

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND REPORT STRUCTURE

The City of Vaughan retained Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI), in collaboration with Unterman McPhail Associates and AECOM to: develop a preliminary cultural heritage landscape inventory; and prepare cultural heritage landscape policies for inclusion into the City's new Official Plan. The protection and integration of significant cultural heritage landscapes into the land use planning process is recognized through new definitions and policy statements contained in the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). Although some types of cultural heritage landscapes have been conserved for years in various municipalities through designation of heritage conservation districts under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, the 2005 PPS defines cultural heritage landscapes much more broadly and provides municipalities with a clear mandate to develop programs for identifying, evaluating, and protecting these types of cultural heritage resources.

This study focuses on the identification, protection and management of cultural heritage landscapes by:

- Proposing a method for establishing a cultural heritage landscape inventory;
- Recommending particular sites and properties that may be included on a cultural heritage landscape inventory;
- Demonstrating application of a preliminary framework for analyzing cultural heritage landscapes; and
- Presenting associated policy statements for inclusion into the City of Vaughan's Official Plan.

The study begins in this section with a review of key concepts and definitions regarding cultural heritage resources generally and cultural heritage landscapes specifically. Sections 2.0 and 3.0 provide a framework for identifying and analyzing cultural heritage landscapes in the City of Vaughan. Section 2.0 presents historical land use themes that have shaped the natural landscape and built environment in the City of Vaughan and then identifies and maps potential cultural heritage landscape sites based on: a review of previously conducted studies; review of current aerial mapping; and analysis of the City of Vaughan's existing Heritage Inventory. Section 3.0 presents a case study analysis of one potential cultural heritage landscape and demonstrates application of a framework for analyzing cultural heritage landscapes and establishing their significance and identifying associated heritage attributes. Section 4.0 reviews municipal approaches for conserving cultural heritage landscapes and integrating them into the land use planning and development approval process. The results of this policy review and the proposed cultural heritage landscape inventory provide the basis for developing cultural heritage landscape policies for inclusion into the City's Official Plan. Section 5.0 proposes a series of policy statements that aim to continually inventory, evaluate, and conserve significant cultural heritage landscape sites in the City, and integrate these unique cultural heritage resources into the land use planning process.



1.1 Cultural Heritage Resources: Definitions

1.1.1 *Conservation, Change and Planning: Some Key Concepts*

The Province's natural resources, water, agricultural lands, mineral resources, and cultural heritage and archaeological resources provide important environmental, economic, and social benefits. The wise use and management of these resources over the long term is a key provincial interest. The Province must ensure that its resources are managed in a sustainable way to protect essential ecological processes and public health and safety, minimize environmental and social impacts, and meet its long-term needs (Vision for Ontario's Land Use Planning System, Provincial Policy Statement, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing 2005, pp. 2-3).

In Ontario, cultural heritage conservation is accepted as a legitimate objective of planning activity, as it is in many other provinces and countries. Conservation planning provides an important mechanism for ensuring that future development (e.g., residential, industrial and infrastructure construction) respects the cultural heritage of the City.

Conservation planning and management is generally concerned with ensuring that valued cultural heritage resources are conserved and protected, in a sound and prudent manner, in the continuing and unavoidable process of change in the environment. A key issue is that the role of the custodian and steward of these resources generally falls to the private property owner. It is neither possible nor desirable that all resources be brought into public ownership. Therefore, conservation management is undertaken by a variety of actors, and it is necessary, through legislation and education, to bring all of these actors together in pursuit of a common goal. In many instances, it is traditional planning mechanisms that now seek to ensure that cultural heritage resources are conserved and/or maintained within the process of change.

In the process of change, cultural heritage resources may be affected in several ways. Change may be some action that is purposefully induced in the environment, such as development activities (e.g., road building, residential construction). This may result in both adverse and beneficial impacts, depending on the degree to which the change is sensitively managed. Change may also be a gradual and natural process of aging and degeneration, independent of human action, which affects artifacts, building materials, human memories or landscapes. Thus cultural resource management must ensure that change, when it does occur, is controlled. Its negative impacts upon cultural heritage resources must be either averted or minimized, through either ensuring that change has no adverse impacts whatsoever, or that intervention in the process will result in the promotion of beneficial effects.

In the protection of above ground cultural heritage resources from land use disturbances or infrastructure facilities, the major characteristics of these resources and "planning" have a bearing on success. Above ground cultural heritage resources have many distinct attributes that make their protection a challenging task. Not only are they fragile and non-renewable, but from a planning perspective these resources are typically immovable and are frequently located on private property, and may retain heritage attributes that permeate municipal parcel boundaries. Thus, any policy must attempt to satisfy the dual and sometimes conflicting objectives of respecting certain private property rights while at the same time, protecting a resource valued by society. "Planning" is generally undertaken in an effort to seek a common or public good that market forces and private interests do not seek.



On the other hand, the nature of the decision-making process constitutes one of the major and unique characteristics of planning in Ontario. Indeed, each example of impact to a cultural heritage resource is considered on a case-by-case basis and is resolved through serious consideration of the resource's significance, which is determined by application of heritage evaluation criteria and identification of a site's heritage attributes. Also, the involvement of public and interest groups is encouraged or mandatory, such that decisions are sensitive to community concerns and are discussed openly. Municipal heritage committees, local historical societies, and interested citizens play an important role in this process. Moreover, the review and approvals process permits administrative hearings on matters at issue, with an independent decision. Thus, there is the opportunity to protect or conserve heritage features by selecting least damaging alternatives, through participation in planning decisions and in the review and approvals process.

1.1.2 Defining Cultural Heritage

The utility of this study as a guide that will assist to incorporate cultural heritage landscapes within the overall planning and development process, fundamentally rests upon a clear understanding of the physical nature of cultural heritage resources in general, the variety of forms they may assume, and their overall significance and value to society.

In common usage, the word heritage tends to be vaguely equated with “things of the past.” While it may be arguable that such an interpretation of the term is true, it is so only in the very narrowest sense. An interest in heritage does indeed indicate an awareness of, and concern for, “things of the past,” yet at the same time it recognizes that these “relics” are worthy of such interest primarily because they provide insights into the processes that have helped to shape the contemporary world in which we live, and that will continue to exert an influence into the future. Examination of our heritage, therefore, not only allows us to learn about our origins and our history, but it also provides a means of understanding who we are now, and a means of glimpsing who we may become.

In recognition of the essentially timeless quality of these “things of the past,” Ontario's heritage has been defined as:

all that our society values and that survives as the living context — both natural and human — from which we derive sustenance, coherence and meaning in our individual and collective lives (Ontario Heritage Policy Review [OHPR] 1990:18-19).

Such an all-encompassing definition has the additional advantage of recognizing that our heritage consists of both natural and cultural elements. As human beings, we do not exist in isolation from our natural environment. On the contrary, there has always been a complex interrelationship between people and their environment and each has shaped the other, although the nature and direction of these mutual influences has never been constant. This definition further recognizes that heritage not only includes that which is tangible, but also that which is intangible.

All of those elements that make up this heritage are increasingly being viewed in the same manner as are “natural resources,” in that they are scarce, fragile, and non-renewable. These cultural heritage resources, therefore, must be managed in a prudent manner if they are to be conserved for the sustenance, coherence and meaning of future generations, even if their interpretations of the significance and meaning of these resources in contributing to society may be different from our own.

The development of the means by which to manage these cultural resources depends, in turn, on the recognition that on a practical level it is necessary to categorize them by type, yet at the same time these basic types also form a continuum. Both the distinctiveness of the individual categories of cultural resources and the overlap between these categories has been recognized by the Ontario Heritage Policy Review. This work (OHPR 1990:23) defined three broad classes of cultural resources:

IMMOVABLE HERITAGE – land or land-based resources, such as buildings or natural areas that are “fixed” in specific locations; for example:

structures – buildings, ruins, and engineering works, such as bridges;

sites – archaeological sites, battlegrounds, quarries, earth science sites such as rock formations, and life science sites such as rare species habitats;

areas – streetscapes, neighbourhoods, gardens, lakes, rivers and other natural, scenic, and cultural landscapes;

MOVABLE HERITAGE – resources, such as artifacts and documents, that are easily “detachable” and can be transported from place to place; for example:

objects – artifacts such as artworks, utensils and adornments, and earth and life science specimens, such as fossils and crystals;

documents – including newspapers, letters, films, and recordings;

INTANGIBLE HERITAGE – such as traditional skills and beliefs; for example:

values – attitudes, beliefs and tastes;

behaviours – including skills, games, dances and ceremonies;

speech – stories and narratives, songs, sayings, and names.

Each of these categories, however, often overlaps with others. Archaeological sites, for example, are “immovable” resources, yet in most cases these sites are formed by concentrations of man-made or man-modified objects that are “movable” resources. Similarly, “movable” or “immovable” resources, such as buildings or documents often derive their significance through their intangible cultural associations, as they may reflect or typify specific skills or beliefs.

Despite the fact that all cultural heritage resources should be viewed as components of a single continuum, there remains a need to distinguish between the three basic categories outlined above. This is because the approaches to the examination of resources within the different categories must be specifically tailored to their characteristics and needs. Not only does the study of the different types of resources require different and often highly specialized techniques, but the threats that these resources face are often different as well. Thus planning decisions related to the conservation of different types of resources are informed by different sets of considerations. Likewise, the means by which such planning decisions are implemented will also vary.

1.1.3 Defining Cultural Heritage Landscapes

The term cultural heritage landscape (CHL) has a long history in the evolution of the heritage conservation field. The concept initially evolved out of investigations centred on cultural geography with the term officially coined in 1926 to describe any place modified by humankind. By the mid twentieth century, the concept and its holistic approach to resource investigation emerged at the international level when the United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) adopted a 'Recommendation Concerning the Safeguarding of the Beauty and Character of Landscapes and Sites'. This recommendation called for the "preservation and, where possible, the restoration of the aspect of natural, rural, and urban landscapes and sites, whether natural or man-made, which have a cultural or aesthetic interest or form typical natural surroundings". By 1975, the General Assembly of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS), the international professional membership NGO which acts as the custodian of conservation doctrine, further recognized the importance of cultural heritage landscapes as an integral unit of analysis with passing *Resolutions on the Conservation of Smaller Historic Towns*. During the 1980s, additional declarations and charters issued by ICOMOS emerged, with special attention placed on defining cultural heritage landscapes.

In 1992, the World Heritage Convention was amended to include the concept of cultural heritage landscapes, resulting in the first legal instrument able to recognize and protect cultural heritage landscapes. Article 1 of the World Heritage Convention now acknowledges that cultural heritage landscapes represent the "combined works of nature and man". The World Heritage Convention further developed this concept by identifying three categories of cultural heritage landscapes (See World Heritage Convention Operational Guidelines 2008, Annex 3). The three broad cultural heritage landscape categories include:

- **Landscapes designed and created intentionally by man.** These embrace garden and parkland landscapes constructed for aesthetic reasons which are often (but not always) associated with religious or other monumental buildings and ensembles.
- **Organically evolved landscapes.** This results from an initial social, economic, administrative, and/or religious imperative and has developed its present form by association with and in response to its natural environment. Such landscapes reflect that process of evolution in their form and component features. [These landscapes] fall into two sub-categories:
 - a relict (or fossil) landscape is one in which an evolutionary process came to an end at some time in the past, either abruptly or over a period. Its significant distinguishing features are, however, still visible in material form.
 - A continuing landscape is one which retains an active social role in contemporary society closely associated with the traditional way of life, and in which the evolutionary process is still in progress. At the same time it exhibits significant material evidence of its evolution over time.
- **Associative cultural landscapes.** The inclusion of such landscapes on the World Heritage List 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.

In the Province of Ontario, formal protection of cultural heritage landscapes has been legally established since the early 1980s when the first heritage conservation district was recognized. Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* enables designation of *areas* which as a whole, retain cultural heritage value. Within this context, cultural heritage landscapes can include:

an area with a group or complex of buildings, or a larger area with many buildings and properties. It may also comprise entire municipalities... potential districts can be found in urban and rural environments. They may include residential, commercial, and industrial areas, rural landscapes or entire villages or hamlets with features or land patterns that contribute to a cohesive sense of time or place (Ministry of Culture 2006:5 - 6)

In 2005, cultural heritage landscapes were further recognized in the Province of Ontario's Provincial Policy Statement. This document establishes that "significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscape shall be conserved". In this policy context, a cultural heritage landscape

means 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, mainstreets and neighbourhoods, cemeteries, trailways, and industrial complexes of cultural heritage value (Provincial Policy Statement: 29)

Municipalities in the Province of Ontario have simultaneously recognized the value of cultural heritage landscapes and the need to integrate them into the planning approval process. Municipal official plans frequently contain provisions for their identification, protection, and management. Designation of cultural heritage landscapes sites under Part IV or Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* is encouraged and several municipalities in the Province of Ontario have initiated mechanisms for identifying these types of resources by developing cultural heritage landscape inventories or registers. Section 27 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* provides the legislative basis for establishing cultural heritage landscape inventories. While such inventories list properties designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, they also function as a tool to identify properties that a municipality believes to be of cultural heritage interest and which should be considered during the course of infrastructure improvements and integrated into the planning approval process.

