. The front door of this well kept house is oriented east as if to a former pioneer road (now the hydro corridor), with stone fencerows remaining along 12th Sideroad and extending into the woods, along the former frontage.

**Landscape characteristics**
- Gravel-surfaced roads, blind lines at 3rd Sideroad, 12th Sideroad)
- Open farmland; woodlots as backdrops
- Sugar maple along fencerows/roadway
- Stone fencerows along 4th Line between 12th Sideroad and Grey Road 19
- Mixed deciduous forest and lowland forests adjacent to roads
- 3rd Sideroad west of 4th Line; rough, narrow, wooded road mid-concession through to 6th Line
- Area known for natural spring water

**Noted properties with historic buildings**

4th Line (12th Sideroad to Grey Road 19)
- 595584 4th Line
- 595728 4th Line
- 609388 12th Sideroad, unique stone farmhouse with brick window trim, oriented east as if to a former road, with stone fencerows in woods

4th Line (6th Sideroad to Osprey – The Blue Mountains Townline)
- 595353 4th Line, 2-storey red-brick centre gable house
- 595327 4th Line
- 595312 4th Line
- 595264 4th Line, red brick house
- Gibraltar Cemetery on east side 4th Line, north of 3rd Sideroad
- 595251 4th Line
- 595224 4th Line, farmstead, stone pumphouse
derelict house and barn opposite 595224
- Cemetery at southeast corner of 4th Line & 3rd Sideroad, 595190 4th Line
4th Line (3rd Sideroad to Osprey – The Blue Mountains Townline)
  • 595181 4th Line
  • 595144 4th Line, brick homestead, pumphouse with windmill, derelict barn
  • 595115 4th Line
  • 595080 4th Line
  • 595042 4th Line
  • 595038 4th Line

3rd Sideroad
  • 549264 3rd Sideroad

4th Line, Gibraltar
9. **Redwing & Area**

Nestled in the Mill Creek Valley at Sideroad 12, Redwing was established in 1849 as a milling community. It is said to have been named the victor of a battle between two First Nations chiefs, Redwing and Red Cloud, who fought over the love of the same woman, with Chief Redwing winning the battle.

The boundaries of Redwing overlapped with Rockhaven and Little Germany, generally extending along the 10th Line from Osprey-The Blue Mountain Townline to the 15th Sideroad. Rockhaven was settled later, in 1867, and Little Germany around 1872. Of the three places only Redwing developed as a hamlet, likely because of its access to water power and milling opportunities.

The community built a log school in 1863 on one tenth of an acre of land at Lot 11, Concession 10. That school was replaced in 1873 by a modern school building on half an acre of land on lot 11, Concession 11. At that time Redwing was a thriving community with three stores, two blacksmith shops, a harness shop, a shoemaker, a flour mill, a saw mill, and woodwork shop. Adam Goodfellow established a furniture factory on his property at Lot 12 Concession 11, which operated throughout the late 19th and early 20th century.

**Landscape characteristics**
- Views over valley to the east, from high ground south of Grey Road 119 (15th Sideroad)
- High point at intersection of 12th Sideroad and 10th Line, with views to the northwest
- 12th Sideroad at 10th Line, tree-lined gravel road
- 11th Line, from Grey Road 119 to 12th Sideroad; well-vegetated gravel road

**Noted properties with historic buildings**

12th Sideroad
- 608193 12th Sideroad
- 608130 12th Sideroad

11th Line
- 395983 11th Line
- 395903 11th Line
10th Line
- Single lane bridge over Mill Creek
- 415928 10th Line
- 415901 10th Line
- 415865 10th Line
- 415853 10th Line
- 415877 10th Line
- 415851, 415853 10th Line, ‘Wimmer Farm’
- 415814 10th Line
- 415799 10th Line
- 415782 10th Line
- 415736 10th Line, Board and Batten Schoolhouse (S.S.12)
- 415719 10th Line
- 415718 10th Line
- 395903 11th Line
- 415901 10th Line
- 395983 11th Line

9th Sideroad
- 588175 9th Sideroad
- 588029 9th Sideroad

Grey Road 119
- 628090 Grey Road 119

Designated heritage building (Part IV of section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act)
- David J. McNichol Residence (588135 9th Sideroad)

10. Old Mail Road

This pioneer road, originally called Old Government Road, was established about 1840, probably following an old First Nations trail. It was formalized as a public road in 1846. It ran from Barrie to Meaford and was the first road in Grey County. The road served as the main route into Collingwood Township from 1846 to 1852 or 1853. All that remains of the Old Mail Road is the section from Heathcote to Griersville. This section is most certainly a cultural heritage landscape. Other areas are barely discernible - at its first intersection with the Bruce Trail, the Old Mail Road looks like an unused logging trail. With some investigation, it is possible that other traces of the road may be found in the backlots and woods of the farms along the assumed route as shown generally on Figure 2.
8.0 INDIVIDUAL PROPERTIES WITHIN THE STUDY LANDS

The following historic sites and properties, although not specifically falling within the boundaries of an identified cultural heritage landscape, were noted in the cultural assessment of the Town of The Blue Mountains. They are listed here for further investigation in a town-wide inventory of built heritage resources.

**12th Sideroad, east of 4th Line**

A fairly new community, Castle Glen, along with Osler Bluff Ski Club directly to the south of it, takes its name from Osler Castle, which was built in 1893 by Britton Bath Osler, a prominent criminal lawyer from Hamilton, and abandoned in 1901 with his death. The ruins of the castle remain on a property owned by Castle Glen Estates, which is planned for development. It is hoped that the heritage features will be saved from demolition. The ruins (not mapped) are located on a hill and can be reached from New Mountain Road (Grey Road 19), just past Osler Lane – look for a grassy road on the right.  

*Historic Features*
- Ruins of Osler Castle
- 615771 3rd Line

**6th Sideroad, between 6th Line and 4th Line**

*Natural Features*
- Grey County Managed Forest on the north side

*Historic Features*
- 2-storey log structure, at 569123 6th Sideroad

**Grey Road 40, east of Grey Road 2**

*Historic Features*
- 828411 Grey Road 40, old schoolhouse
- 828351 Grey Road 40, brick farmhouse

**7th Line, south of Grey Road 40 to 21st Sideroad**

Several heritage farms and orchards, south of Georgian Bay Club to crest of hill

*Historic Features*
- Stone house with open farmland beyond, views west over orchards
- Yellow/cream farmhouse at foot of hill

---
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Euphrasia Townline, north of 33rd Sideroad

Historic Features
  • 357417 Euphrasia Townline

24th Sideroad, west of Grey Road 2

Historic Features
  • 808231 24th Sideroad

Grey Road 2, south of 12th Sideroad

Historic Features
  • 495709 Grey Road 2
  • 495611 Grey Road 2

21st Sideroad

Historic Features
  • 729297 21st Sideroad
9.0 OTHER VILLAGES, HAMLETS AND SETTLEMENT AREAS

The following areas (which lie outside of the identified study areas) are also of interest as potential cultural heritage landscapes or heritage conservation districts and should be considered for further investigation in a town-wide inventory.

Craigleith

One of the community's earliest settlers, Andrew Craig Fleming, gave the Gaelic name Craigleith, or "Rocky Bay", to his own property. Later, as the population expanded, the use of the name grew, and it now refers to a scenic 3-mile stretch of Highway #26 between Collingwood and Thornbury, together with the historic core.

Craigleith was the home of the famous Sir Sanford Fleming whom we know as "The Father of Standard Time", and also as the site of the tragic sinking of the steamer Mary Ward in 1872, commemorated by Ward's Road which marks Craigleith's western boundary.

Northwinds Beach is a sandy beach, popular for sunbathing and board sailing. Nearby Craigleith Provincial Park protects significant natural features including fossils, and offers camping.

Historic features

- Lunan family two-storey log house; regarded as the oldest surviving house in Craigleith
- Craigleith School House, 1861
- Craigleith House, built by A. G. Fleming (demolished in 1988)

Designated heritage buildings (Part IV of Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act)

- Craigleith Schoolhouse (Craigleith Community Centre)
- The Craigleith Station, one of the last of the old wooden CNR stations.

Clarksburg

The first inhabitants of Clarksburg were the Marsh family of Grape Grange on the south-east side of the village. William Marsh built his first home there in the 1850s. He was a farmer, merchant, and the founder of Clarksburg. The main street carries his name. The village was named after the second resident, William Clark, who operated a woolen mill on the river.

The Directory of the County of Grey 1865-1866 describes the evolution of the village up to that time:
'It is now some years since W. J. Marsh, Esq., took up 400 acres of wild land adjoining the northern boundary of the town plot of Thornbury; with a roaring stream pursuing its headlong way through his domain. In 1856 he settled on his land. Thornbury then contained a Grist and Saw Mill, and a few houses. In 1859, W. A. Clark purchased of him a water privilege on the Beaver River, with 5 acres of land attached. Mr. Clark made immediate preparations for building his woollen mills; and a residence for himself. In 1860, John Tyson came in, and purchased of Mr. Clark water privilege and land for a flouring mill.

The flouring mill was put in operation in January, 1861, and the woollen factory in October of the same year. The parties who owned the ground adjoining, W. T. Marsh, W. A. Clark, and A. J. Whitney, offered every facility to parties wishing to settle in the new village; and soon Stores, Inns, and Mechanics Shops began to make their appearance in the new village, as yet without a name. The inhabitants wished it called Clarksville after the enterprising proprietor of the Woollen Works; but the P.O., authorities seem of late years to have set their faces against any more "villes", and so they compromised the matter by establishing a P. O. under the name of CLARKSBURG. At first it was merely a sub-office in connexion with Thornbury, but for a year past it has been independent, and receives daily mails from Collingwood.'

A woolen mill and a flour mill were erected around 1860 with the Beaver Valley Inn first used as a boarding place for workers at the woolen mill. The Inn is believed to stand in the original location to this day. Clarksburg’s first school was built in 1863, with Robert Albery as the first teacher. In 1892, Hillcrest school was constructed, which is believed to be standing to this day.

Sometime around 1890, a bicycle rim factory operated in Clarksburg, shipping products across Canada and to several European countries. A bicycle club in Thornbury and Clarksburg grew to several hundred members around that time. Clarksburg also had a grain mill, a mercantile, an armory, a curling rink, and a hotel.

The Black Bridge, a concrete bowstring arch bridge, is a designated heritage structure spanning the Beaver River on the 30th Sideroad. The steel truss bridge and the Clendenan Reservoir at the historic mill site are also notable features. The mill history dating back to Clendenan, the second owner, is interpreted at the site, which is located just south of the village. It was the first source of electricity for Clarksburg when a power house was installed in 1910. However its use as a mill site dates back to 1862 and David N. Cumming one of the most important early settlers in the area.

A number of historic commercial blocks remain in the business district of Clarksburg. The main street as it extends northward through Clarksburg and West Thornbury, contains many fine late 19th and early 20th century residences and churches, as do the neighbouring streets. Both Clarksburg and West Thornbury should be further examined for consideration as Heritage Conservation Districts.

Designated heritage buildings / structures (Part IV of Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act)
- Hoxford Residence; board & batten house
Black Bridge; concrete bowstring arch
Mitchell Farm
Municipal Office; former Clarksburg School

**Thornbury**

At the time when Charles Ranking first surveyed Collingwood Township, he had allocated 900 acres at the mouth of the Beaver River for a town site, which became Thornbury. It is recorded that at least three First Nations villages had occupied the site prior to the European settlement in the area.

Solomon Olmstead was the first settler in town. He came from Ottawa and saw the potential for a good milling business. In 1848, local farmers built him a home to keep his mill close by. Early settlers referred to the town as Beaver River. The popular theory about the town's current name is that it was named after a town in England by a surveyor, Gifford, but others believe it might have something to do with thorny bushes that were plentiful around the mouth of the Beaver River.

By the mid 1800s there were three mills, a general store, four hotels, a church, a school, a blacksmith shop and forty other businesses in Thornbury. Thornbury was incorporated as a town in 1887, with Andre Grier as the first mayor and Thomas Andrews as the first reeve.

The large red building on Highway 26, east of the main intersection in town, was previously the home for Mitchell's Apple Juice and following that Golden Town Apple Products. The Ministry of Natural Resources completed a state of the art fish ladder early in the spring of 2003. Thornbury is experiencing growth and change, both as a retirement community and a four seasons recreational area. The downtown is undergoing urban renewal and recognition of its historic roots and conservation of significant heritage features will be an important consideration.

**Little Germany (Germany)**

Little Germany, historically defined as Lots 1 to 6 in the 10th and 11th Conc., was first established in the latter half of the 19th century on the challenging terrain of the forested Niagara Escarpment. The town ostensibly derived its name after one of its earliest settlers, a Mr. Moore, who was of German-Dutch ancestry.

The community flourished between 1890 to 1910 with farms, several sawmills and timber-cutting for mills in Rockhaven and other locations. The well-known people that held timber lots in Little Germany include: Albert G. McKean, Henry Pedwell, Keenan Bros. Ltd. and Sawyer Massey Co. Ltd. The first log school was built in 1895, which was replaced by a new frame school in 1918 on Lot 4, Conc. 10.

Much of the community now is forested and has become part of the Kolapore Uplands Park.
Rockhaven

Rockhaven, established in 1867, was the location of lumber and limestone industries situated in rugged terrain, which set it apart from the adjacent communities of Little Germany and Redwing. The first settlers were two brothers, Joseph and James Bell, who built a log house on Lot 8, Concession 11.

William Walter, son of Ravenna pioneer, George Walter, constructed a mill near a 40 foot high waterfall on Mill Creek. Ever since Alexander Jr. Mitchell bought the mill from Walter in 1888, the falls have been known as Mitchell’s Falls. Further, the Metcalfe family’s arrival to Rockhaven in 1895 marked the beginning of industrial activities on Lot 8, Conc. 11, with the construction of a lime kiln, sawmills and creamery. The large escarpment rock outcropping which 10th Line jogs around is known as Metcalfe Rock.

Historic features
- 415526 10th Line, former church

Landscape features
- Metcalfe Rock - splendid view across the Kolapore Creek Valley, used for climbing

Kolapore

Kolapore was started in 1860s, with the first sawmill built in 1865 and a few others thereafter using the water power from the creek. This community started out as a hybrid of a farming community and a logging community. The logging has decreased greatly, but much of the area is still farmed. The re-growth forest area includes the Kolapore Forest Trails. Kolapore also has an active Church of the Nazarene congregation.

Landscape features
- Pinnacle Rock - a large piece of rock that has separated from the edge of the escarpment

Union Community

The fertile valley around the Lot 17, Concession 12, became known as Union and was settled before the founding of Clarksburg. The lot was first purchased by William Hewgill in 1851 from William Henry Draper, and several generations of Hewgills occupied the farm. Other early pioneers to this area were Clark, Spiking, Conn, Brockelbank, Lougheed, Wallace, and Thompson.

Union’s main industries were mixed farming and fruit growing. However, in the late 1920s and 1930s there were many silver fox ranches. The first Union Community school was built in 1858 with Heathcote’s Richard Rorke as teacher.

Historic features
- 627317 Grey Road 119
- 627366 Grey Road 119
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Duncan

Straddling the border of The Blue Mountains and Grey Highlands, Duncan is a small farming community high above the Beaver Valley. It was also known as a lumbering centre of the area. Duncan got its name in honor of Duncan Boles, teacher of the school which served both Duncan and Egypt in 1869. Duncan had a post office which opened in 1870, and a general store and a new school opened in 1884.

It is home to Duncan Crevice Caves Provincial Nature Reserve, a major feature along the Bruce Trail.

Pretty River Valley

The Pretty River Valley is still a quiet, secluded part of The Blue Mountains as it was when first settled. In recent years much of the valley farmland has been purchased by the Ontario Government, the buildings have been removed and the land allowed to revert to the original state of forest and natural wildlife habitat. The park land is a protected area. Several historic farms remain perched on the escarpment edge, with stunning views over the valley and beyond.

The Village at Blue / Craigleith Ski Community

In 1941, Jozo and Helena Weider purchased land in Collingwood Township near Craigleith and dreamed of developing a world-class ski resort. Although there was skiing in the area prior to the Weider’s arrival, Jozo was the driving force behind the development of the family-oriented Blue Mountains Resort over the next several decades. Existing farm buildings on the property were redeployed as ski facilities, and the ski runs were widened and made safer. Beginning in 1947 pottery was made on the property using clay scraped from the hills to smooth out the slopes. While in operation Blue Mountain Pottery became Canada's largest manufacturer of pottery giftware, and was internationally popular as an icon of Canadiana. Operations ceased in 2004 and is now considered a collector’s item. Together with the neighbouring Craigleith Ski Club, founded in 1958, The Blue Mountains area evolved into a full-fledged residential ski community. With the addition of The Blue Mountain Inn in the 1980s, and later a golf course, and with the surrounding attractions afforded by Georgian Bay and the Escarpment the area began to attract year-round use.

In 1999, Blue Mountain Resorts partnered with Intrawest Corporation to develop The Village at Blue Mountain. In addition to the ski facilities, the four seasons community now includes gathering and performing places, retail areas, restaurants, and residential communities in a village setting, surrounded by landscaped grounds and the Millpond.

Swiss Meadows

This collection of ski chalets and permanent residences, built in the mid 20th century and onwards, sits on top of the ski area of The Blue Mountains, hence the name of the community. It is on a blind stretch of the 18th Sideroad, north of Scenic Caves Road. There are several good locations for panoramic views of Georgian Bay from along the road and along the Bruce Trail in the Swiss Meadows area.

On the road to Swiss Mountains, there is a ruin of a substantial stone house located just north of 15th Sideroad, across the road from the ‘gondola’, which is of interest.
Preserving the overall integrity of a CHL is a primary objective of the conservation process in all types, whether evolved, associative or designed. Inherent in the CHL concept is the acknowledgement that these areas are dynamic. Change will, and must occur, but identification as a CHL increases the chances that the special character of the place will be respected and preserved. The historical built and landscape elements that are essential to the understanding of a particular CHL are most sensitive to change and, as such, should be the focus of preservation efforts.

Through this study, within the examined portions of the Town, there are several areas that have been identified as candidate CHLs. This early identification of candidate CHL areas, along with their inherent built heritage properties, as contained in this report, denotes that these areas are of ‘special interest’ to the Town and that future land use and planning decisions must take into account the conservation of their special heritage character.

Ultimately, the strongest protection for heritage properties is afforded through designation under the Ontario Heritage Act (Part IV for individual properties, and Part V for Heritage Conservation Districts, which can also be used for cultural heritage landscapes). As the heritage designation process requires additional study and evaluation some municipalities are also considering the values and merits of other planning tools as well. The range of conservation tools are discussed below (see also Section 13.0 Recommendations).

Cultural heritage assessment requirements specific to the Green Energy and Green Economy Act, as proposed under the Renewable Energy Approval Regulation (Draft June 2009) are discussed in Section 12.0.

In determining a course of action for the conservation of heritage resources, the Town will need to consider the reason for formally recognizing an area as a CHL, including any future potential threats to its integrity, and the protection afforded by each of the available planning tools.

**Listing of Historic Properties on a Municipal Register**

With the 2006 changes to the Ontario Heritage Act, potential heritage conservation tools for cultural heritage landscapes are now integrated with those of other heritage resources. The ‘listing’ of historic properties or areas on a register is one step that a municipal Council can take toward heritage conservation. ‘Listed’ according to 27(1) of the Ontario Heritage Act (OHA) involves a register of all heritage properties that are designated under the OHA, as well as properties that have not been designated, but are considered by a municipal Council to be properties of cultural heritage value or interest to a municipality. The Ontario Ministry of Culture Heritage Toolkit[7] notes that compiling the register can be as simple as completing a survey or recording form and photographing properties from the nearest public vantage point. There must be sufficient description to identify the property(ies) and the survey form typically includes the essential details of street address and legal property description, type of heritage feature, and general observations on the physical characteristics and context.

---

The register is intended to be a planning document that can be consulted by municipal decision makers when development proposals or permits are considered, and a first step in the identification and evaluation of a property that may warrant some form of heritage conservation, recognition and/or long term protection. Although listing of properties does not offer any protection under the Ontario Heritage Act, section 2.6.1 of the Provincial Planning Statement recognizes listed properties, and the Ministry Tool Kit notes it both as a potential tool on its own, or an important first step toward formal designation under the Ontario Heritage Act.

In addition to the documentation and formal recognition of properties of cultural heritage value to a community, the Ministry of Culture notes a number of additional potential benefits for ‘listing’ on a municipal register, including: the fostering of civic pride; promotion of a community’s history; and leveraging of tourism and economic benefit.

At present the Town of The Blue Mountains does not have a formal register of built heritage properties or cultural heritage landscapes, although several individual properties throughout the Town have been designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, as noted in the Inventory sections of this report.

The work of this study on cultural heritage landscapes should be sufficient for the purposes of ‘listing’ on a municipal register the cultural heritage landscapes identified on Figure 10. Municipal council’s approval (normally given by resolution) is required to add cultural heritage properties that have not been designated to the register. In municipalities with a municipal heritage committee, council must consult with its committee before a non-designated property is added to or removed from the register. Until such time as there is confirmation through formal recognition, the CHLs identified through this study are noted as ‘proposed’ or candidate CHLs. Further evaluation of these areas including a more in-depth property by property assessment and documentation, and boundary confirmation or refinement would be needed to fulfill a Part V Designation process under the Ontario Heritage Act, in accordance with Ministry of Culture guidelines, should the Town wish to pursue this course of action (see Section following).

The prominent heritage buildings and structures are noted within the descriptions of the CHLs. Although not intended to be exhaustive, this preliminary list may form the basis for further work on developing a Town-wide listing of built heritage resources. At some point the Town may wish to complete a town-wide inventory of all built heritage resources, and complete a cultural heritage landscape evaluation for the entire Town.

**Designation under Part IV or Part V of section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act**

Designation is a legal process under the Ontario Heritage Act that provides protection to a historic property and its specified heritage attributes based on the passing of a Municipal bylaw. Properties can be designated individually under Part IV of Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act, or as part of a larger area or Heritage Conservation District (HCD) under Part V. Property designation is not limited to buildings or structures but can include groups of buildings, cemeteries, natural features, cultural landscapes, landscape features, or ruins. The Act and Ontario Regulation 9/06 set out the criteria for determining heritage significance. All new designations must be evaluated using the prescribed criteria.8

---
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There are several historic buildings within the Town of The Blue Mountains that have undergone the designation process under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.

As noted, the designation of individual properties or districts under Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act affords the strongest protection, and is recommended for significant built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes, where it is beneficial to invoke the policies of the Act. This may include urban areas subject to growth or development pressures, or areas where significant land use change or modifications are anticipated which may be detrimental to heritage conservation objectives. Owner consent is not required for designation under the Ontario Heritage Act, however it will be important to consider the interests and opinions of the property owners whose lands are under consideration for designation.

In both the PPS and Ontario Heritage Act, cultural heritage landscapes are now synonymous with heritage conservation districts. In the Ministry of Culture Heritage Tool Kit guidelines for HCDs (Heritage Conservation Districts: A Guide to District Designation under the Ontario Heritage Act), they are both described in similar language, using Designed, Evolved and Associative categories to reflect their evolutionary process. The identification process contained within the Guide should be referred to in the contemplation and execution of a formal process for designation of cultural heritage landscapes as may be included on a municipal register, or identified through other means such as an Environmental Assessment or a Secondary Plan process.

Ontario Regulation 9/06 must be applied to properties being considered for designation under section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act. Screening properties for potential protection in accordance with the criteria in the regulation is a higher evaluation test than required for ‘listing’ non-designated properties on the register. The prescribed methodology, includes a thorough investigation of the inherent cultural heritage values and characteristics of an HCD, along with the development of a Statement of Significance, which clearly outlines the significant attributes of the property or area. As well, the property must meet at least ‘one or more’ of the criteria grouped into categories of Design / Physical Value, Historical / Associative Value and Contextual Value (refer to Chapter 3.0 of this report).

While the original model for a HCD was a historic village, neighbourhood or civic precinct, the concept has been broadened, particularly in recent years, to encompass the full range of potential CHLs including rural properties, trailways, ruins and associative landscapes. At this time, however, no CHLS of these specific types have been designated as HCDs under the Act, although increasingly, HCD studies are examining and encompassing a broader contextual landscape area within their boundaries.

A number of examples of HCDs with surrounding rural or landscape contexts are described below.

In the former Village of Rockcliffe Park, now part of the City of Ottawa, the designation of the Village as a Heritage Conservation District respects the existing road and lot pattern established in 1864, which is strongly influenced by the topography and woodland areas. The ensuing development form includes a winding road network, and park-like surroundings, which include an escarpment overlooking the Ottawa River, MacKay Lake, and the Pond.

In Vaughan, the Kleinburg-Nashville Heritage Conservation District encompasses two distinct former mill villages, linked by a road network, and the Humber River. The district boundaries include a substantial area of the natural valley. Through amendments to the City’s Site Plan Control By-law, all development located within the Kleinburg-Nashville Heritage Conservation District is subjected to site plan approval.
The HCD Plan for *Blair Village* in Cambridge includes the historic village area, and a surrounding “primary area”, as well as a broader contextual “area of secondary importance”, which includes a new business park. The inclusion of the primary and secondary areas within the designated district, allows a range of design guidelines to be applied to ensure that there will be appropriate landscape screening and buffers established. The HCD includes landscape areas and water features such as the millpond and creek. The guidelines address overall design, details and choice of materials of new development - to ensure compatibility and integration with the rural character of the Village, as well as conservation guidelines for the important character defining elements of the district, which include both built heritage and landscape heritage features.

The Township of Woolwich (in the Region of Waterloo) is considering designation of the historic village of *West Montrose*, together with an area of surrounding rural countryside, as a Heritage Conservation District. The area was identified as a cultural heritage landscape in a study undertaken by the Region in 2006 due to the significance of the area and its historic features, which include the last remaining covered bridge in Ontario. A recently completed study by the Heritage Resources Centre at the University of Waterloo concluded that there is significant public support for the designation. Local residents were engaged in an innovative process of boundary setting to confirm the suggested boundaries in the original CHL study.

**Official Plan and Other Planning Tools**

The *Planning Act* provides for a range of tools that can be applied, through regional and municipal Official Plans, to heritage resource identification and conservation including cultural heritage landscapes. Pursuant to the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), the Ministry of Culture released a series of guides to clarify the intent of heritage policies contained in Policy 2.6 of the PPS. Now contained within the ‘Ontario Heritage Tool Kit’, which is available on-line at the Ministry’s website, the guides address a range of subjects pertaining to the heritage conservation process: including; heritage property evaluation (which includes the identification and conservation of cultural heritage landscapes); implications for undertaking development or site alterations on lands adjacent to protected heritage property; and considerations for the undertaking of heritage impact assessments and conservation plans.

In support of the PPS policies for the conservation of significant cultural heritage landscapes, the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit information supports the inclusion of objectives and policies pertaining to cultural heritage landscapes into Official Plans, land use planning documents, and related development procedures and approval processes (Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process).

With respect to the identification of CHLs, the Tool Kit guide notes that CHLs may be:
- ‘Listed’ on a municipal register using evaluation criteria;
- an OHA protected heritage property (designated under Part IV, V or VI, subject to a conservation easement, or the subject of a covenant or agreement); or,
- newly identified as part of a proposal for development or site alteration.

The Ontario Heritage Tool Kit cites a number of additional planning tools that can be used for conservation purposes, as follows:
- Heritage Impact Assessments;
- Conservation plans;
- Community improvement plans;
• Secondary Plan policies;
• Special zoning by-laws;
• Site plan controls;
• Subdivision agreements;
• Management Plans (e.g. for parks, nature areas or corridors).

However, as yet there have been a limited number of CHLs that have been formally documented or inventoried in Ontario, and therefore the effectiveness of these planning mechanisms is yet to be demonstrated.

At present several policy sections within the Town of The Blue Mountains Official Plan make reference to the preservation of cultural landscapes, and maintaining the rural open landscape character. The protection and preservation of all cultural heritage resources, including ‘man-made or modified rural landscapes’ is provided for in the section on Cultural Heritage Resources (Section 8.11). However, the recognition of cultural heritage landscapes in the Official Plan could be made stronger by referencing the Provincial Policy Statement definition and policies with respect to their conservation (PPS Section 2.6.1).

As well, the development or updating of policies in other sections of the Official Plan that may have influence or impacts on cultural heritage landscapes, e.g. natural environment, agriculture, renewable energy, mineral resources should specifically cross-reference cultural heritage landscape policies.

Under the proposed Renewable Energy Approval Regulation, in support of the Green Energy and Green Economy Act, a heritage impact assessment would be required of proposed energy generation development facilities with a nameplate capacity greater than 3 kW and with a sound power rating of greater than 102dBA, to identify and mitigate potential negative impacts. Ministry of Culture review of the assessment is required.

Where a renewable energy generation facility is proposed on a property where heritage designation by-laws are in place under the Ontario Heritage Act, no heritage impact assessments are required of the proponents, however the consent of the local council or agreement holders is required.

Additional discussion on the requirements of the Renewable Energy Approval Regulation and the potential implications to cultural heritage landscapes is provided in Section 11.0, following.
11.0 CHLS AND WIND ENERGY FACILITIES

Requirements of the Renewable Energy Approval Regulation under the Environmental Protection Act (Draft, June 9 2009)

The (draft) Renewable Energy Approval Regulation proposes that proponents of new renewable energy generation facilities, or proponents of expansions, modifications and redevelopment of commissioned renewable energy facilities will be required to submit a Renewable Energy Approval application to the Ministry of the Environment, together with supporting documentation.

In general terms, no form of approval is required for projects with nameplate capacities that are less than 3kW (wind) and 10kW (solar).

The proponent’s documentation is proposed to include demonstration that any cultural heritage resource considerations are assessed and recommendations provided for mitigation, if applicable, based on the following (source: Part III, (4) Cultural Heritage, Renewable Energy Approval Regulation under the Environmental Protection Act (Draft, June 9, 2009).

- Self-assessment by the proponents is required to identify any known or potential effects to archaeological or heritage resources that could result from the renewable energy generation project. If potential negative impacts are identified then an archaeological and/or heritage assessment is required to confirm the findings and to recommend mitigation of any such impacts. The assessment is subject to review by the Ministry of Culture.

- The heritage assessment would not apply to renewable energy generation facilities that can be described as:
  - wind power with a nameplate capacity greater than 3kW with a sound power rating of less than 102 dBA;
  - wall or roof mounted solar with a nameplate capacity greater than 10kW;
  - farm-based biogas and biomass facilities (definition and parameters for these facilities is provided in Part IV of the Regulation).

- For renewable energy generation facilities proposed on properties where by-laws, instruments or agreements under Part II, Part IV or Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act are in place (i.e. designations or easements), no heritage assessment is required, however consent of the local council or agreement holder must be sought. The process of seeking consent is the same as for any alteration to a Designated property which includes consultation with the Municipal Heritage Committee, where one has been established; a decision by Council which could include consent with or without terms and conditions, or refusal; and, potential referral to the Conservation Review Board for dispute resolution.
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Implications of the Renewable Energy Approval Regulation

It is understood from personal communication with representatives at the Ministry of the Environment that the intent of the cultural heritage requirements of the Regulation are to recognize considerations for conservation of heritage resources as outlined in the Provincial Policy Statement and under the Ontario Heritage Act, while excluding small-scale facilities from a formal heritage assessment.

However the design parameters by which the renewable energy facilities are defined do not specifically address the issues that are of most concern for cultural heritage resources, which relate to size, scale, visual impact, and potential loss of character that could impact the integrity of the property or area and affect its potential for designation. Cultural heritage landscapes typically have high visual values which, combined with their significant heritage attributes, make them vulnerable to land-use changes and alterations. As with any large-scale industrial development, or other major land-use alteration, the development of large-scale wind facilities could be contrary to the intent to preserve the natural and cultural values of a cultural heritage landscape and could significantly alter their visual characteristics.

While the application of both a nameplate capacity and a sound rating to wind facilities within the Regulation is intended to define the size at which approval or other assessment is required, the sound output of a wind turbine is largely an issue of community and social impacts. Under the parameters outlined in the Regulation, facilities that are exempt from a heritage assessment have the potential to be quite large and with substantial impact on the visual characteristics of a heritage area. A turbine rated at, or just under 3kW has the potential to be on a tower that is 75 to 100 feet high, with no heritage assessment required and no formal approval required other than a building permit. As well facilities which are greater than 3kW but with a sound power rating of less than 102 dBA are also exempt from a heritage assessment, and no municipal or community consultation is required. These facilities have the potential to be even larger, particularly as technology advances that will allow for reductions in the sound power rating.

The exception to the exclusions for a heritage assessment under the Renewable Energy Approval Regulation are those heritage properties that have conservation easements, or have been designated under the Ontario Heritage (Part IV or Part V). For these sites, approval of the local council and / or agreement holder is required. In this regard, cultural heritage landscapes are best protected from potential impacts from development or land use changes, by the formal heritage designation process.

Given the rural nature of the CHLs identified in the Town of The Blue Mountains other requirements of the Renewable Energy Approval Regulation with respect to setbacks from natural features, roads, property lines and sound reception points (residences) may also serve to provide buffers within, and to, cultural heritage landscapes.

The vulnerabilities of cultural heritage landscapes to large-scale visual changes are discussed further in the following section.

Potential Impacts to Cultural Heritage Landscapes

With recent interest in, and the directives of the Provincial Policy Statement toward conservation of, cultural heritage landscapes, there is a growing consensus that these areas in particular are sensitive to large-scale and visual changes to the landscape.
Notwithstanding that a process for undertaking a heritage impact assessment has been outlined in the Renewable Energy Approval Regulation, it is important to understand the potential impacts of wind energy facilities and other large-scale development to cultural heritage landscape resources in general terms, in order to inform decisions that are subject to municipal approval, such as in the case of an area or property designated under Part IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act.

To facilitate this understanding the study team undertook a review of research and literature, both academic and applied, pertaining to the assessment of landscape sensitivities and wind energy development. The exercise concluded that there are a number of potential impacts to cultural heritage landscapes from large-scale wind energy facilities. These are similar to any large-scale industrial or other form of development. Impacts can be both physical and visual. The following sections summarize the sensitivities of, and potential impacts to cultural heritage landscapes.

**Views and Viewsheds**

The introduction of large-scale wind turbines or other tall structures may significantly alter the visual characteristics of an area. If the values of a heritage landscape lie in the significant views that it offers, the development of a wind farm and its associated infrastructure, including new large-scale transmission lines, can potentially materially impact the views, both into and from a place.

Landscapes that are visually contained or have limited inward and outward views may be less sensitive to wind energy development than areas with extensive inward and outward views. Research suggests that the presence of extensive close or middle range views from scenic routes, well-known vistas or tourist viewpoints may increase a landscape’s sensitivity to wind energy development, as does close proximity to settlement areas.

**Landscape Quality**

Landscapes that form a distinctive backdrop or context to a specific feature or cluster of features are sensitive to wind energy development, as are those that contain strong visual features and focal points such as hilltop farms, church spires or other important landmarks for historic settlement areas. Areas with a high degree of man-made influence on the landscape may be less sensitive to change due to wind energy development. Turbines are likely to be less conspicuous in brownfield or industrial landscapes already affected by built structures such as masts, pylons or chimneys, provided there are no visual conflicts where the structures are seen in close proximity.
**Historical Connections**

Rural cultural heritage landscapes present a more pastoral and/or natural character (due to limited man-made structures or wildness), recalling the historic origins of an area, and somewhat removing one from the present-day. Wind turbines can alter the perceptions of remoteness and tranquility – bringing a more industrial character to the affected landscapes, and diminishing heritage character or associations. Areas where the condition and integrity of historic landscape patterns, elements and features are relatively good are likely to be more highly valued by the observer, and are therefore more sensitive to wind energy development than areas where condition is poor. Where historic or landscape features are directly affected by construction works and/or access tracks, conservation objectives are at risk.

**Scale and Proportion**

The scale of human-made elements and their relationship to the surrounding natural landscape are often an important historical aspect of a cultural heritage landscape. Small-scale or intimate landscapes, with historic field patterns are particularly sensitive to large-scale wind energy facilities as the turbines would dominate, and hedgerows, individual trees, and buildings can be compared to and highlight their size. These small-scale landscapes are typical in the cultural heritage landscapes areas of the Town of The Blue Mountains. Simple, uncluttered, or large-scale landscapes with sweeping lines and extensive areas of consistent ground cover are less-sensitive to wind energy development.

A sense of enclosure provided by topography or vegetation – especially in areas with large scale topography or mature woodlands – may increase the ability of the landscape to provide screening for the lower parts of turbine structures and for associated access and infrastructure and hence indicate lower landscape sensitivity. However woodlands and forestry would need to be long term feature if their screening effects are to be relied upon.
**Roads and Roadscapes**
The road system is significant to the character of an historic place, its exploration, and in conveying the historic settlement patterns, particularly in rural settings. A number of the rural roads leading to and within the TOBM CHLs remain relatively unimproved with gravel surface, narrow width and ditches. The challenges of the difficult terrain and constraints posed by natural features are evident in the curves and dead-end roads that disrupt the surveyed grid pattern. Threats from WEFs include potential road and intersection widenings, regrading, road re-surfacing and the creation of new access roads across agricultural lands to towers. These ‘road improvements’ and alterations could substantially alter the visual and historical characteristics of an area, and result in loss of vegetation or other landscape features such as walls or fences.

**Scenic Quality**
The scenic quality of a cultural heritage landscape is often derived from visual appeal due to important views, visual interest and variety, contrasting landscape patterns, or dramatic topography. Areas of scenic quality are sensitive to distracting and dominating changes which alter the familiar views.

**Amenity and Recreation**
Areas offering high quality landscapes, memorable places, or opportunities for open-air recreation are more sensitive to wind energy development due to potential effects on access and/or on the quality of the recreational experience.

**Archaeological Sites and Potentials**
Archaeological potential were not specifically investigated in this study, beyond an acknowledgement of those areas already identified in general terms within the Town’s Official Plan as containing location of known archaeological sites. These areas are illustrated on Figure 10.

However given the natural features and known history of human settlement in the area, the potential for unidentified archaeological resources is likely to be high throughout the Town. Wind energy facilities, like any development or land disturbance, can physically impact archaeological sites, both pre- and post-contact.
12.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

The conservation of cultural heritage properties is vital to a community’s overall cultural and economic development plan. The Ontario Planning Act and Provincial Policy Statement support heritage conservation as part of land-use planning, and encourage municipalities to identify, evaluate and conserve historic properties that have lasting cultural heritage value or interest to their community. The identification of heritage resources for the purposes of listing on a municipal register is a first step which has been initiated through this study. Clear and comprehensive policies that address heritage conservation are also needed to ensure that the appropriate tools are in place to be consulted and enacted when development proposals or permits are being considered.

In developing a series of next steps and specific policies to address the conservation of cultural heritage landscape resources, the Town may wish to consider the following recommendations.

Suggested guidelines for conservation measures for cultural heritage landscapes which could be considered within a broader set of heritage policies, or within conservation master plans or heritage conservation district studies are provided in Section 13.0 following.

1. Establish a municipal Heritage Advisory Committee, as provided for under the Ontario Heritage Act.

2. Complete an Inventory of Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes for the entire Town, in consultation with a heritage advisory committee, applicable agencies, and the public;

3. Establish a register (listing) of properties of cultural heritage value or interest (both designated and non-designated), for both Cultural Heritage Landscapes and Built Heritage Resources, in consultation with the Heritage Advisory Committee, and endorsed by Council resolution;

4. Establish a process and policies for the undertaking of a heritage impact assessment, visual impact assessment and a conservation management plan to address large-scale development, land use change or major site alterations proposed within or immediately adjacent to an identified or listed cultural heritage landscape.

   The Heritage Impact Assessment should include the confirmation of the presence and significance of heritage resources in the area, including the boundary of the cultural heritage landscape, and identify any mitigative measures and/or alternative development approaches needed to maintain the historic and cultural character of the heritage features and surrounding context.

   The Visual Impact Assessment should consider key landscape, heritage and scenic characteristics, identify sensitivities to the proposed development or land-use change, and propose impact mitigation measures such as design measures, setbacks, or screening, and should be conducted using acknowledged and tested best practices for visual assessment.

5. Undertake a Heritage Conservation District Study (ies), to further evaluate listed CHLs, and with objectives for designation under Part V of section 29 of the OHA, including a Master Plan and guidelines to address specific heritage conservation measures, and development controls (two or three CHLs could be selected initially);
6. Strengthen general heritage policies within the Official Plan, with respect to cultural heritage landscapes, and as appropriate to the objectives of the Plan, and outlining any/all conservation tools, including consideration of the following:

a) Identify the proposed (candidate) cultural heritage landscape areas as Special Policy Areas, outlining heritage impact assessment and visual assessment requirements for large-scale development or land-use alterations;

b) Area-specific heritage policies as developed within a secondary plan process;

c) Designation of heritage properties or districts under Part IV or Part V section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act, in accordance with criteria identified in Ontario Regulation 9/06;

d) Heritage conservation agreements: voluntary legal agreements with owners which set out requirements for maintaining a property or specific heritage features of a property, registered on title, and binding for future owners (can be used in conjunction with the granting of planning approvals);

e) Development of further guidelines for identification, evaluation, protection tools, and impact mitigation activities;

f) Cross-reference cultural heritage landscape policies in other sections of the Official Plan that may have influences or impacts on cultural heritage landscapes, e.g. natural environment, agriculture, renewable energy, mineral resources.
13.0  GENERAL CONSERVATION GUIDELINES

The following are suggested general guidelines for the conservation of CHLs, based on the types of conservation measures recommended by Parks Canada (Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada) and the U.S. Parks Service. They are not intended to replace, but to be complementary to other policies pertaining to heritage resources, such as those contained within Official Plans, the *Ontario Heritage Act*, or the *Cemeteries Act*.

With respect to specific built heritage and archaeological resources, they may be supplemented by more specific guidelines that may be developed through the designation of heritage properties or districts under Section 29 or Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, or the application of guidelines, recommendations or policies developed in conjunction with such planning tools as a *Heritage Impact Assessment* to be applied to specific sites.

**Land Patterns**

The overall land pattern of the CHL as defined by the overall arrangement and interrelationship of topography, forests, fields, woodlots, farmsteads, water features, hedgerows and laneway and road systems, is integral to its significance and should be protected from major alterations.

Subdivision or amalgamation of properties and fragmentation of land patterns must be avoided.

New development within hamlets and settlement areas should respect the existing street patterns in both size and character.

**Landform and Physiographic Features**

Landforms including naturally occurring hills, valleys, slopes, plains and other topographical features, as well as terraces, embankments, berms, dams, swales, ponds and other human-engineered topographical changes that are important in defining the overall heritage value of the CHL should be protected from major alterations.

**Roads and Circulation Networks**

Existing road widths and alignments including jogs, offset intersections, curves and varying road allowance widths, should be protected.

Unpaved road surfaces should be preserved where they exist.
Other circulation systems — such as paths, walkways, parking lots, roads, highways, railways and waterways that are important in defining the overall heritage value of the landscape should also be preserved wherever possible.

**Land Use**

To maintain the continuum of character defining elements or associations that are reflected in a CHL, the maintenance of long-standing uses is encouraged.

Significant urbanization, landform changes, major road widening and re-grading, quarrying, and other land-use alterations that are visually or physically intrusive are significant threats to the integrity of a CHL, and must be avoided.

When new uses are to be introduced they should be visually compatible with the character of the CHL.

New buildings and structures should be located to minimize their visual impact on the character defining elements of the CHL.

Where necessary, visual screening of adjacent land uses should be provided.

**Buildings, Structures and Objects**

Retaining the historic relationships between the landscape and its built features is encouraged.

Demolition of existing historic buildings, structures, monuments, landscape features or designed elements that represent the character defining elements of the CHL should be avoided.

In reviewing proposals for the construction, demolition or removal of buildings and structures or the alteration of existing buildings within a Cultural Heritage Landscape, the process should be guided by the following general principles, as well as any specific recommendations such as may be provided through the designation of heritage buildings or structures under Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, or through a Heritage Conservation District Study and designation as a Heritage Conservation District.

a) heritage buildings and archaeological sites including their surroundings should be protected from any adverse effects of the development;

b) original building fabric and architectural features should be retained and repaired; and,
c) new construction and/or infilling should fit the immediate physical context and streetscape and be consistent with the existing heritage architecture by, among other things: being generally of the same height, width and orientation as adjacent buildings; of similar setback; of like materials and colours; and using similarly proportioned windows, doors and roof shape.

**Vegetation Relating to Land Use**

Removing or radically changing vegetation that is important in defining the overall character of the landscape should be avoided.

Mature trees, hedgerows and other woodlots that define the land patterns should be retained and managed through adequate, professional arboricultural care to extend their lives as long as possible.

Where removal of mature trees and other vegetation is deemed necessary due to disease, damage or health and safety, replacement planting should be undertaken to ensure the protection of significant areas of vegetation, i.e. historic treelines, hedgerows and windrows, gardens, and landscaped areas.

When new plantings are introduced the use of plants that reflect the species, habit, form, and scale of historic vegetation should be encouraged.

**Views and Viewsheds**

The preservation of views, viewsheds, and the scenic context is important to the conservation of the overall character of the CHL and the preservation of the character defining elements.

Any proposed alterations that will visually impact the significant features of the CHL should be subject to a Visual Assessment using a recognized methodology (e.g., visual assessment process recommended by the Niagara Escarpment Commission).

**Boundaries**

The suggested boundaries as identified in the individual CHL descriptions, are primarily based on the historic boundaries of the settlement areas that they represent, with consideration of the continuity of the heritage fabric. In the case of the ‘Blue Mountains – Euphrasia Townline & The Beaver Valley’ unit, several historic community areas that were closely associated with one another, and whose boundaries blur, have been included as one CHL. In other instances the boundaries are reflective of natural or cultural features. Attempts have been made to consider an appropriate boundary for the CHL, based on the tangible or
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associative heritage attributes as appropriate to this study level. However some further confirmation and refinement of the boundaries would be warranted during a formal listing or designation process, as the historic integrity of an area can change over time. As well the input of local residents should be sought in confirming an appropriate boundary.

**Buffers**

The identified boundaries include some buffer area to the key features in that the boundaries are based historic settlement area boundaries and include full lots for heritage properties. In this regard, some visual impact absorption has been built in. As well, particularly with respect to Banks, Loree, Gibraltar, Sixth Line Community, and Red Wing, the extension of the CHL boundary into the surrounding NEP lands affords some additional visual buffering.
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