

Goshen Wind, Inc.

Goshen Wind Energy Centre Heritage Assessment Addendum

Prepared by:

AECOM

410 – 250 York Street, Citi Plaza

London, ON, Canada N6A 6K2

www.aecom.com

519 673 0510 tel

519 673 5975 fax

Project Number:

60303557

Date:

September 4, 2013

ORIGINAL REPORT

Distribution List

# of Hard Copies	PDF Required	Association / Company Name
1	Yes	Goshen Wind Inc.
1	Yes	Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport

Revision Log

Revision #	Revised By	Date	Issue / Revision Description
1	Adria Grant	4 Sept 2013	Incorporated MTCS comments

AECOM Signatures

Report Prepared By:



Adria Grant, BA
Senior Archaeologist, Archaeology Practice Lead

Report Reviewed By:



Marc Rose, MES, MCIP, RPP
Senior Environmental Planner

Executive Summary

Goshen Wind, Inc., (Goshen), a wholly owned subsidiary of NextEra Energy Canada, ULC (NextEra), is proposing to construct a wind energy project in the Municipalities of Bluewater and South Huron, Huron County, Ontario. The Project is referred to as the Goshen Wind Energy Centre (the "Project").

A Heritage Assessment Report was written on 20th November 2012 by Golder Associates Ltd. (Golder) for the Project (Golder 2012a). Participating properties were screened for potential heritage resources and if potential heritage resources were identified they were evaluated according to the criteria outlined in O. Reg. 09/06 under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, as required by O. Reg. 359/09. Through a windshield survey a total of 135 potential heritage resources, 67 residences and 68 barns, from 86 sites were identified as over 40 years in age and of these 99, 46 houses and 53 barns, were identified as having cultural heritage value or interest (Golder 2012b). The anticipated impacts to the cultural heritage features identified were evaluated according to *Info Sheet #5* (MTCS 2006) and no negative impacts were anticipated (Golder 2012b). As the single cultural heritage landscape was not determined to have any cultural heritage value or interest and there are no anticipated impacts to the cultural heritage features no further work was recommended (Golder 2012a and 2012b).

Due to modifications to the project layout, namely the transmission line being moved onto private property from the right-of-way, an addendum with revised recommendations and inventory of cultural heritage features was prepared by Golder and submitted on 5th December 2012 (Golder 2012b). The updated recommendations, found in Section 2.0 of *APPENDIX A: Built Heritage Inventory* (2012b) addendum of the *HERITAGE ASSESSMENT REPORT NextEra Energy Canada, ULC Goshen Wind Energy Centre, Municipalities of Bluewater and South Huron, Huron County, Ontario* (Golder 2012a) determined that the Project Location, consists of a single cultural heritage landscape (Golder 2012a:6). Due to the typical nature of the landscape cultural heritage value or interest was not identified according to *Ontario Regulation 9/06* (Golder 2012b:2).

This addendum to the final Heritage Assessment Report (Golder 2013) addresses the proposed layout modifications listed in Section 1.1 and is a required component of an Application for a Renewable Energy Approval (REA application) under Ontario Regulation (O.Reg.) 359/09 made under the *Environmental Protection Act* (EPA).

The majority of the proposed layout modifications consist of the relocation of infrastructure within properties that were evaluated during the original Heritage Assessment or addendum; however, there are some modifications to infrastructure that impact properties not previously evaluated that require a heritage assessment. The addition of easements for construction of the transmission line on the following parcels requires additional heritage assessment: GSH2485, GSH2838, GSH2767, GSH3067, GSH2914, GSH2956, GSH2555, GSH3068, GSH3065 and GSH2441.

The additional land required for the proposed modifications remains within the previously classified single typical rural landscape and cultural heritage value or interest is not identified according to *Ontario Regulation 9/06*. The proposed layout modifications listed in Section 1.2 will not cause any direct or indirect negative impacts to any cultural features. No impacts to heritage resources are anticipated as a result of the proposed layout modifications and the recommendations presented in the Heritage Assessment Report (Golder 2012a) and Addendum to the Heritage Assessment Report (Golder 2012b) remain unchanged.

The Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport is asked to review this addendum to the Heritage Assessment Report (Golder 2012a) and Addendum to the Heritage Assessment Report (Golder 2012b). As this addendum did identify additional potential and confirmed heritage resources existed on the parcels of land that were added to the project area the MTCS is asked to issue a revised written comments letter.

Project Personnel

Project Director	Marc Rose, MES, MCIP, RPP
Project Manager	Adria Grant, BA, R131
Research	Nancy VanSas, MA, R323
Report Composition	Adria Grant, BA, R131, Nancy VanSas, MA, R323
Office Assistance	Brian Kelly, Jennifer Deline

Acknowledgements

Proponent	Thomas Bird, Environmental Services Project Manager, NextEra Energy Canada, ULC
Ministry of Tourism, Culture & Sport	Paula Kulpa, Team Lead, Heritage Land Use Planning

Table of Contents

Distribution List
Executive Summary
Project Personnel

		page
1.	Introduction.....	1
	1.1 Proposed Modifications to the Project Layout for REA Amendment.....	1
	1.2 Evaluation Process.....	1
2.	Results.....	3
3.	Recommendations.....	5
4.	References.....	6
5.	Figures.....	7

List of Tables

Table 1.	Direct Negative Impacts to Built Heritage	2
Table 2.	Indirect Negative Impacts to Built Heritage.....	2
Table 3.	Analysis of Direct Negative Impacts to Built Heritage.....	3
Table 4.	Analysis of Indirect Negative Impacts to Built Heritage	3

List of Figures

Figure 1.	Location of Study Area.....	8
Figure 2.	Location of Additional Properties Subject to Heritage Assessment.....	9
Figure 3.	Location of Additional Sites for Inventory of Cultural Heritage Features	10

Appendices

Appendix A. Inventory of Built Heritage

1. Introduction

Goshen Wind, Inc., (Goshen), a wholly owned subsidiary of NextEra Energy Canada, ULC (NextEra), is proposing to construct a wind energy project in the Municipalities of Bluewater and South Huron, Huron County, Ontario. The Project is referred to as the Goshen Wind Energy Centre (the "Project").

A Heritage Assessment Report was written on 20th November 2012 by Golder Associates Ltd. (Golder) for the Project (Golder 2012a). Participating properties were screened for potential heritage resources and if potential heritage resources were identified they were evaluated according to the criteria outlined in O. Reg. 09/06 under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, as required by O. Reg. 359/09. Through a windshield survey a total of 135 potential heritage resources, 67 residences and 68 barns, from 86 sites were identified as over 40 years in age and of these 99, 46 houses and 53 barns, were identified as having cultural heritage value or interest (Golder 2012b). The anticipated impacts to the cultural heritage features identified were evaluated according to *Info Sheet #5* (MTCS 2006) and no negative impacts were anticipated (Golder 2012b). As the single cultural heritage landscape was not determined to have any cultural heritage value or interest and there are no anticipated impacts to the cultural heritage features no further work was recommended (Golder 2012a and 2012b).

Due to modifications to the project layout, namely the transmission line being moved onto private property from the right-of-way, an addendum with revised recommendations and inventory of cultural heritage features was prepared by Golder and submitted on 5th December 2012 (Golder 2012b). The updated recommendations, found in Section 2.0 of *APPENDIX A: Built Heritage Inventory* (2012b) addendum of the *HERITAGE ASSESSMENT REPORT NextEra Energy Canada, ULC Goshen Wind Energy Centre, Municipalities of Bluewater and South Huron, Huron County, Ontario* (Golder 2012a) determined that the Project Location, consists of a single cultural heritage landscape (Golder 2012a:6). Due to the typical nature of the landscape cultural heritage value or interest was not identified according to *Ontario Regulation 9/06* (Golder 2012b:2).

This addendum to the final Heritage Assessment Report (Golder 2013) addresses the proposed layout modifications listed in Section 1.1 and is a required component of an Application for a Renewable Energy Approval (REA application) under Ontario Regulation (O.Reg.) 359/09 made under the *Environmental Protection Act* (EPA).

1.1 Proposed Modifications to the Project Layout for REA Amendment

The majority of the proposed layout modifications consist of the relocation of infrastructure within properties that were evaluated during the original Heritage Assessment or addendum; however, there are some modifications to infrastructure that impact properties not previously evaluated that require a heritage assessment. The addition of easements for construction of the transmission line on the following parcels requires additional heritage assessment: GSH2485, GSH2838, GSH2767, GSH3067, GSH2914, GSH2956, GSH2555, GSH3068, GSH3065 and GSH2441.

1.2 Evaluation Process

In order to confirm that the recommendations provided in the Appendix A Built Heritage Addendum (Golder 2012b) continue to be applicable, a windshield survey of each of the additional properties was conducted on July 24, 2013. During this investigation the cultural landscape was re-evaluated in accordance with *Ontario Regulation 9/06*. All buildings greater than 40 years of age located on the properties now included in the Project Location due to the proposed layout modifications were assessed for their cultural heritage value or interest. Appendix A provides an inventory of additional structures dating to over 40 years of age now included in the Project Location, and the details of the evaluation of cultural heritage value or interest for each structure are provided in Section 2.

1.3 Impact Assessment

Where potential cultural heritage value or interest was determined to be present according to *Ontario Regulation 9/06*, the anticipated direct and indirect impacts of the Project were assessed based on the potential impacts outlined in *Info Sheet #5 in Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology Policies of the Ontario Provincial Policy Statement, 2005* (MTCS 2006). The potential impacts defined in *InfoSheet #5* (MTCS 2006) include both direct and indirect negative impacts. Direct negative impacts to heritage features include destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features; and/or alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance (MTC 2006). Indirect negative impacts include shadows, isolation, direct or indirect obstruction, a change in land use and land disturbances (MTC 2006). Tables 1 and 2 outline the potential impacts identified in *InfoSheet #5* (MTCS 2006).

Table 1. Direct Negative Impacts to Built Heritage

Types of Direct Negative Impact
Destruction of any, or part of any, <i>significant heritage attributes</i> or features
Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance

Taken from MTCS 2006

Table 2. Indirect Negative Impacts to Built Heritage

Types of Indirect Negative Impact
Shadows created that alter the appearance of a <i>heritage attribute</i> or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden
Isolation of a <i>heritage attribute</i> from its surrounding environment, context or a <i>significant</i> relationship
Direct or indirect obstruction of <i>significant</i> views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features
A change in land use such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new <i>development</i> or <i>site alteration</i> to fill in the formerly open spaces
Land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an <i>archaeological resource</i>

Taken from MTCS 2006

2. Results

The Project Location was previously determined to represent a single vernacular rural landscape of primarily mixed-use agricultural activity consistent with the historic division of land and characterized by evolving cash crops, pasture, woodlots, social institutions and two transportation corridors (Golder 2012b:2). The additional land to be impacted by the proposed modifications remains within this single typical rural landscape and cultural heritage value or interest was not identified according to *Ontario Regulation 9/06*.

Participating properties were screened for potential heritage resources and if potential heritage resources were identified they were evaluated according to the criteria outlined in O. Reg. 09/06 under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, as required by O. Reg. 359/09. Ten additional structures dated to over 40 years of age are now situated within the Project Location, including six houses and four barns. All of the structures were photographed and evaluated according to *Ontario Regulation 9/06* and each was determined to have cultural heritage value or interest. Appendix A provides the details of the additional features to be added to the Built Heritage Inventory for the Project.

The anticipated direct and indirect impacts of the Project on these cultural heritage features were assessed based on the potential impacts outlined in *Info Sheet #5 in Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology Policies of the Ontario Provincial Policy Statement, 2005* (MTCS 2006). Tables 3 and 4 provide the analysis of direct and indirect impacts.

Table 3. Analysis of Direct Negative Impacts to Built Heritage

Type of Direct Negative Impact	Impacts Associated with Layout Modifications
Destruction of any, or part of any, <i>significant heritage attributes</i> or features	None anticipated
Alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance	None anticipated

Table 4. Analysis of Indirect Negative Impacts to Built Heritage

Type of Indirect Negative Impact	Impacts Associated with Layout Modifications
Shadows created that alter the appearance of a <i>heritage attribute</i> or change the viability of a natural feature or plantings, such as a garden	None anticipated
Isolation of a <i>heritage attribute</i> from its surrounding environment, context or a <i>significant</i> relationship	None anticipated
Direct or indirect obstruction of <i>significant</i> views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features	None anticipated
A change in land use such as rezoning a battlefield from open space to residential use, allowing new <i>development</i> or <i>site alteration</i> to fill in the formerly open spaces	None anticipated
Land disturbances such as a change in grade that alters soils, and drainage patterns that adversely affect an <i>archaeological resource</i>	None anticipated

The proposed layout modifications listed in Section 1.2 will not cause any direct or indirect negative impacts to any cultural features. No impacts to heritage resources are anticipated as a result of the proposed layout modifications and the recommendations presented in the Heritage Assessment Report (Golder 2012a) and Addendum to the Heritage Assessment Report (Golder 2012b) remain unchanged.

3. Recommendations

The Project Location was previously determined to represent a single vernacular rural landscape of primarily mixed-use agricultural activity consistent with the historic division of land and characterized by evolving cash crops, pasture, woodlots, social institutions and two transportation corridors (Golder 2012b:2). The additional land to be impacted by the proposed modifications remains within this single typical rural landscape and cultural heritage value or interest was not identified according to *Ontario Regulation 9/06*.

The participating properties examined during the original heritage assessment (Golder 2012a), addendum to the original assessment (Golder 2012b) and this current assessment were found to contain a total of 109 built heritage resources: 57 barns and 52 houses. These structures were identified as having cultural heritage value or interest due to their age according to O. Reg. 09/06. No further mitigation is recommended as it was determined that there are no anticipated direct or indirect impacts as a result of the undertaking.

4. References

Golder Associates Ltd. (Golder)

- 2012a *HERITAGE ASSESSMENT REPORT NextEra Energy Canada, ULC Goshen Wind Energy Centre, Municipalities of Bluewater and South Huron, Huron County, Ontario*. On file with the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, Toronto.
- 2012b *APPENDIX A: Built Heritage Inventory Addendum*. On file with the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, Toronto.

Ontario Government

- 2006 *ONTARIO REGULATION 9/06, CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST*. Retrieved July 16, 2013 from http://www.e-laws.gov.on.ca/html/regs/english/elaws_regs_060009_e.htm

Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS)

- 2012 *REA Checklist: Consideration of Potential for Heritage Resources*. Retrieved 22 July 2013 from [http://www.forms.ssb.gov.on.ca/mbs/ssb/forms/ssbforms.nsf/GetFileAttach/021-0483E~1/\\$File/0483E.pdf](http://www.forms.ssb.gov.on.ca/mbs/ssb/forms/ssbforms.nsf/GetFileAttach/021-0483E~1/$File/0483E.pdf)
- 2006 Info Sheet #5. In *Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology Policies of the Ontario Provincial Policy Statement, 2005*. Retrieved July 16, 2013 from http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/publications/Heritage_Tool_Kit_Heritage_PPS_infoSheet.pdf

5. Figures

Maps illustrating the location of the additional properties subject to the heritage assessment and the location of structures added to the inventory may be found in the following pages.

APPENDIX A: Built Heritage Inventory

Addendum Site #1: 70122A Parr Line, Municipality of Bluewater

Date: Early 20th Century

Description: A 2 ½-storey red brick steeply pitched hipped steel roof structure with a hipped roofed dormer window on an undermined foundation. A central red brick chimney and covered front red brick porch accent the house.

Heritage Attributes: A 2 ½-storey red brick house is representative of the brick, steeply sloped hip roof with hip roofed dormer.

Heritage Value According to O. Reg 9/06

Design or Physical Value: Representative of a typical early 20th century red brick hipped roof and dormer house

Historical or Associated Value: None identified.

Contextual Value: This early 20th century vernacular rural landscape.

Heritage Attributes Potential Direct or Indirect Impact: None anticipated.

Proposed Mitigation of Negative Impacts: No direct or indirect impacts identified, therefore no further mitigation is recommended.

Addendum Site #2: 70016 Hern Line, Woodham, Ontario

Date: 1890s – 1920s

Description: A yellow brick 2-storey hipped roof house structure on top of a concrete block foundation, with an enclosed front porch. The vernacular is identified as that of Queen Anne design, based on the hipped roof, asymmetrical design, front gable and ornate quoins.

Heritage Attributes: A yellow brick 2-storey L-plan structure with a hipped roof and gabled front dormer.

Heritage Value According to O. Reg 9/06

Design or Physical Value: Representative of a typical Late 19th to Early 20th century brick L-shaped hipped structure with a single gabled dormer.

Historical or Associated Value: None identified.

Contextual Value: This Late 19th to Early 20th century brick L-plan structure with a hipped roof and single dormer style is of a typical style within the vernacular rural landscape and the associated barn structures.

Heritage Attributes Potential Direct or Indirect Impact: None anticipated.

Proposed Mitigation of Negative Impacts: No direct or indirect impacts identified, therefore no further mitigation is recommended.



Date: 19th - 20th Century

Description: A timber framed, metal roof Bank Barn with a stone foundation on the north (right) and a more recent hipped metal roof barn with a stone foundation to the south (left), adjacent to a concrete silo.

Heritage Attributes: Timber framed Bank Barn with the attached hipped roof barn.

Heritage Value According to O. Reg 9/06

Design or Physical Value: Representative of a 19th timber frame bank barn and a 20th century timber frame hip roof barn, typical of the Study Area.

Historical or Associated Value: None identified.

Contextual Value: Typical structure within the vernacular rural landscape.

Heritage Attributes Potential Direct or Indirect Impact: None anticipated.

Proposed Mitigation of Negative Impacts: No direct or indirect impacts identified, therefore no further mitigation is recommended.

Addendum Site #3: 69976 Sunshine Line, Woodham, Ontario

Date: 19th Century

Description: A 1 ½ -storey yellow brick symmetrical house structure with a central doorway. The front porch extends across the entire front of the house.

Heritage Attributes: A symmetrical 1 ½ -storey brick house with covered front porch.

Heritage Value According to O. Reg 9/06

Design or Physical Value: Representative of a typical 19th century symmetrical brick house structure.

Historical or Associated Value: None identified.

Contextual Value: This 19th century symmetrical house structure is of a typical style within the vernacular rural landscape.

Heritage Attributes Potential Direct or Indirect Impact: None anticipated.

Proposed Mitigation of Negative Impacts: No direct or indirect impacts identified, therefore no further mitigation is recommended.

Addendum Site #4: 42489 Plugtown Line, Kirkton, Ontario

Date: 1890s – 1920s

Description: A 2-storey yellow brick hipped roof house on a stone foundation. A symmetrical hipped roof house. A symmetrical façade with fixed shutters.

Heritage Attributes: A 2-storey brick symmetrical hip roofed structure.

Heritage Value According to O. Reg 9/06

Design or Physical Value: Representative of a typical Late 19th to Early 20th century symmetrical hipped roof house.

Historical or Associated Value: None identified.

Contextual Value: This Late 19th to Early 20th century brick symmetrical house structure is in character with the adjacent barn structures and the vernacular rural landscape.

Heritage Attributes Potential Direct or Indirect Impact: None anticipated.

Proposed Mitigation of Negative Impacts: No direct or indirect impacts identified, therefore no further mitigation is recommended.



Date: 19th - 20th Century

Description: A 2-storey timber framed, metal roof, raised 3-bay barn with additions to the front with a sloped roof enclosed wooden drive shed with a metal roof. To the northwest of the drive shed is a wood framed, metal roof shed. At the rear, a 1-storey barn is attached.

Heritage Attributes: Timber framed 3-bay barn construction that compliments the vernacular rural landscape and adjacent house structure.

Heritage Value According to O. Reg 9/06

Design or Physical Value: Representative of a 19th - 20th century timber frame barn, typical of the Study Area, but becoming a rarity in southwestern Ontario.

Historical or Associated Value: None identified.

Contextual Value: Typical structure within the vernacular rural landscape.

Heritage Attributes Potential Direct or Indirect Impact: None anticipated.

Proposed Mitigation of Negative Impacts: No direct or indirect impacts identified, therefore no further mitigation is recommended.

Addendum Site #5: 42433 Plugtown Line, Kirkton, Ontario



Date: Early 20th Century

Description: A 1 ½ -storey sided house structure that is asymmetrical in general appearance. An addition was added to the front of the house as a single storey room and an addition to the south (left). A single brick chimney runs up the exterior south wall of the original house structure.

Heritage Attributes: A sided asymmetrical house structure.

Heritage Value According to O. Reg 9/06

Design or Physical Value: Representative of a 20th century asymmetrical sided house structure.

Historical or Associated Value: None identified.

Contextual Value: This 20th century asymmetrical house structure is complimentary of the vernacular rural landscape within the vicinity, as well as the associated barn structures.

Heritage Attributes Potential Direct or Indirect Impact: None anticipated.

Proposed Mitigation of Negative Impacts: No direct or indirect impacts identified, therefore no further mitigation is recommended.



Date: 19th - 20th Century

Description: A timber framed, metal roof and siding, raised 3-bay barn with field stone foundation

Heritage Attributes: Timber framed 3-bay barn construction that compliments the vernacular rural landscape.

Heritage Value According to O. Reg 9/06

Design or Physical Value: Representative of a 19th - 20th century timber frame barn, typical of the Study Area, but becoming a rarity in southwestern Ontario.

Historical or Associated Value: None identified.

Contextual Value: Typical structure within the vernacular rural landscape.

Heritage Attributes Potential Direct or Indirect Impact: None anticipated.

Proposed Mitigation of Negative Impacts: No direct or indirect impacts identified, therefore no further mitigation is recommended.

Addendum Site #6: 42477 Dump Road, Kirkton, Ontario



Date: 19th Century

Description: A 1 ½ -storey sided L-shaped house with a front porch and cinder block foundation.

Heritage Attributes: A 1 ½ -storey L-plan sided house structure.

Heritage Value According to O. Reg 9/06

Design or Physical Value: Representative of a typical 19th century L-shaped sided house structure.

Historical or Associated Value: None identified.

Contextual Value: This 19th century L-shaped sided house is of a typical style within the vernacular rural landscape and the associated outbuilding.

Heritage Attributes Potential Direct or Indirect Impact: None anticipated.

Proposed Mitigation of Negative Impacts: No direct or indirect impacts identified, therefore no further mitigation is recommended.



Date: Late 19th - 20th Century

Description: A timber framed, metal roof barn with a concrete and metal silos adjacent.

Heritage Attributes: Timber framed barn construction that compliments the vernacular rural landscape of Centennial Road.

Heritage Value According to O. Reg 9/06

Design or Physical Value: Representative of a Late 19th - 20th century timber frame barn.

Historical or Associated Value: None identified.

Contextual Value: Typical structure within the vernacular rural landscape.

Heritage Attributes Potential Direct or Indirect Impact: None anticipated.

Proposed Mitigation of Negative Impacts: No direct or indirect impacts identified, therefore no further mitigation is recommended.