



Conserving Heritage Landscapes

Cultural Heritage Landscape Project – Volume 2

Prepared for the City of Mississauga
January 2022

Final Report



Providing Archaeological &
Cultural Heritage Services

528 Bathurst Street Toronto, ONTARIO M5S 2P9
T 416-966-1069 F 416-966-9723 asiheritage.ca

Project Personnel



Project Lead:

Rebecca Sciarra, M.A.,
C.A.H.P. (Phase One)

Annie Veilleux, M.A.,
C.A.H.P. (Phase Two)

Technical Lead:

Annie Veilleux, M.A.,
C.A.H.P. (Phase One)

Kristina Martens, B.A., Dip.
Heritage Conservation
(Phase Two)

Heritage Property

Researcher/Historian:

Johanna Kelly, M.S.c.
(Phase One)

Michael Wilcox, P.h.D.
(Phase Two)

C.H.L. Inventory Advisor:

Laura Loney, M.Plan,
C.A.H.P. (Phase One)

Indigenous Engagement Coordinator:

Eric Beales, M.A. (Phase
One and Two)

Martin S. Cooper, M.A.
(Phase Two)

Geomatics Specialist:

Jonas Fernandez, M.S.C



Public Engagement Lead and Land Use and Urban Design Policy Lead:

Ute Maya-
Giambattista, MCIP,
RPP, LEED AP,
M.Pl., B.Arch



Land Use Planner:

David Riley, B.E.S.,
M.C.I.P., R.P.P.

Consultation Coordinator:

Yasaman Soofi
Jamie Unwin, M.E.s.



Senior Landscape Architect:

Mark T. Steele,
M.L.A., O.A.L.A.,
C.S.L.A.

Landscape Architect:

Roderick B.
MacDonald, M.L.A.,
O.A.L.A., F.C.S.L.A.



Heritage Architect:

Christopher Borgal,
O.A.A., F.R.A.I.C.,
C.A.H.P.

Cover Image: Aerial view of Mississauga (Hunting Survey Corporation Limited 1954a)


Table of Contents

Schedules	1
Appendix A: Cultural Landscapes, Cultural Features and Community Nominated Sites Identification/Evaluation Process and Results	4
Appendix B: City of Mississauga’s Official Plan	7
Appendix C: Screening Results	27
Appendix D: Mississauga: A Thematic History	27
Appendix E: Community Engagement	76
Appendix F: Indigenous Engagement	134
Appendix G: Evaluation Criteria	136
Appendix H: Policies and Legislation Toolkit and Non-Regulatory Strategies	139
Appendix I: Areas of Interest	142
Appendix J: Areas Requiring Further Review	145
Appendix K: Low Stone Walls	197

Schedules

Schedule 1: Significant CHLs


X:\2018 Projects\CH\18CH-022 Mississauga CHL Inventory\ArcPro_Workspace\ArcPro_Workspace.aprx



Schedule 1: Significant Cultural Heritage Landscapes

Schedule 2: Areas of Interest

X:\2018 Projects\CH\18CH-022 Mississauga CHL Inventory\ArcPro_Workspace\ArcPro_Workspace.aprx



Schedule 2: Areas of Interest



Projection: NAD 1983 UTM Zone 17N Scale: 1:78,000 Page Size: 11 x 17	
0 3 Kilometres	
ASI Project No.: Date: 9/30/2021 3:59 PM	Drawn By: pblkoulis File: Schedule 2 Areas of Interest

Appendix A: Cultural Landscapes, Cultural Features and Community Nominated Sites Identification/Evaluation Process and Results

Table 1: Cultural Landscapes, Cultural Features and Community Nominated Sites Identification/Evaluation Process and Results

Cultural Landscapes, Cultural Features and Community Nominated Sites	Component Parts/Features	Phase of Project Addressed	2005 Inventory or Community Nominated	Identification/Evaluation Process	Findings	Result
Adamson Estate	No additional	Two	2005 Inventory	Screened	Protected under Part IV of the <i>O.H.A.</i>	Significant C.H.L.
Applewood Acres	No additional	Two	Community-Nominated	Evaluated	Meets criteria	Requires Further Review (further consultation)
Arsenal Lands	Water Tower	Two	2005 Inventory	Screened	Protected under Part IV of the <i>O.H.A.</i>	Significant C.H.L.
Benares	No additional	Two	2005 Inventory	Screened	Protected under Part IV of the <i>O.H.A.</i>	Significant C.H.L.
Bradley Museum	No additional	Two	2005 Inventory	Screened	Protected under Part IV of the <i>O.H.A.</i>	Significant C.H.L.
BraeBen Golf Course	No additional	Two	2005 Inventory	Screened	Does not meet criteria	Area of Interest
Britannia Farm	No additional	Two	2005 Inventory	Screened	Protected under Part IV of the <i>O.H.A.</i>	Significant C.H.L.
C.R.H. Canada Mississauga Cement Plant	No additional	Two	2005 Inventory	Evaluated	Does not meet criteria	Area of Interest
Cawthra Estate	No additional	Two	2005 Inventory	Screened	Protected under Part IV of the <i>O.H.A.</i>	Significant C.H.L.
City Centre Precinct	City Hall Clock Tower	Two	2005 Inventory	Evaluated	Meets criteria	Significant C.H.L.
Clarkson Road (Benares to Bradley Museum)	No additional	Two	Community Nominated	Evaluated	Does not meet criteria	Not a Significant C.H.L.
Credit Grove	No additional	Two	Community Nominated	Evaluated	Does not meet criteria	Not a Significant C.H.L.
Credit River Corridor	Q.E.W. Bridge over Credit River; C.N. Bridge over Credit River; Credit River Geological Formations; Port Credit Memorial Park	Two	2005 Inventory	Evaluated	Meets criteria	Significant C.H.L.
Credit Valley Golf and Country Club	No additional	Two	Community-Nominated	Not evaluated	Undetermined	Requires Further Review (Requires Access)
Creditview Road Scenic Route	No additional	One	2005 Inventory	Evaluated	Does not meet criteria	Area of Interest
Creditview Wetland	No additional	Two	2005 Inventory	Evaluated	Does not meet criteria	Area of Interest

Cultural Landscapes, Cultural Features and Community Nominated Sites	Component Parts/Features	Phase of Project Addressed	2005 Inventory or Community Nominated	Identification/Evaluation Process	Findings	Result
Dickson Park Crescent	No additional	Two	Community-Nominated	Evaluated	Meets criteria	Significant C.H.L.
Erindale Village	Erindale Park; Erindale Power Dam Ruin	One and Two	2005 Inventory	Evaluated	Meets criteria	Significant C.H.L.
Gordon Woods	No additional	Two	Community-Nominated	Evaluated	Meets criteria	Significant C.H.L.
Hancock Woodlands	No additional	Two	Community-Nominated	Evaluated	Meets criteria	Significant C.H.L.
Harding Waterfront Estate	No additional	Two	2005 Inventory	Screened	Protected under Part IV of the <i>O.H.A.</i>	Significant C.H.L.
Hustler Farm	No additional	Two	2005 Inventory	Screened	Protected under Part IV of the <i>O.H.A.</i>	Significant C.H.L.
Jack Darling Memorial Park	No additional	Two	Community Nominated	Evaluated	Does not meet criteria	Not a Significant C.H.L.
Kariya Park	No additional	Two	2005 Inventory	Evaluated	Meets three criteria areas	Significant C.H.L.
Lake Iroquois Shoreline	No additional	Two	2005 Inventory	Evaluated	Does not meet criteria	Area of Interest
Lakefront Promenade Park	No additional	Two	2005 Inventory	Evaluated	Meets criteria	Significant C.H.L.
Lakeview Golf Course	No additional	Two	2005 Inventory	Screened	Protected under Part IV of the <i>O.H.A.</i>	Significant C.H.L.
Lorne Park Estates	No additional	One	2005 Inventory	Not evaluated	Undetermined	Requires Further Review (Requires Access)
Meadowvale Village H.C.D.	Meadowvale Valley Ridge	Two	2005 Inventory	Screened	Protected under Part V of the <i>O.H.A.</i>	Significant C.H.L.
Meadowvale West	Lake Aquitaine Park; Lake Aquitaine; Lake Wabukayne	Two	Community-Nominated and part of 2005 Inventory	Evaluated	Meets criteria	Significant C.H.L.
Middle Road Bridge	No additional	Two	2005 Inventory	Screened	Protected under Part IV of the <i>O.H.A.</i>	Significant C.H.L.
Mineola East	No additional	Two	Community Nominated	Evaluated	Does not meet criteria	Not a Significant C.H.L.
Mineola Neighbourhood	No additional	One	2005 Inventory	Evaluated	Meets criteria	Significant C.H.L.
Mississauga Road Scenic Route	No additional	One	2005 Inventory	Evaluated	Meets criteria	Significant C.H.L.
Mississaugua Golf and Country Club	No additional	One	2005 Inventory	Not evaluated	Undetermined	Requires Further Review (Requires Access)
Pearson International Airport	No additional	Two	2005 Inventory	Evaluated	Does not meet criteria	Area of Interest

Cultural Landscapes, Cultural Features and Community Nominated Sites	Component Parts/Features	Phase of Project Addressed	2005 Inventory or Community Nominated	Identification/Evaluation Process	Findings	Result
Petro-Canada Lubricants	No additional	Two	2005 Inventory	Evaluated	Does not meet criteria areas	Area of Interest
Pinchin Farm	Leslie Log House	Two	2005 Inventory	Screened	Protected under Part IV of the <i>O.H.A.</i>	Significant C.H.L.
Port Credit¹	Old Port Credit Village H.C.D.; Old Port Credit (outside H.C.D.); Port Credit Harbour; Port Credit Pier Scenic View	Two	2005 Inventory	Screened	Protected under Part V of the <i>O.H.A.</i> found to appropriately convey the cultural heritage value of Port Credit	Significant C.H.L.
Ratray Marsh	No additional	Two	2005 Inventory	Evaluated	Does not meet criteria	Area of Interest
Riverwood	No additional	Two	2005 Inventory	Screened	Protected under Part IV of the <i>O.H.A.</i>	Significant C.H.L.
Robertson Farm	No additional	Two	2005 Inventory	Screened	Protected under Part IV of the <i>O.H.A.</i>	Significant C.H.L.
Sanford Farm	No additional	Two	2005 Inventory	Screened	Protected under Part IV of the <i>O.H.A.</i>	Significant C.H.L.
Sheridan Research Park	No additional	One	2005 Inventory	Evaluated	Does not meet criteria	Area of Interest
Streetsville Village Core	Streetsville Memorial Park	One	2005 Inventory	Evaluated	Meets criteria	Significant C.H.L.
Toronto Golf Club	No additional	Two	Community-Nominated	Evaluated	Meets criteria	Requires Further Review (Review in 5 years)
Trelawny Community	No additional	One	2005 Inventory	Evaluated	Does not meet criteria	Area of Interest
University of Toronto Mississauga (U.T.M.)	No additional	One	2005 Inventory	Not evaluated	Undetermined	Requires Further Review (Requires Access)
Wartime Housing (Malton)	No additional	One	2005 Inventory	Evaluated	Does not meet criteria	Area of Interest

¹ Several cultural landscapes and cultural features were identified in the 2005 Cultural Landscape Inventory within Port Credit. These include: Old Port Credit (located west of the Credit River and straddling Lakeshore Road), Port Credit Harbour (mouth of the Credit River), and Port Credit Pier Scenic View. Since the 2005 inventory, the Old Port Credit Village H.C.D. was designated and the H.C.D. includes the area south of Lakeshore Road and the Port Credit Harbour. As part of this study, all previously identified areas of Port Credit were reviewed, and it was determined that the Old Port Credit Village H.C.D. boundary represented a Significant C.H.L.

Appendix B: City of Mississauga's Official Plan

Natural Heritage Systems, Cultural Landscapes, and Community-Nominated Areas

The following table provides a summary of the natural heritage systems that are protected in the City of Mississauga's *Official Plan*. In some circumstances, these natural areas coincide with the location of Significant Cultural Heritage Landscapes and Areas of Interest.

Natural Areas	Official Plan Section	Summary
Residential Woodlands	6.3.9 6.3.17-21 6.3.25 6.3.40	Residential Woodlands are generally older residential areas with large lots that have mature trees forming a continuous canopy and minimal native understorey due to the maintenance of lawns and landscaping.
Provincially Significant Wetlands (P.S.W.)	6.3.12g 6.3.28 6.3.30	Provincially Significant Wetlands (P.S.W.s) are those areas identified by the province as being the most valuable. They are determined by a science-based ranking system known as the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System (O.W.E.S.). This Ministry of Natural Resources (M.N.R.) framework provides a standardized method of assessing wetland functions and societal values, which enables the province to rank wetlands relative to one another. This information is provided to planning authorities to support the land use planning process. A wetland that has been evaluated using the criteria outlined in the O.W.E.S. is known as an "evaluated wetland" and will have a "wetland evaluation file" (Ministry of Natural Resources:1).
Wetlands	6.3.12g	Wetlands are "lands that are seasonally or permanently covered by shallow water or conditions where the water table is close to or at the surface. Swamps, marshes, bogs and fens are disappearing across Ontario" (Credit Valley Conservation 2018:para. 1).

Natural Areas	Official Plan Section	Summary
Significant Natural Areas	6.3.7 6.3.9 6.3.12 6.3.21 6.3.25 6.4.35-36 6.3.40	Significant Natural Areas are areas that meet one or more of the following criteria: a. provincially or regional significant life science areas of natural and scientific interest (A.N.S.I.); b. environmentally sensitive or significant areas; c. habitat of threatened species or endangered species; d. fish habitat; e. significant wildlife habitat; f. significant woodlands; g. significant wetlands; h. significant valleylands
Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest	6.3.12 6.3.28-30	Areas of Natural and Scientific Interest (A.N.S.I.s) are lands and waters with features that are important for natural heritage protection, appreciation, scientific study or education.
Natural Hazard Lands	6.3.47-55	Natural Hazard Lands are generally unsafe, and development and site alteration will generally not be permitted due to the naturally occurring processes of erosion and flooding associated with river and stream corridors and the Lake Ontario shoreline.
Urban Forest	6.3.39-46	The Urban Forest, comprising trees on public and private properties in the city, also contributes to a healthy and sustainable city, and should be protected and enhanced where possible.
Linkages	6.3.21-38	Linkages are those areas that are necessary to maintain biodiversity and support ecological functions of Significant Natural Areas and Natural Green Spaces but do not fulfill the criteria of Significant Natural Areas, Natural Green Spaces, Special Management Areas or Residential Woodlands.
Special Management Areas	6.3.9 6.3.15-16 6.3.21 6.3.32 6.3.35 6.3.40	Special Management Areas are lands adjacent to or near Significant Natural Areas or Natural Green Spaces and will be managed or restored to enhance and support the Significant Natural Area or Natural Green Space.

Natural Areas	Official Plan Section	Summary
Lake Ontario Shoreline	6.3.37 6.3.56-63	The Lake Ontario shoreline is an integral component of the Green System and is a key Provincial linkage due to the unique ecological functions and habitats it provides. In addition, it has an important role in leisure activity and tourism. To sustain the health of shoreline and watershed ecosystems, the local physical and ecological functions should be retained in an undisturbed state to the greatest extent possible and, where deemed appropriate, enhanced and restored. Effective natural hazards management and ecological conservation can only occur on a comprehensive shoreline or watershed/sub-watershed basis.
Valleylands	6.3.47-49	Valleylands are shaped and reshaped by natural processes such as flooding and erosion. In general, erosion hazards associated with valleylands include consideration for slope stability and watercourse erosion, which are also interrelated with the flood hazard. The degree and frequency with which the physical change occurs in these systems depends on many factors such as extent and type of vegetation present, soil/bedrock type, and the characteristics of the erosion and flood hazards present. Development adjacent to valleylands and watercourse features must incorporate measures to ensure public health and safety; protection of life and property; as well as enhancements and restoration of the Natural Heritage System.
Flood Plains	6.3.50-55	Lands subject to flooding are a danger to life and property and, as such, development is generally prohibited. However, it is recognized that some historic development has occurred within flood plains and may be subject to special flood plain policy consideration.

Cultural Landscapes in Focus in the Official Plan

In terms of land use policies applicable to the cultural heritage landscapes across the city, Mississauga's Official Plan identifies different elements of City Structure (as shown on Schedule 1b: Urban System – City Structure) and uses these to define the city's areas. These elements include:

- Downtown;
- Major Nodes;

- Community Nodes;
- Corporate Centres;
- Neighbourhoods;
- Employment Areas; and
- Special Purpose Areas

Within these categories, specific “Character Areas” are outlined, which represent elements of Mississauga’s urban structure that contribute to the individual identities of various parts of the city, including attributes of the physical, natural, and social aspects of an area. The Character Area policies are found within Part Three of the *Official Plan*, in addition to specific land use designation policies. This review focuses on the specific Character Areas in Part Three where the cultural landscapes and cultural features identified in the Cultural Landscape Inventory (2005) are found, which include all area categories except Major Nodes. Official Plan policies which relate to community nominated areas are discussed in Section 2.2.6.

Downtown

Chapter 12 of the *Official Plan* identifies the various Character Areas of Downtown Mississauga. Of the 32 cultural heritage landscapes, two are located within the Downtown Core Character Area, which include the City Centre Precinct (including the City Hall Clock Tower) and Kariya Park. According to the *Official Plan*, all policies pertaining to land in the Downtown Core are contained under a different cover within the Downtown Core Local Area Plan. This Plan outlines general and precinct-specific design guidelines, land use policies, and transportation policies and recommendations for the entire Downtown Core area.

Within the Local Area Plan, Policy 3.3.2 outlines information as it relates to the Civic Centre Precinct, containing the Living Arts Centre, Civic Centre, and the Central Library, which all function as landmarks in the city according to the Plan. The Urban Design Vision for the area is outlined in Policy 3.3.2a), which encourages built form that defines the street line, pedestrian scaled development and strong interconnection, visual openness, and active uses at the street edge. While the Civic Centre Precinct is outlined in this way, the plan does not make any reference to the landmark City Hall Clock Tower, which is a key part of the cultural heritage landscape, nor Kariya Park which is also located within the Downtown Core.

Community Nodes

Chapter 14 of the *Official Plan* identifies the Community Node Character Areas in Mississauga. The Port Credit Harbour and Pier cultural heritage landscape takes up a large portion of the Port Credit Community Node, which is subject to the policies of the Port Credit Local Area Plan. Section 3 of the Plan provides a current context for the area, stating that both the Port Credit Harbour and the Port Credit Pier are identified as cultural landscapes. Section 8.2 outlines the cultural heritage policies of Port Credit, again, stating that the Port Credit Pier Scenic View is

identified as a cultural landscape. The Port Credit Harbour is identified as Special Site 8 within Section 13.1.8 of the Plan, outlining that a future comprehensive master plan for the lands will be prepared to address land use, built form, and transportation through consultation with landowners, the local community, and other stakeholders.

Appendix I to the Local Area Plan contains the 2013 Port Credit Built Form Guide. This guide demonstrates how the urban form policies within the Plan may be achieved and is intended to be used during the design and review of development applications. It divides the Port Credit Community Node into various precincts. Of relevance to this study, the Port Credit Harbour cultural landscape falls within the Harbour Mixed-Use precinct. Section 2.8 of the Guide discusses cultural heritage resources, stating that heritage is an important characteristic of the Port Credit node. It states that the Port Credit Node also contains Cultural Landscapes, of which the Port Credit Harbour and Port Credit Pier are included. The following definition is provided for these landscapes:

“Cultural Landscapes can be defined as a setting which has enhanced a community’s vibrancy, aesthetic, quality, distinctiveness and sense of history or sense of place.”

Corporate Centres

The Corporate Centre Character Areas in Mississauga are identified in Chapter 15 of the Official Plan. Of all the study’s cultural heritage landscapes, Hustler Farm located within the north-west portion of the Meadowvale Business Park Character Area is the only landscape located within a Corporate Centre. For the purpose of this review, the Pearson International Airport cultural heritage landscape area only encompasses the lands north of Highway 401, while the Airport Corporate Centre Character Area applies to only the southern lands. Therefore, only the Airport Special Purpose Area Policies will be discussed as they relate to the airport lands later in this report.

Section 15.4 outlines the Meadowvale Business Park policies as they pertain to the general urban design and land use of the Business Employment Lands. This section does not make any specific mention of Hustler Farm nor does it provide any site-specific policies for the cultural heritage landscape.

Neighbourhoods

Chapter 16 of the Official Plan identifies a total of 23 separate Neighbourhood Character Areas. The cultural heritage landscapes in focus form only a part of the overall Neighbourhood Character Areas, as only 8 of them contain various cultural heritage landscapes under review as part of Phase Two of this study. In general, the policies for the applicable Neighbourhood Character Areas address the character of neighbourhoods in the context of new development or redevelopment within them, requiring an appropriate and compatible transition in built form and density.

Policies of the Neighbourhood Character Areas containing Phase Two of the study's cultural heritage landscapes in focus can be summarized by neighbourhood as follows:

The Hurontario Neighbourhood Character Area contains the Britannia Farm cultural heritage landscape. Section 16.2 recognizes Britannia Farm as a unique feature in the city, owned and operated by the Peel District School Board, and under the Institutional designation. Section 16.12.2.2 states that the cultural heritage landscape, which has maintained its original rural character and is used for agricultural and educational purposes, will be developed in accordance with the Britannia Farm Master Plan. This Plan recommends that the lands be developed for the purposes of education to provide experiences related to farming and the environment, while making use of the historic schoolhouse. The farm is identified as Special Site 1, which outlines permitted uses, proposed transportation additions to allow access to the site, as well as an outline of the implementation process for the development of the master plan.

The Central Erin Mills Neighbourhood contains the Pinchin Farm cultural heritage landscape. Section 16.3 pertaining to the neighbourhood only outlines site specific policies for the area, which do not encompass the cultural heritage landscape.

The Clarkson-Lorne Park Neighbourhood contains the following three cultural heritage landscapes: Benares, the Mississauga Golf and Country Club, and Rattray Marsh (with Rattray Barrier Beach). Section 16.5 outlines the area specific policies for urban design, focusing on compatible infill and replacement development and the maintenance of the established community identity. The policies also outline that the corresponding natural heritage systems should be maintained. These cultural heritage landscapes are not subject to any site-specific policies or requirements.

The Meadowvale Neighbourhood Character Area also contains three of the identified cultural heritage landscapes: Sanford Farm, Lake Aquitaine Park (with Lake Aquitaine), and Lake Wabukayne. Section 16.16 briefly outlines land use and transportation policies for the area which focus on acceptable built form transitions and appropriate use for the area. The section does not make reference to any of the specific cultural heritage landscapes.

The Lakeview Neighbourhood Character Area contains both the Cawthra Estate and Adamson Estate, as well as the Arsenal Lands (including the Water Tower), Lakeview Golf Course, Lakefront Promenade Park (with the Lakefront Promenade Scenic View) and the Bowstring Bridge, now known as Middle Road Bridge, over Etobicoke Creek. This Character Area is subject to the Lakeview Local Area Plan.

The Lakeview Local Area Plan first provides historical context for the area in Section 2, which began in the early 1800s when the community consisted of large family-owned farms. Specific reference is made to the Cawthra-Elliot Estate, which according to the Plan, remains a significant heritage site in the city. The area of Lakeview is noted to have a history of significant industrial and military presence. What is known today as the Arsenal Lands was first purchased in 1935 and Small Arms Limited, a munitions factory, opened in 1940. The Small Arms

Inspection Building was saved in 2009 from demolition by a Lakeview community group. Section 2 also makes further reference to the heritage sites of Lakeview Golf and Country Club (1907), Adamson Estate (1919) and Cawthra-Elliot Estate (1926), which all provide a glance at Lakeview's past as a village community.

Section 7 of the Local Area Plan discusses the value of the environment, stating that the natural system is an important element of the community concept. The Natural Heritage System in Lakeview includes the Cawthra Woods, which is located on the Cawthra Estate cultural heritage landscape, and is one of the city's remaining large, forested areas. These lands consist of Provincially Significant Wetlands (P.S.W.), a Regional Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (A.N.S.I.) and an Environmentally Significant Area (E.S.A.). Section 7 also touches on the importance of golf courses as parks and open space for social interaction and recreation, which relates to the Lakeview Golf Course cultural landscape. Another important feature mentioned is Waterfront Parks, which serve regional wide functions as an important component of the Parks and Open Space System. This section mentions the Lakefront Promenade Park and the proposed park on the Arsenal property, among others. It states that the development of the Arsenal park will include naturalization techniques and connectivity to the future Lakeview Waterfront Connection Project. The general policies related to these open spaces involve their protection and enhancement, encouraging the creation of connections between them, and restoring trees and vegetation which contribute to the character of the area.

Section 8 of the Local Area Plan outlines policies that are intended to protect and enhance the attributes of a complete community within the neighbourhood. Most relevant to this study is Section 8.2, which touches on Cultural Heritage. The plan states that Lakeview contains a number of important cultural heritage resources. First, cultural features serve to provide scenic views and are significant features and landmarks. These include the Water Tower on the Arsenal Lands, Bowstring Bridge over the Etobicoke Creek, and Lakefront Promenade Park. These are all features identified as cultural heritage landscapes within this study as well. The Plan also mentions cultural landscapes, which are associated with the natural environment or are significant historical resources, and include: Lakeview Golf Course, Cawthra Estate, and Adamson Estate. These are also all included as landscapes within this study. This section of the Plan sets out three cultural heritage policies. Policy 8.2.1 states that streetscape improvements are encouraged to accentuate cultural heritage sites through elements such as landscaping, signage, lighting, benches, art, and signs, among others. Policy 8.2.2 mentions that the City will implement a Community Improvement Plan that will seek to incentivize the protection, preservation, and reuse of cultural heritage sites. Policy 8.2.3 states that adjacent development must both integrate and enhance the existing character of heritage resources.

The development of the Arsenal park is specifically touched on in further detail in Section 10.2.1 of the Local Area Plan, identifying it as a Gateway Park. The Plan states that a park master plan will be required, which will seek to adaptively reuse the Small Arms Inspection

Building and will provide placemaking opportunities to encourage community and cultural uses that incorporates open space, the environment, and public art.

The Local Area Plan also specifies Special Site Policies within Section 13. Special Site 1 identifies the lands known as the Cawthra Woods, which includes the Cawthra Estate. The estate houses the Cawthra-Elliot Estate House and formal gardens on the north and south sides of the estate house, the walled garden, and the sugar maple forest. The Plan states that these elements all form a cultural heritage landscape which is designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The site-specific policies allow additional complementary uses and require that development of the Estate House address the environmental policies of the Plan, retain the existing forest in its natural condition, and require development plans to obtain an approved Parks Master Plan, as well as a heritage permit.

Special Site 2 identifies the lands known as the Adamson Estate and Derry Property, which provides policies for additional uses, and the requirement of development on the site to address the restoration and preservation of the historically designated buildings, public access maintenance, the enhancement of recreation opportunities, respect for the existing character and surrounding land uses, servicing requirements, and the conservation of archaeological resources. A heritage permit is also required.

Appendix I to the Local Area Plan contains the 2015 Lakeview Built Form Standards, which provide a further in-depth review of the area, and divides Lakeview down into five precincts (North, Central, South, Lakeshore Corridor, and Employment) and 13 sub-areas, being the smaller defined neighbourhoods. The standards outline built form type, stating that new development must be compatible and enhance the existing character of the area. Further detail is provided based on the types of residential, commercial, and industrial buildings, breaking information down into site-specific building design and size requirements that conform to the character of the area. The standards also highlight the established nature of the pedestrian realm and streetscape, requiring this remain, as well as the encouragement of environmental sustainability.

Of key importance to this study is Section 2.3, Routes, Landmarks and Views. This section states that development must ensure routes and views are maintained and enhanced. Landmarks are recognized as places, building or structures that are recognizable by place and may have historical significance. Figure B40 outlines these features, and identifies Cawthra-Elliot Estate, Lakeview Golf Course, Adamson Estate, Lakefront Promenade Park, the Small Arms Building, and the Lakeview Water Tower, which are all (or part of) cultural heritage landscapes of this study. The Lakefront Promenade is identified as one of the many routes and views. The Built Form Standards document also provides images of all of these features. Section 2.4, Cultural Heritage, defines heritage as an important characteristic of the Local Area Plan. Again, this section states that cultural heritage is to be preserved and that adjacent development respects the existing structures and landscapes. It states that Lakeview contains both Cultural Landscapes and Cultural Features, providing the following definitions for both:

“Cultural Landscapes are defined as a setting that enhance a community's vibrancy, aesthetic quality, distinctiveness, sense of history or sense of place.”

“Cultural Features can be defined as visually distinctive objects and unique places within a cultural landscape. They are not necessarily consistent with their immediate natural surroundings, adjacent landscape, adjacent buildings or structures.”

It is important to note that the *Official Plan* identifies a Major Node Corridor Area enclosed within the Lakeview Neighbourhood which seeks to shape the area into a model sustainable and creative mixed-use community on the waterfront that will include generous open space, cultural and recreational amenities, and employment opportunities. In the future, this may influence the surrounding cultural heritage landscapes, especially the Lakefront Promenade Park directly to the west.

The East Credit Neighbourhood contains the Britannia Hills Golf Course (now known as BraeBen) and Britannia Landfill Site, as well as the Creditview Wetland. Section 16.8 of the *Official Plan* outlines specific urban design policies for Business Employment lands north of Britannia Road West, and transportation policies related to Second Line West, both of which do not apply to the cultural heritage landscape.

The Erindale Neighbourhood Character Area contains both Erindale Park (with Erindale Power Dam Ruin) and the Chappell Estate/Mississauga Garden Park, now known as Riverwood. Chappell Estate/Mississauga Garden Park is identified as Special Site 3, according to Policy 16.9.2.3 which states that the lands are to be developed as part of a City Garden Park which will include display gardens, exhibits, interpretive sites, and buildings linked by a system of trails. The policies allow for additional complementary and appropriately built uses and buildings. Policy 16.9.2.3.2 c) states that the planning and development of Mississauga Garden Park will rely on the approval of the Mississauga Garden Park Master Plan and Implementation Strategy. The Erindale Neighbourhood Character Area policies do not make any specific reference to Erindale Park.

The Streetsville Neighbourhood Character Area contains the Vista Heights Scenic View, looking towards the east and south of the neighbourhood from Britannia Road. The neighbourhood policies of Section 16.24 specifically highlight compatible development in order to maintain and enhance the existing character as a distinct established community. Reference is also made to the protection of heritage resources, which include but are not restricted to properties listed on the City's Heritage Register, in proper keeping with the original character of the resources to be maintained. These policies have a direct impact on the scenic view from Vista Heights.

Employment Areas

Chapter 17 of the *Official Plan* identifies the City's various Employment Character Areas. Out of the eight areas, all five of the cultural heritage landscapes contained within Employment Areas

are located within the Southdown Employment Area. These include the Robertson Farm, Harding Waterfront Estate, C.R.H. Canada Mississauga Cement Plant, Petro-Canada Lubricants, and the Bradley Museum. The Southdown Area is subject to the policies of the Southdown Local Area Plan, under different cover to the *Official Plan*. While the Robertson Farm, C.R.H. Mississauga Cement Plant, Petro-Canada Lubricants, and the Bradley Museum are all mentioned within the Local Area Plan, the Harding Waterfront Estate is not.

The Local Area Plan provides a historical summary and planning context for the area in Sections 3 and 4, both referencing the evolution and importance of the St. Lawrence Cement Company and the Petro Canada Refinery that helped to define the strong industrial character of the Southdown area. According to Section 4, the Employment District was established in 1997, containing industrial and business employment uses. These two sites are mentioned together as major existing industrial operations containing excessive amounts of outdoor storage.

Appendix B to the Plan provides a detailed historical overview, outlining that the area was first settled between 1807 and 1815 through the allotments of large parcels of land by the government for farming purposes. A picture of the Robertson House, situated on the Robertson Farm cultural heritage landscape, is included within Appendix B, describing that it was built on the first grant allotment in 1851. The caption states that today the structure, barn, and farmstead layout still exist, which make up the entire cultural heritage landscape part of this study, at the northeast corner of Winston Churchill Boulevard and Lakeshore Road West. An image of “The Anchorage” 1840 building that was relocated to the Bradley Museum grounds, another cultural heritage landscape, in 1978 is also included.

The establishment of the British American Oil Company and its waterfront refinery in early 1940 transitioned the area to industrial uses. This site eventually came under the ownership of Petro Canada in 1985. Furthermore, the introduction of the St. Lawrence Cement Company in 1950 to the area was a key transitional factor to the area becoming industrialized. According to the Local Area Plan, it is known for its conveyor belt that arcs over Lakeshore Road West, which is a prominent landmark and represents a part of Southdown’s industrial heritage. The Plan states that Southdown has transitioned from a rural farming community to an employment industrial area, with a vision for intensification of manufacturing, research and development, and office uses.

Section 6 of the Southdown Local Area Plan provides an analysis of the built environment of the area, stating that Petro-Canada Lubricants and C.R.H. Canada Mississauga Cement Plant both occupy extensive plots of land, while the rest of the area consists of low-rise buildings consisting of multi-units, as well as office and industrial uses with outdoor property for processing and storage. This section also mentions that the conveyor bridge is a significant component of the landscape of the area.

The Local Area Plan also provides an outline of the general vision for the area to provide for current and future employment uses through a specific urban design strategy and policies

related to land use and transportation. Within Section 9.1 – Community Pattern, the Robertson Farm is mentioned and pictured as an example of agricultural heritage in the area, explaining that it is listed on the City’s Heritage Register as a designated property. The majority of the urban design and land use policies highlight the type of development that should occur that is mindful of the existing streetscape, surrounding buildings, and pedestrian environment.

Special Purpose Areas

Chapter 18 identifies the two Special Purpose Area Character Areas of the *Official Plan*, both of which are identified as cultural heritage landscapes within this study: Pearson International Airport and the University of Toronto Mississauga.

Section 18.2 outlines Pearson International Airport policies pertaining to the recognized impacts of the facility operations, including noise. Land use policies pertaining to airport requirements and future development are also briefly mentioned.

Section 18.3, outlining University of Toronto Mississauga policies explains the site’s location and briefly mentions policies for expansion and conditions of future development. Policy 18.3.2.3 states that development should have regard for the Mississauga Road Scenic Route Policies.

Scenic Routes

Many of the 32 cultural landscapes in focus are found within scenic route corridors: these are the Mississauga Road Scenic Route and the Creditview Road Scenic Route.

Both of these scenic routes fall within a number of “Character Areas” across the city. The Mississauga Road Scenic Route in particular falls within six separate Character Areas, whereas the Creditview Road Scenic Route falls within two separate Character Areas. Nevertheless, there are no specific policies within any of the Character Areas that define the scenic route character of each of these routes.

Section 8.3 of the Official Plan contains a policy that requires any maintenance or physical modification of scenic routes to reinforce or enhance the “scenic route qualities” of the corridor. In addition, section 9.3.3 of the Official Plan contains a policy that highlights the importance of protecting public views of important natural or man-made features along streets and scenic routes since these views add value to the built form and contribute to neighbourhood identity. This policy applies equally to streets that are identified as “scenic routes” and those that are not.

In 2017, the City approved an Official Plan amendment to implement policies pertaining to the Mississauga Road Scenic Route, along with associated design guidelines. The intent of these policies and guidelines is to identify those character defining elements in the private realm that contribute to the identity of Mississauga Road as a scenic route, and to protect and enhance these elements through future development and redevelopment along the corridor. It is our understanding that these policies are currently under appeal, however they are summarized here. Overall, the policies state that properties along Mississauga Road will be subject to the following:

- Limiting development to single detached dwellings, generally on lots with a minimum depth of 40 metres;
- Encouraging direct vehicular access to Mississauga Road;
- Requiring upgraded building elevations;
- Prohibiting buffer roads and reverse lot frontage;
- Limiting increases to existing pavement width;
- Requiring consistent built form in terms of massing, design and setback of dwellings;
- Discouraging projecting garages;
- Encouraging on-site turn-arounds so as to avoid vehicles reversing onto Mississauga Road;
- Requiring tree preservation and enhancement on both public and private property;
- Discouraging the removal of existing landscape features;
- Requiring the location of utilities to minimize the impact on existing vegetation;
- Requiring appropriate grading of properties; and

- Encouraging opportunities to enhance pedestrian and cycling connections, particularly within the Credit River Valley Corridor.

These policies are aimed at preserving the existing character of Mississauga Road, and ensuring that new development continues to maintain those scenic route qualities. There are no such policies applying specifically to the Creditview Road Scenic Route.

Credit River Corridor

Similar to the Scenic Routes, the Credit River Corridor crosses many geographic boundaries within Mississauga, including Character Area boundaries. The Credit River is a feature of many of the 32 cultural heritage landscapes, such as the University of Toronto Mississauga, Pinchin Farm, Riverwood, Sanford Farm, and Erindale Park.

As such, there are many policies that apply to the Credit River Corridor throughout the Official Plan, including the applicable environmental policies. While there are no policies in the Official Plan that refer to the Credit River Corridor as a cultural landscape, there are Special Site policies within various character areas related to the protection of the character of the Credit River Corridor and preserving views to it.

Community-Nominated Areas in the Official Plan

This section includes a summary of applicable policies in the Mississauga Official Plan for each of the community-nominated landscapes which were evaluated during Phase Two of the Study (see Section 3.4.3 for those community-nominated areas which were addressed through a screening process). For Official Plan policies related to cultural landscapes and cultural features identified in the Cultural Landscape Inventory (2005) see Section 2.2.5.

As these areas are currently not identified as cultural heritage landscapes, there are currently no specific policies related to cultural heritage landscapes with respect to these community-nominated landscapes. As such, the following summarizes the applicable Official Plan Green System elements (Schedule 1A), elements of City Structure (Schedule 1B), applicable Corridors (Schedule 1C), Character Areas (Schedule 9) and Land Use Designations (Schedule 10), as well as key policies that may highlight unique elements of character that are currently in effect for each of the community-nominated landscapes.

Applewood Acres

Applewood Acres is a large neighbourhood area that was established in the 1950s, generally bordered by Queen Elizabeth Way to the south, The Queensway East to the north, Cawthra Road to the west and Dixie Road to the east. Historically, the area was used as an orchard until its development as a post-Second World War subdivision.

As illustrated on Schedule 1A of the Official Plan, there are portions of the City's Green System interspersed throughout this area.

The structure of the City's urban system, according to Schedule 1B of the Official Plan, identifies Applewood Acres as a "Neighbourhood". The east and west edges of the community, along Cawthra Road and Dixie Road, are identified as "Corridors" on Schedule 1C of the Official Plan. Corridors are identified as important elements of the public realm, serving as important links between communities, and are generally meant to accommodate a mix of uses at greater densities, but compatible with the character or element of City structure that they are located within.

Schedule 10 of the Official Plan identifies the City's Land Use Designations. This designates the majority of the Applewood Acres Neighbourhood as "Residential Low Density 1", permitting low-rise residential building types including single detached, semi-detached, and duplex dwellings.

Schedule 9 of the Official Plan identifies the various character areas within the city. Applewood Acres is located within the north-western corner of the Lakeview Neighbourhood Character Area, which is subject to the Lakeview Local Area Plan. The Lakeview Local Area Plan provides historical context for the area in Section 2, which began in the early 1800s when the community consisted of large family-owned farms. Specific reference is made to Applewood Acres, which according to the Plan, was developed as a new subdivision in 1950 when the Lakeview area was transforming from a rural area into a suburban landscape with land used for industrial, residential, commercial and public spaces.

According to Section 5.2.2, Applewood Acres, along with Sherway West, are the two smaller neighbourhoods/subareas that make up the North Residential Neighbourhood Precinct. According to the Plan, these areas consist predominantly of detached housing, with several schools serving the area.

Desirable urban form for the area is discussed in Section 10 of the Plan, with Section 10.1.2 providing detail on the North Residential Neighbourhood Precinct for Applewood Acres and Sherway West. This area is to be maintained while allowing for infill which enhances and is compatible with the character of the area.

Appendix I to the Local Area Plan contains the 2015 Lakeview Built Form Standards, which provides further in-depth policies for the area. This document divides Lakeview into 5 different precincts (North, Central, South, Lakeshore Corridor and Employment) and 13 sub-areas, being the smaller defined neighbourhoods. Applewood Acres is identified as a Neighbourhood Sub-Area within the North Residential Precinct.

The standards outline built form type, stating that new development must be compatible and enhance the existing character of the area. Further detail is provided based on the types of residential, commercial, and industrial buildings, breaking information down into site-specific

building design and size requirements that conform to the character of the area. The standards also highlight the established nature of the pedestrian realm and streetscape, requiring this to remain, as well as the encouragement of environmental sustainability.

Section 2.3 of the Built Form Standards identifies Routes, Landmarks and Views. This section states that development must ensure routes and views are maintained and enhanced. Figure B40 outlines these features and identifies the Queensway Hydro Corridor and the Applewood Junction Corridor, which both run east-west through the Applewood Acres neighbourhood.

Clarkson Road (Benares to Bradley Museum)

The neighbourhood running north and south of Lakeshore Road East along Clarkson Road is identified as a largely residential area with many old homes, churches, cemeteries and some schools. This neighbourhood was established around 1850 and generally runs south from the Benares Historic House to the Bradley Museum.

According to Schedule 1A, there are portions of the City's Green System interspersed throughout this area. Schedule 1B identifies the majority of this area as a "Neighbourhood", and the areas passing Lakeshore Road West as "Community Node".

This neighbourhood along Clarkson Road runs parallel to the nearby Southdown Road "Corridor" to the east and passes over the Lakeshore Road East "Corridor" to the north and south, as illustrated in Schedule 1C. According to Schedule 10, the majority of this neighbourhood is designated Residential Low Density I and Residential Low Density II. The Residential Low Density I designation permits low-rise residential building types including single detached, semi-detached and duplex dwellings, whereas the Residential Low Density II designation permits those same dwelling types, as well as triplexes, street townhouses and other forms of low-rise dwellings with individual street frontages.

In keeping with Schedule 1B, the majority of the area is located within the Clarkson-Lorne Park Neighbourhood, and a portion of the area is located within the Clarkson Village Community Node that runs along Lakeshore Road, as identified on Schedule 9. The policies for the Clarkson Village Community Node are outlined in Section 14.2 of the Official Plan and those for the Clarkson-Lorne Park Neighbourhood are outlined in Section 16.5. The Clarkson Village Community Node policies of Section 14.2 address specific requirements for development, related to the various precincts within the village and identifying development standards related to permitted uses, built form, parking and other matters. The Clarkson-Lorne Park Neighbourhood Character Area policies of Section 16.5 contain urban design policies for infill housing, focusing on compatible infill and replacement development and the maintenance of the established community identity.

Credit Grove

The Credit Grove neighbourhood area was established in 1912 and is located near downtown Port Credit. It is generally bordered by the C.N. Railway to the north, Lakeshore Road East to the south, Seneca Avenue to the east and Rosewood Avenue to the west. The dense area consists of mature trees, houses, and schools, with prevailing architecture styles from 1912 to 1914 of mostly revivalist and bungalow styles. This area has been described as an early bedroom community for commuters to Toronto.

There are small portions of the City's Green System located within Credit Grove according to Schedule 1A. Schedule 1B of the Official Plan identifies the area as a "Neighbourhood". Additionally, Credit Grove is located adjacent to the Port Credit "Community Node". According to Schedule 1C, the east edge of Credit Grove is identified as the Hurontario Street "Intensification Corridor" and the south edge as the Lakeshore Road East "Corridor". Over time, intensification Corridors are intended to function as attractive, mixed use areas, accommodating development at transit-supportive densities. The majority of Credit Grove is identified as Residential Low Density II, according to Schedule 10 of the Official Plan, permitting low-rise residential building types including single detached, semi-detached and duplex dwellings, as well as triplexes, street townhouses and other forms of low-rise dwellings with individual street frontages.

Schedule 9 of the Plan illustrates that this area is located within the East Port Credit Neighbourhood. This Neighbourhood is subject to the Port Credit Local Area Plan.

Applicable to this area, Section 10.3 of the Local Area Plan outlines Neighbourhood Character Areas. Section 10.3.4 identifies Credit Grove as one of two precincts that make up the North Residential Neighbourhood, with Shawnmarr/Indian Heights being the other. The Plan describes that these predominately stable residential areas will be maintained while allowing for infill which is compatible with and enhances the character of the area. Section 10.3.4.1 states that the predominant characteristics of these areas will be preserved including:

- low-rise building heights;
- the combination of small building masses on small lots;
- the well landscaped streetscapes; and
- the regular street grid.

Appendix I to the Local Area Plan contains the 2013 Port Credit Built Form Guide. This guide reiterates the same built form policies for the North Residential Precinct as the Local Area Plan.

Gordon Woods

Gordon Woods is a dense, pre-1950s neighbourhood area, located south-west of Hurontario Street and The Queensway West, north of the QEW and the Mineola neighbourhood. It consists of large properties with primarily single detached dwellings, lush trees and long driveways, with no curbs, gutters or sidewalks, giving the area a “country-feel”.

The neighbourhood of Gordon Woods has an expansive Green System that occupies the majority of the area according to Schedule 1A. Gordon Woods is identified as a “Neighbourhood,” and is located to the west of the “Downtown” area, as outlined in Schedule 1B. According to Schedule 1C, the neighbourhood is located directly to the west of the Hurontario Street “Intensification Corridor”.

According to Schedule 10, the majority of Gordon Woods is designated “Residential Low Density I”, permitting low-rise residential building types including single detached, semi-detached and duplex dwellings. Schedule 9 illustrates that Gordon Woods is located within the Cooksville Neighbourhood (West). The Neighbourhood policies for all of Cooksville are outlined within Section 16.6 of the Official Plan. Despite the permission for semi-detached and duplex dwellings in the Residential Low Density I designation, policy 16.6.1.1 states that only single detached dwellings will be permitted within the area bound by Hurontario Street, the Q.E.W., Stavebank Road and The Queensway (the Gordon Woods neighbourhood). Much of Gordon Woods is within Special Site 4 (Section 16.6.5.4.1) which states that the predominant characteristics of these areas will be preserved including:

- generous front, rear, and side yard setbacks;
- landscaping and natural features;
- existing grades and drainage conditions; and
- existing high-quality trees.

Additionally,

- new housing is to fit the scale and character of the surrounding development and take advantage of the features of a particular site;
- garages should be recessed or be located behind the main face of the house, or in the rear of the property;
- new development will have a minimal impact on adjacent development;
- buildings will be encouraged to be one to two storeys in height; and
- hard surface areas in the front yard are to be less than half of the front yard.

Hancock Woodlands Park

Hancock Woodlands Park is located on Camilla Road between The Queensway and the Q.E.W. Starting in 1931 the site was used as a commercial nursery. In 2018, it was opened as a City Park.

As illustrated in Schedule 1A, Hancock Woodlands Park is located entirely within the City's Green System. Schedule 1B identifies the park as a "Neighbourhood". Schedule 10 of the Official Plan designates the site Public Open Space and Greenlands.

Hancock Woodlands Park is located within the Cooksville Neighbourhood (East), according to Schedule 9. Policies for this neighbourhood are outlined in Section 16.6 of the Official Plan. Hancock Woodlands Park is not directly addressed within these policies.

Jack Darling Memorial Park

Jack Darling Memorial Park is a large waterfront park opened in 1970 with playgrounds, gardens, trees, and recreational amenities. Additionally, the site is home to the Lorne Park Water Treatment Facility. The park is located at 1180 Lakeshore Road West.

As illustrated in Schedule 1a, Jack Darling Memorial Park is located entirely within the City's Green System. Schedule 1B identified the park as a "Neighbourhood." Schedule 10 of the Official Plan designates the site Public Open Space, Greenlands, and Utility.

Meadowvale West

Meadowvale West is a neighbourhood developed in the 1970s, consisting largely of residential houses and several parks. It is located at Winston Churchill Boulevard and Derry Road.

According to Schedule 1A, it has various elements of the City's Green System interspersed throughout the area. According to Schedule 1B, the area is identified as a "Neighbourhood". Schedule 10 designates the various portions of the neighbourhood differently. The edges of this community are designated Residential Low Density II, with a mixture of Residential Medium Density, Greenlands and Public Open Space clustered within the middle of the area.

As illustrated in Schedule 1C, the neighbourhood is located along the Churchill Boulevard "Corridor" to the west. The Derry Road "Corridor" runs east-west through the area. Corridors are identified as important elements of the public realm, serving as important links between communities, and are generally meant to accommodate a mix of uses at greater densities, but compatible with the character of element of city structure that they are located within.

The Meadowvale West neighbourhood is located within the Meadowvale Neighbourhood, as illustrated within Schedule 9 of the Official Plan. Policies for the Meadowvale Neighbourhood are briefly outlined in Section 16.16 of the Official Plan, touching on land use and transportation policies for the area which focus on acceptable built form transitions and

appropriate use for the area. The section does not make specific reference to Meadowvale West.

Mineola East

Mineola East is a large, pre-1950s neighbourhood located south of the Q.E.W., east of Hurontario Street, west of Cawthra Road and north of the C.N. Railway. The neighbourhood features a mix of large old and new residential homes and mature trees. Most streets in the neighbourhood do not have any sidewalks.

According to Schedule 1A, large segments of the City's Green System are interspersed throughout the neighbourhood. Mineola East is identified as a "Neighbourhood" within Schedule 1B. As outlined on Schedule 1C, the west and north-western edge of the community is bordered by the Hurontario Street "Intensification Corridor". The eastern edge is bordered by the Cawthra Road "Corridor". Corridors are identified as important elements of the public realm, serving as important links between communities, and are generally meant to accommodate a mix of uses at greater densities, but compatible with the character of the city structure that they are located within. Schedule 10 designates the majority of Mineola East as both Residential Low Density I and Residential Low Density II. The Residential Low Density I designation permits low-rise residential building types including single detached, semi-detached and duplex dwellings, whereas the Residential Low Density II designation permits those same dwelling types, as well as triplexes, street townhouses and other forms of low-rise dwellings with individual street frontages.

Schedule 9 of the Official Plan illustrates that the entirety of the Mineola East area is within the Mineola Neighbourhood. Neighbourhood policies for Mineola are outlined in Section 16.18 of the Official Plan. Mineola East is not specifically referenced within this Section, however certain policies apply for development and redevelopment, including urban design policies for infill housing, generally recognizing that development and redevelopment should be compatible with the scale and siting of dwellings in the neighbourhood, as well promoting additional tree planting along Mineola Road itself, and maintaining the open ditch roads as they contribute to the character of the area.

Toronto Golf Club

This location of the Toronto Golf Club was established in 1912, located between Dixie Road and the Etobicoke Creek, described as having a beautiful natural setting along the Etobicoke Creek. The course was designed by well-known English golf course architect H.S. Colt. This course is located adjacent to the Lakeview Golf Course, which is located on the west side of Dixie Road.

The Toronto Golf Club is located entirely within the City's Green System, as illustrated in Schedule 1A. Schedule 1B identifies the Golf Club as a "Neighbourhood". According to Schedule 1C, the Dundas Street West "Intensification Corridor" borders the north of the site, however it

is not within the Intensification Corridor itself. Schedule 10 of the Official Plan designates the entire Toronto Golf Club Site as Private Open Space.

Schedule 9 outlines that the Golf Club is located within the Lakeview Neighbourhood, which is subject to the policies of the Lakeview Local Area Plan. While the Toronto Golf Club is not specifically referenced within the Local Area Plan, Section 3 – Current Context, describes that cultural and heritage resources of the area include cultural landscapes associated with scenic parks and golf courses. Section 7 of the Plan also touches on the importance of golf courses as parks and open space for social interaction and recreation.

Appendix I to the Local Area Plan contains the 2015 Lakeview Built Form Standards, which provide a further in-depth review of the area. Section 2.3 of the document identifies Routes, Landmarks and Views. This section states that development must ensure routes and views are maintained and enhanced. Figure B40 outlines these features and identifies the Toronto Golf Club as a Landmark.

Summary of Community-Nominated Areas in the Official Plan

There is a common theme throughout the various Character Area policies to preserve and protect the important defining elements that contribute to the identity of each Character Area. Many of these policies are fairly broad and high-level, requiring development to be generally compatible with existing built form and to preserve views. In some cases, the policies are more specific, requiring development to respect the historic and open space elements that help to define character.

Appendix C: Screening Results

Screening Results

Site	2005 Inventory or Community Nominated	Screening Results
Agricultural lands along Creditview Road, south of Old Derry Road	Community Nominated	Sanford Farm is already designated under Part IV of the O.H.A. and considered a Significant C.H.L.
BraeBen Golf Course	2005 Inventory	While included on the Cultural Landscape Inventory (2005), the property has a recent date of construction and is an Area of Interest.
Bridge along Culham Trail and/or trail itself	Community Nominated	Integrated into Credit River Corridor C.H.L.
Confederation Bridge over 403	Community Nominated	Screened out based on nature of comment which was focused more on having the lighting on the bridge operational.
Danville Park	Community Nominated	The property has a recent date of construction.
Etobicoke Creek	Community Nominated	Not recommended for further study as part of this project. Etobicoke Creek forms much of the eastern boundary of the City of Mississauga and is a waterway which has potential cultural heritage value or interest. The creek is currently protected under the Conservation Authority. This potential should be further explored in coordination with the City of Toronto in recognition of its cross-municipality location.

Site	2005 Inventory or Community Nominated	Screening Results
Goodwin Road, Montbeck Road, Byngmount Road	Community Nominated	Review of aerial mapping and Google streetview suggests that much of the identified military housing of potential significance in this area has been replaced by new builds. Field survey confirmed.
J.C. Saddington Park	Community Nominated	Park protected under Part V of the O.H.A. as part of the Old Port Credit H.C.D.
Kindree Cemetery	Community Nominated	Protected under Part IV of the O.H.A.
Lakeside Park	Community Nominated	The property has a recent date of construction.
Lakeview Generation Plant	Community Nominated	Determined to be demolished.
Lisgar	Community Nominated	The area has a recent date of construction. There are little remnants of the historical village of Lisgar.
Lorne Woods	Community Nominated	Screened out during field survey.
Osprey Marsh	Community Nominated	The property has a recent date of construction with vast change occurring between 1992 and 1997.

Site	2005 Inventory or Community Nominated	Screening Results
St. Peter's Mission Church	Community Nominated	Based on review of historical mapping/aerials the area surrounding this property has been significantly altered with the historical connection to the agricultural landscape completely removed. Not recommended for further evaluation as a potential Significant C.H.L. The property itself may have cultural heritage value or interest which would be best protected under Part IV of the O.H.A.
Trail Network along Fletchers Creek	Community Nominated	The property has a recent date of construction.
Vista Heights Scenic View	2005 Inventory	Fieldwork found that this point offers some views of the city however evaluation as a potential Significant C.H.L. is not recommended. The view may be protected through other planning mechanisms.

Appendix D: Mississauga: A Thematic History

This thematic history broadly covers the area that is now the City of Mississauga. Section 1.0 discusses the city's physiographic landforms. Section 2.0 focuses on Indigenous history and settlement, with attention paid to both the pre- and post-contact periods. Section 3.0 highlights nineteenth-century settlement patterns and provides concise information about important themes during this era, including immigration, agriculture, industry, transportation, and culture. Section 4.0 continues to discuss these key themes and trends during the twentieth century. Section 6.0 provides several maps of both the former Toronto Township and the City of Mississauga between 1877 and 2019.

The thematic history is designed to provide a broad overview of several key themes and developments that occurred in the lands now within the borders of the City of Mississauga with specific emphasis on understanding the development and context of the cultural landscapes and cultural features identified in the 2005 Inventory.

1.0 Physiography

Several different landforms are found in southern Ontario, the result of thousands of years of glacial deposits. In *The Physiography of Southern Ontario*, L.J. Chapman and D.F. Putnam demarcate 55 physiographic regions in the province (Chapman and Putnam 1984). Parts of Mississauga are found within two of these regions: the Iroquois Plain and the Peel Plain.

The Iroquois Plain physiographic region of Southern Ontario is a lowland region bordering Lake Ontario. This region is characteristically flat, formed by lacustrine deposits laid down by the inundation of Lake Iroquois, a body of water that existed during the late Pleistocene, a period from c. 130,000 to c. 11,700 years ago. This region extends from the Trent River, around the western part of Lake Ontario, to the Niagara River, spanning roughly 300 kilometres. The old shorelines of Lake Iroquois include cliffs, bars, beaches, and boulder pavements while its old sandbars are good aquifers that have historically supplied water to nearby farms and villages (Chapman and Putnam 1984).

Moving further inland, the Peel Plain is a level-to-undulating area of clay soil which covers an area of approximately 77,700 hectares across the central portions of the York, Peel, and Halton Regions. The Peel Plain has a general elevation of between 150 and 230 metres (500 and 750 feet) above sea level with a gradual uniform slope towards Lake Ontario. Through Mississauga, this plain has several deep valleys created by the Credit River and Etobicoke Creek. Spread over the surface of the Peel Plain is shale and limestone till, which in many places is veneered by occasionally varved clay. This clay is heavy in texture and more calcareous than the underlying till and was presumably deposited by meltwater from limestone regions into a temporary lake

impounded by higher ground and the ice lobe of the Lake Ontario basin (Chapman and Putnam 1984).

The Peel Plain was once home to large swathes of trees, including beech, basswood, sugar maple, white oak, and white pine in the well-draining areas and white ash, white cedar, and elm in the depressional areas. However, most of these trees were cut down when large-scale settlement began in the first half of the nineteenth century. Nearly all the hardwood forest was exhausted by mid-century, giving way to farms. The region does not possess any good aquifers and the high level of evaporation from the clay's now deforested surface is a disabling factor in ground-water recharge. Further, deep groundwater accessed by boring is often found to be saline. Nevertheless, where there is good surface drainage, the soil has proven to be very productive (Chapman and Putnam 1984).

2.0 Indigenous History and Settlement

Like the rest of southern Ontario, the City of Mississauga has a cultural history which begins approximately 13,000 years ago, or 11,000 Before the Common Era (B.C.E.) and continues to the present (Ferris 2013). As there tends to be less widespread awareness of the depth of pre-contact settlement history, or general knowledge of the societies that inhabited Ontario prior to the onset of Euro-Canadian settlement, a brief review of the pre-contact history of the area is necessary in order to provide an understanding of the various natural and cultural forces that have operated to create the archaeological sites that are found today. While many types of information can inform the pre-contact settlement history of the City of Mississauga, this section, especially those dealing with the earliest history, provides information drawn from archaeological research conducted in southern Ontario over the last century. As such, the terminology used in this review—including the terms “pre-contact” and “post-contact”—relate to standard archaeological terminology for the province rather than relating to specific historical events within the region. The chronological ordering of this review of the study area's pre-contact history is made with respect to two temporal referents: Before Common Era (B.C.E.) and Common Era (C.E.).

2.1 Paleo Period (c. 11,000-9,000 B.C.E.)

While the entry of Paleo period hunting bands into Ontario has not been accurately dated, it is thought that they arrived sometime after the draining of several large meltwater lakes which isolated southern Ontario (Ellis and Deller 1990).

Given the tundra-like or taiga-like environment which prevailed during this period and the location of their hunting camps, it is postulated that their economy focused on the hunting of large Pleistocene mammals such as mastodon, moose, elk, and especially caribou. Of particular interest in this regard is the frequent location of Paleo period sites adjacent to the strand lines of large post-glacial lakes. This settlement pattern has been attributed to the strategic placement of camps to intercept migrating caribou herds.

The traditional view of Paleo period groups' reliance almost exclusively on large game has been modified somewhat, as it has become more apparent that smaller game and fish were also important dietary contributors (Storck 1988). It may be that their subsistence practices were more flexible and broadly based than previously assumed. Site locations at topographic breaks along the Glacial Lake Iroquois strandline may also indicate equal interest in the natural resources available in both the upland and lowland zones. Whether groups were dependent on the constantly moving herds or on less communal species during this period, these subsistence strategies would have necessitated that social groups remained relatively small and egalitarian. These highly mobile bands probably moved in seasonal patterns throughout very large territories, establishing small camps for only brief periods of time, although they may have been re-occupied on a seasonal basis.

Evidence concerning Paleo period peoples is very limited since populations were not large and since little of the sparse material culture of these nomadic hunters has survived the millennia. Virtually all that remains are the tools and by-products of their chipped stone industry, the hallmark being large, fluted spear points, including the Gainey, Barnes, and Crowfield types. Fluted points are distinctive in that they have channels or grooves parallel to their long axis and usually on both faces of the tool. These grooves are created by the removal of long, thin, singular flakes from the base of the point. During this period, there was a marked preference for lithic raw materials derived directly from bedrock outcrops, over secondary sources such as glacial till. Paleo period populations throughout much of southwestern and southcentral Ontario obtained toolstone from the Collingwood and Beaver Valley areas, where Fossil Hill Formation cherts were quarried extensively (Ellis and Deller 1990).

2.2 Archaic Period (c. 9,000-1,000 B.C.E.)

The Archaic period is commonly divided into three sub-periods: Early Archaic period (c. 9,000-6,000 B.C.E.), Middle Archaic period (c. 6,000-2,500 B.C.E.), and Late Archaic period (c. 2,500-1,000 B.C.E.).

The transition from the Paleo period to the subsequent Archaic period occurred at about the same time that deciduous forest was beginning to cover southern Ontario. Few Early or Middle Archaic period sites have been investigated and they, like Paleo period sites, are often identified based on the recovery of isolated projectile points. Paleo-environmental data suggest that a mixed forest cover had been established in Ontario by c. 9,000 B.C.E. and that the nomadic hunter-gatherers of this period hunted deer, moose and other animals, as well as fish and some plant resources, still moving relatively large distances during the year. The landscape in which these people lived continued to change, with much lower water levels in the Great Lakes and the expansion of more temperate forests. Over the following millennia, technological and cultural change is evident in the wide variety of tools produced, which in turn are reflections of the shifts in hunting strategies necessitated by a constantly evolving environment.

The Early Archaic witnessed a change in lithic procurement practices, as a wider range of chert sources were used, with an emphasis on secondary sources rather than a few distant primary deposits. The lithic tool kit became increasingly dominated by small disposable tools and for the first time, heavy wood working tools manufactured from stone are evident (Ellis et al. 1990).

During the Middle Archaic period, many of the artifact types considered characteristic of the Archaic period first appear in quantity. These include netsinkers and ornate ground stone items such as bannerstones. Raw materials used in the production of flaked and ground stone tools were increasingly limited to locally available material. In southeastern Ontario, a number of sites dating to the Middle Archaic period have yielded evidence of the use of copper to produce a range of decorative and prosaic items, and also boasted a wide array of ground stone tool forms (Ellis et al. 1990).

By about 3,000 B.C.E., there is evidence for increased population levels within smaller areas exploited during the annual round. Sites were larger and occupied for longer periods of time, at least in areas characterized by more stable and productive natural environments. Despite a reduction in territory size on the part of individual hunter-gatherer communities, long-range exchange remained important to at least those communities in eastern Ontario that produced items made of copper (Ellis et al. 1990).

By the Late Archaic period, hunter-gatherer bands had likely settled into familiar hunting territories. Their annual round of travel likely involved occupation of two major types of sites. Small inland camps, occupied by small communities of related families during the fall and winter, were situated to harvest nuts and to hunt the deer that also browsed in the forests, and which congregated in cedar swamps during the winter. Larger spring and summer settlements located near river mouths were places where many families came together to exploit rich aquatic resources such as spawning fish, to trade, and to bury their dead, sometimes with elaborate mortuary ceremonies and offerings (Ellis et al. 1990; Ellis et al. 2009).

2.3 Woodland Period (c. 1,000 B.C.E.-1650 C.E.)

The Woodland period is divided into four sub-periods: Early Woodland (1,000-400 B.C.E.), Middle Woodland (400 B.C.E.-600 C.E.), Transitional Woodland (600-1000 C.E.) and Late Woodland (1000-1650 C.E.). Moreover, the Late Woodland period is further subdivided into Early (1000-1300 C.E.), Middle (1300-1400 C.E.), and Late (1400-1649 C.E.) stages, reflecting major changes in settlement-subsistence patterns and inferred socio-political dynamics. While a large diversity of lifeways and social organization has been observed archaeologically throughout the province during this period, this brief summary focuses on the archaeological interpretation of sites along the north shore of Lake Ontario during this period. For this reason, much of the patterns described relate to what was historically documented amongst Wendat (Huron) and Hatiwendaronk (Neutral) societies.

The Early Woodland period differed little from the previous Late Archaic period with respect to settlement-subsistence pursuits. On the other hand, this period is marked by the introduction of ceramics into Ontario and may be characterized as a time of increasing social or community identity. This latter attribute is especially evident in changes to, and elaboration of, mortuary ceremonialism.

The analyses of Early Woodland period cemeteries have provided evidence of ritual burial behaviour such as the application of large quantities of symbolically important red ochre to human remains. In addition, these cemeteries often contain grave offerings of art indicative of prevailing social and spiritual perspectives. Much of this art is often fabricated from exotic raw materials such as native copper from the western end of Lake Superior and, as in the case of certain ground slate figurines, it often displayed a considerable investment of time and artistic skill. Moreover, the nature and variety of these exotic grave goods suggest that members of the community outside of the immediate family of the deceased were contributing mortuary offerings. Thus, social integration during the Early Woodland period appears to have increased and expanded relative to earlier times (Spence et al. 1990).

The Middle Woodland period similarly represents a continuation of an earlier lifestyle with certain notable changes. For example, in some areas of Ontario the influences of complex societies based in the Ohio Valley are exhibited, especially in the realm of mortuary ceremonialism. Most notable are the burial mounds constructed in the vicinity of Rice Lake (Spence et al. 1990). Similar monuments are known to have been built along the shore of Lake Ontario between Burlington Bay and Twenty Mile Creek.

While earlier subsistence regimes continued to be practiced, the end of this period witnessed the beginnings of profound changes to ancestral Wendat and Hatiwendaronk communities due to increased utilization of horticultural crops (particularly corn) that were introduced to southern Ontario through interaction with communities living south of the Great Lakes. This incipient agriculture of the Transitional Woodland period (Birch and Williamson 2013:13–15) also seems to have led to a re-orientation in settlement patterns for some areas, as sites which

appear to have been more intensively occupied and subject to a greater degree of internal spatial organization were increasingly located on terraces overlooking the floodplains of large rivers.

The Late Woodland period continued the revolutionary changes in the settlement-subsistence regime of many of the Indigenous peoples and communities in southern Ontario. From the beginning of the Late Woodland period (approximately 1000 C.E.), lifeways became more similar to that described in early historical documents for the Wendat, Hatiwendaronk, and Tionontaté (Petun). Between approximately 1000-1300 C.E., the communal site was replaced by the village focused on horticulture. Seasonal dispersal of the community for hunting, fishing and collecting over a wider territory and more varied resource base was still practised (Williamson 1990:317). By 1300-1400 C.E., this episodic community dispersal was no longer practised and populations now communally occupied sites throughout the year (Dodd et al. 1990:343). From 1400-1649 C.E. this process continued with the coalescence of these small villages into larger communities (Birch and Williamson 2013). Through this process, the socio-political organization of the Wendat, Hatiwendaronk, and Tionontaté, as described historically by the French explorers who first visited southern Ontario, was developed.

Early stage Late Woodland society (1000-1300 C.E.) in the region is best viewed as a continuation of the important transitional stage between Middle Woodland hunting and gathering society and later, fully agrarian society (Williamson 1990). Villages tended to be small, palisaded compounds with longhouses—large (30 m long, 7 m wide, and 7 m high) wooden house structures constructed by covering a cedar sapling frame with large sheets of elm and cedar bark. These structures are assumed to have usually housed a single matrilineage — a woman, her daughters, and their families. These extended families formed the basis of community socio-political organization and, to a lesser extent, intercommunity integration. While villages were typically located on sandy soils to facilitate corn horticulture, camps and hamlets were often strategically placed to continue with the exploitation of traditional food resources. Indeed, while corn appears to have been an important dietary component at this time, its role was more of a supplement than that of a staple.

By approximately 1300 C.E., a noticeable change is seen in the archaeological record where sites show an increased reliance on corn-bean-squash agriculture and a more fully integrated village political system based on extended kinship (Dodd et al. 1990). Widespread similarities in pottery and smoking pipe styles also point to increasing levels of intercommunity communication and integration.

In many cases, it appears that southern Ontario communities may have coalesced at the beginning of the fourteenth century precipitating these dramatic changes in the economic, social, and political spheres that mark the onset of this period. While there is not yet substantial evidence, it would also seem that villages and village networks were in conflict with each other, and/or together against Anishinaabeg groups in the region. Whatever the causal factors, some villages became more heavily palisaded and some household groups (and longhouses) became

larger. These developments may also have been due, in part, to a general increase in population over Middle Woodland period levels.

Settlement and subsistence patterns appear to have stabilized by the beginning of the fifteenth century, marking the late stage of the Late Woodland period. The most noticeable changes occurred in the socio-political system. Indeed, by the fifteenth century, certain village households became larger and more variable in membership than others within the same community. This trend peaked around the turn of the fifteenth century with some ancestral Hatiwendaronk longhouses reaching lengths of over 120 metres with three or more extensions evident. Some ancestral Wendat and Hatiwendaronk villages attained a size of over four hectares. This trend may reflect changes in the fortunes and solidarity of dominant lineages within villages and/or the movement of families between allied communities (Birch and Williamson 2013). During the sixteenth century, however, longhouses became more regular in size, perhaps as clans became more important than lineages. Clans are groups in which membership is defined by kinship through one parent and which provide mutual security, governance, marriage regulation through exogamy and social institutions, religion and ceremonies, property regulation, and social control. The members of a clan often trace descent to an original ancestor, often a mythical figure or animal. Since clan membership cuts across related communities, this aspect of kinship was an important source of tribal integration. When European explorers and missionaries arrived in Ontario at the beginning of the seventeenth century, villages were under the direction of various chiefs elected from the principal clans. In turn, these villages were allied within powerful tribal confederacies.

2.4 Post-contact Period

By about 1600, most, if not all, of the Lake Ontario north shore communities had moved from Lake Ontario northward, joining with other communities in Simcoe County to form the Tionontaté (Petun) and Wendat (Huron), or westward to join other ancestral groups of the Hatiwendaronk (Neutral), who were situated around the west end of Lake Ontario and in the Niagara Peninsula.² These communities are the ancestors to the present-day Haudenosaunee,

² At the time of contact with Europeans, the Niagara Peninsula was peopled by the “Neutral Nation” (*Gens Neutral*), a term coined by the French, in reference to the fact that this group took no part in the long-term conflicts between the people of the Wendat Confederacy of Simcoe County and the Haudenosaunee in New York. The Wendat referred to the Neutral as *Hatiwendaronk*, meaning “peoples of a slightly different language.” Conversely, the Neutral used the same term to refer to the Wendat. Unfortunately, none of the contemporary documents mention the term that the Neutral used to refer to themselves collectively. Although we do know the names of three Neutral communities from the *Jesuit Relations*, there is no known word comparable to the word Wendat that would indicate that the Neutral recognised themselves as a confederation of individual tribes. The term “Neutral” is an artifact

Huron-Wendat and Wyandot Nations. At the time of European contact in the early seventeenth century, the Anishinaabeg³ territory was a vast area extending from the east shore of Georgian Bay, and the north shore of Lake Huron, to the northeast shore of Lake Superior and into the upper peninsula of Michigan (Rogers 1978:760). Individual bands were politically autonomous and numbered several hundred people. These communities were highly mobile, with a subsistence economy that was based on hunting, fishing, gathering of wild plants, and garden farming (Rogers 1978:760). While the movement of communities likely took place over many generations, the final impetus was conflict with the Haudenosaunee (Five Nations Confederacy) of what is now the state of New York.⁴ These wars, exacerbated by the deleterious effects of the intrusion of Europeans (most notably the spread of epidemic diseases), resulted in the dispersal of the Wendat, Petun, and Hatiwendaronk confederacies of southern Ontario and many of their Anishinaabeg allies who occupied inland territories near the southern limits of the Canadian Shield during this period. These events, combined with periods of starvation through the mid-and-late seventeenth century, contributed to population reductions among all Indigenous peoples in the region. Those who survived were often freely adopted into remaining communities. By 1650 the Haudenosaunee had destroyed, dispersed, and adopted most of the remnant members of these former Nations. Population dislocation, migrations, community fission and amalgamation of formerly independent groups, and shifting territories further complicate the picture.

During this period, the Haudenosaunee established a series of settlements at strategic locations along the long-established communication and trade routes inland from the north shore of Lake Ontario. The Haudenosaunee farmed, hunted, and trapped beaver which they traded primarily with the English but also initially had friendly relations with the French. From east to west, these Haudenosaunee villages consisted of Ganneious, on Napanee Bay, an arm of the Bay of Quinte; Quinte, near the isthmus of the Quinte Peninsula; Ganaraske, at the mouth of the Ganaraska River; Quintio, at the mouth of the Trent River on the north shore of Rice Lake; Ganestiquiagon, near the mouth of the Rouge River; Teiaiaagon, near the mouth of the Humber

of the European explorers, a name which poorly describes their position vis à vis surrounding Wendat, Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabeg peoples. Moreover, it implies a level of political unity equivalent to the Wendat or Haudenosaunee confederacies, which may be inaccurate.

³ “Anishinaabeg” (also Anishnaubeg, Anishnaabek, Nishnaabeg) is a collective term used for the Algonquian-speaking groups of the upper Great Lakes such as the Mississauga, Ojibwa, Chippewa, and Odawa.

⁴ The Haudenosaunee are also known as the New York Iroquois or Five Nations Iroquois and after 1722 Six Nations Iroquois. They were a confederation of five distinct but related nations: the Seneca, Onondaga, Cayuga, Oneida, and Mohawk. Each lived in individual territories in what is now known as the Finger Lakes district of Upper New York. In 1722, the Tuscarora joined the confederacy.

River; and Quinaouatoua, on the portage between the western end of Lake Ontario and the Grand River. Ganestiquiagon, Teiaigon, and Quinaouatoua were primarily Seneca; Ganaraske, Quinte, and Quintio were likely Cayuga, and Ganneious was Oneida, but judging from accounts of Teiaigon, all of the villages might have contained peoples from a number of the Haudenosaunee constituencies (Konrad 1981:135). It seems likely that at least some of the people who occupied the Seneca north shore sites were former Wendat who had been incorporated into Haudenosaunee communities and were thus descendants of the Lake Ontario north shore Wendat/Hatiwendaronk/Petun communities of the sixteenth century. Some of these individuals may even have had first-hand familiarity with the area, gained during hunting forays south from Simcoe County prior to the dispersal of the Wendat Confederacy.

In the 1680s hostilities broke out between the Five Nations Confederacy and the French. Led by Denonville, the French began attacking villages on the south side of Lake Ontario and it is also known that they destroyed the Oneida village of Ganneious and the Cayuga Village of Kente on the north shore. It is likely due to the aggression of the French that the north shore villages were abandoned by 1687.

During the 1690s, some Mississauga and other Ojibwe-speaking groups began moving into southern Ontario. Anishinaabeg communities established themselves at various locations during this early period of expansion, including Lake Saint Clair east of Detroit, on the Niagara Frontier, and at Matchedash Bay, east of the town of Midland (Rogers 1978:761). Moreover, it is likely that the former Haudenosaunee settlements along the north shore of Lake Ontario were reoccupied and that a presence was established at the mouth of the Credit River. In 1736, the French estimated there were 60 men at Lake Saint Clair and 150 among small settlements at Quinte, the head of Lake Ontario, the Humber River, and Matchedash (Rogers 1978:761).

The history of Anishinaabeg movement from along the north shore of Lake Huron and their military actions against the Haudenosaunee is based almost entirely on Anishinaabeg oral tradition provided by elders such as George Copway (Kahgegagahbowh) or Robert Paudash. George Copway was born among the Mississauga in 1818 and followed a traditional lifestyle until his family converted to Christianity. He became a Methodist missionary in Canada and the United States, including to the Saugeen Mission for a period, and later became a popular author and lecturer (MacLeod 1992:197; Smith 2000).

According to Copway, the objectives of campaigns against the Haudenosaunee were to create a safe trade route between the French and the Anishinaabeg, to regain the land abandoned by the Wendat and “drive the Iroquois wholly from the peninsula.” Copway describes more than 700 canoes meeting near Sault Ste. Marie and splitting into three parties for a three-pronged attack via the Ottawa River, Lake Simcoe and along the Trent River, and the St. Clair River, and all of which had fierce engagements with the Haudenosaunee. While various editions of Copway’s book have these battles occurring in the mid-seventeenth century, common to all is a statement that the battles occurred around 40 years after the dispersal of the Huron (Copway 1850:88; Copway 1851:91; Copway 1858:91). Various scholars agree with this timeline ranging

from 1687, in conjunction with New France Governor the Marquis de Denonville's attack on Seneca villages (Johnson 1986:48; Schmalz 1991:21–22) to around the mid-to-late-1690s leading up to the Great Peace of 1701 (Schmalz 1977:7; Bowman 1975:20; Smith 1975:215; Tanner 1987:33; Von Gernet 2002:7–8).

Robert Paudash's 1904 account of Mississauga origins is similar to Copway's in that it relies on oral history. It came from Paudash's father, who died at the age of 75 in 1893 and was the last hereditary chief of the Mississauga at Rice Lake. His account in turn came from his father Cheneebesh, who died in 1869 at the age of 104 and was the last sachem or Head Chief of all the Mississaugas. He also relates a story of origin on the north shore of Lake Huron near the river that gave them their name having been founded by a party of Shawnee and later, after the dispersal of the Wendat, carrying out coordinated attacks against the Haudenosaunee (Paudash 1905:7–8).

Francis Assikinack provides similar details on battles with the Haudenosaunee (1858:308–309). Francis Assikinack (b. 1824) was an Ojibwe historian from Manitoulin Island. He enrolled at Upper Canada College when he was 16 and after graduation, worked for the Indian Department as an interpreter, clerk, and teacher.

Doug Williams (Gidigaa Migizi) is a former chief of the Curve Lake First Nation and is a Pipe Carrier, Sweat Lodge Keeper and Associate Professor/Director of Studies for the Ph.D. Program of the Chanie Wenjack School of Indigenous Studies at Trent University. His oral histories were related to him by his grandparents, great uncle, and their contemporaries and he relates that the Mississauga pushed the Haudenosaunee out of southern Ontario (Migizi 2018). A detailed history of the Michi Saagiig prepared by Gidigaa Migizi was provided to A.S.I. by Dr. Julie Kapyrka of Curve Lake First Nation (Migizi and Kapyrka 2015) for inclusion in this report:⁵

The traditional homelands of the Michi Saagiig (Mississauga Anishinaabeg) encompass a vast area of what is now known as southern Ontario. The Michi Saagiig are known as “the people of the big river mouths” and were also known as the “Salmon People” who occupied and fished the north shore of Lake Ontario where the various tributaries emptied into the lake. Their territories extended north into and beyond the Kawarthas as winter hunting grounds on which they would break off into smaller social groups for the season, hunting and trapping on these lands, then returning to the lakeshore in spring for the summer months.

The Michi Saagiig were a highly mobile people, travelling vast distances to procure subsistence for their people. They were also known as the “Peacekeepers” among Indigenous nations. The Michi Saagiig homelands were located directly between two very powerful Confederacies: The Three Fires Confederacy to the north and the Haudenosaunee

⁵ It is important to note that not all present-day Indigenous communities agree with this account.

Confederacy to the south. The Michi Saagiig were the negotiators, the messengers, the diplomats, and they successfully mediated peace throughout this area of Ontario for countless generations.

Michi Saagiig oral histories speak to their people being in this area of Ontario for thousands of years. These stories recount the “Old Ones” who spoke an ancient Algonquian dialect. The histories explain that the current Ojibwa phonology is the 5th transformation of this language, demonstrating a linguistic connection that spans back into deep time. The Michi Saagiig of today are the descendants of the ancient peoples who lived in Ontario during the Archaic and Paleo-Indian periods. They are the original inhabitants of southern Ontario, and they are still here today.

The traditional territories of the Michi Saagiig span from Gananoque in the east, all along the north shore of Lake Ontario, west to the north shore of Lake Erie at Long Point. The territory spreads as far north as the tributaries that flow into these lakes, from Bancroft and north of the Haliburton highlands. This also includes all the tributaries that flow from the height of land north of Toronto like the Oak Ridges Moraine, and all of the rivers that flow into Lake Ontario (the Rideau, the Salmon, the Ganaraska, the Moira, the Trent, the Don, the Rouge, the Etobicoke, the Humber, and the Credit, as well as Wilmot and Sixteen Mile Creeks) through Burlington Bay and the Niagara region including the Welland and Niagara Rivers, and beyond. The western side of the Michi Saagiig Nation was located around the Grand River which was used as a portage route as the Niagara portage was too dangerous. The Michi Saagiig would portage from present-day Burlington to the Grand River and travel south to the open water on Lake Erie.

Michi Saagiig oral histories also speak to the occurrence of people coming into their territories sometime between 500-1000 A.D. seeking to establish villages and a corn growing economy – these newcomers included peoples that would later be known as the Huron-Wendat, Neutral, Petun/Tobacco Nations. The Michi Saagiig made Treaties with these newcomers and granted them permission to stay with the understanding that they were visitors in these lands. Wampum was made to record these contracts, ceremonies would have bound each nation to their respective responsibilities within the political relationship, and these contracts would have been renewed annually (Migizi and Kapyrka 2015). These visitors were extremely successful as their corn economy grew as well as their populations. However, it was understood by all nations involved that this area of Ontario were the homeland territories of the Michi Saagiig.

The Odawa Nation worked with the Michi Saagiig to meet with the Huron-Wendat, the Petun, and Neutral Nations to continue the amicable political and economic relationship that existed – a symbiotic relationship that was mainly policed and enforced by the Odawa people.

Problems arose for the Michi Saagiig in the 1600s when the European way of life was introduced into southern Ontario. Also, around the same time, the Haudenosaunee were given firearms by the colonial governments in New York and Albany which ultimately made an expansion possible for them into Michi Saagiig territories. There began skirmishes with the various nations living in Ontario at the time. The Haudenosaunee engaged in fighting with the Huron-Wendat and between that and the onslaught of European diseases, the Iroquoian speaking peoples in Ontario were decimated.

The onset of colonial settlement and missionary involvement severely disrupted the original relationships between these Indigenous nations. Disease and warfare had a devastating impact upon the Indigenous peoples of Ontario, especially the large sedentary villages, which mostly included Iroquoian speaking peoples. The Michi Saagiig were largely able to avoid the devastation caused by these processes by retreating to their wintering grounds to the north, essentially waiting for the smoke to clear.

Michi Saagiig Elder Gidigaa Migizi recounts:

“We weren’t affected as much as the larger villages because we learned to paddle away for several years until everything settled down. And we came back and tried to bury the bones of the Huron, but it was overwhelming, it was all over, there were bones all over – that is our story.

There is a misnomer here, that this area of Ontario is not our traditional territory and that we came in here after the Huron-Wendat left or were defeated, but that is not true. That is a big misconception of our history that needs to be corrected. We are the traditional people, we are the ones that signed treaties with the Crown. We are recognized as the ones who signed these treaties and we are the ones to be dealt with officially in any matters concerning territory in southern Ontario.

We had peacemakers go to the Haudenosaunee and live amongst them in order to change their ways. We had also diplomatically dealt with some of the strong chiefs to the north and tried to make peace as much as possible. So, we are very important in terms of keeping the balance of relationships in harmony.

Some of the old leaders recognized that it became increasingly difficult to keep the peace after the Europeans introduced guns. But we still continued to meet, and we still continued to have some wampum, which doesn’t mean we negated our territory or gave up our territory – we did not do that. We still consider ourselves a sovereign nation despite legal challenges against that. We still view ourselves as a nation and the government must negotiate from that basis.”

Often times, southern Ontario is described as being “vacant” after the dispersal of the Huron-Wendat peoples in 1649 (who fled east to Quebec and south to the United States). This is misleading as these territories remained the homelands of the Michi Saagiig Nation.

The Michi Saagiig participated in eighteen treaties from 1781 to 1923 to allow the growing number of European settlers to establish in Ontario. Pressures from increased settlement forced the Michi Saagiig to slowly move into small family groups around the present-day communities: Curve Lake First Nation, Hiawatha First Nation, Alderville First Nation, Scugog Island First Nation, New Credit First Nation, and Mississauga First Nation (Migizi 2018).

Peace was achieved between the Haudenosaunee and the Anishinaabeg in August of 1701 when representatives of more than twenty Anishinaabeg Nations assembled in Montreal to participate in peace negotiations (Johnston 2004:10). This was known as the Dish with One Spoon Treaty. During these negotiations, captives were exchanged and the Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabeg agreed to live together in peace and share their resources. This was also known as the Great Peace of Montreal and resulted in the end of hostilities between the Haudenosaunee and the French. Peace between these nations was confirmed again at council held at Lake Superior when the Haudenosaunee delivered a wampum belt to the Anishinaabeg Nations.

In 1701, the Haudenosaunee also made an agreement with the British Lieutenant Governor of New York, John Nanfan. The Nanfan Treaty, also known as the Fort Albany Treaty of 1701, was amended in 1726 and provided British Crown protection of extensive Haudenosaunee beaver hunting grounds.

At the conclusion of the Seven Years War (1756-1763), the British were now the strongest imperial power, controlling much of eastern and northern North America, but European settlement along the northwest shore of Lake Ontario was limited. Although its potential to serve as an effective link in the transportation and communications network associated with the fur trade was widely recognized, it was not exploited (Careless 1984). At the conclusion of the American War of Independence (1774-1783), however, the British were forced to recognize the emergence of a new political frontier, one that had to be maintained by a strong military presence. In addition, large numbers of British loyalists travelled north and crossed the border to remain in British territory. Many of them were given land grants by the Crown in exchange for loyal service. These new developments ultimately led to the purchase of lands from the Mississauga, who the Crown recognized as the “owners” of the north shore of Lake Ontario.

Continued military support of the British during the American War of Independence resulted in persecution of a large number of the Haudenosaunee. In 1784, under the terms of the “Between the Lakes Purchase,” which was signed by Sir Frederick Haldimand as Governor of the Canadas, the Crown acquired over one million acres of land stretching westward from near the head of Lake Ontario along the north shore of Lake Erie to Catfish Creek. Title to a portion of the lands acquired through the Between the Lakes Purchase was granted to the Six Nations in restitution for their territories that British had surrendered to the American government under the terms of the Treaty of Paris in 1783. These lands consisted of a tract six miles deep on either side of the Grand River, from its mouth to its source. Joseph Brant, the Mohawk

hereditary chief, led the migration to the Grand River valley in the winter of 1784 and spring of 1785. This tract of land was to be enjoyed by Six Nations and their posterity forever. Unfortunately, the illegal sale of the land, encroachment by settlers and misappropriation of funds has reduced the original area of what is referred to as the Haldimand Tract. This has resulted in numerous land claim cases against the Federal and Provincial governments.

In 1797, Brant was personally awarded a 3,450-acre tract of land (known as Brant's Block) on the north side of Burlington Bay. The purchase of Brant's Block from the Mississaugas had been authorized by Lieutenant-Governor John Graves Simcoe, following recommendations made years earlier to reward Brant for his military services during the Revolutionary War. Nevertheless, throughout the 1790s the Mississauga had grown increasingly disillusioned with their treatment at the hands of the British Crown and its colonial administration and were determined that any further land cessions would be made only at prices of their choosing. To this end they formally appointed Brant, in 1798, as their guardian and agent for all future land dealings. This relationship went further however, in that it was intended to represent a formal alliance between the Haudenosaunee and Mississauga peoples (Johnson 1990). The colonial government saw this emerging alliance as a real threat to the future Euro-Canadian settlement in Upper Canada, particularly as there was continued fear that the nations on the western frontier of the United States would come to the support of the Upper Canada Haudenosaunee and Mississauga.

By 1799, however, it became clear that the western nations were not willing to enter into any military alliances. This realization, combined with the increasing difficulty with which the Mississauga could carry out their traditional lifeways within their ever more circumscribed territory, and the death of their more experienced leaders, undermined their position.

2.5 The Mississaugas in Toronto Township, 1806-1847

The Mississauga lands between Burlington Bay to the west and Etobicoke Creek to the east formed part of what was called the "Mississauga Tract" at the turn of the nineteenth century. Although the British had secured the right to travel and trade within this area, it long remained as a physical barrier between the East and West Ridings of York County. In 1805, for example, it was noted that "the tract between the Tobicoake and the head of the lake is frequented only by wandering tribes of Missassagues." Much of Toronto Township was "a wilderness," in which "some Mississauga Indians are stationary" (Boulton 1805:48).

The "Toronto Purchase," also known as Treaty #13, occurred during the administration of Upper Canadian "President" Alexander Grant in August 1805. It was negotiated to resolve confusion over a 1787 "provisional surrender" of lands on the north shore of Lake Ontario from Ashbridges Bay to Etobicoke Creek. The Toronto Purchase was followed by Treaty #14 or the

Head of the Lake Purchase, concluded in September 1806.⁶ At that time, the Mississaugas surrendered 70,784 acres west of the Toronto Purchase, extending inland from the lakeshore for a distance of six miles, in exchange for £1000 in goods. The terms of the treaty were to maintain the Mississaugas' "sole right of the fisheries" and the "flats or low grounds," to grow corn on Twelve and Sixteen Mile Creeks, and the Etobicoke and Credit Rivers (Johnson 1990:249). In the latter instance, the reserve was specified as "one mile on each side of the river." The Credit River itself was described as a "fine, clear stream with a strong bottom," which contained an abundance of salmon, bass, bullheads, pike, and redhorse. The fishing rights of the Mississaugas were not always respected by the local settler community. Complaints were made by Chief Kineubenae regarding the abuses upon the salmon fisheries by European settlers as early as 1806 (Weeks 1995; Robb et al. 2003).

In 1818, the government purchased more land from the Mississaugas to accommodate increased settlement (the Ajetance Purchase, or Treaty #19). New townships were surveyed from this purchase, including Nassagaweya and Esquesing, and Nelson and Trafalgar townships were extended north in a new survey (Mathews 1953). In February 1820, Acheton and other "principal Chiefs, Warriors and people of the Mississauga Nation of Indians," ceded their lands at Twelve and Sixteen Mile Creeks along with northwestern and southeastern portions of the Credit River Reserve under Treaty #22. As part of this agreement, two hundred acres located in southeasterly portion of the Credit River Reserve would be set aside as a village site for the Mississaugas of the Credit. Treaty #23, negotiated later the same day, saw the central portion of the Credit River Reserve, along with its woods and waters, ceded to the Crown for £50.

In 1826, the Mississaugas petitioned for the right of possession of the remaining reserve lands on the Credit and established a village there (Graham 1975). The Credit River settlement developed largely under the leadership of the Methodist missionary Peter Jones, who was the son of the Anglo-American surveyor Augustus Jones and Tuhbenahneequay, a Mississauga woman from the Credit community. By 1826, most of the community had converted to Christianity and taken up farming. The mission settlement, in outward appearances at least, resembled contemporary Euro-Canadian rural settlement centres, consisting of 20 log cabins set closely together in a straight line (Smith 2002). By the mid-to late 1830s, the Credit River settlement, with a population of some 200 people, boasted a hospital, a mechanic's shop, eight barns, two sawmills, and 40 houses. Plus, 900 acres were in pasture, under crops of wheat, oats, peas, corn, potatoes and other vegetables, or developed into orchards (Smith 2002). This settlement was registered by Victor Konrad as an archaeological site—the Mississauga Indian Village site (AjGv-14)—and is located within the grounds of the Mississauga Golf & Country Club. Although no formal research was carried out to determine the precise location or extent of the settlement, the registering archaeologist assumed that it had been destroyed by the

⁶ Note that disagreements between the Mississaugas and the Crown concerning the Toronto Purchase and subsequent treaties were settled in 2010.

development of the golf course, but this may not entirely be the case. The designation AjGv-70 refers to a component of the Mississaugas of the Credit Mission settlement that was affected by landscaping at the Mississaugua Golf & Country Club in 2010. Limited surficial investigations were carried out by engineering firm A.M.E.C. prior to measures being undertaken to protect the site. It has been suggested that the finds may be associated with the village chapel (Amec Earth & Environmental 2010).

Despite these transformations, the people at the Credit Mission did not abandon their interests downstream at the mouth of the river. They continued to fish the spawning runs of salmon, trout and other fish, although this became an increasingly challenging process due to competition with Euro-Canadian settlers and reduced resources, including drastically reduced salmon stocks from increased milling activity further upstream. They also purchased majority shares in the Credit Harbour Company, chartered in 1834, to construct harbour facilities at the mouth of the river, where the Credit Mission Mississauga had built a store and warehouse a few years earlier. The harbour development was to be complemented by the development of the village of Port Credit, which was laid out in 1835 on the west bank of the river.

Ultimately, however, the Mississauga community on the Credit came to an end. Euro-Canadian settlement continued to expand in the area through the 1830s and 1840s and continued to undermine the Mississaugas' ability to pursue the way of life that they desired, and the government denied them the security of tenure at the Credit Mission. In consequence, most of the Mississauga Credit River community had relocated to a new community on Six Nations reserve lands near Hagersville by 1847. The 1859 *Tremaine's Map of the County of Peel* identifies the former site of the Credit Mission as the "Old Indian Village" and depicts 10 structures still standing, 12 years after the move.

Finally, it is important to note that the eighteenth century saw the ethnogenesis in Ontario of the Métis, when Métis people began to identify as a separate group, rather than as extensions of their typically maternal First Nations and paternal European ancestry (MNC n.d.). Living in both Euro-Canadian and Indigenous societies, the Métis acted as agents and subagents in the fur trade but also as surveyors and interpreters. While Métis populations were predominantly located north and west of Lake Superior, communities were located throughout Ontario (MNC n.d.; Stone and Chaput 1978). During the early nineteenth century, many Métis families moved towards locales around southern Lake Huron and Georgian Bay, including Kincardine, Owen Sound, Penetanguishene, and Parry Sound (MNC n.d.).

3.0 Settlement Patterns, 1791-1900

3.1 Immigration and Political Organization

As noted above, at the conclusion of the American Revolutionary War (1775-1783), thousands of British supporters decided to leave or were forced to flee. About 70,000 Loyalists, as they came to be called, travelled north from the newly created United States, crossing the border to live in the remaining British territories. Many of them were promised provisions and land grants by the Crown in exchange for loyal service and as compensation for their losses. But what colonial authorities such as Governor Frederick Haldimand controlled in “British” North America in the late eighteenth century was minimal. They recognized the need to access much more land if they were to fulfill their land grant commitments and begin to establish settlements (Conrad et al. 2014). To secure such land, Crown representatives negotiated treaties with many Indigenous nations along the St. Lawrence River and across what would become, in 1791, the colony of Upper Canada. In doing so, the Crown was following protocol laid out in the 1763 Royal Proclamation, which recognized Indigenous communities’ title to the land and provided guidelines for treaty making (Conrad et al. 2014). The treaties covering the lands in present-day Mississauga include the Head of the Lake Purchase (Treaty #14, 1806) and the Ajetance Purchase (Treaty #19, 1818) and are discussed in detail above.

The land covered by the Head of the Lake Purchase was immediately surveyed and politically organized, including the formation of Toronto Township, part of York County. Dundas Street served as the dividing line of the Concessions, with long rectangular 200-acre lots (see the south half of the map in Figure 1). While land was opened for settlement, most of the limited number that came did not follow authorized channels. Indeed, before the War of 1812, Toronto Township was a frontier settlement; many of the first settlers were squatters who hoped that by showing a commitment to the land, they would receive land grants (Riendeau 2002).

The number of inhabitants gradually increased in the first two decades of the nineteenth century, as Loyalists and their descendants began to get settled. New migrants from the United States also began to arrive. Sometimes derisively called Late Loyalists, these migrants were lured more by the promise of accessible and fertile land than by association with British institutions (Conrad et al. 2014). For colonial authorities, the influx of new settlers meant an even greater push for land access in Upper Canada. Following the securement of new lands to the north through the Ajetance Purchase, a survey was undertaken to make these lands available for settlement (Emerson and Emerson 2002). Carried out by Timothy Street, founder of Streetsville, the New Survey allotted lots and half-lots in grants on both sides of concession roads, with Hurontario Street acting as the centre (see the north half of the map in Figure 1). This development facilitated access into the interior and therefore significant population growth in Toronto Township. Between the 1820s and 1850s, most of these new arrivals came

from England, Scotland, and Ireland (City of Mississauga 2004). While many of these settlers from the British Isles established farms, many others moved to the emerging villages and communities in Toronto Township.

While Upper Canada was seen as a destination point for Black people – especially following the abolition of slavery in the British Empire in 1834 – there were very few non-white settlers in Toronto Township in the nineteenth century. The population of Toronto Township as a whole grew from c. 1,000 in 1821 to c. 9,000 in 1851 before declining to c. 6,400 by the end of the century (Table 2). There were 60-70 recorded Black settlers in Peel County during that time period. One documented example is Dinah Green who worked on the Cherry Hill property belonging to the early and prominent pioneer family of Joseph Silverthorn.⁷ Amongst the major challenges for Black settlers in Toronto Township at this time was the distance it was from more established Black communities in Upper Canada, such as Chatham and St. Catharines. The reality was that Toronto Township was perceived as more of a stopover site before re-settling somewhere else; most Black families only stayed for brief periods of time (Brubacher n.d.). Moreover, research indicates that the number of Black settlers declined in the late nineteenth century, with many moving to Oakville and Toronto where there were not only greater populations of Black people, but also social, cultural, religious, and economic opportunities and associations (Smardz Frost 2007). Nevertheless, some Black people did decide to stay in the area in the hope of creating a new and better life. This included Black Loyalists, emancipated former enslaved people, freedom seekers, and free Black people. They were engaged in a diverse array of jobs, including farmers, servants, labourers, barbers, and teachers (Brubacher n.d.; Brubacher 2006).

Table 2: Population of all of Toronto Township, 1809 to 1966 and Population of Mississauga, 1976 to 2016

Year	Population
1809	175
1821	c. 1,000
1835	c. 4,500
1851	c. 9,000
1901	c. 6,400
1931	12,231
1951	33,310
1961	74,875
1966	107,851

⁷ The Cherry Hill Archaeological Collection is maintained by the Museums of Mississauga and refers to the collection of approximately 30,000 artifacts from the Cherry Hill House, located on Lot 11, Concession 1. Among the collection are artifacts which may suggest the presence of Black servants and/or labourers.

1976	250,017
1981	315,055
1991	463,388
2001	612,925
2016	721,599




Figure 1: Lot and Concession System in Old and New Survey (Riendeau 2002)

3.2 Agricultural Developments

Most settlers were familiar with the expectations involved with establishing a farm (Riendeau 2002). While access to the land was relatively easy, the regulations for settlement duties were not. There were several requirements for those who received land grants and/or for those tenants who actually lived on the site, including the obligation to build a house, develop and fence in five acres, and remove the brush and logs from the roadway in order to ease travel (Richardson 1956).

The majority of this population in the early settlement years relied upon subsistence farming because there was little in the way of a local purchasing public, poor road conditions limited the ability to get produce to larger markets, and farmers only had the ability to clear about one to two acres of land per year for cultivation. Farms generally included a stable, pigpen, milk house, and granary, with larger farms having a barn and an icehouse. The primary crops grown included wheat, barley, oats, peas, potatoes, and turnips. Other mixed crops and livestock were

gradually introduced. Farmers were able to supplement their agricultural goods with fishing, hunting, and fruit trees (R.E. Riendeau 1985). Overall, self-sufficiency was key to agricultural success until the 1830s, when markets began to open, particularly from the new harbour facilities at Port Credit.

The experience of Black farmers was varied. George Woodford Ross, an emancipated former slave from Virginia, and his wife Didamia, for instance, owned the 200-acre Cedar Park Farm in the Cooksville area from the 1830s to the 1870s (Brubacher 2006). This was not possible for all farmers, though, and a number of Black people in Peel either had to work on other farmers' lands as labourers or domestic servants or had to rent small plots of land. For instance, a Black couple known as Benjamin and Hannah Workman rented a farm in Port Credit between c. 1851 and the 1880s. Benedict Duncan, an ex-slave who escaped to Toronto Township, also rented a plot of land to farm in Port Credit (Brubacher n.d.; Brubacher 2006).

In 1851, Toronto Township became a part of Peel County and had a population greater than 7,500. Lots and concessions had been determined, though not all occupied. In the southern half of the township, plots in what would later be called the Old Survey primarily ran in a north-south direction, while the New Survey lands in the northern half primarily ran east-west (Figure 1). From mid-century through to 1900, there was significant rural depopulation throughout Toronto Township, just as there was across rural Ontario (Riendeau 2002). Nevertheless, those that stayed were gradually improving their farms. In the second half of the nineteenth century, many of the original farms were being subdivided into smaller parcels and commercial agriculture was taking hold. There were many more farmhouses and more plots and orchards under cultivation throughout both the northern and southern halves of the township (Walker and Miles 1877).

3.3 The Growth of Villages

At the same time as these agricultural developments were occurring, a series of unincorporated villages began to spring up in Toronto Township. Roughly separated a few miles apart, and often at key crossroad intersections, these villages provided nearby farmers with basic supplies and services, and usually included at least one church and a tavern or inn for those requiring a resting place along their travels (Riendeau 2002). Once a post office was opened, a name for the area was given somewhat official status.

The principal sign of village settlement in Toronto Township was found along Dundas Street. Indeed, the distinct villages of Harrisville (Cooksville) (1808), Sydenham (Dixie) (1816), Summerville (1818), and Springfield (Erindale) (1822) were all established along Dundas Street between the Etobicoke Creek and Credit River (Riendeau 2002). By the 1850s, the township's largest villages had shifted from an east-west axis to a north-south axis, signaling a distinct movement into the interior. The Credit River was especially significant in this development, with the communities of Port Credit, Springfield, Streetsville, and Meadowvale all found along

its shores (Tremaine 1859). When it incorporated in 1858, Streetsville was the only officially-recognized town – meaning that it had an elected council with taxation powers – in nineteenth-century Toronto Township. Once the Great Western and Grand Trunk Railways were constructed in the 1850s, the population shifted once again to areas around the railway lines and close to Lake Ontario, such as Clarkson, which had been among the first villages in the area (Figure 5).

3.4 Industry

Mississauga has an important industrial history, including a strong record of involvement in the primary, secondary, and tertiary sectors of the economy.⁸ The diversity of industry has helped shape the region for generations, accelerating established communities' growth, contributing to the emergence of new communities, and providing employment to greater numbers of people.

In the early days of Toronto Township, the leading non-agricultural industry was lumbering. The proximity to timber, primarily a mixture of hardwood and pine, was being gradually cut down to make the land arable for farming while also contributing to the development of a diverse array of industries. The lumbering industry supported shipbuilding, particularly in the Port Credit area after the establishment of the Port Credit Harbour Company in 1834, as well as the steam- and water-powered sawmills, flour and grist mills, and woolen mills (R.E. Riendeau 1985).

The Credit River, Etobicoke Creek, and their tributaries were the sites of the majority and most prominent nineteenth-century mills. By 1849-1850, the township contained seven grist mills and 17 sawmills (Smith 1851). Most mills were in the township's northern half, indicating that the woodlands of the southern half, the area that had been settled earlier, had been greatly reduced. Woolen mills started in the township during the 1830s, but by the late 1840s the leading industry was undoubtedly Barber's Woolen Mills operation, which moved from Georgetown to open a facility on the Credit River south of Streetsville in 1844. By the 1860s, the mill was employing more than 100 people and was processing about 1,000 yards of cloth daily (Richardson 1956; R.E. Riendeau 1985).

Before the turn of the twentieth century, Toronto Township's industrial landscape was dominated by small-scale industries. A wide variety of establishments had been erected to produce consumer and capital goods. Among the many shops were those that manufactured cabinets, carriages and wagons, and shoes. There were also lathe and shingle mills, tanneries

⁸ Primary manufacturing involves the harvesting and initial processing of natural resources. Secondary manufacturing comprises those institutions – large and small – that generate consumer products and the goods used to make them. Finally, the tertiary sector revolves around providing a wide range of services to the general population.

(leatherworking), saddleries, cooperages (where barrels, casks, and tubs were made), and blacksmith shops (Tremaine 1859; R.E. Riendeau 1985). These industries helped residents with their daily lives, providing goods needed for survival or just to make their lives easier.

3.5 Cultural and Community Development

In the nineteenth century, Toronto Township's population was dominated by white Christians of British background. While the available amenities varied by location and local community needs, a general portrait indicates that villages had a church, tavern, schoolhouse, blacksmith shop, hotel or inn, post office, and a general store. At the corner of one small village called Palestine, located around the intersection of what is now Derry and Tomken Roads, there was a church, school, tavern, and store which locals endearingly called Salvation, Education, Damnation, and Starvation (Heritage Mississauga). As time went on, larger villages might also have had a Sons of Temperance Hall or Orange Lodge. For those villages located close to railway lines, a railway station was usually erected. These villages sometimes played host to horse-racing events, agricultural fairs, speeches, parades, and a variety of sporting competitions (R.E. Riendeau 1985).

For some sub-sections of the general population, such as the Black community, specific cultural and/or community-oriented events and organizations may have been available. While there are limited resources available to provide a comprehensive history of Black peoples' social and cultural life in Toronto Township, it is plausible that they attended Emancipation Day celebrations in nearby Hamilton, Oakville, and Toronto, read about causes of concern such as abolition, education, temperance, religion, and agriculture that were being championed in newspapers such as Henry Bibb's *Voice of the Fugitive*, or attended rallies and gatherings (Henry 2010; O'Farrell). Of particular note was an anti-slavery speech by famed American freeman turned slave turned fugitive Solomon Northrup, given at the Streetsville Town Hall in 1857 (Insauga.com 2019).

3.6 Transportation

Much as it was elsewhere across Upper Canada, population and settlement went hand in hand with transportation developments in Toronto Township. Colonel John Graves Simcoe, the colony's first Lieutenant Governor, sought to build roads to facilitate communication between regions and thereby provide defensive protection. Government funds were provided to achieve that end, as was the case with Dundas Street (City of Mississauga 2004). A route was surveyed in 1793 and the portion through Toronto Township was completed by the early nineteenth century. Stagecoach service to neighbouring York (Toronto) was made available in the 1820s.

At the same time, colonial officials also recognized that roads would open the land for settlement. In Toronto Township, a key part of the new survey of 1819-20 was a road through

the centre of the township that would extend northward through Chinguacousy and Caledon. While at first called Centre Road, the name was changed to Hurontario when plans arose regarding its extension from Lake Ontario all the way to Lake Huron. The descriptors W.H.S. and E.H.S. are used to indicate West of Hurontario Street and East of Hurontario Street for the lot and concession system after 1821 (Hicks 2007).

While colonial officials were eager to have roads built and maintained, they generally did not want to provide the funds or manpower needed to achieve those ends. As such, various alternative measures were taken to spur road development. One effort was to allow private citizens or firms to pay for road construction and upkeep, relying on tolls collected by users to help cover costs. More importantly, though, was the system of Statutory Labour. As part of the duties for receiving a crown land grant, landowners were expected to maintain the road(s) adjacent to their property or devote three to 12 days per year to the removal of brush, trees, and rock, digging culverts or ditches, hauling sand or gravel to grade uneven ground, and building bridges (Richardson 1956; Neill 2016). Enforcement was to be carried out by the local Pathmaster, a government posting designed to supervise and oversee road development in the colony. By the 1850s, several well-established roads ventured across the entire township. The principal roads that ran north-south were Hurontario Street and Mississauga Road while the main east-west arteries were Dundas Street and Lakeshore Road (Tremaine 1859).

There were various types of materials and construction techniques for roadbuilding in the nineteenth century including dirt, corduroy, macadam, and plank. They did not always coincide with different eras of development, for they were often overlapping in use throughout the township. Corduroy roads – wherein logs were placed side-by-side with dirt packed in between – began in the early nineteenth century along the township's main routes (Neill 2016). In 1832, for example, the colonial government built a corduroy road along the swampiest sections of the lakeshore east of the Credit River. More sophisticated roads were established soon thereafter, including macadam roads which were built of countless shapes and sizes of stone. Dundas Street, initially a dirt road with sections of corduroy, was macadamized east of Mississauga Road in the late 1830s and fully graveled by 1850 (R.E. Riendeau 1985). Planking was yet another form of road surface, one which involved laying down timbers roughly 16 feet apart and then placing three-inch hewn wooden boards across them. To some degree, these planked roads are reminiscent of a rather large boardwalk. This type of road was smoother and cheaper to build, leading the colonial legislature to initiate the Road Companies Act in 1849 with the aim of encouraging companies to build more of them and allowing tolls to be collected to help cover maintenance costs. Each type of road presented unique challenges for travelers, animals, wagons, and carriages, including rough surfaces and natural breakdown over time, exacerbated by bad weather. Indeed, because so many planks decayed or simply collapsed, macadam and gravel continued to be the primary road surface on Toronto Township's main arteries until the First World War (R.E. Riendeau 1985; Neill 2016). By the turn of the twentieth century, the main thoroughfares through the township – both north-south and east-west – were well entrenched; they remain important roads today. Given the nature of the lot and concession

system, the roads are unsurprisingly evenly spread out, as depicted on the 1909 topographic map (Figure 6).

Besides roads, the development of the railway has been crucial to Mississauga's history. By the late 1850s, there were two railways in the township: the Grand Trunk Railway crossed the northeast corner near Malton and crossing the township from east to west and running just north of Lakeshore Road was the Hamilton & Toronto Railway, which was bought out by the Great Western Railway in the 1860s. The Credit Valley Railway – later taken over by the Canadian Pacific Railway – was added to the mix when it was incorporated in 1871, and Streetsville was at the crux of this line running between Toronto and St. Thomas as well as a branch line north to Orangeville. Overall, trains had the ability to move goods and people quicker than by road or water, and the stations became important hubs for towns and villages in late nineteenth century Toronto Township.

Roads continued to remain important at this time, and many roads were evident across the township, particularly in the north-south direction. These roads allowed farmers in the New Survey, as well as from Chinguacousy and Caledon, to transport goods more easily to markets. In particular, Hurontario Street continued to develop rapidly, with farms, orchards, shops, and small towns dotting the road from the lake through to the upper reaches (Neill 2016).

In sum, the combination of the arrival of thousands of English-speaking immigrants – men and women, individuals and families, rich and poor, white and Black, and urban and rural-based – as well as the growth of small shops and businesses, municipal organizing, community services, and road building marked the beginning of the creation of a settled countryside (Armstrong 1985).

4.0 Settlement Patterns, 1900 To Present

4.1 Residential Developments until the 1970s

The expansion and improvements in transportation combined with commercial and industrial growth were central to settlement and residential development in the twentieth century. This development started off relatively slowly, with the population growing at a moderate level through the century's first five decades. Much of this new built form was evident along the major thoroughfares; nowhere was this growth more visible than along Dundas Street where houses were found close to the road from east to west (Figure 6). Nevertheless, farms and orchards, along with swathes of forested land, continued to dominate the landscape throughout most of the township until at least 1950 (Figure 7 and Figure 8).

Available maps and aerial photography show that residential development in Toronto Township exploded into full-blown suburbanization in the post-World War II era, especially in the

southern portion between the Credit River and Etobicoke Creek. This growth occurred in historic towns such as Streetsville and Cooksville but also around key intersections in the township's smaller hamlets and villages (Figure 9 and Figure 10).

The first new planned housing developments emerged in the 1950s. While subdivisions such as Credit Grove had been established early in the century, they were generally "small, random collections of homes built on lots carved out of recently sold farmland" (R.E. Riendeau 1985). In marked contrast, the intentionally designed and massive scale of planned subdivisions such as Applewood Acres and Park Royal dwarfed the early incarnations, gradually filling in what was once farmland and orchards.

Overall, though, the area north of Dundas Street remained primarily rural in character through to the 1970s (Figure 10). As historian Roger Riendeau notes, "The rapidly expanding suburban frontier south of Dundas Street was clearly distinguishable from the relatively static rural frontier to the north. Even in the southern districts, century-old farms stood side by side with newly built housing subdivisions and industrial complexes, thereby reinforcing the curious blend of the rural past and urban future" (R.E. Riendeau 1985).

4.2 Community and Culture

As Toronto Township's population began to climb after its gradual decline in the second half of the nineteenth century, so too did the diversity of the population. For its first 150 years, Mississauga was primarily white, Christian, and of British background, including England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales. Even as Italian and Croatian immigrants began to arrive in large numbers in the 1910s and 1920s to work in emerging industrial workplaces, 88% of Toronto Township's population was still of British descent by 1941. Since the 1950s, but especially since the 1970s, immigration from the Caribbean, Africa, Asia, Latin America, southern and eastern Europe, Africa, and the United States have changed the face of the city (R.E. Riendeau 1985; City of Mississauga 2004). By 1981, the number of Mississauga residents who claimed to be of British background had decreased to 49%.

Among the leisure activities in the first half of the twentieth century were agricultural fairs, horse-racing, skating, movie theatres, libraries, and picnics. Sports and recreation also provided an opportunity for camaraderie and/or competition, with baseball and lacrosse games beginning in the late nineteenth century, the establishment of the Port Credit Yacht Club in 1936, five golf courses operating by the late 1930s, and the township launching its own minor hockey association in 1947 (Insauga 2019). Moreover, the influx of a variety of immigrant groups also meant a greater diversity of cultural traditions and practices. This new multiculturalism has been visible in many ways; besides new languages heard in every corner of the city, new cultural centres, commercial centres, restaurants, and religious institutions have become omnipresent. Such diversity has contributed to the city's vitality and encouraged still more new immigrants to come and settle (Preston 2002; Heritage Mississauga 2018).

4.3 Transportation

By the turn of the century, significant developments occurred which transformed roadbuilding across the province, and in Toronto Township specifically. In 1901, the Ontario government allotted \$1 million to improve and develop the county road system. Then, to tackle construction and maintenance costs, the province founded the Highway Commission – later renamed the Department of Highways – in 1913. The following year, Lakeshore Road between Toronto and Hamilton was the first highway to be paved under the Commission's authority. Five years later, Dundas Street received the same treatment (Shragge and Bagnato 1984). Further improvements continued in the following decades, including the Queen Elizabeth Way in 1937 (Figure 2) and the construction of Highway 401 in the late 1950s (Stamp 1987; City of Mississauga 2004).



Figure 2: Cloverleaf design at interchange of Queen Elizabeth Way and Hurontario Street, 1978 (City of Mississauga)

These advancements in roads and highways, combined with the launching of GO Transit rail operations in 1967, made taking transit to work both locally and to neighbouring communities – especially Toronto – much more accessible (City of Mississauga 2004). Such accessibility enabled Mississauga to become an important commuter centre and contributed to major housing development, discussed in detail below, and a skyrocketing population (See Table 2). Furthermore, these road and rail improvements successfully shattered the idea of distance, which had hampered industry from developing on a grand scale. As transportation options expanded in the mid-twentieth century, so too could industry.

4.4 Industry

The twentieth century marked a gradual shift from small-scale to large-scale industry in Toronto Township, though the two operated side by side for decades. In the early decades, the centre of business and industry concentrated on the increasingly growing communities in the southern part of the township, particularly around Port Credit and Cooksville. Many new businesses were established here, including the prominent St. Lawrence Starch Company (1889-1989) and the Cooksville Brick and Tile Yard (1912-1970) (City of Mississauga 2004). The lakeshore was an especially important site for industrial development, as it was close to transport options on the ground such as trains and highways and provided access to shipping vessels. Besides St. Lawrence Starch Company, other key sites included the Arsenal Lands and the British American Oil Refinery (Riendeau 2002).

Manufacturing operations continued to expand over the following decades, in large part thanks to the development of hydroelectricity. From its large dam on the Credit River, the Erindale Power Company supplied most of the electricity to the township between 1910 and 1922. When it was sold to the Hydro-Electric Power Commission (H.E.P.C.) of Ontario, the dam was demolished (Richardson 1956). Nevertheless, the H.E.P.C. and other providers expanded electrical capacity dramatically in the first half of the century. Power lines crisscrossed the township and allowed industry to grow (Figure 8).

In the northern parts of the township, Streetsville and Malton were important towns serving the surrounding agricultural areas as well as centres of industry in their own right. Malton, for instance, shifted from a small village to an economic and industrial hub beginning with the arrival of the airport in 1937. Despite its modest beginnings on 1,400 acres across 13 farms, Malton Airport and the town itself were transformed during the Second World War. Several new military industries opened in the area, including the National Steel Car Company, which became Victory Aircraft Limited in 1942, and A.V. Roe Limited. The expansion of industry contributed to road improvements and the residential development of Victory Village (Riendeau 2002).

World War II had a strong impact on the expansion of industry elsewhere in Toronto Township as well. The Small Arms Limited, a Crown Corporation, opened a munitions factory on the Lakeshore to assemble rifles and Dominion Metalware Industries manufactured parts and hospital equipment for the Armed Forces. Another contribution to the war effort came from the British American Oil Refinery, which opened near Clarkson in 1943. Now the site of Petro-Canada Lubricants, this institution manufactured aviation fuel before switching to producing gasoline and heating oil after the war. With more than 500 employees in 1950, it was the largest oil processing plant in Canada (R.E. Riendeau 1985).

Historian Roger Riendeau notes that there were several reasons for industries to move out of cities and towards suburbs in the postwar period, including “easy transportation access, an abundance of hydro-electric power, and proximity to a large labour supply and consumer

market [...] the advantages of more room for expansion, lower land values and taxes, as well as cheaper living costs for employees, since they could live close to the factory” (Riendeau 2002). Capitalizing on these factors, Toronto Township launched an aggressive effort to stimulate industrial expansion in the 1950s. This marked the beginning of the Cinderella Township story. The 1953 Official Plan allotted nearly 6,000 acres for industrial activities and an Industrial Committee was formed for promotion purposes. Soon, several industrial zones were created, including the Dixie Industrial Area and the Clarkson Industrial Development.

Much of the major industrial activity was taking place along the waterfront. Several prominent companies were established in this period. Besides the Clarkson Refinery mentioned above, there was the St. Lawrence Cement Company, the largest manufacturer of its kind in the country when it opened in 1956, as well as the Lakeview Generating Station, which was believed to be “the world’s largest thermal electric generating plant” when it was built by Ontario Hydro in 1962 (R.E. Riendeau 1985). Manufacturing and industrial growth continued unabated in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s. Sheridan Park Research Centre opened in 1964, and by the 1970s, large industrial and/or commercial sections had formed in several locations, including around the airport, around the oil refinery in the southwest, and around the former Arsenal Lands in the southeast.

4.5 Planning the City since the 1950s

Residential planning, transportation, and industry were important facets of urban development taking place in Toronto Township after 1950. Indeed, there was an increasing recognition that preparation and organization was crucial to shaping the future of the township. Beyond these areas, but as a direct complement to them, civic leaders were busy planning in a wide variety of fields. For instance, large waterworks and sanitation systems developed and have continued to be built since the 1950s. Commercial and retail services also expanded, with shopping complexes such as Lorne Park Shopping Centre and Applewood Village Shopping Plaza, which both opened in the early 1950s, through to the massive Square One mall, which opened in 1973 and was at the time the largest shopping mall in the country (Figure 3). The focus on the car was plainly visible when more than 6,000 parking spaces were made available around Square One, and which jumped to 8,700 by 1986 (R.E. Riendeau 1985; City of Mississauga 2004).



Figure 3: Square One Shopping Centre, surrounded by farmland, 1974 (City of Mississauga)

There was also significant administrative and political maturity in the postwar era. Talks of amalgamating the entirety of Toronto Township sprang up in the 1960s. By 1968, the Town of Mississauga was established with a population of more than 100,000. It included all villages of the former Township except Streetsville and Port Credit, which, as the two largest urban centres, had already been granted town status in 1961 and 1962, respectively. With the population of the Town of Mississauga growing rapidly, Streetsville and Port Credit faced either amalgamation or annexation. By 1974, they were absorbed by Mississauga, in the process transforming the Town into the City of Mississauga. At roughly 250,000 people, it was now the largest municipality in the new Region of Peel (City of Mississauga 2004).

In the years following amalgamation, the population was largely concentrated in the most southern parts of the city. This was not unexpected, given that is where many of the established communities were already located, and where important road and rail options were available for a commuting population. Since that time, the city's residential development has by and large proceeded from south to north. As seen in the maps below, development moved swiftly and inexorably north, and included vast master planned communities, such as Meadowvale and Erin Mills (Figure 10 to Figure 13). In these developments, a range of housing options were built alongside recreation facilities, parks, shopping malls, businesses, and schools (Walker 1979).

Industry has taken over a large swathe of the landscape as well; while formerly located primarily along the lakeshore, large businesses and industrial zones are now found particularly along the Highway 401 corridor and around the airport (Figure 10). At the same time, the area around the waterfront has shifted toward large parks and greenspaces. From the 1950s to the 1970s, the waterfront was a mix of industry, private residences, and public open spaces. From the 1970s on, there has been a lot of attention over waterfront developments from many quarters, including City staff, environmental groups, and private citizens. While industry has not entirely disappeared, there has been much more development of public greenspace and parkland, providing people with more diversity of recreational experiences all along the roughly 14 kilometres of waterfront (CVCA). Of particular note is the physical creation of more waterfront space through the addition of landfill onto the water resulting with the creation of J.C. Saddington Park and Lakefront Promenade Park.

In the last quarter of the century, urban sprawl was relentless. The reality of housing development running adjacent to barns and farms was striking (Figure 4). While agriculture had been the lifeblood of the area for almost 200 years, there were few farms left in the city by the end of the 1990s (Figure 11). Much of the land was developed for housing, allowing the population to climb rapidly, reaching more than 600,000 by 2001 (City of Mississauga 2004).



Figure 4: Subdivision development abutting barns and farmland in Mississauga, c. 1980 (R.E. Riendeau 1985)

Mississauga has changed from a small, dispersed, and largely agrarian community to a diverse, dynamic, and multifaceted place, the country's sixth largest city. Capturing this transformation, long-time mayor Hazel McCallion has stated that Mississauga is "a city of small communities ... trying to grow from the outside in" (R.E. Riendeau 1985). Between the 1970s and 1990s, the land continued to be re-fashioned from agriculture to housing, commercial enterprises, and parklands. As each former village or community continued to expand geographically, the boundaries began to blur. In the process, Mississauga has transformed from an amalgam of small communities into a city with a distinct identity.

5.0 Maps of Toronto Township and Mississauga, 1877-2019




Figure 5: The current boundary of the City of Mississauga placed around the 1877 Illustrated Historical Atlas for the County of Peel (Walker and Miles 1877) and the Illustrated Historical Atlas for the County of Halton (Pope 1877)




Figure 6: The current boundary of the City of Mississauga placed around a 1909 topographic map, Brampton Sheet (Department of Militia and Defence 1909)



Figure 7: The current boundary of the City of Mississauga placed around a 1922 topographic map, Brampton Sheet (Department of Militia and Defence 1922)



Figure 8: The current boundary of the City of Mississauga placed around a 1931 topographic map, Brampton Sheet (Department of National Defence 1931)




Figure 9: The current boundary of the City of Mississauga placed around merged 1954 aerial photographs, Photos 435.793 and 436.793 (Hunting Survey Corporation Limited 1954a)




Figure 10: The current boundary of the City of Mississauga placed around the 1974 N.T.S. map (Department of Energy, Mines and Resources 1974)




Figure 11: The current boundary of the City of Mississauga placed around the 1994 N.T.S. map (Department of Energy, Mines and Resources 1994)




Figure 12: The current boundary of the City of Mississauga placed around a 1995 aerial image (City of Mississauga 2020)




Figure 13: The current boundary of the City of Mississauga placed around a 2005 aerial image (City of Mississauga 2020)




Figure 14: The current boundary of the City of Mississauga placed around a 2019 aerial image (City of Mississauga 2020)

6.0 References

- Ahmed, A.
2013 *Recovering the Landscape of the Credit Indian Mission - A Cultural Landscape of the Mississauga First Nation*. University of Toronto.
- Amec Earth & Environmental
2010 *Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment, Driving Range Development, Mississauga Golf and Country Club, 1725 Mississauga Road, Mississauga Road*. Report on file with the Ontario Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries, Toronto.
- Armstrong, F.H.
1985 *Handbook of Upper Canadian Chronology*. Dundurn Press, Toronto.
- Army Survey Establishment, R.C.E
1963 *Brampton Sheet 30M/12*. Brampton, Ontario.
- Assikinack, F.
1858 *Legends and Traditions of the Odawa Indians*. *The Canadian Journal, Second Series* III:115–125.
- Batten, J.
1976 *The Toronto Golf Club, 1876-1976*. The Bryant Press, Limited.
- Birch, J., and R.F. Williamson
2013 *The Mantle Site: An Archaeological History of an Ancestral Wendat Community*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., Latham.
- Boulton, D.
1805 *Sketch of His Majesty's Province of Upper Canada*. Reprinted in Toronto by the Baxter Publishing Company, 1961. C. Rickaby, London.
- Bowman, I.
1975 *History of the Peninsula Portage and Canoe Route: Colpoy's Bay to Lake Huron - with an Overview of Indian Occupation of the Bruce Peninsula*. Toronto.
- Brubacher, E.
2006 *A Fugitive Past: Black History in Mississauga*. *Heritage Mississauga*.
<https://heritagemississauga.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Black-History-A-Fugitive-Past.pdf>.
- n.d. *Black History in Peel: An Introduction*. Heritage Mississauga.
<https://heritagemississauga.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Black-History-Part-2-Introduction-to-Black-History-in-Peel.pdf>.
- n.d. *Other Notables*. Heritage Mississauga. <https://heritagemississauga.com/wp->

content/uploads/2018/11/Black-History-Part-10-Other-Notables.pdf.

Bull, W.P.

1934 *From Rattlesnake Hunt to Hockey: The History of Sports in Canada and of the Sportsmen of Peel, 1798 to 1934*. The Perkins Bull Foundation/George J. McLeod, Ltd., Toronto.

Annotated Land Records. William Perkins Bull Fonds. Peel Art Gallery, Museum, and Archives (PAMA).

Burk, S., and J. Doucette

2019 *Toronto's Lost Golf Courses: How the Game of Golf Shaped a City*. Barlow Book Publishing, Toronto.

Careless, J.M.S.

1984 *Toronto to 1918: An Illustrated History*. James Lorimer & Co., Toronto.

Chapman, L.J., and F. Putnam

1984 *The Physiography of Southern Ontario*. Vol. 2. Ontario Geologic Survey, Special Volume. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Toronto.

City of Mississauga

2004 *Mississauga: The Evolution of a City*. February.

2020 Mississauga Maps - Interactive Online Mapping Service. City of Mississauga, Mississauga, Ontario. <https://www.mississauga.ca/portal/services/maps>.

QEW Cloverleaf Interchange, Cooksville. *Historic Images Gallery*.
http://www.mississauga.ca/portal/residents/allhistoricimages?paf_gear_id=13400033&imageId=5200203n&index=0&returnUrl=%2Fportal%2Fresidents%2Fallhistoricimages.

Square One Shopping Centre, Aerial View. *Historic Images Gallery*.
http://www.mississauga.ca/portal/residents/businessesgallery?paf_gear_id=13400033&imageId=3900020n&index=418&returnUrl=%2Fportal%2Fresidents%2Fbusinessesgallery%3Fimages%3D517.

St. Peter's Anglican Church. *Historic Images Gallery*.
http://www.mississauga.ca/portal/discover/charlotteschribergallery;jsessionid=FADZgiNZDMC_g3imjt_cLCQjaFYjGaOXajUs-ZGY?paf_gear_id=13200032&imageId=40600037&index=0&returnUrl=%2Fportal%2Fdiscover%2Fcharlotteschribergallery%3Bjsessionid%3DFADZgiNZDMC_g3imjt_cLCQjaFYjGaOXajUs-ZGY.

Claus, William on behalf of the Crown

1806 Agreement. Library and Archives Canada.

Conrad, M., A. Finkel, and D. Fyson

2014 *History of the Canadian Peoples: Beginnings to 1867, Vol. 1 (Sixth Edition)*. Pearson Canada, Toronto.

Cook, D.

2004 *Apple Blossoms and Satellite Dishes: Celebrating the Golden Jubilee of Applewood Acres*. D.L. Cook, Mississauga, Ontario.

Copway, G.

1850 *The Traditional History and Characteristic Sketches of the Ojibway Nation*. Charles Gilpin, London.

1851 *The Traditional History and Characteristic Sketches of the Ojibway Nation*. Benjamin B. Mussey & Co., Boston.

1858 *Indian Life and Indian History*. Albert Colby and Company, Boston.

Credit Valley Conservation

2018 Wetland Management. *Credit Valley Conservation: Inspired By Nature*.
<https://cvc.ca/your-land-water/countryside-stewardship/stewardship-resource-centre/your-wetlands-streams-and-ponds/wetland-management/>.

CVCA

The Mississauga Waterfront: A Plan for the Development of the Mississauga Waterfront Sector of the Metro Toronto Planning Area. Local Archives Collection: Credit Valley Conservation Authority. Mississauga Central Library, Canadiana Room.

Department of Energy, Mines and Resources

1974 Brampton Sheet 30M/12. National Topographic System.

1994 Brampton Sheet 30M/12. National Topographic System.

Department of Militia and Defence

1909 Brampton Sheet No. 35. Topographic Map.

1922 Brampton Sheet No. 35.

1933 Brampton Sheet. National Topographic System.

Department of National Defence

1931 Brampton Sheet 30M/12. Brampton, Ontario.

1942 Brampton Sheet. National Topographic System.

Dilse, P.

2012 *Heritage Impact Statement on the Pump House at the Mississauga Golf and Country Club*. October 11.

Dodd, C.F., D.R. Poulton, P.A. Lennox, D.G. Smith, and G.A. Warrick

1990 The Middle Ontario Iroquoian Stage. In *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650*, C. J. Ellis and N. Ferris, eds, pp. 321–360. Occasional Publication of the London Chapter

OAS Number 5. Ontario Archaeological Society Inc., London, ON.

Ellis, C.J., and D.B. Deller

1990 Paleo-Indians. In *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650*, C. J. Ellis and N. Ferris, eds, pp. 37–64. Occasional Publication of the London Chapter OAS Number 5. Ontario Archaeological Society Inc., London, ON.

Ellis, C.J., I.T. Kenyon, and M.W. Spence

1990 The Archaic. In *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650*, C. J. Ellis and N. Ferris, eds, pp. 65–124. Occasional Publication of the London Chapter OAS Number 5. Ontario Archaeological Society Inc., London, ON.

Ellis, C.J., P.A. Timmins, and H. Martelle

2009 At the Crossroads and Periphery: The Archaic Archaeological Record of Southern Ontario. In *Archaic Societies: Diversity and Complexity across the Midcontinent.*, T. D. Emerson, D. L. McElrath, and A. C. Fortier, eds, pp. 787–837. State University of New York Press, Albany, New York.

Emerson, J., and S. Emerson

2002 A Quinetessential Village: The Story of Streetsville. In *Mississauga: The first 10,000 years*, Frank A. Dieterman, ed. Eastendbooks, Toronto.

Ferris, N.

2013 Place, Space, and Dwelling in the Late Woodland. In *Before Ontario: The Archaeology of a Province*, pp. 99–111. McGill-Queen's University Press.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt32b7n5.15>.

Graham, E.

1975 *Medicine Man to Missionary: Missionaries as Agents of Change among the Indians of Southern Ontario, 1784-1867*. Peter Martin Associates, Toronto.

G.S. Shipp & Son Limited

1953 Applewood Acres September 25.

Hall, J.E.

1933 Record of the Club. William Perkins Bull Fonds: From Hemisphere to Hamlet Collection. Peel Art Gallery, Museum, and Archives (PAMA).

Halton Peel Branch, Ontario Genealogical Society

Credit Indian Village Methodist Chapel Cemetery.

Henry, N.

2010 *Emancipation Day: Celebrating Freedom in Canada*. Dundurn Press, Toronto.

Heritage Mississauga

2009 Lorne Park Estates. *Heritage Mississauga*.
<https://www.heritagemississauga.com/page/Lorne-Park-Estates>.

- 2018 Mississauga: Vibrant, Diverse and Dynamic Cultures. *Heritage Mississauga*. <https://heritagemississauga.com/cultural-heritage/>.
- Palestine. *Heritage Mississauga*. <https://heritagemississauga.com/palestine/>.
- Hicks, K.
2003 *Clarkson and Its Many Corners*. Mississauga Library System, Mississauga. http://www5.mississauga.ca/library/EBooks/8147_ClarksonBook.pdf.
- Hicks, K.
2005 *Lakeview: Journey from Yesterday*. The Friends of the Mississauga Library System, Mississauga.
- Hicks, K.
2007 *Port Credit: Past to Present*. Mississauga Library System, Mississauga.
- Hunting Survey Corporation Limited
1954a Digital Aerial Photographs, Southern Ontario 1954. http://maps.library.utoronto.ca/data/on/AP_1954/index.html.
- 1954b Digital Aerial Photographs. <https://mdl.library.utoronto.ca/collections/air-photos/1954-air-photos-southern-ontario/index>.
- Insauga
2019 The History of What Mississauga Did For Fun. *insauga.com*. January 12. <https://www.insauga.com/the-history-of-what-mississauga-did-for-fun>.
- Insauga.com
2019 Facts You Never Knew About Prominent Black Mississauga Residents. *Insauga News*. February 16. <https://www.insauga.com/facts-you-never-knew-about-prominent-black-mississauga-residents/>.
- Ireland, C.
2011 Developer Saved the Best for Himself June 30. <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/real-estate/developer-saved-the-best-for-himself/article585033/>.
- Johnson, I.V.B.
1986 The Early Mississauga Treaty Process, 1781-1819 in Historical Perspective. PhD Dissertation, University of Toronto.
- Johnson, L.A.
1990 The Mississauga-Lake Ontario Land Surrender of 1805. *Ontario History* 83(3):233–253.
- Johnston, D.
2004 *Connecting People to Place: Great Lakes Aboriginal in Cultural Context*. Unpublished paper prepared for the Ipperwash Commission of Inquiry.

<http://www.attorneygeneral.jus.gov.on.ca/inquiries/ipperwash/transcripts.pdf>.

Jones, E.

1838 *Memoir of Elizabeth Jones, a Little Indian Girl, Who Lived at River Credit Mission, Upper Canada*. John Mason, London.

Konrad, V.A.

1981 An Iroquois Frontier: The North Shore of Lake Ontario during the Late Seventeenth Century. *Journal of Historical Geography* 7(2):129–144.

Lorne Park Estates Historical Committee

1980 *A Village within a City: Lorne Park Estates Historical Committee*. The Boston Mills Press, Cheltenham.

Lough, M.

1889 Block B, Lorne Park Annex, Part Lot 22, Concession 3, South of Dundas Street, Township of Toronto. PAMA R912.

MacLeod, P.

1992 The Anishinabeg Point of View: The History of the Great Lakes Region to 1800 in Nineteenth-Century Mississauga, Odawa, and Ojibwa Historiography. *Canadian Historical Review* 73(2):194–210.

Mathews, H.C.

1953 *Oakville and the Sixteen. The History of an Ontario Port*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.

Métis National Council

n.d. The Métis Nation. <<http://www.metisnation.ca/index.php/who-are-the-metis>>.

n.d. Métis Historic Timeline. <http://www.metisnation.org/culture-heritage/m%C3%A9tis-timeline/>.

Migizi, G.

2018 *Michi Saagiig Nishnaabeg: This Is Our Territory*. ARP Books, Winnipeg.

Migizi, G., and J. Kapyrka

2015 Before, During, and After: Mississauga Presence in the Kawarthas. , edD. Verhulst. *Peterborough Archaeology*:127–136.

Ministry of Culture

2006 Heritage Conservation Districts. *Ontario*.
http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/heritage/heritage_conserving_list.shtml.

Ministry of Natural Resources

Significant Wetlands and the Ontario Wetland Evaluation System.
https://www.grca.on.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/stdprod_091597.pdf.

Mississauga Library System

Sports Gallery: Mississauga Golf and Country Club, Aerial View. *Historic Images Gallery*.

Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation

2017 Head of the Lake Treaty, No. 14 (1806). In *Treaties 1781-1820*. Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation, Hagersville.

Mississauga Golf and Country Club

Report Minute Book. William Perkins Bull Fonds: From Hemisphere to Hamlet Collection. Peel Art Gallery, Museum, and Archives (PAMA).

MNC, (Metis National Council)

n.d. The Metis Nation. *The Metis Nation*. <http://www.metisnation.ca/index.php/who-are-the-metis>.

Mollenhauer, J.

1981 *Mississauga Golf and Country Club, 1906-1981*. Heritage Press, Mississauga.

Neill, K.

2016 From Mud to Pavement: The Early History of the Peel Roadways as Told by Our Records. Peel Archives. <https://peelarchivesblog.com/2016/06/30/earlyroadways/>.

O'Farrell, J.K.A.

Bibb, Henry Walton. *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*. http://www.biographi.ca/en/bio/bibb_henry_walton_8E.html.

PAMA

Plan of the Indian Reserve, River Credit 1849. Region of Peel Map and Plan Collection. PAMA.

Paudash, R.

1905 The Coming of the Mississagas. *Ontario Historical Society Papers and Records* 6(190).

Percy, John, and Sabeen Abbas, eds,

2007 *Celebrating 40 Years of History at the University of Toronto Mississauga*. University of Toronto Mississauga.

Pope, J.H.

1877 *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Halton, Ont.* Walker and Miles, Toronto.

Preston, V.

2002 A Community Enriched: Moving to Mississauga. In *Mississauga: The First 10,000 Years*, Frank A. Dieterman, ed, pp. 209–226. Eastendbooks, Toronto.

Richardson, A.H.

1956 *Credit Valley Conservation Report*. Credit Valley Conservation, Toronto.

- Riendeau, R.
1985 *Mississauga: An Illustrated History*. Windsor Publications Ltd.
- Riendeau, R.
2002 Settlement and Lost Villages: A History of Toronto Township. In *Mississauga: The First 10,000 Years*, Frank A. Dieterman, ed. Eastendbooks, Toronto.
- Riendeau, R.E.
1985 *Mississauga: An Illustrated History*. Windsor Publications, Northridge, CA.
- Robb, G., P. Dilse, H. Henderson, B. Hermsen, W. Shearer, and P. Stewart
2003 *Heritage Conservation Feasibility Study of Old Port Credit Village Stage 1 Report*. City of Mississauga.
- Robertson, J.R.
1908 *Robertson's Landmarks of Toronto : A Collection of Historical Sketches of the Old Town of York, from 1792 until 1837, and of Toronto from 1834 to 1908*. Toronto.
- Rogers, E.S.
1978 Southeastern Ojibwa. In *Handbook of North American Indians: The Northeast*, 15:. Smithsonian Institution, Washington.
- Ryerson, E.
1883 *The Story of My Life: Being Reminiscences of Sixty Years' Public Service in Canada*. , ed George J. Hodgins. William Briggs, Toronto, ON.
<https://archive.org/details/storyofmylife00ryeruoft/mode/2up>.
- Schmalz, P.S.
1977 *The History of the Saugeen Indians*. Ontario Historical Society, Ottawa.

1991 *The Ojibwa of Southern Ontario*. University of Toronto Press.
- Shragge, J., and S. Bagnato
1984 *From Footpaths to Freeways*. Ontario Ministry of Transportation and Communications.
- Smardz Frost, K.
2007 *I've Got a Home in Glory Land: A Lost Tale of the Underground Railroad*. Thomas Allen, Toronto.
- Smith, D.B.
1975 Who Are the Mississauga? *Ontario History* 67(4):311–222.

2000 Kahgegagahbowh. *Dictionary of Canadian Biography Online*.
http://www.biographi.ca/009004-119.01-e.php?&id_nbr=4517.

2002 Their Century and a Half on the Credit: The Mississaugas in Mississauga. In *Mississauga: The First 10,000 Years*, F. A. Dieterman, ed, pp. 107–122. Eastend Books, Toronto.

Smith, W.H.

1851 *Canada: Past, Present and Future, Being a Historical, Geographical, Geological and Statistical Account of Canada West*. Vol. 1. Thomas Maclear, Toronto.

Spence, M.W., R.H. Pihl, and C. Murphy

1990 Cultural Complexes of the Early and Middle Woodland Periods. In *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650*, C. J. Ellis and N. Ferris, eds. Occasional Publication of the London Chapter OAS Number 5. Ontario Archaeological Society Inc., London.

Stamp, R.M.

1987 *QEW - Canada's First Superhighway*. The Boston Mills Press, Toronto.

Stone, L.M., and D. Chaput

1978 History of the Upper Great Lakes. In *Handbook of North American Indians*, Bruce G. Trigger, ed, pp. 602–609. Smithsonian Institution, Washington.

Storck, P.L.

1988 Recent Excavations at the Udora Site: A Gainey/Clovis Occupation Site in Southern Ontario. *Current Research in the Pleistocene* 5:23–24.

Tanner, H. H., ed,

1987 *Atlas of the Great Lakes Indian History*. Oklahoma University Press, Norman.

The Landplan Collaborative Ltd., Goldsmith Borgal & Company Ltd., Architects Ltd., North South Environmental Inc., and Geodata Resources Inc.

2005 Cultural Landscape Inventory: City of Mississauga. City of Mississauga.
http://www5.mississauga.ca/pdfs/Cultural_Landscape_Inventory_Jan05.pdf.

Toronto Golf Club

Toronto Golf Club. *Toronto Golf Club's History*.
<https://www.torontogolfclub.com/Membership/History>.

Toronto Golf Club. *Colt Course - 18 Hole*.
<https://www.torontogolfclub.com/Membership/History>.

Toronto Star Weekly

1914 March 21.

Tremaine, G.C.

1859 Tremaine's Map of the County of Peel. George C. Tremaine, Toronto.

University of Toronto Mississauga

2020 Fact Sheet. <https://www.utm.utoronto.ca/about-us/fact-sheet>.

Unknown

1919 Part Lots 22 & 23, Registered Plan B-88 Blocks ADEFGHIKLMO, Registered Plan C-89 Lots 1 & 13 to 16, Remaining after Plan A-23. PAMA RPB-88 and C-89.

Von Gernet, A.

2002 *'Within the Prick'd Line': The Historical Context of the 1701 Deed from the Iroquois to the King of England of a Vast Tract of Land. Report Prepared for the Province of Ontario.*

Walker and Miles

1877 *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Peel, Ont.* Walker and Miles, Toronto.

Walker, G.

1979 *Meadowvale, a Vision: Planning Report.* Karl Frank Collection. Mississauga Public Library, Canadiana Room.

Weeks, V.M.

1993 *Lorne Park: Dreams of Long Ago.* Verna Mae Weeks, Chesley, Ontario.

Weeks, V.M.

1995 *Port Credit: A Glimpse of Other Days.* Porcupine's Quill Press, Erin, Ontario.

Wilkinson, M.

2019 *Mississauga Golf and Country Club.* October 1.

Williamson, R.F.

1990 *The Early Iroquoian Period of Southern Ontario.* In *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650*, C. J. Ellis and N. Ferris, eds, pp. 291–320. Occasional Publication of the London Chapter OAS Number 5. Ontario Archaeological Society Inc., London.

Wybenga, D.

2019 *History of the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation May 22, Hagersville.*

Appendix E: Community Engagement

Consultation allows for members of the community to contribute to the identification of heritage objectives for a heritage study. People who live and work in the area can express and communicate the value of the area and are often best able to identify important landmarks, boundaries, and defining characteristics. A summary of each community consultation conducted as part of the study is provided.

The City hosted a Public Information Centre on September 29, 2018 to launch the study and three additional community workshops in varying locations in Mississauga on November 15, 19, and 26, 2018. Workshops were advertised and planned in specific locations of the city to solicit feedback from residents, property owners, and individuals and groups with a known or expressed interest in the eight cultural heritage landscapes and two cultural features assessed during Phase One of the study. The City of Mississauga, S.G.L. Planning & Design, and A.S.I. facilitated the sessions to garner feedback from key stakeholders and the public on the study and the Phase One cultural heritage landscapes. Surveys were made available to attendees at these meetings as well as on the Project website and these comments are incorporated into the Phase One report and recommendations. Input received at these meetings included information such as, but not limited to input on potential boundaries for the cultural heritage landscapes; input on tools for the protection of cultural heritage landscapes; input on significant features that should be protected; input on issues and pressures currently impacting the landscapes; historical mapping and secondary sources of interest; and personal histories and accounts associated with the landscapes.

In November 2018, the consultant team met with Cameron McQuaig, a member of the City of Mississauga's Heritage Advisory Committee to receive feedback and input regarding how the 2005 Cultural Landscape Inventory has been implemented and priorities for consideration as part of the current study.

On May 6, 2019, a Public Information Centre was hosted by the City to launch the second phase of the study. The purpose of this meeting was to introduce the cultural heritage areas being studied in the phase and to gather feedback from key stakeholders and the general public on work completed in the first phase. This was the study's third round of public consultation, after the second Public Information Centres held on November 15, 19, and 26, 2018, and first public information session held on September 29, 2018. Attendees were welcomed to the event by consultant Ute Maya-Giambattista who explained the evening's events. This was followed by a presentation of Phase One study results and summary of recommendations and an introduction to Phase Two goals and study areas, led by consultant Annie Veilleux. The rest of the event included an initial question and answer period and an activity period when participants were

asked to mark their thoughts and comments on a series of maps showing Phase Two cultural landscapes and cultural features organized by theme.

On September 19, 2019 Fotenn, S.G.L. Planning & Design and A.S.I. facilitated a working session to garner feedback from key stakeholders and the general public on Mississauga's Cultural Heritage Landscape Project's sites, areas, and features being assessed as part of Phase Two. This was the second public consultation session in Phase Two of the study. When attendees arrived, they signed in and looked at the project boards on display, which provided: a summary of the Phase Two landscapes under review; a summary of potential tools available for the protection and management of C.H.L.s; and a board that outlined the project process. This was followed by a welcoming of attendees and explanation of the evening's agenda. The session began with a presentation providing a project description, work in progress, description of Phase Two landscapes and summary of available land use planning tools to manage change within Phase Two landscapes. The presentation classified all Phase Two landscapes into different types: Farms and Estates; Parks and Open Spaces; Industrial Landscapes; and Campuses and Golf Courses. A break-out group working session was prepared; however due to the fact that there were only three people in attendance, an extended group question and answer period took place instead. The hour-long question and answer session included questions focused on process and implementation and the general objectives of the study.

The project website initiated in Phase One of the study was updated to reflect the Phase Two cultural landscapes and cultural features. The website included a survey as well as mapping where the community was able to identify why these places were unique or valuable. The mapping tools were also available for the identification of additional places of importance. To date, the website has had over 7,000 visits.

As part of the public consultation outreach efforts for Phase Two of the study, and to ensure the public had the opportunity to provide feedback on all potential cultural heritage landscapes assessed as part of the study, a survey was developed to solicit feedback on community-nominated landscapes. Based on the consultant team analysis and preliminary recommendations on the identified C.H.L. candidates as well as previous public input, the survey was tailored to seek input from residents on what character elements define each candidate C.H.L. as well as residents' understanding of the regulatory context implicit in a C.H.L. designation. Furthermore, City staff participated in virtual meetings regarding Applewood Acres on March 22, 2021, and regarding Meadowvale West, Gordon Woods, and Dickson Park Crescent on June 1 and June 3, 2021. These meetings included staff presentations and question and answer sessions.

A final Public Information Centre was held on October 13, 2021 to present the final results of the study and recommendations, and to allow participants the chance to ask questions and provide comments. There were approximately seven attendees. There was discussion regarding the role of the province in heritage conservation, with examples from Erindale Village and the City's Lakeview neighbourhood, as well as discussion on how the designation process

potentially impacts development in Streetsville. Clarification on the evaluation results for the Pearson Airport Area of Interest was also provided.

Another facet of community engagement included meetings with the City of Mississauga's Heritage Advisory Committee (H.A.C.). The consultant team presented the findings of the Phase 1 Technical Memorandum to H.A.C. on March 5, 2019 and findings of the Final Draft Report for the project on October 12, 2021.

DATE: October 10, 2018 Project ID: CH.MS
TO: Paula Wubbenhorst - Heritage Planner
Rebecca Sciarra – Partner ASI
FROM: Ute Maya-Giambattista – Principal SGL
RE: Mississauga’s Cultural Heritage Landscapes Study – Workshop No. 1
Summary

On September 29th, 2018, SGL Planning & Design and ASI facilitated a working session to garner feedback from key stakeholders and the general public on Mississauga’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study. This was the study’s first public consultation session.

Location: South Common CC, Gladys Hagen Room, 2233 South Millway, Mississauga


Time: 1:30-4:30 pm

When attendees arrived, they signed in and looked at the project boards on display, which provided a summary of each of the ten neighbourhoods being studied and a board that outlined the project process. This was followed by a welcoming of attendees and explanation of the day’s agenda.

The session began with a presentation on the historical and character identities and relevant planning policies for each of the ten study areas. The presentation was followed by a brief question and answer session where attendees reflected on the historical and cultural features presented and the importance that the full range of features are captured and not lost in silos or buckets.

This was followed by a twenty-minute discussion panel on Place Making and City Building with panel members Philip Weinstein (SGL advisor, Planner and Urban Designer) and Walter Khem (LANDinc, Landscape Architect), and moderated by Joe Muller (City of Toronto, Heritage Planner). The panel spoke to the importance of character and scale and identifying the spirit and feeling of a place. The discussion also touched on the difference between conservation and preservation and the importance of integrating the new with the old.

Following the panel discussion, the final session had attendees' breakout into a working session on the two study areas of Erindale Village and Mineola. Attendees were asked to provide feedback on the cultural heritage features and unique elements that are important and contribute to the area's character. The original intent was to obtain feedback on all ten study areas however due to the small attendance numbers this wasn't feasible. Below is a breakdown of the comments provided by attendees at the session.



Mineola Neighbourhood

Desirable Neighbourhood Qualities

- Maturity of trees is highly desirable
- Setbacks are considered appropriate even when large homes are built as lot are large and allow form generous front setbacks
- City was already strict on city building standards and no further building standards are needed for single detached homes
- Single family homes are preferred
- The neighbourhood is quiet with no outside traffic to include no school bus route in the neighbourhood
- No service road in neighbourhood
- Mary Fix house provides a great historical anchor to the neighbourhood
- Rural cross section on all streets with no sidewalks and curbs
- Neighbourhood's undulating terrain and slopes which incorporate important drainage features of the area
- Lack of entry points makes for a quiet secluded neighbourhood

Concerns

- Tree cutting is an issue, would like stronger enforcement
- Townhouses near GO station can set a precedence on townhouse built form in the neighbourhood and create an issue of how far into the neighbourhood they could be built (see **red dot** on map)

Opportunities

- A pedestrian trail along the river, and a trail to the river (see **blue dot** on below map) would be nice amenity additions to the area
- The construction of a proper path in the corner lot at Highway QEW E and Hurontario Street (see **blue dot** by river on below map) would ensure the area is better used by residents.

Figure 1: Mineola Study Area – Workshop Map



Erindale Village

Desirable Qualities

- Local fauna: animals, deer
- Credit river, peacefulness, quiet, nature, scenery, picturesque/special town in middle of the city
- Huge sense of community, in part because limited entry and exit points, therefore lots of interaction, we see each other
- Credit River is surrounding and protecting the village
- Portion of the neighbourhood have beautiful views of Credit River
- Many people from outside community come to Erindale to walk
- Because lots are larger there is a sense of space, don't feel congested
- Built form along Dundas has heritage commercial feel, want to retain that
- When people coming into village, scenic views from top of Dundas and Mississauga Rd.
- Every building (commercial + residential) has 2 storeys or less
- Clean fresh air
- Sense of history, log cabins, stone homes, 100 yr old homes, A-frame homes
- Some homes have "green" shingles – add to green feel of neighbourhood
- Community events, street party, social functions have great turnout, community garage sale
- Neighbourhood of people who have lived in the community for generations, people try to move back into area when older, enhances sense of community
- No high rises in neighbourhood, underground parking, urban sprawl
- Newer development in SE corner recognized the existing theme and character of neighbourhood
- Strong sense of place, historic building and homes that are designated and listed
- Country road atmosphere of the street, coach and buggy feel
- No curbs, culverts, no sidewalks, no signs
- Apple trees in people's yards
- **Red dots on map** = significant buildings to neighbourhood's context

Concerns

- Only one entrance into park on NW side of Dundas St W (see red dots). Additional entrances would enhance the use of the park by residents.
- Noted that there are two summer homes for Toronto residents

Opportunities

- Existing built form has an existing "theme" that should be reflected in new developments.
- "theme" = nature, quiet, trees, heritage homes
- Village sign/gateway at bridge on Dundas St W near Mississauga Road (see yellow dot)
- No amenities in the neighbourhood, could be nice to have some if done within

respect to the neighbourhood's context

Figure 2: Erindale Village Study Area – Workshop Map





DATE: December 10, 2018 Project ID: CH.MS
TO: Paula Wubbenhorst - Heritage Planner
Rebecca Sciarra – Partner ASI
FROM: Ute Maya-Giambattista – Principal Fotenn Planning & Design
RE: Mississauga’s Cultural Heritage Landscapes Study – PIC No. 1 Summary

Three Public Information Centres were held in varying locations around Mississauga on November 15th, 19th and 26th. Fotenn Planning & Design, SGL Planning & Design and ASI facilitated the sessions to garner feedback from key stakeholders and the general public on Mississauga’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study. This was the study’s second round of public consultation, after the first public information session was held on September 29th, 2018.

The PIC’s were held in the following locations:

PIC 1: November 15th 2018 Malton Hall, 11 attendees

PIC 2: November 19th 2018 Streetsville, 32 attendees

PIC 3: November 26th 2018 Huron Park Community Centre, 10 attendees

Total participants at PIC’s: 58

To garner further public input a Cultural Heritage Landscape Survey was developed and circulated for completion both online through the project website and via printed copies circulated and collected during the Public Information Sessions. A total of 41 surveys were filled out. The compiled results of the surveys can be found in section 4 of this report.

Table of Contents

<i>Section 1: Summary of Public Information Centres held on November 15th, 19th and 26th 2018</i>	3
1.1 Format of Public Information Centres and Information Covered.....	3
1.2 Questions Asked During the Public Information Centres.....	3
<i>Section 2: Compiled Results from Mapping and Table Discussions during PIC's 1 - 3.....</i>	6
2.1 Malton.....	6
2.2 Streetsville Village Core	8
2.3 Erindale Village:.....	10
2.4 Creditview Road Scenic Route:	11
2.5 Mississauga Road Scenic Route:.....	12
2.6 Trelawny Community:	13
2.7 Credit River Scenic Route	14
2.8 Mineola.....	14
2.9 General comments provided	16
<i>Section 3: Summary of Responses to the Conserving Cultural Heritage Landscapes Survey</i>	17
1. Streetsville Village Core.....	18
2. Sheridan Research Park	19
3. Credit River Corridor	20
4. Malton Neighbourhood	21
5. Mineola Neighbourhood	23
6. Lorne Park Estates.....	24
7. Trelawny Community	25
8. Erindale Village.....	26
9. Creditview Road Scenic Route	27
10. Mississauga Road Scenic Route	28
<i>Section 4: PIC Attendee Lists.....</i>	30

Section 1: Summary of Public Information Centres held on November 15th, 19th and 26th 2018

1.1 Format of Public Information Centres and Information Covered

The structure for each PIC was as follows:

1. Introduction of project and the project team
2. Welcome to attendees from the City of Mississauga
3. Explanation of what cultural heritage landscapes are and an overview of available tools for protecting them
4. Breakout session amongst individual tables using maps of their chosen study area (out of the ten being looked at in this phase of the study) and note pads to draw and write on the maps and note pads to answer the following questions:
 - What elements in the area do you consider to be cultural heritage?
 - Based on these elements is the boundary identified in the 2005 study functional?
 - What tools would you be interested in seeing used to protect cultural heritage elements? What would you like tools to address?
5. Presentation from each table to the group about their identified elements, boundaries and preferred tools
6. The PIC's wrapped up with discussion and questions sessions

1.2 Questions Asked During the Public Information Centres

1.2.1 PIC 1: Malton Hall November 15th, 2018

Q: Are owners required to maintain listed heritage properties?

A: properties that are listed on the heritage register would be subject to the same property enforcement as any other property in Mississauga, there's no difference. You can call 311 with your concerns and enforce any by-laws.

Q: Is having us identify these cultural elements going to stop people from tearing them down?

A: It depends on the tool(s) selected. We can't freeze communities in time, identifying how we will allow change to happen in a way that won't destroy the "flavor" or character of the community is a goal of this project.

Q: There is already a concern about houses being destroyed. A lot of residences have moved out and no one is there to take care of those houses, so what happens, they go on sale and get torn down. That's a big concern.

A: We need to look at is there enough cultural heritage left to implement protective measures. (People responded saying there is lots)

1.2.2 PIC 2: Streetsville November 19th, 2018

Q: Does the city of Mississauga have a tree bylaw?

A: Yes, it applies to when there's removal of 3 or more trees.

Q: In reference to Streetsville we are losing trees to disease, I see damaged and dying trees all over. What kind of strategies can we have to help the streetscape to replace trees or combat this? Not only to address individual issues, but a policy for tree maintenance for the city, assistance to public on what to do about trees dying on our lots, rather than just reacting to people wanting to take trees down.

A: We are hearing that there's a bigger conversation about the environmental contributions these places can have and the bigger conversation of tree canopy in an urban environment. This is a recommendation we can take to report back on, that this is part of something bigger.

Q: From a resident of downtown Streetsville. With the bylaws in place what do we do about places that are heritage designation that were never an attractive home, or have gone up in flames, what can we do to have something more slightly. Do we need to keep it there derelict and vacant, that's not helping our community in any way? Not just keeping them because there are heritage bylaws, if they're staying derelict why are we keeping them.

A: We have the tools to protect but the other side is the property owners, there's no manner that we can force property owners to upkeep, no manner to force to retrofit or rebuild a heritage home. Once the structure is severely damaged there are ways that if the structure can be potentially used differently. If damage is extensive and there's nothing to salvage and retrofit from a heritage perspective the owner can apply to have it removed from the designation.

Q: Are heritage designations staying? Once designated, if you don't have the money you can let it deteriorate. Are we forcing owners to let designated homes become derelict because they're too expensive to update?

A: There are many examples of this situation, you have situations where the property is so far gone, we ask what can we do here? What is trying to be achieved here/ need to step back and realize that we need to enter into a conversation with the property owner in good faith. That property owner will work with the city to maintain the building and keep it in good condition just like any other property owner is expected to. The tool is not intended to cause derelict properties.

Comment: From a member of the Lisgare Residents Association. The 9th line corridor is about to be developed, which includes St Peter's Mission Church, Kindry Cemetary, and Aushbry these should be reserved. We are excited to see this conversation, we want to see our heritage, we have very little in Mississauga. Along 16 mile creek we lost a trail marker tree put in by first nations people. Also the white school house was lost on Britannia road and 10th line. We want it acknowledged, plaques there, developed in a way that reflects that environment. Something that reflects the heritage. At the corner of

9th Line & Britannia road there is potential to develop a transit hub, that's where St Peter's Church and a historical house are, maybe it's not the best location for development if its' going to jeopardise heritage sites.

Comment: I live close to Barbara house restaurant, it's a disaster in progress. Mississauga scenic road route, we worked with the city for 2-3 years however now there's a commercial issue because another developer has purchased the property. Our problem is the enforcement, they're going to destroy Barbara house which is a historic site. How do you stop a disaster in progress, that should be part of this process, we need a tool for that. A problem is that the councilors voted against us.

1.2.3 PIC 3: Huron Park Community Centre November 26th, 2018

Q: Is there a hierarchy of importance to all the tools? Which have the greatest weight?

A: Some are stronger than others it's dependent on what you want to achieve.

Registering something on title through a bylaw is one of the strongest ways you can regulate a property or an area if you're using a conservation district. However the OP designation although not registered on title is the highest authority that guides planning in the City of Mississauga. It functions to shape policy at the highest more important level so there are some tradeoffs between the tools. Some are very good at managing an individual property but they don't necessarily impact big planning decisions unless they're in the OP.

Q: Specifically in Mineola, my understanding is Mineola is under the cultural heritage landscape and that has recently changed. How did that get removed?

A: Answer from City of Mississauga employee: We found there was a lot of redevelopment happening in Mineola. We weren't actually designating anything, hadn't heard any interest, there were so many applications coming in, so the heritage advisory committee asked us to remove it from the register. Ultimately, it's council's decision in consultation with the heritage committee. The idea was we knew we were going to get the funding for this project to do an in-depth study. There are some areas that are still on the register, but the vast majority has been removed in spring 2016. The City considers it a cultural landscape, the cultural heritage committee's opinion was it wasn't working.

General comments: People are frustrated that they didn't hear about Mineola being removed from the register. If we have a plan we can all adhere to that. It also offers guide to developers on what they can/can't do, especially with trees and setbacks. The canopy of trees in Mineola needs to be projected.

A: Part of the frustration, is even if there's cultural heritage protection, there's no further guidelines that speak to the trees, landform, and built form. There's no tool to push a specific message for development. In our minds it's becoming clear that it's one thing to have the designation then you need the tools for development guidance.

Comment from attendee: It seems like city departments aren't talking. The committee of adjustment allows everything, over 95% of everything that goes to committee of adjustment goes through. It's ridiculous.

A: This is why we went through a rigorous tool exercise to identify how to protect what matters to each area. If it's just buildings that's one tool, if it's layers then it's another tool.

Section 2: Compiled Results from Mapping and Table Discussions during PIC's 1 – 3

During the Public Information Centre the following questions were answered by attendees through the use of maps and notes taken at individual tables after an explanation of what Cultural Heritage Landscapes are, the elements that create them and potential planning tools for protecting them.

- 1) What elements in the area do you consider to be cultural heritage?
- 2) What tools would you be interested in seeing used to protect cultural heritage elements?

2.1 Malton

- 1) What elements in the area do you consider to be cultural heritage?
 - a. Cultural Heritage Elements
 - Victory School
 - Ariann Terrace on Airport Rd is where the former Malton Public School was located
 - Names of streets (signage)
 - Front lawns
 - No monster homes
 - The plane (off map)
 - Cenotaph
 - Institutional Buildings
 - Airport Road
 - 4 corners was the real heart of the communities
 - Trees
 - Victory Park – heart
 - Old Malton – HCD (late 18's)
 - War time housing landscape exclusive to East side, housing sold to first owners by the government
 - Early 19th C. Malton on W. side of Airport Rd.
 - Some heritage houses: Scarborough St
 - Big lots
 - Ridgewood + Marvin heights

- b. Undesirable Elements/things of note
- Those living south of Airport Rd. don't go to the ravine/park area to the north west because you need to cross Airport Rd which has a short light/feels unsafe
 - Concern over homes being used as boarding houses, creating a negative impact on community building
 - There's not much left in historic Malton south of Airport Rd.
 - Character has been lost
 - 1969 gas destroyed 4 corners and Main Street, now there is no sense of entry or exit into the area
- c. Requested Elements
- More food options would be great, grocery stores/restaurants along Airport Road
 - Bathroom at Station Way Park
 - Arena at Goreway and Derry hub for community
 - Trinity United Church
 - Malton Bible Chapel
 - Malton Victory Hall
 - Victory Crescent noted as having multiple war time houses
 - Victory Park Ravine
- 2) Based on these elements is the boundary functional
- Area south west of Airport Rd has historical farmhouse homes from the 1800s. It also has a historical home that has been gutted and sat vacant for many years. There are homes that are listed on the heritage registry in that area.
 - Multiple people supported having Old Malton Village being included because of its numerous heritage homes
- 3) What tools would you be interested in seeing used to protect cultural heritage elements?
What would you like tools to address?
- Tool to support having a few heritage war time homes in a row (or close together) could stay so we know they existed that would be nice, doesn't have to be all of them
 - Concerns about process related to the size of new development
 - Important that new builds are sensitive
 - Change the by-law to better reflect housing and enforce
 - Prevent Paving Front lawns
 - Property standards/maintenance
 - Loss of heritage fabric, makes it tough to make HCD argument
 - Move control to include east side of Airport Road, up to Morningside

2.2 Streetsville Village Core

1) What elements in the area do you consider to be cultural heritage?

a. Cultural Heritage Elements

- Designated heritage properties
- Main St and Thomas St are main entrances
- Key area shown as Queen St from Caroline St to just east of Thomas St
- There was a lot of support for Odd Fellows Hall as heritage 271 Queen St S
- Culham Trail that goes north past river grove community centre, important for walking/running and views
- The town square and old shopping area: Along Queen from Thomas St to Tannery St and down Main Street between Queen St and Church St
- Streetsville Cemetery (views, running, jogging) – 295 Queen St S
- Views of river
- Salmon ladders
- St Andrews Church – 295 Queen St S
- Streetsville United Church – 274 Queen St S
- Trinity Church – 69 Queen St S
- Field train Station – one of 2 wooden stations left, would be good to move it to a more prominent location
- Centetaph
- Timothy Street's House – namesake of the town – 41 Mill Street
- Vic Johnson Community Centre
- Original school house
- BIA building
- Streetsville Library and Park
- Legion
- Old Mill equipment, building located on the river, down a driveway from the parking lot at 101 Church St
- Water Wheel #16
- WN Atkinson House
- Historical walking tours take place in town
- Russell Langmaid Public School – 170 Church St
- Arena
- Mullet Creek is important
- Murphy's ice cream shop
- Area – community (trail leads from main st to forest) meets another community centre
- Arrowheads have been found along the river
- Our lady of good voyage – first elementary school

- Should maybe include Creditview and Britannia important intersection, first taco bell
 - Old English lane (important intersection)
 - Cullum trail should be protected
- a. Undesirable
- Broken up characters along Queen St
 - City allowing trees to deteriorate
 - Burnt building that continues to change owners over 15 years, eye sore, because of the parking lot abutting it, you can't get a delivery truck into it = thought that this keeps ruining ability to make business viable in building, but parking lot is liked
 - Savannah Row home also burnt (unsure if it's heritage)
- b. Requested
- Need to add more trees
- 2) Based on these elements is the boundary functional
- Extend South to include Mullet Creek (some is on private property, there was no interest in including the homes abutting onto Mullet Creek)
 - Extend north to far side of the river to include the forested area and trails
 - Extend east to include the flour mills to the rail bridge over the Credit River
 - Far side of Credit River should be included
 - Include the Credit River
- 3) What tools would you be interested in seeing used to protect cultural heritage elements? What would you like tools to address?
- Create bylaw to enforce tree protection/health
 - City purchasing unkept heritage properties and restoring them
 - Maintain 2 storey massing
 - Support ground floor commercial
 - Support 2nd floor residential
 - Desire to include “not only pretty” include the town's economic history/why it grew = the mills
 - is there a way to make property owners change buildings to look better?
 - Lack of accountability
 - Tools through HCD plans to keep character
 - Main street, shops – needs regulation, there's no consistency/quality
 - Things that need regulation
 - Flashing lights
 - Paint colours
 - Should be regulated all the way up to Britannia rd

- Extend to Eglinton Cherry trees
- Should have (or do have) street lighting and signage unique to Streetsville
- Development should fit in with landscape, not a condo
- Development should maintain the look of the area
- Building heights should maintain the look of the area
- Native/culturally significant tree varieties should be protected/maintained/replaced.
- Currently native/culturally significant trees are being replaced with small fruit trees instead of the previous varieties of trees that grew to large scale
- Stricter tree bylaws for developers to save the larger trees (especially native/culturally significant trees)
- Tools to increase pedestrian safety (Streetsville is very walkable, but cars speed into the area)

2.3 Erindale Village:

- 1) What elements in the area do you consider to be cultural heritage?
 - a. Cultural Heritage Elements
 - Wildlife patterns
 - Trails of naturalized area
 - Views in and out from village to Dundas and from Dundas/Erindale Park
 - Existing house to lot coverage
 - Community may have interest in HCD
 - Dundas Street frontage would be priority for managing change
 - Scenic corridor? Dundas St. West (Credit Woodlands – Heritage Mississauga)
 - Unique signage with in community up in 2018 “Erindale Village est. 1830”
 - CVC has identified unique fauna in the forested area at the southwest corner of Dundas St W and the river
 - St Peter’s Anglican Erindale
 - Erindale Community Hall
 - Piatto restaurant
 - 2581 Mindemoya Road
 - 2595 Jarvis St (predates confederation) (not sure correct home was given?)
 - Ultimate Academy 1555 Dundas St W
 - Erindale Presbyterian Church 1560 Dundas St W
 - Erindale United Church 1444 Dundas Crescent
 - 1484 Adamson St
 - Home to the west of 1520 Adamson St is heritage (address won’t come up on google maps)
 - 2505 Jarvis St

- 2470 Jarvis St
- 2409-2431 Jarvis ST (crescent was marked)
- Log cabin on the property of 2552 Jarvis St
- Signage located at Dundas St W and Mississauga Rd
- Damn remnants + river rail
- Two (salmon ladders?) damns are located just north west of the Dundas St W bridge in the river

- b. Undesirable
 - c. Requested
 - Vision/Goal: public pedestrian gateway access into valley from entrance to Erindale Park
- 2) Based on these elements is the boundary functional
 - Map suggested extending the neighbourhood boundary to the include some of the park and the river to the north west
 - Dundas St W has the following notes:
 - i. “To heritage Mississauga” NE entrance
 - ii. “Start at the credit Woodlands” SW entrance
 - 3) What tools would you be interested in seeing used to protect cultural heritage elements? What would you like tools to address?
 - Interest in HCD?
 - a. To be discussed with resident’s association
 - b. Some concerns about limitation
 - c. Education would be key

2.4 Creditview Road Scenic Route:

- 1) What elements in the area do you consider to be cultural heritage?
 - a) Cultural Heritage Elements
 - Farmland area located between Old Derry Rd, Hwy 401 E and Old Creditview Rd
 - Homes on Velebit Court
 - Homes on Spring Garden Ct
 - Farm house located north of Old Creditview Rd and Hwy 401 E
 - Homes on Rivergate Pl.
 - Deer and beavers have been seen in Credit Meadows Park
 - Trails were noted into Credit Meadows Park from the parking lot off Creditview Road, south of Kenninghall Crescent and, pedestrian path from Kenninghall Crescent and Steen Dr.

- Cul-de-sace should be included – landmark (Velebit Court) – views, access to credit river
- Harris farm – plans to make it a park
- Views and vistas – maintain
- Agricultural fields – keep
- Remnant of settler road
- Mature area
- Nice mix of housing
- Credit River interpretation
- Farmland/homes to the south of Hwy 1
- Views from Hwy 401 East bridge over Credit River
- Noted that there's a 19th century home located near 10 Steen Drive

b) Undesirable Elements

c) Requested Elements

2) Based on these elements is the boundary functional

- Extend to include:
 - i. Slightly further south down the river from Creditview Rd, to include the walking bridge that crosses the river
 - ii. Include cluster of residential development on Spring Garden Ct, just south of Old Creditview Rd

3) What tools would you be interested in seeing used to protect cultural heritage elements? What would you like tools to address?

2.5 Mississauga Road Scenic Route:

1) What elements in the area do you consider to be cultural heritage?

a. Cultural Heritage Elements

- Mississauga Rd and Alpha Mills Rd noted
- Eglinton Ave W and Mississauga Rd noted
- Mississauga Rd and Reid Drive noted
- Section between Mississauga Rd and Reid Drive to Hwy 403 E and Mississauga Rd circled
- entry signage
- School and church near Dundas of value
- Large houses on small lots
- Trees between Eglinton and Melody

b. Undesirable Elements

- Unhealthy trees
- City doesn't really maintain trees

- Lots of development around Barber House

c. Requested Elements/Actions

- Concern with traffic in Streetsville
- More crosswalks and traffic lights in streetsville
- More trails, wider trails, picnic tables
- Close Queen St off to traffic
- Carve tree stumps in Streetsville
- Enlist UTM/students to assist with project, tree maintenance
- Enlist Law school students for OMP/LPAT hearings and planning students
- Interpretive signage by Mississauga Golf Club requires paving and more
- More parkland
- Balusters along roads in this area could help

2) Based on these elements is the boundary functional

3) What tools would you be interested in seeing used to protect cultural heritage elements?
What would you like tools to address?

- How to keep trees healthy
- Clear cut trees are a concern as well as short setback to street near Barber House

2.6 Trelawny Community:

1) What elements in the area do you consider to be cultural heritage?

a. Cultural Heritage Elements

- Small section of Lisgar
- White school house location perfect
- 16 Mile Creek should be protected – large tree used by first nations as a trail marker was cut down (noted as important generally for Mississauga’s cultural heritage, not located inside Trelawny)
- Agricultural fields (noted as important generally for Mississauga’s cultural heritage, not located inside Trelawny)
- Small section of Lisgar including 9th line
- Kindree Cemetery
- Flood plain, lots of floods (Catholic swamp) settled by Irish – (Ninth Line and Britannia Road)
- Attracts a lot of wildlife – native flora Carolinian forest (Hale Oak, Hickory)
- St Peter’s mission church – oldest church in Mississauga , predates confederation
- Signage – Lisgar Village (lost village heritage Mississauga)
- Osprey march extends to 9th line corridor

- b. Undesirable Elements
 - Snow removal, parking (no parking) only street parking is an issue
 - The circle doesn't work
 - c. Requested Elements
 - Bike lanes
- 2) Based on these elements is the boundary functional
- 3) What tools would you be interested in seeing used to protect cultural heritage elements?
What would you like tools to address?
- Protect flood plane

2.7 Credit River Scenic Route

- 1) What elements in the area do you consider to be cultural heritage?
- a. Cultural Heritage Elements
 - Trails leading to Credit River are of major interest. Long history of trail use amongst residents
 - Indigenous history abounds where Credit meets Lake Ontario
 - Lighthouse
 - Indian Rd and St John St – there's a skating rink and a walking path lined with the provinces flags. There used to be totem pole
 - Veteran's association near Korean War museum Assets extend from it
 - Raised board walks
 - Malauglin Rd – major farm house
 - Falukner and Old Creditview River – used to fish and get crawfish there
 - Pet cemetery – very picturesque
 - There are 2 lakes 1) Aquitaine 2) Lake Wabukayne
 - There are numerous paths/trails hidden and obvious that people use to access the Credit throughout Mississauga
 - b. Undesirable Elements
 - d. Requested Elements
- 2) Based on these elements is the boundary functional
- 3) What tools would you be interested in seeing used to protect cultural heritage elements?
What would you like tools to address?

2.8 Mineola

- 1) What elements in the area do you consider to be cultural heritage?
 - a) Cultural Heritage Elements
 - Scenic road along Stavebank and, along Mineola Rd W between Stavebank and Hurontario St
 - Cannoli Lots promised each lot with 25 trees. (Carmine Dr). “a forest is a gynassium of the soul”
 - Developers gave rebate for trees during development of Mineola
 - Wildlife
 - Mix – hybrid of landscape and trees/no fences (like Rockcliff, Ottawa) + scenic rd Stavebank
 - Spacing b/w homes is an important aspect to the landscape
 - Water level/table importance on the overall landscape
 - The landscape benefits the community as a whole – people who don’t live there come to walk/run/cycle
 - b) Undesirable Elements
 - Traffic issues from Hurontario St along Mineola St W to Glenburnie Rd, along Glenburnie Rd to Pinetree Way to Hurontario St.
 - Clarify new pedestrian overpass (from Gordon Woods and Hospital)
 - Don’t want bridge Indian Rd
 - Traffic calming – need stop signs
 - Don’t change cross -section of street profile
 - Hurontario st. will widen with the LRT
 - c) Requested Elements
- 2) Based on these elements is the boundary functional
 - Connect to Credit River
- 3) What tools would you be interested in seeing used to protect cultural heritage elements? What would you like tools to address?
 - Question change in downgrading CHL
 - Issue with monster home
 - Water issues – flooding needs to be addressed
 - Trees are a big loss (need by-law)
 - Pools and basements are an issue because of water table and flooding
 - Protection of trees during construction is needed
 - Make heritage tree inventory as part of the heritage process or a metric to allow owners to buy into the mixed hybrid HCD

2.9 General comments provided

Comments made:

- Bike trail needed along 9th line
- Development on both sides of the tracks in Streetsville impacts all of Streetsville
- All along credit river should be connected
- What about archaeological assessment?
- One of the original peace pipes used between Indigenous and settlers is from Mississauga – now at Downsview
- Suburban development outside Streetsville depends on Streetsville and vice versa
- Trails are a major connector (salmon runs, hiking, biking)
- There was interest in protecting mid-century modern architecture within Mississauga
 - Lornewoods has some concentrated areas of mid-century homes/buildings and there are sections in Mineola
 - Mid century auto shop from the 50/60s was torn down b/w Port Credit and Lakeshore, - the service station across the road from the same era is being considered for designation in January 2019
 - Feels mid century architecture (post war up to 1990s) is representative of Mississauga's growth
 - There is a designated service station which is the only one designated in GTA
 - George Carlson is co-chair of heritage committee
 - Getting post war onto heritage is difficult
 - There's a misconception that there's a lot of it out there
 - Provincial guidelines 1st criteria for heritage is 40 + yrs old
 - Next yr new landscapes will be considered, places like Lornewoods would be good candidates – it all depends on how the heritage committee/general public feel about it

Section 3: Summary of Responses to the Conserving Cultural Heritage Landscapes Survey

Location: Surveys were filled out online and during the project's three November Public Information Centres

Fifteen people responded to printed surveys handed out and collected during the Public Consultation Sessions held in Mississauga on November 15th, 19th and 26th 2018. An additional twenty people responded to the same survey online via the project website.

The survey results are largely in line with the responses heard throughout the Public Consultation Processes held in November. Key Cultural Heritage Landscape elements that were noted included large trees and tree canopy, wildlife, the Credit River and its tributaries, trails, unique architecture, historic buildings and strong feelings of community.

The majority of respondents filled out one to two sections of the survey. To address the fluctuating number of respondents to each question the survey results include the number of respondents to each question, allowing percentages to be calculated.

The survey asked what makes Mississauga's Cultural Heritage Landscapes unique in each of the following ten study areas:

1. Streetsville Village Core
2. Sheridan Research Park
3. Credit River Corridor
4. Malton Neighbourhood
5. Mineola Neighbourhood
6. Lorne Park Estates
7. Trelawny Community
8. Erindale Village
9. Creditview Road Scenic Route
10. Mississauga Road Scenic Route

Additional areas of interest were noted by some respondents on the hand written survey:

- Port Credit HCD
- Etobicoke CK corridor (Dundas to Lake Ont.)
- Lakeview
- Lorne Woods (north of Lakeshore)

1. Streetsville Village Core

1.1 Streetsville was described in the 2005 Cultural Landscape Inventory Study as having heritage buildings of a consistent scale and portraying a period landscape of a small village.

Do you think these factors still contribute to Streetsville's sense of 'place'?

- 22 out of 23 respondents felt that Streetsville's heritage buildings being of a consistent scale and portraying a period landscape of a small village contribute to Streetsville's sense of 'place', 1 respondent did not.
- Reasons for this being the case included:
 - The village/small town feeling that still remains due to the charm and character of the village core area and the streetscape still fundamentally reading as an established older village
 - The history of place that the heritage buildings provide
 - Sensitive infill that respects height and massing
 - Numerous "mom and pop" shops
 - Walkability to shops, coffee, restaurants
 - Narrow streets
- Undesirable elements that were noted include:
 - Infill that is not sensitive to the existing built character
 - Signs and lighting that are not sensitive to the existing built character
 - Lack of density provided by existing buildings to support local coffee shops and restaurants which is resulting in more dental offices, insurance and wealth management offices that don't make the area feel vibrant
 - The Main Street Square being too modern
 - Christmas trees decorated by the school do not weather well

1.2 As part of the current study, the following features have emerged as important or unique elements that contribute to Streetsville's character.

Please check the elements you agree with:

- the village's local road and Main Street streetscape treatment such as street paving material, furniture, lights, signage and street landscaping; **Count: 22/22**
- heritage buildings and features like cemeteries; **Count: 22/22**
- street lighting and signage; **Count: 20/22**
- main street business/retail signs; **Count: 19/22**
- Streetsville square; and **Count: 22/22**
- War Memorial Cenotaph **Count: 20/22**

Additional comments on 1.2:

- The house on the corner of Main and church is disgusting

- Streetsville square is lacking in taste, especially the seasonal lighting re-street lighting and signage
- Dislike neon street signs. Like Streetsville Memorial Park. Recommend extending Colham Trail south of Memorial Park.

1.3 What else makes Streetsville important to you?

- Small Town Environment
- Walkability to a variety of small businesses
- Trail network: Culham Trail
- Credit River
- Lack of billboards or big neon signs and the consistent signage and style of building's façades
- Community Events: bread and honey parade, the small town feel, pedestrian spaces, small businesses, historical walking tours
- Vibrant BIA
- Narrow roadway that increases walkability
- The history provided by the built form
 - The railway station on William Street
 - Odd Fellows Hall
 - Robson Bray Tea Room
 - Churches
- Lack of condominiums in the village core
- Existing historical signage and plaques
- Floral decorations

Respondents also used this space to highlight further concerns including:

- Desire for building materials to be more architectural
- Need for protection of mature trees
- A participant noted a dislike for the white modern structure in the middle of the pedestrianized area near Goodfellas
- Desire for the Cagney's/LCBO plaza to be updated and brought to the street front
- Additional seasonal decorations on main street

2. Sheridan Research Park

2.1 Sheridan Research Park is described in the 2005 Cultural Landscape Inventory Study as an early private campus for commercial research designed using comprehensive planning guidelines that guided the development of grand corporate headquarters.

Do you think these qualities still contribute to Sheridan Research Park's unique character?

- Yes **Count: 2/2**
- No **Count:**
- Why or why not:
 - The large greenspace area around the industries make the area attractive
 - Branding/overall plan gives it a feel like "Silicon Valley"

2.2 As part of the current study, the following features have emerged as important or unique elements that contribute to the character of the Sheridan Research Park:

Please check the elements you agree with:

- the Xerox building and other exceptional corporate office architecture and landscape features, and **Count: 1/2**
- the grand research park entrance landscaping features and signage off North Sheridan Way **Count: 2/2**

1.4 What else makes Sheridan Research Park important to you?

- The overall plan and strategy is good but it also makes it feel dated and needs to be revitalized to stay current.
- It needs to be updated to have enhanced transit.

3. Credit River Corridor

3.1 The Credit River Corridor is described in the 2005 Cultural Landscape Inventory Study as the largest natural heritage feature in Mississauga: as the focus of settlement in the area for thousands of years, it has shaped the city into its modern form, and is central to many natural, traditional, recreational and commercial activities.

Do you think these qualities contribute to the Credit River Corridor as a place?

- Yes **Count: 20/20**
- No **Count:**
- Why
 - Historical impact Credit River has on the creation of Mississauga
 - Distinctive natural heritage of the river
 - Recreational activities
 - Commercial activities
 - Desire to preserve natural area amongst development
 - The river as a connector to the whole city
 - Wildlife

- Natural beauty provides an oasis

3.2 As part of the current study, the following features have emerged as important or unique elements that contribute to the character of the Credit River Corridor:

Please check the elements you agree with:

- Trees; **Count: 20/29**
 - parks and recreational uses along riverbanks; **Count: 19/20**
 - pedestrian bridges; **Count: 20/20**
 - ecological features; **Count: 20/20**
 - remaining mills; **Count: 15/20**
 - scenic views / vistas; **Count: 20/20**
 - unique plants and animals; **Count: 18/20**
 - trails **Count: 20/20**
 - additional responses to 3.2:
 - Mills should be protected before they disappear
 - Importance of Culham Trail
- 3.3 What else makes the Credit River Corridor important to you?
- Desirable Qualities
 - Nature
 - Wildlife both aquatic and terrestrial
 - Trails
 - Gathering spaces: picnic tables, parks
 - Riverwood Conservation area's programs and gardens
 - Free, unrestricted access to the River
 - History
 - Flour Mill
 - Historical movement of people and goods
 - Connection to farmland
 - Connectivity provided by the Credit River
 - Things that could be Improved
 - Bike trails
 - The area south of 401/East of Creditview Rd is not accessible to public, one respondent wants to know why
 - Improved parking near trails
 - Desire for conservation
 - Lack of clarity over water quality

4. Malton Neighbourhood

4.1 The Malton Neighbourhood is described in the 2005 Cultural Landscape Inventory Study as retaining a number of post-World War II houses, known as Victory houses, which represent some of the first mass produced housing in the Greater Toronto Area.

Do you think these features contribute to Malton's sense of 'place'?

- Yes – **Count: 5/5**
- No – **Count:**

Responses to 4.1:

- Positives
 - History of WWI
 - Uniqueness of housing type provides historical reference and sense of place
- Concerns
 - Concern of homes being relatively small for what people are wanting today
 - Do not need to protect all of the war time houses, just some

4.2 As part of the current study, the following features have emerged as important or unique elements that contribute to Malton's character.

Please check the elements you agree with:

- the neighbourhood's unique one or one and a half storey war time housing; **Count: 5/5**
- the location of home's garage entrances and driveways; **Count: 4/5**
- front setbacks and front lawn treatment/landscaping; **Count: 4/5**
- street design and trees. **Count: 5/5**

4.3 What else makes the Malton Neighbourhood important to you?

- The original homes
- Set back of homes
- 4 corners
- Multicultural
- People maintaining street up keep
- Large trees
- Elementary schools leaving trees to grow
- Historical buildings/spaces
 - Victory Hall
 - CF-100 Airplane
 - War Memorial Cenotaph
 - Victory Park

5. Mineola Neighbourhood

5.1 The 2005 Cultural Landscape Inventory Study describes Mineola as one of the most visually interesting and memorable neighbourhoods in Mississauga because it retains natural topography and vegetation. Roads wind around natural topography and houses often sit at odd angles to take advantage of slopes and locations of large trees.

Do you think these elements still contribute to Mineola's sense of 'place'?

- Yes: **Count: 23/15**
- No: **Count: 2/15**
- Why
 - The country setting in the city feel
 - Remaining CHL attributes
 - Concern over redevelopment pressure destroying what is left of built cultural heritage
 - Walkability and use by wider community
 - A city that is "walkable" requires areas of interest to be walked to. Mineola is an area you walk to/through, not drive through. The residential woodlot of Mineola under the NAS makes up for 0.7% of the 11% NAS IDs over Mississauga's entire area
 - Wide lots
 - Large old trees creating a forest like canopy
 - Watercourses
 - Distinct settlement pattern
 - Mid-century modern housing styles
 - Architecturally interesting neighbourhood
- Why Not:
 - Concern over tree health and protection
 - Concern over intensification
 - "There are many places like Mineola, Lorne Park is an example"

5.2 As part of the current study, the following features have emerged as important or unique elements that contribute to Mineola's character.

Please check the elements you agree with:

- the neighbourhood's rural and winding streetscapes; **Count: 13/14**
- the change in slope; **Count: 11/14**
- the natural drainage system that runs towards the lake and runs through properties across the entire community; **Count: 10/14**
- front lawn setbacks and landscaping; **Count: 11/14**
- garage and driveway location; **Count: 9/14**
- mature street trees; **Count: 13/14**
- mix of formal and natural landscaping treatments **Count: 10/14**

5.3 What else makes the Mineola Neighbourhood important to you?

- Low Density
- No High Rises
- Mix of architectural styles including
- Wildlife
- Traffic calm streets
- No sidewalks
- Mix of smaller and larger single detached homes
- Lack of fences
- Stavebank Rd scenic drive
- Sense of peace coming off of Hurontario into Mineola
- Midcentury modern architecture
- Rural feel
- Lack of access to the river due to private homes was also mentioned

5.4 Do you have documents or images about unique or important elements in the Mineola Neighbourhood? Would you like to submit more detailed comments on the neighbourhood? Please email your ideas or documents to

Heritage.planning@mississauga.ca

- Somewhere in the Peel archives for properties on Kenollie Ave in the area of 199/215 you might find a reference to a promise of 25 mature trees on every lot sold

6. Lorne Park Estates

6.1 Lorne Park Estates is identified in the 2005 Cultural Landscape Inventory Study as a unique shoreline community that combines low density residential development with the protection and management of a forested community representative in many ways of the pre-settlement shoreline of Lake Ontario.

Do you think these qualities still contribute to Lorne Park's sense of 'place'?

- Yes **Count: 2/4**
- No **Count: 1**
- Why:
 - Strong private home owner association protects the area
 - Very unique to the GTA
- Why Not:
 - There are many neighbourhoods like Lorne Park Estates

6.2 As part of the current study, the following features have emerged as important or unique elements that contribute to Lorne Park's character.

Please check the elements you agree with:

- low-density residential; **Count: 3/3**
- forested community (white pines, red oaks); **Count: 3/3**
- residential development within mature forest; **Count: 2/3**
- remnant historical cottages; and **Count: 3/3**
- street's rural cross section with natural drainage road shoulders and no curbs **Count: 2/3**

6.3 What else makes Lorne Park Estates important to you?

- Positives
 - The open spaces between residential buildings
 - Minimal privacy fencing
 - Rolling topography
 - Mid-century modern style homes
- Concerns
 - Developments should be limited – no overbuilding

7. Trelawny Community

7.1 The 2005 Cultural Landscape Inventory Study describes the Trelawny Community as an experimental residential neighbourhood. Its unique organization of street patterns created by arterials and hammer-headed housing clusters increases housing density while retaining the single detached residential form and minimizes the impact of cars by reducing typical road standards and integrating vehicular access more compactly.

Do you think these characteristics still contribute to Trelawny's sense of 'place'?

- Yes **Count: 2/3**
- No **Count: 1/3**
- Why
 - Great place to live, quiet and safe for kids
- Why Not
 - "Never build a community like this again"

7.2 As part of the current study, the following features have emerged as important or unique elements that contribute to Trelawny's character.

Please check the elements you agree with:

- the community's distinctive layout; **Count: 13/4**
- the homes' angled siting; **Count: 3 /4**
- garage and driveway treatments; **Count: ¾**

- the Trelawny Public School, Our Lady of Mount Carmel Secondary School and Trelawny Woods park, which are in the core of the community; **Count: 2 /4**
- Entry pavilions on either end of Trelawny Circle **Count: 3 /4**

7.3 What else makes the Trelawny Community important to you?

- It is a unique development within the city, possibly within the GTA?
- Lots of mature trees

7.4 Do you have documents or images about unique or important elements in the Trelawny Community? Would you like to submit more detailed comments on the community? Please email your ideas or documents to Heritage.planning@mississauga.ca

8. Erindale Village

8.1 Erindale Village is described as having heritage buildings of a common scale, mature trees, and former agricultural fields in the 2005 Cultural Landscape Inventory Study, all of which are remnants of this nineteenth-century village.

Do you think these elements still contribute to Erindale's sense of 'place'?

- Yes **Count: 4**
- No **Count:**
- Why
 - The proximity to the Credit River, the flora and fauna, the space between homes, lack of concrete, including sidewalks and curbs, and unique street signs, a strong home owners association supports this.
- Concern noted:
 - Like Mineola there is a lot of development pressure on the area. Unlike Mineola, it is geographically a much smaller area and as such unsympathetic infill has greater negative impact on the area.

8.2 As part of the current study, the following features have emerged as important or unique elements that contribute to Erindale's character.

Please check the elements you agree with:

- the rural streetscape, with no concrete curbs or sidewalks; **Count: 5/5**
- mature street trees; **Count: 5/5**
- views of the Credit River valley; **Count: 4/5**
- front yard setback and treatment; **Count: 3/5**
- street signs posts and light posts **Count:3/5**

6.4 What else makes Erindale Village important to you?

- Variety of architectural eras and styles
- The community hall is a focal point
- Historical elements:
 - The remnant of Old Dundas Rd and the contemporary buildings (to the road's construction) that remain
 - Erindale Park with leftover bridge
 - The history shown in pictures inside the Anglican Church on the hill;
 - That there used to be a lake
 - The Scout building is simply beautiful
- Natural greens spots that inspire photography and creative acts
- Sense of community
- The village association

9. Creditview Road Scenic Route

9.1 The 2005 Cultural Landscape Inventory Study describes the Creditview Road Scenic Route as offering a scenic view of select areas of significant historical, horticultural, and scenic interest in Mississauga, available from nearby recently established commercial and residential neighbourhoods.

Do you think these qualities still contribute to the Creditview Road's sense of 'place'?

- Yes **Count: 10/10**
- No **Count: 0**
- Why
 - For the nature view, we need more green spaces in the city
 - The trees
 - The historic buildings that remain
 - It provides an escape from rows of housing while on a drive
 - It's unique and keeps us connected to our past
- Why Not:
 - There is too much traffic
 - "The roads have been redirected to benefit corporations but it is not as easy to access the Credit View Scenic Drive"

9.2 As part of the current study, the following features have emerged as important or unique elements that contribute to the Creditview Road Scenic Route character.

Please check the elements you agree with:

- nature framing the scenic route; **Count: 10/10**
- views of the Credit River Valley; **Count: 9/10**

9.3 What else makes the Creditview Road Scenic Route important to you?

- The houses on route
- It's a rare, remnant of historically rural roadways which serve to remind users of the City's origins and history
- Only one lane of traffic in each direction which keeps the speed of vehicles at a manageable pace and keeps you connected to the natural surroundings.
- There is a different feeling that you get once you get north of Bancroft. It kind of opens up a new part of Mississauga that isn't the same as everywhere else in the city and I love that it is still unique. It has character which makes the city something special.

10. Mississauga Road Scenic Route

10.1 The Mississauga Road Scenic Route is identified in the 2005 Cultural Landscape Inventory Study as one of the oldest roads in Mississauga, largely following the Credit River along its western bluffs south of Eglinton, where it aligns with the concession surveys. The road offers scenic views as it traverses a variety of topography and varying land uses from old established residential neighbourhoods to new industrial and commercial areas.

Do you think these qualities still contribute to Mississauga Road's sense of 'place'?

- Yes **Count: 14**
- No **Count:**
- Why
 - Trees
 - Mature gardens
 - Access to natural beauty
 - Peacefulness
 - Homes and buildings make it feel like you're out of the big city
 - The Catholic retreat centre
 - Historic churches
 - House set backs
 - Mid-century homes
- Why Not:
 - Dislike of new industrial areas and "split dual houses"

10.2 As part of the current study, the following features have emerged as important or unique elements that contribute to Mississauga Road's character.

Please check the elements you agree with:

- the winding road alignment; **Count: 15/15**
- the building's setbacks from the street; **Count: 13/15**
- front lawns landscaping; **Count: 8/15**
- property fencing; **Count: 6/15**

- mature street trees; [Count: 14/15](#)
- views of the Credit River Valley. [Count: 11/15](#)

Additional comments given for 10.2:

- Single family residences
- Single-lane width

10.3 What else makes the Mississauga Road Scenic Route important to you?

- other elements - Mississauga Scenic Route North: Erin Mills Parkway to Hwy 403
 - It's nonlinear alignment, it's tow lane width
 - Streetsville – maintaining Queen Street as is; not having too tall buildings (condos) destroying the safe place to walk/run/cycle; scenic views along Mississauga Road; Maintaining heritage buildings – Barber House, Timothy Street House etc.
 - There should be no commercial development from the 403 north to the tracks in South Streetsville
- other elements - Mississauga Scenic Route Central: Hwy 403 to Queen Elizabeth Way
 - Zoning consistency – single detached homes; keeping views on credit river; reducing traffic to increase safety for pedestrians/cyclists
 - University of Toronto campus
 - No commercial development
- other elements - Mississauga Scenic Route North: Queen Elizabeth Way to Lakeshore Boulevard
 - Maintain historical buildings in Port Credit/Lorne Park area; not allowing condo development; keeping height of buildings to current standards; keep area safe for pedestrian traffic
 - Mid-century modern architecture
 - No commercial development



1547 Bloor Street West
 Toronto, Ontario M6P 1A5
 PH: (416) 923-6630
 Email: info@sglplanning.ca

DATE: June 12th, 2019 Project ID: CH.MS
 TO: Paula Wubbenhorst - Heritage Planner
 Annie Veilleux – Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist – Manager Cultural Heritage Division
 FROM: Ute Maya-Giambattista – Principal Fotenn Planning & Design
 RE: Mississauga’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Project – May 6, 2019 Phase 2 Kick-off Meeting Summary

On May 6th, 2019 a Public Workshop was facilitated by Fotenn Planning & Design, SGL Planning & Design and ASI to launch the second phase of the study and to gather feedback from key stakeholders and the general public on work to date and the cultural heritage areas being studied in this phase.

This was the study’s third round of public consultation, after the second Public Information Centres held on November 15th, 19th and 26th 2018, and first public information session held on September 29th, 2018.

Attendees were welcomed to the event by consultant Ute Maya-Giambattista who explained the evenings events. This was followed by a presentation of Phase 1 study results and summary of recommendations and an introduction to Phase 2 goals and study areas and, by consultant Annie Veilleux.

The rest of the event included an initial question and answer period and an activity period where residents were asked to mark their thoughts and comments on a series of maps showing Phase 2 cultural heritage features organized by theme.

The questions and answers are listed below, followed by the results of the group mapping activates on area specific questions.

Question and Answer Period:

Q: Why incorporate river for Mineola but not Streetsville CHLs?

A: This is due to a focus on historical associations and a focus on the character of the built form/landscapes/topography including characteristics such as setback of houses and curbsless roads.

Q: How does Mississauga Golf and Country Club fit into both Mississauga Scenic Route and Credit River Corridor?

A: Landscapes often overlap with each other and, the golf course is listed on 2005 inventory in three places.

Q: What is the connection between the Conservation Authority and the Credit River Corridor?

A: ASI sought CA feedback on history and boundary; implementation strategy TBD; no conflict between visions of two organizations as of now.

Q: Will the project include Credit River Golf Course for review? Could it be associated with Erindale Village?

A: This is not included in the boundary of Erindale Village

Q: The City and Conservation Authority have differences of opinion regarding bylaws for preservation.

A: Hopefully all parties will work together regarding a larger vision because long-term vision is important; it was Dep't of Public Works that came to us (consultants) at outset because they're looking for direction for scenic routes and to rejuvenate tree program.

Q: Why have none of these areas identified as CHLs focused on year of creation? What criteria was there to ensure not just anything makes the list?

A: A lot of rigorous research into history; methodology was in line with standards in heritage assessment; this presentation was just one small part of the large report.

Q: Can you speak to the criticism about 9/06 being more for buildings than for landscapes?

A: It is still important, particularly design and aesthetic value, but must use landscape lens; a landscape can still be a landmark; reminder that significant CHLs still must go beyond 9/06 to include community value and historical integrity.

Q: Can you explain “historical integrity” further?

A: It is the evaluation of landscapes of the past and the landscape may have changed over time. Including: land use resemblance and continuity; built elements from creation or period of significance; vegetative elements; relationships between buildings and features and landscapes; views; possibility of rehabilitation/restoration.

Q: Will Applewood Acres be considered for review?

A: We will put it on the list for review.

Q: What direction are protection measures going? What specifically?

A: Broadly speaking there will be site specific measures recommended to manage change; consider both immediate development pressures and unique situations.

Q: What is the difference between an HCD and a CHL? Which has more teeth?

A: An HCD is one tool to manage a CHL; our focus will be on recommending the most effective tools to manage specific sites. HCDs more amenable to areas with built-form continuity (like Streetsville). All planning tools are open to help facilitate protection (under the PPS).

Comment: Proposing Etobicoke Creek, Toronto Golf Club, and Gordon Woods for review.

Q: Can council decision-making over-rule community input regarding importance of protection measures on one issue or another (i.e., Mineola East vs. West)?

A: Council will potentially have to face repercussions from their constituents.

Comment: Attendee noted that South Mineola used to be called Peel Gardens.

Q: Are there different sets of protection measures for sites that overlap into three different CHLs (i.e., Mississauga Golf Course)?

A: The details need to be ironed out, the final tools are not yet defined.

Q: What to do when dealing with Erindale Village being changed by students and foreign ownership?

An answer was not provided for this as this pertains to economics and market forces outside study scope

Q: What about a Conservation Plan (rather than a Preservation Plan) as a way to sell plan to owners. Focus on adaptability to change rather than refusal to change anything.

A: It is a balancing act; multi-layered and contextual; the focus is on idea that places are special but not frozen in time.

Q: Why is there such a gap between 2005 and 2018 for a review?

A: Funding.

Q: Please explain further what the criteria is for agricultural landscapes, since “there may be crops but not farms”.

A: re-iteration of text on PowerPoint slide.

Mapping Activities

Map 1

- Noted the Toronto Golf Club west of the Lakeview Golf Course
- Noted the Credit Valley Golf and Country Club (G & CC) area along the Credit River north of the Mississauga Golf and Country Club




Map 2

- Noted the following locations to be further refined and studied:
 - Gordon Woods (Area between Queensway West, Hurontario Street, Highway QEW E and the Credit River)
 - Applewood Acres (Area between Queensway, Highway QEW E, Dixie Road and Cawthra Road)
 - Port Credit Main Street (Area along Lakeshore Road East running east of the Credit River to midway between Hurontario Street and Cawthra Road)
 - Toronto Golf Club and Clubhouse (located east of Dixie Road beside the Lakeview Golf Course)



Map 3

- Requested further study of the Arsenal Lands/Water Tower area
- Requested commemoration for the St Lawrence Cement, and Petro Canada Refinery lands
- Requested commemoration for the Pearson International Airport lands



DATE: October 3, 2019 Project ID: CH.MS
 TO: Paula Wubbenhorst - Heritage Planner
 Annie Veilleux - ASI
 FROM: Ute Maya-Giambattista – Principal FOTENN Planning & Design
 RE: Mississauga’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study – Phase 2, Workshop
 No. 2 Summary

On September 19th, 2019, SGL Planning & Design and ASI facilitated a working session to garner feedback from key stakeholders and the general public on Mississauga’s Cultural Heritage Landscape Study’s sites, areas and features being assessed as part of Phase 2. This was second public consultation session in Phase 2 of the study.

Location: Burnhamthorpe Community Centre – Fleetwood Village Room, 1500 Gulleden Dr, Mississauga

Time: 7:00 – 9:00 pm

When attendees arrived, they signed in and looked at the project boards on display, which provided: a summary of the Phase 2 landscapes under review; a summary of potential tools available for the protection and management of CHLs; and a board that outlined the project process. This was followed by a welcoming of attendees and explanation of the evening’s agenda.

The session began with a presentation providing a project description, work in progress, description of Phase 2 landscapes and summary of available land use planning tool to manage change within Phase 2 landscapes. The presentation classified all Phase 2 landscapes into different types: Farms and Estates; Parks and Open Spaces; Industrial Landscapes; and Campuses and Golf Courses.

A break out group working session was prepared, however due to there only being three people in attendance, an extended group question and answer period took place instead. The hour-long question and answer session included questions focused on process and implementation and the general objectives of the study.

Representatives of the University of Toronto Mississauga Campus were interested on the scope and intent of the study and were looking to advance strategies to ensure future campus re-development and development is streamlined and less cumbersome from current practice.

City of Mississauga Conserving Heritage Landscapes: Cultural Heritage Landscape Project Survey Response Summary

DATE: April 21, 2021

TO: Paula Wubbenhorst – Heritage Planner, City of Mississauga
Annie Veilleux – Senior Cultural Heritage Specialist, ASI

FROM: Ute Maya-Giambattista – Principal, Fotenn Planning + Design

RE: City of Mississauga Conserving Heritage Landscapes: Cultural Heritage Landscape (C.H.L.)
Project – Survey Response Summary

Executive Summary

As part of the the public consultation outreach efforts for Phase 2 of the study, and to ensure the public has the opportunity to provide feedback on all potential cultural heritage landscapes assessed as part of the study, a survey was developed to solicit feedback on community-nominated landscapes. Based on the consulting team analysis and preliminary recommendations on the identified C.H.L. candidates as well as previous public input, the survey was tailored to seek input from residents on what character elements define each candidate C.H.L. as well as resident's understanding of the regulatory context implicit in an C.H.L. designation.

A total of 341 responses were collected via a survey conducted between February 1, 2021 and April 11, 2021. Due to a high number of responses and community interest related to the Applewood Acres area, and at the request of the Ward Councillor, the feedback period was extended from March 31, 2021 to April 11, 2021 to allow additional surveys and comments to be collected. Surveys were promoted using social media, via email to those who provided addresses at C.H.L. meetings, and one road sign in Meadowvale. The majority of participants responded utilizing an online platform, while 23 responses were received using printed surveys which were mailed out to properties within the study areas. Respondents also provided comments and feedback via email related to the study, which have been incorporated into the summaries below.

The survey contained a set of four questions related to six candidate C.H.L.s. These landscapes were brought forward by members of the public as part of previous public consultation outreach for the study and determined by the consultant team to have the potential to be significant C.H.L.s. The six study areas include:

- / Applewood Acres
- / Dickson Park Crescent
- / Gordon Woods
- / Hancock Woodlands
- / Meadowvale
- / Toronto Golf Club

Participants were asked the following questions

- / Do you live in the [study area]? (mandatory question, as applicable);
- / What features contribute to the [study area] character? (optional question);
- / Do you agree with the boundary indicated? (optional question); and,
- / Do you support the City implementing a policy or by-law to protect this [study area] characteristic features? (mandatory question, with exception of Toronto Golf Club).

With exception of the Applewood Acres area, the majority of responses received were supportive of a by-law or policy to protect the proposed Cultural Heritage Landscapes. Many of the responses included suggestions on how the boundaries may be expanded or changed to better encompass each area. Participants generally agreed with

the list of features which contribute to each study area's character and provided additional characteristics for each area.

Survey results and additional comments related to the Applewood Acres area were mixed. While participants indicated characteristics that contribute to the character of the area, the majority of respondents believed the boundary to be too small and restrictive and indicated a larger boundary be considered. Further, respondents were divided on their support for the implementation of a policy or by-law to protect the Applewood Acres study area, indicating concerns related to impacts on property values and additional restrictions and regulations.

Applewood Acres

Applewood Acres is described as an early example of a post-Second World War development. Characteristics include a country style cross section with curbless roads and shallow ditches as well as an orderly quality in the rhythm of its homes and trees. The neighbourhood is also valued for its "Shipp Built" homes, a recognized and familiar name in the history of Mississauga's growth. Although many responses were received via the online platform, 139 hard copy surveys were mailed out for the Applewoods Acres study area. Survey participants were asked to provide responses to the following questions.

Do you live in Applewood Acres?

For this mandatory question, 139 responses were received. The majority of respondents live in Applewood Acres.

- / Yes; Count 123/139
- / No; Count 16/139

What features contribute to Applewood Acres' character?

For this optional question, 132 responses were received, and 7 respondents skipped the question. The majority of respondents agreed that curbless streets, similar houses, and similar lots are the main contributing features to the character of Applewood Acres.

- / Curbless Streets; Count: 103/132
- / Similar Lots; Count: 83/132
- / Similar Houses; Count: 83/132
- / Remnant Apple Trees; Count: 64/132
- / Modest Driveways; Count: 45/132
- / Single Carports/Garages; Count: 34/132
- / Other (please specify); Count: 35/132
 - o Additional Characteristics indicated include:
 - Character Homes
 - Family Friendly
 - Walkability
 - Residents
 - Lush gardens
 - Mature Trees
 - No Sidewalks
 - Ditches
 - Small Town feel
 - Large lots with small/modest houses
 - Sense of Community Pride
 - Privacy
 - Quiet and Safe
 - Proximity to Schools and Shopping

Do you agree with the neighbourhood boundary below?

For this optional question, 134 responses were received, and 5 respondents skipped the question. The majority of respondents did not agree with the neighbourhood boundary indicated, where many participants indicated the current boundary is too small and should be expanded.

- / Yes; Count: 42/134

- / No; Count: 92/134
- / Why or Why Not?; Count: 68/134
 - o Reasons where **Yes** was indicated include:
 - The boundary is perfect as is
 - o Reasons where **No** was indicated include:
 - Boundary should extend east to Harvest or Courtland
 - Many participants stated the boundary should extend to Applewood East and Applewood West
 - Many participants noted the boundary should extend to Dixie Road
 - Many participants noted the boundary should extend west to Cawthra
 - Many participants stated that Applewood Acres is from Cawthra to the west, the Queensway on the north, Queen Elizabeth Way to the south, and Dixie Rd on the east. The current boundary is too constrictive
 - Many participants noted that Applewood Acres is a larger neighbourhood than shown
 - Many participants noted that generally boundary is too small and should include a larger area

Do you support the City implementing a policy or by-law to protect this landscape's characteristic features?

For this mandatory question, 139 responses were received. Respondents were divided on their support of the City implementing a policy or by-law to protect the characteristic features of Applewood Acres. It should be noted that prior to the extended comment period (for surveys and comments collected prior to March 31), approximately 70% of respondents were in support of a bylaw to protect the landscapes characteristic features, however the final 38 responses received (between April 1 and April 11) were nearly all opposing a policy or by-law.

- / Yes; Count 67/139 (48.2%)
- / No; Count: 63/139 (45.3%)
- / I reviewed the information online but still need more information; Count: 8/139 (6.5%)
- / **Note:** Email responses from 26 participants were received without a completed survey, with all responses opposing the study. Concerns within these email responses include:
 - o Many respondents indicated concerns that study would become an additional cost to property owners, particularly related to renovations or additions
 - o Many respondents disagreed with the proposed boundaries
 - o Many respondents indicated concern that the study may negatively impact property values
 - o Many respondents indicated concern that a by-law or policy might place restrictions against properties
 - o Respondents indicated that existing homes do not hold any heritage value
 - o Respondents indicated that the new, larger homes built in the area are not reflective of the character in the area
 - o Respondents believe more engagement should be undertaken with residents, and expressed concern about consultation strategies and the study moving forward during the pandemic
 - o Respondent indicated concerns over the condition of existing municipal infrastructure, including watermains and stormwater management.

Dickson Park Crescent

Dickson Park Crescent is nested within the Gordon Woods Community and holds value due to its unique set of residences with consistent and high-quality mid-twentieth century design. Although many responses were received via the online platform, 37 hard copy surveys were mailed out for the Dickson Park study area. Survey participants were asked to provide responses to the following questions.

Do you live in Dickson Park Crescent?

For this mandatory question, 24 responses were received. The majority of respondents live in Dickson Park Crescent.

- / Yes; Count: 16/24
- / No; Count: 8/24

What features contribute to Dickson Park Crescent's character?

For this optional question, 23 responses were received, and 1 respondent skipped the question. The majority of respondents agreed that mid-century modern design and foundation planting and mature coniferous trees are the main contributing features to the character of Dickson Park Crescent.

- / Mid-Century Modern Design; Count: 20/23
- / Foundation Planting and Mature Coniferous Trees; Count: 20/23
- / Similar Houses; Count 10/23
- / Other (please specify); Count: 7/23
 - o Additional Characteristics indicated include:
 - Dissimilar Houses, which creates a harmonious feel
 - Unique architectural details and characteristics of each house
 - Privacy
 - Reduced Traffic
 - Large Lots
 - No Sidewalks
 - Kenollie Creek

Do you agree with the neighbourhood boundary below?

For this optional question, all 24 participants responded to the question. The majority of respondents agreed with the neighbourhood boundary indicated.

- / Yes; Count: 21/24
- / No; Count: 3/24
- / Why or Why Not?; Count: 5/24
 - o Reasons where **Yes** was indicated include:
 - Most homes have maintained their original design
 - The neighbourhood has a distinct architectural character
 - o Reasons where **No** was indicated include:
 - The neighbourhood should also include Dickson Road, the condominium development adjacent to the cemeteries, and Lynchmere Avenue
 - Boundary should include the natural landscape and trees surrounding the areas

Do you support the City implementing a policy or by-law to protect this landscape's characteristic features?

For this mandatory question, all 24 participants responded to the question. The majority of respondents support the City implementing a policy or by-law to protect the characteristic features of Dickson Park Crescent.

- / Yes: Count 19/24 (79.2%)
- / No; Count: 3/24 (12.5%)
- / I reviewed the information online but still need more information; Count: 2/24 (8.3%)

Gordon Woods

The Gordon Woods Community is valued for its countryside qualities, including curbless streets, narrow roadways, natural landscape, and dense tree canopy. The area is associated with the Gordon family who were significant in the Cooksville area. Although many responses were received via the online platform, 84 hard copy surveys were mailed out for the Gordon Woods study area. Survey participants were asked to provide responses to the following questions.

Do you live in Gordon Woods?

For this mandatory question, 24 responses were received. The majority of respondents live in Gordon Woods

- / Yes; Count: 15/24
- / No; Count: 9/24

What features contribute to Gordon Woods' character?

For this optional question, 23 responses were received, and 1 respondent skipped the question. The majority of respondents agreed that mature trees, nestled houses, deep front yards, and curbless streets are the main contributing features to the character of Gordon Woods.

- / Mature Trees; Count: 22/23
- / Nestled Houses; Count: 18/23
- / Deep Front Yards; Count 17/23
- / Curbless Streets Count 17/23
- / Mary Fix Creek; Count 13/23
- / Rolling Landscape; Count 12/23
- / Other (please specify); Count: 8/23
 - o Additional Characteristics indicated include:
 - Large Lot Sizes
 - Tree Canopy and Forest Areas
 - Wildlife
 - No Sidewalks
 - Sense of Tranquility

Do you agree with the neighbourhood boundary below?

For this optional question, all 24 participants responded to the question. The majority of respondents agreed with the neighbourhood boundary indicated.

- / Yes; Count: 18/24
- / No; Count: 6/24
- / Why or Why Not?; Count: 6/24
 - o Reasons where **No** was indicated include:
 - The boundary should be expanded to the east to include Grange Drive
 - The boundary should be expanded to include the Grange, Autumn Breeze, Breezy Pine, and Harborn Trail as they host mature trees and woodland
 - Gordon Woods is bounded by Queensway, Grange, Premium Way and Dickson and this entire area should be protected as a unique woodland.

Do you support the City implementing a policy or by-law to protect this landscape's characteristic features?

For this mandatory question, all 24 participants responded to the question. The majority of respondents support the City implementing a policy or by-law to protect the characteristic features of Gordon Woods.

- / Yes: Count 19/24 (79.2%)
- / No; Count: 4/24 (16.7%)
- / I reviewed the information online but still need more information; Count: 1/24 (4.2%)

Hancock Woodlands

Hancock Woodlands is valued as a unique example of a former nursery landscape linking Mississauga's historical agricultural roots and early character of the Cooksville area before it transitioned from orchards to residential tracts. Although many responses were received via the online platform, 272 hard copy surveys were mailed out for the Hancock Woods study area. Survey participants were asked to provide responses to the following questions.

What features contribute to Hancock Woodlands' character?

For this optional question, 29 responses were received, and 2 respondents skipped the question. The majority of respondents agreed that the winding paths and woodlot are the main contributing features to the character of Hancock Woodlands.

- / Winding Paths; Count: 28/29
- / Woodlot; Count: 23/29
- / Site Layout; Count: 22/29

- / Former Header/Green House; Count: 17/29
- / Entry Points; Count: 15/29
- / Former Office Building; Count: 14/29
- / Hancock Houses; Count 13/29
- / "Hancock 2179 and 2171" sign on Camilla Road; Count: 9/29
- / Other (please specify); Count: 7/29
 - o Additional Characteristics indicated include:
 - Many respondents mentioned the Rhododendrons and Azaleas
 - Wildlife
 - Species Variety

Do you agree with the neighbourhood boundary below?

For this optional question, all 31 participants responded to the question. The majority of respondents agreed with the neighbourhood boundary indicated.

- / Yes; Count: 27/31
- / No; Count: 4/31
- / Why or Why Not?; Count: 2/31
 - o Reasons where **Yes** was indicated include:
 - The boundary as described reflects a current understanding of Hancock Woodlands Park, which is an important area to be protected for future generations
 - o Reasons where **No** was indicated include:
 - The two homes in the northwest corner of the woodlot still belong to family members

Do you support the City implementing a policy or by-law to protect this landscape's characteristic features?

For this mandatory question, all 31 participants responded to the question. The majority of respondents support the City implementing a policy or by-law to protect the characteristic features of Hancock Woodlands.

- / Yes: Count 30/31 (96.8%)
- / No; Count: 1/31 (3.2%)
- / No respondents indicated need for more information

Meadowvale

Meadowvale West is described as a large-scale neighbourhood in northwest Mississauga, part of a planned residential, commercial, and cultural community with interconnected parkland and extensive open space. Among the key features of this neighbourhood are Lake Aquitaine and Lake Wabukayne, two storm water treatment ponds encircled by parks and green space. Although many responses were received via the online platform, 2209 hard copy surveys were mailed out for the Meadowvale study area. Survey participants were asked to provide responses to the following questions.

Do you live in Meadowvale?

For this mandatory question, 114 responses were received. The majority of respondents live in Meadowvale.

- / Yes; Count 110/114
- / No; Count 4/114

What features contribute to Meadowvale's character?

For this optional question, all 114 participants provided responses. The majority of respondents agreed that parks and open space, the trail network, and Lake Aquitaine are the main contributing features to the character of Meadowvale.

- / Trail Network; Count: 110/114
- / Lake Aquitaine; Count: 109/114
- / Parks and Open Space; Count: 108/114
- / Lake Wabukayne; Count: 92/114
- / Wildlife and Nature; Count: 89/114

- / Connectivity; Count: 85/114
- / Other (please specify); Count: 12/114
 - o Additional Characteristics indicated include:
 - Sense of Community
 - Diversity
 - Community Centre and Library
 - Safe Spaces
 - Naturalized Surroundings

Do you agree with the neighbourhood boundary below?

For this optional question, 112 responses were received, and 2 respondents skipped the question. The majority of respondents agreed with the neighbourhood boundary indicated.

- / Yes; Count: 104/112
- / No; Count: 8/112
- / Why or Why Not?; Count: 17/112
 - o Reasons where **Yes** was indicated include:
 - To prevent condo buildings and overcrowding
 - Green spaces, lakes, wildlife, and paths should be protected
 - Participant indicated difficulty reading boundary
 - o Reasons where **No** was indicated include:
 - Boundary should extend further west
 - Boundary should include Miller's Grove area
 - Boundary should include high schools and houses in the area
 - Extend boundary from Winston Churchill to Tenth Line
 - Participant indicated difficulty understanding the question

Do you support the City implementing a policy or by-law to protect this landscape's characteristic features?

For this mandatory question, 114 responses were received. The majority of respondents support the City implementing a policy or by-law to protect the characteristic features of Meadowvale.

- / Yes; Count 108/114 (94.7%)
- / No; Count: 1/114 (0.9%)
- / I reviewed the information online but still need more information; Count: 5/114 (4.4%)

Toronto Golf Club

The Toronto Golf Club is the third oldest club in North America and the oldest in Ontario and was founded by James Lamond Smith in 1876. The golf course includes a 9-hole course and an 18-hole course on rolling shores next to Etobicoke Creek. The Toronto Golf Club is valued as an early example of a heathland golf course in Canada. The heathland course is more open, less manicured, and typically less wooded than the other inland course, the parkland course. Survey participants were asked to provide responses to the following questions.

What features contribute to Toronto Golf Club's character?

For this optional question, 8 responses were received, and 1 respondent skipped the question. The majority of respondents agreed that the rolling landscape and views and sightlines are the main contributing features to the character of Toronto Golf Club.

- / Rolling Landscape; Count: 7/8
- / Views and Sightlines; Count: 7/8
- / Club House; Count, 6/8
- / Entry/Driveway; Count: 4/8
- / Pathways; Count: 4/8
- / Course Design and Layout; Count: 4/8
- / Views from the tenth hole; Count: 0/8
- / Other (please specify); Count: 1/8
 - o Additional characteristics were not specified

Do you agree with the boundary below?

For this optional question, 9 responses were received, and 0 respondents skipped the question. The majority of respondents (8 respondents) agreed with the indicated boundary of the Toronto Golf Club, where only 1 respondent did not agree, however explanation was not provided.

/ Yes; Count: 8/9

/ No; Count: 1/9



1547 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario M6P 1A5
☎ (416) 923-6630
✉ info@sglplanning.ca

Conserving Cultural Heritage Landscapes: Mississauga Cultural Heritage Landscapes Study – Final Public Open House

Date: October 13, 2021

Place: Via WebEx

A final Public Open House for the Mississauga Cultural Heritage Landscapes project was held on October 13, 2021, via WebEx at 6:30 p.m. There were approximately 7 attendees, excluding City Staff and Project Consultants. Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) gave a presentation which provided an overview of the project background and status, Cultural Heritage Landscapes, the evaluations conducted, as well project results, recommendations, and implementation measures.

Following the presentation by ASI, attendees had the opportunity to provide comments and ask questions. Four members of the public provided comments.

There was discussion regarding the role of the province in heritage conservation, specifically the Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT), previously the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT). A long-time resident of Erindale Village voiced adversity in the LPAT's approval for a high-rise condominium within the Erindale Village Cultural Heritage Landscape (beside the historic Erindale Community Hall on Dundas Street) which residents had been fighting against for numerous years. This fed into discussion regarding the authority of the Province and heritage matters often being challenged at the OLT, which can lead to the Province overriding municipal jurisdiction as the Tribunal is designed to deal with applications and issues on a case-by-case basis. Another attendee had interest in the City's Lakeview neighbourhood and development near Lakefront Promenade Park, with similar comments. Further discussion was had on a general dissatisfaction with the OLT process in regard to heritage.

There was also a general comment raised by an attendee in the development industry regarding listed heritage properties and the lengthy process of determining whether a designation is required. For example, many properties within Streetsville face this problem which has slowed down or stopped property sales and development to proceed in the past. City Staff indicated that the Heritage Register is posted on the City's website and that listed properties have interim demolition protection, requiring Heritage Impact Assessments to be conducted. Streetsville has been identified as a Significant Cultural Heritage Landscape by the City and a future decision, through a Heritage Conservation District Study, will need to be made as to whether it will be designated as a Heritage Conservation District.

Another attendee indicated interest in the Pearson Airport Area of Interest. ASI staff indicated that the property met community value criteria, as well as Ontario Regulation 9/06 for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest but did not meet the historical integrity criteria to be considered a Significant CHL as part of this study. The entire property remains an Area of Interest and a listed property on the City's Heritage Register.

Appendix F: Indigenous Engagement

Engagement with rights-bearing Indigenous communities or organizations as it relates to the City of Mississauga Cultural Heritage Landscape Project began in July 2018 with the circulation of a project notice by mail and email to the nine identified communities. The notice describes the decision to undertake the project, Phase One and Phase Two scope and timelines, the location of background research and public documents, as well as providing a contact for the City of Mississauga. Additionally, the notice invites recipients to contact the City if they have any preliminary comments on the project or would like to organize a meeting to discuss the project further. Follow-up calls and emails were made on this notice in August 2018 in order to elicit preliminary comments from Indigenous communities and to organize a meeting between City staff, A.S.I. project staff, and representatives of the Indigenous community if requested.

As a second point of engagement, a project update letter was circulated by email to all nine community contacts in January 2019 in order to provide a brief update on the project and remaining tasks. This letter directed recipients to the project website for future updates and provided contact details for the City of Mississauga if recipients would like to schedule a meeting to discuss the project further.

Curve Lake First Nation, Hiawatha First Nation, and the Huron-Wendat Nation identified their interest in the project and asked to be kept informed of any project developments but did not request to meet with the City of Mississauga and A.S.I. to discuss the City of Mississauga Cultural Heritage Landscape Project. Curve Lake First Nation and the Huron-Wendat Nation requested to review a copy of the Pre-contact and Historical summary document which was included as part of Technical Memo #1 in April 2019. This document was provided to the nations and any comments and suggestions were incorporated into the Thematic History included in Technical Memo #2 and the final report.

The Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation indicated interest in the project and requested a meeting with the City of Mississauga to discuss the project further. An introductory meeting was held on September 18, 2018 (during Phase One) at the Nation's Department of Consultation and Accommodation in order to introduce the project, document preliminary comments, and provide any preliminary data or mapping that may help the Nation assess the potential impacts of the project on its Aboriginal and Treaty rights, as well as to determine key contacts and responsibilities moving forward.

The Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation requested to be kept informed of project developments and a conference call was organized between the Nation, the City of Mississauga, and A.S.I. on February 27, 2019 in order to provide an update on Phase One evaluations and Phase Two scope and timelines. Additionally, A.S.I. staff members met with the Traditional Knowledge and Land Use Coordinator for the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation

in order to provide project staff with a history of the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation and the establishment of the historic village on the Credit River. The City of Mississauga and A.S.I. are committed to continued dialogue with the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation and agreed to reach out to contacts at the Nation at key points in the study process.

Following the circulation of the project update letter in January 2019, the Haudenosaunee Confederacy Chiefs Council via the Haudenosaunee Development Institute indicated interest in the project and requested a meeting with the City of Mississauga to discuss the project further. An introductory meeting was held on March 7, 2019 at the Haudenosaunee Development Institute office in order to introduce the project, document comments, and present any data or mapping that may help the Confederacy assess the potential impacts of the project on its Aboriginal and Treaty rights. The Haudenosaunee consider all lands important. The City committed to working further with the Haudenosaunee.

A.S.I. and the City of Mississauga has continued to engage with identified Indigenous communities or organizations over the course of Phase Two of the study process. The City of Mississauga circulated a project update letter electronically to the nine Indigenous communities identified in Phase One of the project on August 13, 2019. This letter provided a brief update on the major tasks completed to date and upcoming tasks, milestones, and proposed completion date. The letter also directed recipients to the project website for additional materials and Phase Two C.H.L. mapping. Alderville First Nation requested clarification on the project and both City and A.S.I. staff followed up with the Consultation Liaison for the First Nation to provide more information and materials.

The City of Mississauga circulated the Final Draft Report to the nine communities identified in Phase One of the project on August 3, 2021. This letter provided a brief update on the major tasks completed to date which included the results of the study. The City of Mississauga offered communities the option to provide feedback on the Final Draft Report. Next steps were also described. Six Nations of the Grand River provided written feedback and a meeting was held with members of Lands and Resources at Six Nations of the Grand River and City and A.S.I. staff to discuss the feedback and proposed changes to the report on October 1, 2021. Following further discussion over email, minor revisions were made to Appendix D and the Interpretation Strategy based on the feedback received.

A record of consultation has been compiled and submitted to the City of Mississauga along with a full record of correspondence with communities as it relates to this project.

Appendix G: Evaluation Criteria

1) Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: based on the criteria provided in Ontario Regulation 9/06 under the Ontario Heritage Act and adapted to record information about the cultural heritage value or interest of a landscape:

1. The landscape has design value or physical value because it,
 - i. is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a landscape (style, trend, movement, school of theory, type, expression, material use or construction method, settlement pattern, time period or lifeway)
 - ii. displays a high degree of design or aesthetic appeal/scenic quality, or
 - iii. demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
2. The landscape has historical value or associative value because it,
 - i. has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community,
 - ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or
 - iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.
3. The landscape has contextual value because it,
 - i. is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area,
 - ii. is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or
 - iii. is a landmark.

2) Community Value: based on the presence of indicators of community value. A community can be broadly defined to include any grouping of people, such as: those who regularly visit or reside in an area; Indigenous communities; historians or heritage advocates; tourists; artists; researchers; cultural groups; etc. While the following examples may not be appropriate for all C.H.L.s, indicators of community value can include, but are not limited to:

- **Community Identity:** The landscape contributes to the community's identity and is used to tell the story of the community or an area
- **Landmark:** the area is widely recognized as a landmark
- **Pride and Stewardship:** The community demonstrates a high degree of pride and stewardship in the area (heritage designations, plaques, voluntary upkeep)

- Commemoration: The area or elements within the area are named to celebrate or commemorate someone or something
- Public Space: The area is a site of frequent or longstanding public gatherings or events
- Cultural Traditions: People use the area to express their cultural traditions
- Quality of Life: Aspects of the landscape are valued for their impact on day to day living
- Local History: the place is written about in local histories or spoken about through local stories or lore
- Visual Depiction: The location is widely photographed or depicted in works of art (visual, literary, etc.)
- Genius Loci: People refer to the area as having a distinctive atmosphere or pervading 'sense of place'
- Community Image: The area is identified with the community image (e.g., appearing in promotions or marketing material; is identified with Mississauga's image outside of Mississauga)
- Tourism: The area is promoted as a tourist destination
- Planning: The area has been identified through another planning process as being unique

3) Historical Integrity: based on the how well the existing landscape physically reflects the landscape of the past and the functional continuity of the landscape over time. While the following examples may not be appropriate for all C.H.L.s, Historical Integrity criteria can include, but are not limited to:

- Land Use: The landscape has had continuity in use and/or a compatible use (agricultural, commercial, residential, or institutional)
- Ownership: There has been a continuity of ownership or occupation of the site, dating to a historic period
- Built Elements: The buildings and other built elements (fences, walls, paths, bridges, corrals, pens, garden features, lighting, sidewalks, fountains, piers, etc.) have survived in their historic form in relatively sound condition.
- Vegetative Elements: plantings (hedgerows, windows, gardens, shade trees, etc.) are still evident and their traditional relationship to buildings, lanes, roadways, walks and fields are still discernable.

- Cultural Relationships: The relationships between historic buildings and other built and designed elements (yards, fields, paths, parks, gardens, etc.) are intact
- Natural Features: Prominent natural features (cliff, stream, vegetation, landform, physiography, soils, etc.) remain intact
- Natural Relationships: The historical relationships to prominent natural features still exist both for the site as a whole and within the site
- Views: the existing views of and within the site can be closely compared to the same view in the past (certain views may have been captured in historic photos)
- Ruins: Ruins and overgrown elements still convey a clear 'message' about the site's history
- Potential for Restoration: Changes to a designed landscape can be corrected so that the property retains integrity versus being irrevocable.

Appendix H: Policies and Legislation Toolkit and Non-Regulatory Strategies

Policies and Legislation Toolkit

Individual Property Designation

Individual properties identified as having significant cultural heritage value can be designated under Part IV of the O.H.A. Designation under Part IV of the O.H.A. allows for the protection of identified heritage values and attributes within a property as defined in a designation by-law and regulates development on properties adjacent to designated heritage properties.

Heritage Conservation District Designation

Heritage Conservation Districts (H.C.D.s) are defined as “areas whose cultural heritage value contributes to a sense of place extending beyond their individual buildings, structures and landscapes” (Ministry of Culture 2006:para. 1). Designation of an area under Part V of the O.H.A. applies to all properties within a defined H.C.D. boundary in relation to the district’s objectives, goals, statement of cultural heritage value, and identified attributes as set out in an H.C.D. Plan.

Cultural Heritage Landscape Designation in the Official Plan

Cultural Heritage Landscape designation in an Official Plan regulates all properties within a defined boundary in relation to the cultural heritage landscape’s defining heritage values and attributes as documented in the municipal Official Plan.

Scenic Road or Corridor Designation

Scenic Roads or Corridors can be identified in a list and map within an Official Plan, allowing the regulation of elements that contribute to the character and quality of scenic roads or corridors within the public right-of-way (see Section 2.3.4 – Scenic Routes for additional information).

Special Policy Areas, Character Area Policies and Local Area Plans

Special Policy Areas, Character Area Policies and Local Area Plans can be incorporated in an Official Plan with associated policies and guidelines based on the character of the surrounding area, typically neighbourhoods. The policies and guidelines regulate such features including, but not limited to, building orientation, setbacks, lot coverage, building heights, and open space.

Urban Design Guidelines

Urban Design Guidelines incorporated into an Official Plan allow a municipality to regulate new construction within residential, commercial, or industrial neighbourhoods, including elements such as streetscape, signage, built form, views, pedestrian amenities, and landscaping.

Protected Views and View Corridors

The identification of significant views and view corridors in an Official Plan, within a list and map or schedule, allows for the protection of those views through the development review process.

Tree Protection By-Law

Tree protection by-laws regulate trees of a certain diameter on private property and city streets, with exceptions including trees less than the size identified in a municipal by-law, or trees that are dying, injured, or posing danger to life or property.

Zoning By-Laws

Zoning by-laws regulate the use of land, including how that land may be used, what types of buildings and structures are permitted, where buildings and structures can be located, and more detailed, often measurable development requirements for that land. Zoning by-laws can be used to ensure compatibility of development with the surrounding properties and within a broader community.

Non-Legislative Strategies

Interpretation and Commemoration Strategy

An interpretation and commemoration strategy allows for the history and stories of areas of interest and significant cultural heritage landscapes to be shared, understood, and appreciated by members of the public through a variety of media, including, but not limited to, interpretive plaques, exhibits, tours, apps, and educational programs.

Canadian Heritage River Designation

Although Canadian Heritage River Designation carries no regulatory authority, designation as a Canadian Heritage River allows for national recognition of significant river systems and encourages public recognition and appreciation of those systems.

Marketing and Promotions Strategy

Marketing and promotions strategies, including branding, wayfinding and signage, walking tours, social media campaigns, cultural festivals and events, and public art, allow further understanding and appreciation of areas of interest and significant cultural heritage landscapes by members of the public.

Fantastic Trees Program

Fantastic Trees (previously recognized as Significant Trees) as a tree that is recognized because of its size, form, rarity of species, age, its association with a historical figure or event, and/or a tree that is distinctive in the community. The Fantastic Trees Program offers Mississauga residents an engagement opportunity to recognize trees on City property and foster an appreciation of Mississauga's Urban Forest. This program is a continuation of the Significant Trees Program but provides a more interactive platform for residents to view current trees in the program through story maps, self-guided walking and cycling tours, as well as use the updated nomination form to recruit more Fantastic Trees.

Appendix I: Areas of Interest

BraeBen Golf Course

Formerly called Britannia Hills Golf Course, BraeBen Golf Course is located on Terry Fox Way south of Britannia Road West. Stemming from its former usage as a landfill, this site is a significant landform raised higher than its surroundings. As such, it is visible from many kilometres away and provides a dramatic viewshed out in all directions.

C.R.H. Canada Mississauga Cement Plant

Formerly known as St. Lawrence Cement, this cement supply facility on Lakeshore Road West opened on formerly agricultural lands in 1956. The massive property includes the production complex (mill building, kiln building, and slurry tanks), overhead conveyor belts, a quarry, lime tailing piles (including ground rock and waste effluents) at the northern border, and a pumphouse and 1,200-foot-long dock on the water. At 556 feet high, the site's iconic smokestack was the tallest structure in Mississauga for more than 50 years. This site has cultural heritage value for its design, historical, and associative values as well as its contextual value as a large-scale industrial property.

Creditview Road Scenic Route

This area extends along Creditview Road from Britannia Road to Old Derry Road and features an altered landscape of commercial buildings, residential subdivisions, and agricultural fields along the Credit River. The recommended boundary for the scenic route designation extends along Old Derry Road from the west boundary of the Meadowvale Village H.C.D., south along Old Creditview Road, and south to Creditview Road at the Credit River. This route is recognized for its scenic and visual quality, including views of various parts of Mississauga and of the Credit River, and for its connection to Mississauga's horticultural and agricultural history.

Creditview Wetland

The Creditview Wetland, located in an urban residential neighbourhood northeast of Creditview Road and Eglinton Avenue West, is also a Provincially Significant Wetland. This intact, sustainable wetland is five hectares in size and is filled with a diverse array of vegetation and wildlife species. The site has community value as it provides a unique sense of place within its residential context and scientific value as a natural heritage site.

Lake Iroquois Shoreline

The Lake Iroquois Shoreline through Mississauga generally runs parallel to the Lake Ontario shoreline ranging approximately 4-5 kilometres inland just south of Dundas Street and particularly between Mavis Road and the Credit River Valley. It is the remnant of an ancient

climatic period when 12,500 years ago, glaciation created the character of the Ontario landscape as it exists today. The raised nature of this ancient shoreline transects the city and allows for panoramic views southward to Lake Ontario. It is among the most important physiographic features in the city.

Pearson International Airport

Officially called Lester B. Pearson International Airport, this site is Canada's largest and busiest airport and is the major international gateway to the Greater Toronto Area, including Mississauga. Beginning with a terminal located in an old farmhouse on 570 hectares of farmland in Malton in 1937, the airport has since grown to include multiple terminals, longer runways, control towers, cargo buildings, hotels, and more. The airport has cultural heritage value for its historical and associative values as well as its contextual value as a local airport which has grown to international status and as a landmark in the City of Mississauga and beyond.

Petro-Canada Lubricants

Formerly known as the Petro Canada Refinery, Petro-Canada Lubricants is a large facility that produces industrial, automotive, and food grade greases, lubricants, oils, and other specialty fluids. The property was primarily agricultural until the British-American Oil Company opened a refinery on the site in 1943, marking the beginning of this stretch of Lakeshore Road as an industrial zone on the waterfront. Its early presence as well as its size and scope of operations contributes to and helps to define the industrial character of this stretch of Lakeshore and Southdown Roads in Mississauga.

Rattray Marsh

Rattray Marsh is located on parts of former estates owned by H.H. Fudger and James Halliday Rattray at the south end of Sheridan Creek. The site consists of 13 vegetation communities, 519 floral species, and 253 faunal species and as such it has a high degree of aesthetic appeal. The 46-hectare property was purchased by the Credit Valley Conservation Authority in the early 1970s to ensure the landscape's protection makes it accessible to the public. The marsh's value mainly relates to the natural heritage of the site. Rattray Marsh is a locally rare example of a baymouth bar coastal wetland and is a designated Natural Area, Provincially Significant Wetland, and an Area of Natural and Scientific Interest.

Sheridan Research Park

This area is located along the western border of the City of Mississauga, northeast of the Q.E.W. and Winston Churchill Boulevard. This landscape, which was created in the 1960s, encapsulates the research campus, a collection of architecturally significant low-rise structures associated with the 'planned research park' movement. The park established a precedent setting model

for similar planned facilities, both academic and private commercial or industrial, across Canada.

Trelawny Community

The Trelawny Community is located to the southwest of the historical settlement of Lisgar in the City of Mississauga, along the west side of Tenth Line West and Trelawny Circle, and within the larger community of Meadowvale. It is a residential community with a unique layout of cul-de-sacs with single-detached residential buildings that was planned and constructed in the mid-to-late 1980s through the 1990s. The Trelawny Community is valued for its design and physical value as an innovative and experimental single-family home development.

Wartime Housing (Malton)

The Wartime Housing (Malton) C.H.L. is located at the northeast corner of Airport Road and Derry Road East. This planned subdivision is associated with the wartime effort and the post-war population and economic booms that necessitated quick, easily built, and affordable housing. These “Victory houses” are representative of some of the first mass produced housing in the G.T.A. They were generally one-and-a-half stories with a steep roof, shallow eaves, no dormers and were typically clad with clapboard.

Appendix J: Areas Requiring Further Review

Applewood Acres

Applewood Acres is a community-nominated landscape. It was among the initial postwar subdivisions in Toronto Township. The study area for Applewood Acres is located between Cawthra and Dixie Roads to the west and east, and between the Queen Elizabeth Way (Q.E.W.) and the Queensway to the south and north.




Figure 15: Location of the Applewood Acres study area (Base Map: ©OpenStreetMap and contributors, Creative Commons-Share Alike License (CC-BY-SA))

Historical Summary

The properties on which Applewood Acres developed were formerly agricultural. In 1859, these parcels were owned by various landowners, with only one house constructed on the properties. By 1877, there were four houses, as well as the emergence of some small orchards (Tremaine 1859; Walker and Miles 1877). Between the 1870s and the 1940s, many houses and barns were erected, primarily along what was called the Middle Road (now the Q.E.W.). Over that time, the lands on which Applewood Acres now sit were developing primarily into orchards, operated by the Hedge and Stewart families in the early twentieth century. By 1909, the Toronto and Niagara Electric power line crossed diagonally through the lots (Department of Militia and Defence 1909). A separate power line run by the Hydro Electric Power Commission was installed on an east-west trajectory in the 1920s. This power line later formed the northern

border of Applewood Acres, and became the route along which Queensway East was built (Department of Militia and Defence 1933).

After more than 50 years of the area being used for apple orchards and other fruit trees, the G.S. Shipp and Son, Ltd. began to develop the area.⁹ The company first bought 23 acres on a narrow strip of land on the former Robinson Farm's northern section (south of the Q.E.W.) and started constructing about 100 homes on what would become Applewood Road (Hicks 2005; Cook 2004). To make way for the new houses, some of the apple trees on the Robinson Farm had to be removed, though the company tried to save as many as possible (Hicks 2005). While these homes were the first built, they are not considered part of the larger subdivision project of Applewood Acres.

The beginning of the Applewood Acres subdivision began in 1952 when the Shipp company bought the Hedge and Stewart farms (north of the Q.E.W.) and started construction on what was at the time "Canada's largest housing project" (Cook 2004). The first Plan of Subdivision (Plan 439) was registered in February 1952 for houses on Greening Avenue, Melba Road, Tolman Road, Snow Crescent, Russett Road, MacIntosh Crescent, and Bloomfield Road (now Stanfield Road) (Cook 2004). The second and third Plans of Subdivision, as well as their amendments, led to the rest of the road configuration and housing development in much of the southeast and northeast corners of the subdivision. There were eight different house designs, and the price ranged between \$15,000 and \$18,000. By 1955, G.S. Shipp and Son had built 732 houses north of the Q.E.W., and that same year, the Applewood Village shopping plaza was opened to the public. The plaza was designed with ample parking for cars, though advertisements also noted that it was within walking distance of anyone residing in the new subdivision. The Shipp company was among the first to occupy a spot in the plaza, transferring their headquarters to this location (Hicks 2005). After 1955, other development companies became involved in the construction of houses in the larger Applewood Acres subdivision. Companies such as Edward Small and Son Construction, Alka Developments, and Edrich Construction, amongst others, 'in-filled' areas that were not yet developed. These undertakings took place between the 1950s and 1990s, with the various additions covering areas as small as parts of a street to as many as four full streets (Cook 2004).

While primarily residential, Applewood Acres includes churches, parks, and schools. From as early as 1961 to at least the mid-1980s, there were still a couple of non-residential buildings adjacent to the diagonal hydro corridor. The largest and last remaining one was the Leaver Mushroom facility slightly north of the plaza, which had stood on the site since 1922 but was converted to houses by the late 1980s (Army Survey Establishment, R.C.E 1963; Department of Energy, Mines and Resources 1994).

⁹ Gordon S. Shipp started his construction company in 1923. His son, Harold Shipp, a real estate developer, joined his father as a full partner in the family business in 1946 (Ireland 2011).

The Shipp Corporation built much more in Mississauga in the second half of the twentieth century, including the massive housing development projects such as Applewood Heights, Applewood Hills, Applewood-on-the-Park apartment buildings, the Mississauga Executive Centre, and the Applewood Landmark condominiums (Hicks 2005).



Figure 16: Houses along Duchess Drive, 1954 (Cook 2004)

SEE! The much talked about

"APPLEWOOD ACRES"
EXTENDED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
the Happy results of Long Term Planning!

HOME '53
TO GIVE YOU IDEAS!
150 NEW HOMES!
150 NEW HOMES!
150 NEW HOMES!

NOW OPEN FOR YOUR INSPECTION

CITY COUNCIL APPROVED

150 NEW HOMES! & BEAUTIFUL DESIGNS TO CHOOSE FROM!

The Cottages
The Single Homes
The Shopping
The Schools
The Churches
shopping in applewood
some important questions
THE ANSWER!
The Design
The Location

PRICE RANGE \$15,600 - \$18,200
for further details telephone CLifford 9-3279 or write
G. S. SHIPP & SON LIMITED
DEVELOPER AND BUILDER OF THE ORIGINAL
APPLEWOOD ACRES
Fast Credit

Figure 17: Applewood Acres advertisement in the Toronto Daily Star, 25 September 1953 (G.S. Shipp & Son Limited 1953)

Mapping




Figure 18: 1954 aerial photograph (Hunting Survey Corporation Limited 1954b)



Figure 19: 1994 N.T.S. map, Brampton Sheet (Department of Energy, Mines and Resources 1994)

Existing Conditions

Table 3: Inventory of existing resources found within and adjacent to Applewood Acres

Address	Recognition
915 North Service Rd	Designated under Part IV of the O.H.A.
849 Duchess Dr	Listed on the City of Mississauga Heritage Register prior to 2005
2265 Stanfield Rd	Listed on the City of Mississauga Heritage Register prior to 2005
871 North Service Rd	Listed on the City of Mississauga Heritage Register prior to 2005
2170 Stanfield Rd	Listed on the City of Mississauga Heritage Register prior to 2005
2240 Dixie Rd	Listed on the City of Mississauga Heritage Register prior to 2005
915 North Service Rd	Listed on the City of Mississauga Heritage Register prior to 2005
1077 North Service Rd	Listed on the City of Mississauga Heritage Register prior to 2005

Fieldwork Photos



Figure 20: Streetscape in Applewood Acres (A.S.I. 2020)



Figure 21: Typical houses within Applewood Acres (A.S.I. 2020)



Figure 22: Mature trees and streetscape in Applewood Acres (A.S.I. 2020)

Lorne Park Estates

The Lorne Park Estates Cultural Landscape is located along Lakeshore Road West between Jack Darling Memorial Park and Richard's Memorial Park. This landscape encapsulates the privately-held community of Lorne Park Estates which was established in 1879 on 75 acres as the Lorne Park Pleasure Resort. Prior to the development of the 2005 Cultural Landscape Inventory, three heritage properties were listed within this landscape. Currently, two properties within Lorne Park Estates are designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (O.H.A.).

The Lorne Park Estates Cultural Landscape was identified in the City of Mississauga's 2005 Cultural Landscape Inventory for its landscape environment, built environment and significant ecological interest (The Landplan Collaborative Ltd. et al. 2005). The site description for the Lorne Park Estates Cultural Landscape in the 2005 Cultural Landscape Inventory indicates that this forested community is, in many ways, representative of the pre-settlement shoreline of Lake Ontario. The 2005 inventory recognized the balance struck between residential development and the protection of a mature forest in the community. The landscape was noted for its scenic quality, natural environment, and its landscape design, type, and technological interest. The built environment was noted for the aesthetic/visual quality and the consistent scale of built features.




Figure 23: Location of the Lorne Park Estates Cultural Landscape overlaid on a 2017 aerial photograph (City of Mississauga)

Historical Summary

The first official survey of Lorne Park Estates was prepared by Samuel Wilmot in 1806 (Lorne Park Estates Historical Committee 1980). The 1806 Patent Plan shows the location of Lorne Park Estates along Lake Ontario in Lots 22 and 23, Concession 3. Much of the area along the lakeshore consisted of a Cranberry Marsh. Between 1839 and 1878, the land was bought and sold several times. The 1859 Tremaine Map shows the unclaimed land marked as “non-resident” and continues to show some marshy areas.

In 1878, a group of nine men from Toronto and Peel purchased the land from a company called the “Lorne Park Association”, however the name was rejected and the company was renamed “The Toronto Park Association” (Lorne Park Estates Historical Committee 1980). The Toronto Park Association cleared the land, built a wharf, a picnic pavilion, fences, walkways and paths between the fall of 1878 and May 1879 and the 30 hectare resort opened for business on May 24, 1879 (Lorne Park Estates Historical Committee 1980).

Lorne Park was named for the Marquis de Lorne, the Governor General of Canada between 1878 and 1883 (Heritage Mississauga 2009). The 1880 Historical Atlas Map shows the location of Lorne Park Estates along the shore of Lake Ontario and George Henderson and J.W Orr as the owners of the Lots 22 and 23, respectively. Orr would later construct the Hotel Louise and wharf (Heritage Mississauga 2009).

In July 1886, the property was sold to a group led by John W. Stockwell, who formed a company called The Toronto and Lorne Park Summer Resort Company (Lorne Park Estates Historical Committee 1980). The newly-formed company made plans to survey and subdivide the land into 50-foot building lots, with plans to sell each lot for \$100 (Lorne Park Estates Historical Committee 1980).



Figure 24: 1889 Lorne Park Summer Resort Survey Map (Weeks 1993)

The plan was registered in May 1888, although sales of the lots had begun two years earlier (Lorne Park Estates Historical Committee 1980). The directors of the company gave their names to the roads running east to west in the subdivision, while names of poets were given to the roads running north and south (Lorne Park Estates Historical Committee 1980).



Figure 25: Gates to Lorne Park Estates, c. 1900 (Heritage Mississauga)

The park area was increased in 1889 with the acquisition of 13 ¼ acres of land to the east, and again in 1890 to the south with the purchase of the water lot from the Crown. This extended the total area of The Park to approximately 90 acres. In 1891, The Park was transferred to The Lorne Park Company Limited, and a new road was opened that divided the area known as the centre commons into two (Lorne Park Estates Historical Committee 1980).




Figure 26: 1889 Lorne Park Annex Plan of Subdivision (Lough 1889)

The Lorne Park Supply Store was opened across from the entrance to the Lorne Park Estates by Albert Shaver in 1892, and the Lorne Park Post Office was opened in the store the same year. The O'Hara family took over the store in 1902 and delivered groceries to the Lorne Park community (Hicks 2003).



Figure 27: O'Hara's General Store, Lorne Park (Historic Images Gallery, <http://www.mississauga.ca/>)

The Hotel Louise, located at the south end of The Park, was re-designed by architect Edmund Burke in 1889 (Lorne Park Estates Historical Committee 1980). The re-opening of the hotel was an important event, and the hotel remained extremely successful until 1908, used as a social club with games and dances held throughout the summer (Lorne Park Estates Historical Committee 1980). In 1909, the hotel ceased operations and its name was changed to the Lakeshore Country Club. By 1912 the building was no longer public and was then occupied as a summer cottage by a private family. Following a fire in the hotel around 1920, the building was demolished (Lorne Park Estates Historical Committee 1980).



Figure 28: Hotel Louise - Lorne Park Estates, c. 1900 (Heritage Mississauga)

In 1877, a long wooden wharf was constructed to allow steamers to come from Toronto's Yonge Street Wharf to Lorne Park in the hopes of attracting summer tourists (Hicks 2003). In June 1903, approximately 300 people were waiting on the wharf for the ferry to Toronto when a short section collapsed, resulting in about 50 people falling into the water. While no one died, several were badly hurt (Weeks 1993). Following the collapse of the wharf, the popularity of Lorne Park as an amusement complex declined (R. Riendeau 1985). However, a new wharf was constructed starting in 1904, and by 1908 the Park had become increasingly popular again (Weeks 1993).



Figure 29: Lorne Park Wharf, n.d. (Historic Images Gallery, <http://www.mississauga.ca/>)

Between 1905 and 1910, The Park was closed to the public and became a private summer resort, with most property owners coming from the City of Toronto (Lorne Park Estates Historical Committee 1980). Lorne Park Station allowed families to go back and forth between Toronto and The Park and for workers to commute daily. Activities at the summer resort included tennis, boating, swimming, corn roasts, bowling, picnicking, and baseball (Lorne Park Estates Historical Committee 1980).



Figure 30: Women's Institute Park Picnic, 1914 (Heritage Mississauga)

In June 1909, in the midst of financial difficulties for the Lorne Park Company Limited, the land was transferred to Trustees William Travers and Frank McPhillips, who then transferred ownership to a newly incorporated company known as The Lake Shore Country Club Limited (Lorne Park Estates Historical Committee 1980). Shortly after the transfer of ownership, the Hotel Louise was renamed as The Lake Shore Country Club (Hicks 2003). The property was mortgaged again through the Farmer's Bank, and by 1912 the Club had dissolved (Hicks 2003).

In March 1911, a portion of the park was sold to Toronto broker Sydney Small for \$46,000, including the hotel and 50 acres of land. The cottagers and lot holders of the park area continued to live in the area currently known as the Lorne Park Estates (Weeks 1993). In 1919, a group of six owners attempted to regain control of the parklands in the ownership of Sydney Small and to restore financial stability to the community. In July of that year, Lorne Park Estates Limited bought back the parklands and unsold lots (Lorne Park Estates Historical Committee 1980).

With new ownership came the establishment and incorporation of the Lorne Park Cottagers' Association, headed by Mary Louise Clarke and, following her death in 1931, was funded through the financial support of her estate (Hicks 2003). The Lorne Park Cottager's Association purchased the parklands from Sydney to regain their control and establish their rights over the

land (Hicks 2003). From this point onwards, The Lorne Park Estates was exclusively residential (Hicks 2003).

Throughout the 1920s and 1930s, Lorne Park Estates was densely treed, with multiple dwellings along the surveyed roads, and development following the original plan of subdivision as far east as Longfellow Avenue. However, the roadways to the east that were anticipated in the plan of subdivision, including Moore Avenue and Orient Avenue, were not developed.




Figure 31: 1919 Lorne Park Estates Plan of Subdivision (Unknown 1919)

The Lorne Park Estates Association became the Lorne Park Estates Limited in April, 1948, and the deed for the land transferred from the estate of Mary Louise Clarke to the villagers (Hicks 2003). By 1950, most of the houses in Lorne Park Estates had electricity, and between 1950 and 1959, several new houses were constructed (Lorne Park Estates Historical Committee 1980). The 1966 aerial photograph shows circulation routes and housing throughout the Park through dense trees and the appearance of Whittier Crescent curving from the lake to Lakeshore Road to the east of the original subdivision. It also shows a significant clearing of trees to the west of Lorne Park Estates for Shoreline Park).

In June 1979, a Centennial Picnic was held to commemorate the opening of the Park and its 100 year history (Lorne Park Estates Historical Committee 1980).



Figure 32: Centennial Picnic, Lorne Park Estates, June 1979 (Historic Images Gallery, <http://www.mississauga.ca/>)

Today, Lorne Park Estates remains a privately-held residential community and has retained much of its original tree canopy and its lot pattern with the addition of Whittier Crescent to the east. According to construction-date data from the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (M.P.A.C.), there are 19 properties within Lorne Park Estates that were constructed before 1930. The data suggests that few properties were constructed between 1930 and 1950, but that development sharply increased in the 1950s and 1960s with 41 properties dating to that time period. Since 1970, 19 properties have been built. It should be noted that this data has not been verified to confirm their accuracy.



Figure 33: Lorne Park Estates, Aerial View, 1972 (Historic Images Gallery, <http://www.mississauga.ca/>)



Figure 34: Lorne Park Estates, 1980 (Historic Images Gallery, <http://www.mississauga.ca/>)

Mapping



Figure 35: Location of the Lorne Park Estates Cultural Landscape overlaid on the 1909 topographic map (Department of Militia and Defence 1909)



Figure 36: Location of the Lorne Park Estates Cultural Landscape overlaid on a 1966 aerial photograph (City of Mississauga)

Existing Conditions

Table 4: Inventory of existing resources found within and adjacent to the Lorne Park Cultural Landscape

Address	Recognition
863 Sangster Ave	Designated under Part IV of the O.H.A.
913 Sangster Ave	Designated under Part IV of the O.H.A.
908 Longfellow Ave	Listed on the City of Mississauga Heritage Register prior to 2005
892 Tennyson Ave	Listed on the City of Mississauga Heritage Register prior to 2005
857 Longfellow Ave	Listed on the City of Mississauga Heritage Register prior to 2005

Mississauga Golf and Country Club

The Mississauga Golf and Country Club – the spelling of the club is different than the city – is listed as a Cultural Feature on the 2005 Cultural Landscape Inventory. It is located on the traditional territory of the Haudenosaunee, the Huron-Wendat, as well as Anishinaabeg peoples, and is within the boundary of the Mississaugas' former Credit Mission Village between 1826 and 1847. The area was likely farmland in the second half of the nineteenth century. The Club was formed in 1906 and is known for its picturesque grounds and Tudor Revival clubhouse. It is located at 1725 Mississauga Road.




Figure 37: Location of Mississauga Golf and Country Club study area (Base Map: ©OpenStreetMap and contributors, Creative Commons-Share Alike License (CC-BY-SA))

Historical Summary

The land on which the Mississauga Golf and Country Club (M.G.C.C.) is located is within the traditional territory of the Haudenosaunee, the Huron-Wendat, as well as Anishinaabeg peoples. In particular, the location of the Mississauga Golf and Country Club is within the land originally set aside for the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation for the establishment of a mission village in 1826. By the end of the seventeenth century, the Mississaugas of the Credit occupied and exercised stewardship over nearly 4 million acres of land in southern Ontario, with a territory extending from along the western end of Lake Ontario from the Rouge River to the headwaters of the Thames River and along Lake Erie from Long Point to the Niagara River.

During this time, the Mississaugas of the Credit had several settlements along the northwest shore of Lake Ontario with their principal location being at the mouth of the Credit River.

Between 1781 and 1820, the Mississaugas of the Credit entered into treaty negotiations with the British government for most of their territory in Southern Ontario. With the 1806 Head of the Lake Treaty, the Mississaugas of the Credit ceded to the Crown the land between Etobicoke Creek and Burlington Bay and northward 6 miles inland from the shore. In exchange, they received 1,000 Pounds of trade goods and retained a one-mile strip of land on either side of (and sole right of the fisheries in) the Credit River and Twelve Mile and Sixteen Mile Creeks for six miles inland from each mouth (Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation 2017; Ahmed 2013; Claus, William on behalf of the Crown 1806).

However, the toll of disease and the encroachment of settlers significantly impacted the Mississaugas' economic situation, their access to hunting and fishing, and ultimately their population. As such, the Mississaugas and the Crown negotiated the sale of all their remaining land through Treaty 22 (1818) and Treaty 23 (1820), although 200 acres were set aside for a village along the Credit River as part of Treaty 23. Led by brothers Peter Jones (Kahkewaquonaby) and John Jones, approximately 200 Mississauga moved onto the Credit Mission Village or Credit Reserve – now the site the Mississauga Golf and Country Club – in 1826 (Ahmed 2013). Over the 40 years of occupation, the village came to include approximately 40 detached log structures aligned along a grid of four streets. The village also had a carpenter and blacksmith shop, a hospital, two public stores, a sawmill, a school, a mission chapel, and a Methodist cemetery. Each log house was surrounded by a small half-acre field for garden crops (Ryerson 1883). While the location of the cemetery is currently not known, it was noted to be behind the Chief's house at a high point overlooking the river, perhaps near the present clubhouse of the Mississauga Golf and Country Club (Halton Peel Branch, Ontario Genealogical Society; Jones 1838). As the majority shareholders of the Credit Harbour Company, the community also constructed a lumber storehouse and the port near the mouth of the river at Port Credit. The Jones brothers, along with missionary Egerton Ryerson (later to be the longstanding Superintendent of Education in the colony/province), helped to foster Methodism while also promoting settler education and agricultural practices within the village. By 1840, about 500 acres of corn, wheat, oats, barley, and rice was under cultivation, livestock was raised in the surrounding fields, regular trade occurred between the community and settlers, and the community was described as thriving with residents described as orderly and pious (Wybenga 2019).

Though the village was prosperous, the Mississaugas' resources were depleting and discussions about relocation surfaced in the 1840s. Finally, in May 1847, 266 Mississaugas moved to 6,000 acres offered by the Six Nations of the Grand River in Brant and Haldimand counties, near the current community of Hagersville. It was there that they established the New Credit Reserve (Halton Peel Branch, Ontario Genealogical Society).

Following the departure of the Mississaugas of the Credit from their reserve, the land was subdivided into new lots that did not coincide with the gridded lot and concession system of the rest of Toronto Township. The old reserve lands were divided up into five Ranges north of Dundas Street, two Ranges south of Dundas Street, and, further south, three Ranges of the Credit Indian Reserve (C.I.R.) all the way down to a Broken Front along the shoreline of Lake Ontario. The former village site itself was found on the most southern edge of Lots 6, 7, and 8 in Range 3 C.I.R., but was part of a larger parcel called the Mill Block, which included all of Lots 5-8.

By 1859, this land was owned by brothers Robert and James Cotton, both prominent businessmen and public officials in nineteenth century Toronto Township. It is plausible that tenant farmers lived on the land, and some, including the Irish-Catholic Dinan family, may have occupied the extant buildings from the Credit Reserve (Halton Peel Branch, Ontario Genealogical Society). The 1859 *Tremaine Map of the County of Peel* identifies the former site of the Credit Mission and depicts 10 structures within the original street grid.

In the 1860s, Peel General Manufacturing Company (P.G.M.C.), established by local business magnate Frederick C. Capreol in 1863, purchased the majority of the Mill Block (Bull). An additional 1,000+ acres was purchased along the Credit River down to the mouth of the harbour. Capreol was a founding member and promoter of the Ontario, Simcoe, and Huron Railroad Company (later known as the Northern Railway) which travelled between Toronto and Collingwood. In purchasing all this land, his vision was to dam the Credit River and erect flax, hemp, and woollen mills as part of an effort to industrialize the Port Credit area. Ultimately, though, the plans were abandoned as he could not secure the required financial investment.

Since no factory or mill ever materialized, it is likely that Capreol/P.G.M.C. leased the land to tenants, as various records indicate that farming continued on the grounds of the old Credit Mission. Local testimonials suggest that the Fazewell, Hector, McConnell, Murray and Turple families all lived on site (Wilkinson 2019). In time, much of the Capreol/P.G.M.C. land was sold off to various buyers, though the P.G.M.C. continued to own the subject property.

In 1905, A.R. Capreol, one of F.C. Capreol's sons, facilitated the purchase of 208 acres from the Peel General Manufacturing Company for \$12,000 for the development of a new golf course. The new club, called the Mississaugua Golf and Country Club, opened in 1906 with members from the recently closed Highlands Club at Lambton Mills forming the core of the new membership (Hall 1933). The site was selected for its picturesque placement on the Credit River, its quality soil, and its proximity to Toronto. When two professional players – Percy Barrett from Lambton Mills and George Cumming from Toronto Golf Club – deemed the land suitable, so began its transformation into a golf course. Barrett himself laid out a 9-hole course, though the landscape was largely retained. Hamilton was named the inaugural president. The first club Championship was handed out in 1906, and several member-only events and tournaments in these early years included the Forester Trophy, the Highlands Trophy, and the Driving Competition (Hall 1933).

The club acquired more land in 1908 and the following year, an expanded 18-hole course was opened, designed by notable architect George Cumming, famous for having designed the Humber Valley Golf Club, Toronto's first public course. Cumming is also notable for being elected the first captain of the Canadian Professional Golfers' Association when it formed in 1911. The grounds of the new M.G.C.C. were widely praised, including the following description from the Toronto Star Weekly in 1914:

“The scenic beauty of the links is remarkable. The view over the course is wonderfully fine – the finest view it is said, within fifty miles of Toronto. ... No more delightful spot for spending a weekend can possibly be imagined. It is a veritable haven of rest for any suffering from brain fag or jaded nerves. In addition, it may be said that it is, incidentally, a sanctuary for game, for it abounds in plover, wild duck, and snipe, none of which are allowed to be shot” (Anon 1914).

Nevertheless, changes and improvements continued to be made. The course was re-developed with design layout alterations from renowned golf course architect Donald Ross in 1919 (Mollenhauer 1981). Another legendary golf course architect, Stanley Thompson, oversaw further upgrades and lengthened the course in 1928. William Perkins Bull, the great chronicler of Peel's history and people, noted as early as 1934 that M.G.C.C. “is regarded by golfers as one of the finest courses in North America ... Trees, hillsides and glades have been treated in a manner designed to preserve the scene much as it was when the Mississauga Indians encamped on the spot” (Bull 1934). Indeed, the course was so highly regarded that it hosted the Canadian Open in 1931, 1938, 1942, 1951, 1965, and 1974.

In addition to the golf course itself, M.G.C.C. is notable for its historic clubhouse. Between 1906 and 1912, the clubhouse was within a vacant farmhouse (Dilse 2012; Mollenhauer 1981). This farmhouse possibly belonged to the Hector family and may have been built out of salvaged material from buildings that were torn down from the Mission (Wilkinson 2019). It is known that some of the buildings from the original village remained in use into the twentieth century. In fact, one log structure known as the “Old Chief's House” continued to be used by the Club Professional until it was demolished in the 1950s (Robertson 1908). However, as membership grew, a new clubhouse was built in 1912 on the site of the old farmhouse, and near the former Credit Mission cemetery (Anon 1914). Designed by W.A. Langton using stone taken from the grounds itself, the clubhouse was built in the Tudor Revival style. It included two verandahs, sleeping accommodations, a lounge, dining room, reception room, card room, smoking room, offices, and locker room (Anon 1914). The clubhouse was enlarged in 1919 and additions were completed in 1920 (Mississauga Golf and Country Club). Elsewhere on the premises, further improvements were undertaken in the early 1920s included a new bungalow for the maids, new garage, an incinerator, machine shop, locker room, shelters, sewage disposal plant, and a new water system. A curling rink was added in 1958, the same year that Mississauga Road was re-routed from in front of the clubhouse further south (Dilse 2012; Mollenhauer 1981).

Even though the physical remains of the original Credit Mission Village are no longer visible in the Mississauga Golf and Country Club, it is clear that evidence of this use of the land may still exist today. This settlement was registered by Victor Konrad as an archaeological site—the Mississauga Indian Village site (AjGv-14)—and is located within the grounds of the Mississauga Golf and Country Club. Although no formal research was carried out to determine the precise location or extent of the settlement, the registering archaeologist originally assumed that it had been destroyed by the development of the golf course, but this may not entirely be the case. In fact, landscaping activities in the southeast portion of the club property in 2010 uncovered archaeological deposits associated with a log structure – assumed to be the mission chapel. These remains were briefly investigated but were not excavated. They have been registered as AjGv-70 and completion of the landscaping work involved preserving the remains in situ (Amec Earth & Environmental 2010).

Around 2018, various community partners, including the Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation¹⁰, Heritage Mississauga, the Erin Mills Development Corporation, and the City of Mississauga, established a small garden and group of plaques commemorating and honouring the memory of the Mississaugas' First Nations ancestors who once lived in the Credit Mission Village. Located on Mississauga Road, just north of the Club's tennis courts, the Chi-twaa Tigaanes/Sacred Garden includes plants that are representative of traditional plants that the Mississaugas would have known.




Figure 38: “Village at the River Credit in 1827 – winter” (Ryerson 1883)

¹⁰ Now known as Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation.



Figure 39: “Old Credit Mission (from a sketch by Mrs. E. Carey)” showing school and council house on the left of the image and the Mission church and Reverend Jones’ study on the right (Ryerson 1883)



Figure 40: “Chief John Jones’ House” (Ryerson 1883)



Figure 41: "Old Chief's House" (Robertson 1908)



Figure 42: Golf course grounds and Credit River, 1913 (Mollenhauer 1981)



Figure 43: The new clubhouse at Mississauga Golf and Country Club, c. 1920s (Bull 1934)



Figure 44: Aerial image of Clubhouse and Curling Rink at Mississauga Golf and Country Club, 1966 (Mollenhauer 1981)



Figure 45: Mississauga Golf and Country Club, aerial view, 1981 (Mississauga Library System)

Mapping




Figure 46: Location of Mississauga Golf and Country Club overlaid on 1849 map showing location of Indian Village (PAMA)



Figure 47: 1859 Tremaine Map of the County of Peel showing location of “Old Indian Village” (Tremaine 1859)



Figure 48: 1877 Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Peel (Walker and Miles 1877)




Figure 49: 1922 topographic map, Brampton Sheet (Department of Militia and Defence 1922)




Figure 50: 1974 N.T.S. map, Brampton Sheet (Department of Energy, Mines and Resources 1974)

Existing Conditions

Table 5: Inventory of existing resources found within and adjacent to Mississauga Golf and Country Club

Address	Recognition
Mississauga Indian Village site (AjGv-14)	Archaeological Site
Flat River Site (AjGv-15)	Archaeological Site
Presumed Mission Chapel (AjGv-70)	Archaeological Site
1993 Mississauga Rd	Bickell Estate – Designated under Part IV of the O.H.A.
Mississauga Road Scenic Route	2005 Cultural Landscape Inventory – cultural feature
2221 Shawanaga Tr	Listed on the City of Mississauga Heritage Register prior to 2005

Archaeological sites within and adjacent to the landscape:

In 1826, the Mississauga established a village on the east side of the Credit River approximately 3.5 kilometres upstream from Lake Ontario. The Credit River settlement developed largely under the leadership of the Methodist missionary Peter Jones, who was the son of the Anglo-American surveyor Augustus Jones and Tuhbenahneequay, a Mississauga woman from the Credit community. By 1826, most of the community had converted to Christianity and taken up farming and the mission settlement, in outward appearances at least, resembled contemporary Euro-Canadian rural settlement centres, consisting of 20 log cabins set close together in a straight line (Smith 2002:114). By the mid-to late 1830s, the Credit River settlement, with a population of some 200 people, boasted a hospital, a mechanics' shop, eight barns, two sawmills, and 40 houses and 900 acres were in pasture, under crops of wheat, oats, peas, corn, potatoes and other vegetables. Ultimately, however, the Mississauga community on the Credit did not survive. Euro-Canadian settlement continued to expand in the area through the 1830s and 1840s and continued to undermine the Mississauga's ability to pursue the way of life that they desired and the government denied them the security of tenure at the Credit Mission. In consequence, the majority of the Mississauga Credit River community had relocated to a new community on Six Nations reserve lands near Hagersville, by 1847. The 1859 *Tremaine's Map of the County of Peel* identifies the former site of the Credit Mission as the "Old Indian Village" and depicts 10 structures still standing, 12 years after the move.

This settlement was registered by Victor Konrad as an archaeological site—**the Mississauga Indian Village site (AjGv-14)**—and is located within the grounds of the Mississauga Golf Club. Although no formal research was carried out to determine the precise location or extent of the settlement, the registering archaeologist assumed that it had been destroyed by the development of the golf course, but this may not entirely be the case. In fact, recent landscaping activities may have uncovered archaeological deposits associated with the chapel. These remains were briefly investigated but were not excavated. They have been registered as **AjGv-70** and completion of the landscaping work involved preserving the remains in situ (AMEC 2010).

The **River Flat site (AjGv-15)** was registered by Konrad as a Middle Archaic camp that was located on the river flats (OASD Site Record Form). It was apparently destroyed by earthmoving activities carried out by the Mississauga Golf and Country Club and the conservation authority in the 1970s.

The designation **AjGv-70** refers to a component of the Mississauga Credit River settlement that was affected by landscaping at the Mississauga Golf Club in 2010. Limited surficial investigations were carried out by engineering firm AMEC prior to measures being undertaken to protect the site. It has been suggested that the finds may be associated with the chapel (AMEC 2010).

Fieldwork Photos



Figure 51: Front entrance to Mississauga Golf and Country Club (A.S.I. 2019)



Figure 52: Plaque at front entrance of Mississauga Golf and Country Club (A.S.I. 2019)



Figure 53: Chi-twa Tigaanes/Sacred Garden and commemoration of the former Credit Mission Village (A.S.I. 2019)



Figure 54: Commemorative plaque showing the layout of the Credit Mission Village overlaid on an aerial image of the area c. 2018 (A.S.I. 2019)

Toronto Golf Club

Toronto Golf Club is a community-nominated landscape. It is home to one nine-hole course and one 18-hole course on undulating terrain next to the Etobicoke Creek. It is located at 1305 Dixie Road.



Figure 55: Location of the Toronto Golf Club study area (Base Map: ©OpenStreetMap and contributors, Creative Commons-Share Alike License (CC-BY-SA))

Historical Summary

The third oldest club in North America and the oldest in Ontario, Toronto Golf Club (T.G.C.) was founded by James Lamond Smith in 1876. The course and clubhouse operated on the Fernhill property in East Toronto, near Gerrard Street and Coxwell Avenue. In 1911, the club purchased its current property on the Etobicoke Creek (Toronto Golf Club).

The new site was the former Smith Estate. Samuel Smith had received the crown patent in 1817, and the property later passed to James A. Smith and Samuel B. Smith. While the northern portion was sold to John Watson in 1872, most of the property was sold to Reginald Ball in the late 1870s or early 1880s. In 1884, Thomas Goldthorpe purchased 50 acres of farm property from Ball and built a brick house on Dixie Road above the Grand Trunk Railway line.¹¹ In the decades thereafter, Goldthorpe established himself as a prominent local politician, serving as

¹¹ Goldthorpe's residence still stands at 1147 Dixie Road, near the southwest corner of the Club property, and is listed on the City of Mississauga Heritage Register. This house, and the neighbouring houses on either side of it, are not technically on the Club grounds, though there are pathways encircling it which lead to the Club's Maintenance Facility.

deputy reeve, councillor, and then reeve in 1906-07. In 1911, he sold 40 acres of his property to the T.G.C., though his barn stayed on the course's sixth green until 1968, serving as a storage equipment facility. The T.G.C. purchased another 221 acres from three other adjacent property owners, bringing the total size to 261 acres (Batten 1976).

The Club hired renowned English golf course architect Harry Shapland Colt to design the course. Most of his work was done overseas, making his name at premier English courses such as Rye and Sunningdale. Colt was particularly well known for incorporating trees and strategically placing fairways and bunkers, which he later used to good effect when helping to design such notable Canadian courses as Hamilton Golf and Country Club (1914), St. George's Golf and Country Club (1920), and York Downs Country Club (1921) (Toronto Golf Club).

The natural undulations and rolling terrain made T.G.C. an ideal heathland course, which was ready for play by the autumn of 1912. After more land to the north was purchased in 1919, an additional 9-hole course was built and was ready for play by 1921. A watering system was introduced for the fairways in 1931, with upgrades in 1937, using the combination of a dam, underground piping, pumping system, and reservoir. By the 1940s, the maintenance of the greens, including weeding, reseeding, and fertilization, was using the newest science and technology available and the course became known for its excellent turf and lush fairways (Batten 1976). This emphasis has continued to the present, as the course is a certified member of Audubon International, which supports environmental stewardship and works to preserve the natural heritage and wildlife habitats on golf courses (Toronto Golf Club). Some redesigning and/or extensions to holes, tees, fairways, bunkers, and sand traps have occurred over the years, as have updates to the course irrigation.

The Scottish-Canadian golf professional George Cumming, widely known as the "dean of Canadian Professional Golfers," was named the T.G.C. golf professional at the age of 21 in 1900 and remained in this position until 1950. In this capacity, he taught generations of club members. Membership has included many prominent business and legal professionals, and the Club has hosted many important people, including the Prince of Wales (later King Edward VIII) and Prince George in 1927 (Batten 1976).

The clubhouse on site today was designed by W.A. Langton and built in 1912-13. Originally, the road up to the clubhouse was off Lakeshore Road, going north-south along the eastern side of the Etobicoke Creek, then crossing a bridge, and then running between holes up to the parking lot. With the construction of the Dixie Road overpass and Queen Elizabeth Way (Q.E.W.) ramps in 1953, a new east-west entranceway was built off of Dixie Road, wandering its way through the course up to the clubhouse (Burk and Doucette 2019). Other major physical changes on site have included the opening of a Pro Shop in 1966 designed by architect Paul Pentland, assisted by John Hunt.

The Toronto Golf Club has hosted the Canadian Open five times, twice in its former Toronto location and three times – in 1914, 1921, and 1927 – in its current location. Additionally, the

club has held the Canadian Amateur Championship nine times, the most of any club in the country (Toronto Golf Club).

In 2009-10, the Colt Course at Toronto Golf Club was redesigned by Martin Hawtree, a golf course architect well-known for (re)creating links courses such as those Colt had done (Toronto Golf Club).



Figure 56: Clubhouse, c. 1914 (Bull 1934)

Mapping



Figure 57: 1942 topographic map, Brampton Sheet (Department of National Defence 1942)




Figure 58: 1974 N.T.S. map, Brampton Sheet (Department of Energy, Mines and Resources 1974)

Existing Conditions

Table 6: Inventory of existing resources found within and adjacent to Toronto Golf Club

Address	Recognition
1147 Dixie Road	Listed on the City of Mississauga Heritage Register prior to 2005
Lakeview Golf Course	Designated under Part IV of the O.H.A.

Fieldwork Photos



Figure 59: Toronto Golf Club Clubhouse (Landplan 2019)




Figure 60: Toronto Golf Club Hole 1 (Landplan 2019)



Figure 61: Toronto Golf Club Green at the 11th hole (A.S.I. 2019)

University of Toronto Mississauga

The University of Toronto Mississauga is listed on the 2005 Cultural Landscape Inventory. Originally known as Erindale College, the campus has grown significantly both in terms of buildings and student population. The campus is set on a 225-acre protected greenbelt property, next to the Credit River. While geographically large, the official address is 3359 Mississauga Road.




Figure 62: Location of University of Toronto Mississauga (U.T.M.) study area (Base Map: ©OpenStreetMap and contributors, Creative Commons-Share Alike License (CC-BY-SA))

Historical Summary

The University of Toronto Mississauga (U.T.M.) campus is located on a 225-acre property on the high ground along the west bank of the Credit River, east of Mississauga Road and north of Dundas Street. Originally known as Erindale College, it is 33 kilometres west of the University of Toronto St. George campus in Toronto (University of Toronto Mississauga 2020).

Around 1885, the Schreiber family owned the property and built Lislehurst, a stone-based Tudor-style estate. The famous artist Charlotte Schreiber lived here from 1885 to 1898 where the surrounding landscape inspired much of her art. Reginald Watkins, a Hamilton businessman, purchased the property from the Schreiber family in 1930. Watkins was responsible for renovating Lislehurst, turning it into its present form. Watkins sold his large property to the University of Toronto (UofT) for what was to be known as Erindale College, and

Lislehurst has been used as the principal's residence since the College's opening in 1967. It is now surrounded by a wooded area called the Arboretum (Percy and Abbas 2007).

In 1964, the architect John Andrews, chair of the UofT Architecture program and famous for his design of Scarborough College, developed the initial Master Plan for the Erindale campus. However, only the North Building was completed in 1966-67. The planning process of what became the South Building was taken over by famed Canadian architects Raymond Moriyama and A.D. Margison & Associates in 1967-68. Their Master Plans envisioned the campus along a north-south axis. The original Moriyama Master Plan involved a massive academic building complex surrounded by nature. When completed in 1970, the South Building was (and remains) the only example of Brutalist architecture in Mississauga. A second Master Plan, put forth by Margison, added plans for five residential blocks and a ring road, but never materialized (Percy and Abbas 2007).

The campus grew in the decades thereafter, though notably along an east-west axis in contrast to the original envisioning. This was particularly evident with the Theatre Building, Storage Sheds, Old Student Pub, the Student Centre, and the Kaneff Centre. Following the 2000 Master Plan, the campus experienced further growth and expansion. In addition to new courtyards, entry plazas, pathways, open spaces, and a more integrated built form, several prominent buildings were constructed, including the Culture, Communication and Technology Building, the Recreation, Athletics and Wellness Centre, and the Hazel McCallion Academic Learning Centre (University of Toronto Mississauga 2020).

The campus is home to several architecturally important buildings. Lislehurst and Alumni House are both designated heritage buildings while the Student Centre and the 1968 wing of the South Building are both listed buildings by the City of Mississauga. More recently, the Instructions Centre was designed by Shore Tilbe Perkins + Will and won an Award of Excellence in 2011 at the 30th annual Mississauga Urban Design Awards. Aside from the buildings, the campus is noted for its beautiful grounds. Deer are common sights, as are numerous species of flora and fauna. Wilson Pond is an artificial lake created in the late 1960s in front of South Building (Percy and Abbas 2007).

When the campus opened in 1967, enrollment was 155 students with 28 faculty and 40 staff members. It has grown to over 14,500 undergraduate students, over 900 graduate students, and over 3,700 full- and part-time employees (University of Toronto Mississauga 2020).



Figure 63: Charlotte Schreiber painting of St. Peter's Anglican Church, just outside the campus grounds (City of Mississauga)



Figure 64: Aerial image of U.T.M. under construction, 1966 (looking west). Erindale Park and the former Erindale Lake is in lower left corner (U.T.M. Archive).



Figure 65: Aerial photo of U.T.M. campus, 1970 (Percy and Abbas 2007)

Mapping



Figure 66: 1944 aerial photograph (City of Mississauga 2020)




Figure 67: 1974 N.T.S. map, Brampton Sheet (Department of Energy, Mines and Resources 1974)

Existing Conditions

Table 7: Inventory of existing resources found within and adjacent to University of Toronto Mississauga

Address	Recognition
AjGw-534	Archaeological Site
AjGw-535	Archaeological Site
Erindale Park	2005 Cultural Landscape Inventory – cultural landscape
Mississauga Road Scenic Route	2005 Cultural Landscape Inventory – cultural feature
1550 The Collegeway (Alumni House/Old Erindale P.S.)	Designated under Part IV of the O.H.A.
3369 Principal's Road (Lislehurst)	Designated under Part IV of the O.H.A.
3041 Mississauga Rd (St. Peter's Anglican Church)	Designated under Part IV of the O.H.A.
3509 Mississauga Rd	Designated under Part IV of the O.H.A.

Archaeological sites within and adjacent to the landscape:

Winding Lane Bird Sanctuary H1 site (AjGv-85) was registered as a midden associated with the occupation of part of Lot 3, Range 2 NDS in Toronto Township on the part of John A. Delaney and his family between circa 1872 and 1898 and subsequently by Ida and Thomas Readman into the first quarter of the twentieth century. The midden was located near the site of a frame house shown on the 1878 Peel atlas and early twentieth century topographic maps. The site was subject to Stage 3 investigation but was determined to be of no cultural heritage value or interest (AWI (Archeoworks Inc.) 2017).

The **Mount Woodham site (AjGw-534)** is a late-nineteenth-to early twentieth-century house owned by Toronto brewer Wyemouth George Schrieber and his wife Harriet. The house, known as Mount Woodham, was one of three residences the Schriebers built on the property during their tenure. The site has been subject to limited investigation through the University of Toronto Mississauga Department of Anthropology Archaeological Field School (Brand 2015).

The **Iverholme site (AjGw-535)** is a late-nineteenth-to early twentieth-century house owned by Wyemouth DeLisle Schrieber and his wife Ottilie. The house known as Iverholme, was one of three residences the Weymouth Delisle's father, Toronto brewer Weymouth George Schrieber, built on the property during their tenure. The site has been subject to limited investigation through the University of Toronto Mississauga Department of Anthropology Archaeological Field School (Brand 2015).

Fieldwork Photos



Figure 68: Entrance sign on northeast corner of Mississauga Road and Outer Circle Road (A.S.I. 2019)



Figure 69: Entrance sign on southeast corner of Mississauga Road and Outer Circle Road (A.S.I. 2019)

References

Ahmed, A.

2013 *Recovering the Landscape of the Credit Indian Mission - A Cultural Landscape of the Mississauga First Nation*. University of Toronto.

Amec Earth & Environmental

2010 *Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment, Driving Range Development, Mississauga Golf and Country Club, 1725 Mississauga Road, Mississauga Road*. Report on file with the Ontario Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries, Toronto.

Army Survey Establishment, R.C.E

1963 Brampton Sheet 30M/12. Brampton, Ontario.

Batten, J.

1976 *The Toronto Golf Club, 1876-1976*. The Bryant Press, Limited.

Bull, W.P.

1934 *From Rattlesnake Hunt to Hockey: The History of Sports in Canada and of the Sportsmen of Peel, 1798 to 1934*. The Perkins Bull Foundation/George J. McLeod, Ltd., Toronto.

Annotated Land Records. William Perkins Bull Fonds. Peel Art Gallery, Museum, and Archives (PAMA).

Burk, S., and J. Doucette

2019 *Toronto's Lost Golf Courses: How the Game of Golf Shaped a City*. Barlow Book Publishing, Toronto.

City of Mississauga

2020 Mississauga Maps - Interactive Online Mapping Service. City of Mississauga, Mississauga, Ontario. <https://www.mississauga.ca/portal/services/maps>.

St. Peter's Anglican Church. *Historic Images Gallery*.
http://www.mississauga.ca/portal/discover/charlotteschribergallery;jsessionid=FADZgiNZDMC_g3imjt_cLCQjaFYjGaOXajUs-ZGY?paf_gear_id=13200032&imageId=40600037&index=0&returnUrl=%2Fportal%2Fdiscover%2Fcharlotteschribergallery%3Bjsessionid%3DFADZgiNZDMC_g3imjt_cLCQjaFYjGaOXajUs-ZGY.

Claus, William on behalf of the Crown

1806 Agreement. Library and Archives Canada.

Cook, D.

2004 *Apple Blossoms and Satellite Dishes: Celebrating the Golden Jubilee of Applewood Acres*. D.L. Cook, Mississauga, Ontario.

Department of Energy, Mines and Resources

1974 Brampton Sheet 30M/12. National Topographic System.

1994 Brampton Sheet 30M/12. National Topographic System.

Department of Militia and Defence

1909 Brampton Sheet No. 35. Topographic Map.

1922 Brampton Sheet No. 35.

1933 Brampton Sheet. National Topographic System.

Department of National Defence

1942 Brampton Sheet. National Topographic System.

Dilse, P.

2012 *Heritage Impact Statement on the Pump House at the Mississauga Golf and Country Club*. October 11.

G.S. Shipp & Son Limited

1953 Applewood Acres September 25.

Hall, J.E.

1933 Record of the Club. William Perkins Bull Fonds: From Hemisphere to Hamlet Collection. Peel Art Gallery, Museum, and Archives (PAMA).

Halton Peel Branch, Ontario Genealogical Society

Credit Indian Village Methodist Chapel Cemetery.

Heritage Mississauga

2009 Lorne Park Estates. *Heritage Mississauga*.
<https://www.heritagemississauga.com/page/Lorne-Park-Estates>.

Hicks, K.

2003 *Clarkson and Its Many Corners*. Mississauga Library System, Mississauga.
http://www5.mississauga.ca/library/EBooks/8147_ClarksonBook.pdf.

Hicks, K.

2005 *Lakeview: Journey from Yesterday*. The Friends of the Mississauga Library System, Mississauga.

Hunting Survey Corporation Limited

1954 Digital Aerial Photographs. <https://mdl.library.utoronto.ca/collections/air-photos/1954-air-photos-southern-ontario/index>.

Ireland, C.

2011 Developer Saved the Best for Himself June 30. <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/real-estate/developer-saved-the-best-for-himself/article585033/>.

Jones, E.

1838 *Memoir of Elizabeth Jones, a Little Indian Girl, Who Lived at River Credit Mission, Upper Canada*. John Mason, London.

Lorne Park Estates Historical Committee

1980 *A Village within a City: Lorne Park Estates Historical Committee*. The Boston Mills Press, Cheltenham.

Lough, M.

1889 Block B, Lorne Park Annex, Part Lot 22, Concession 3, South of Dundas Street, Township of Toronto. PAMA R912.

Mississauga Library System

Sports Gallery: Mississauga Golf and Country Club, Aerial View. *Historic Images Gallery*.

Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation

2017 Head of the Lake Treaty, No. 14 (1806). In *Treaties 1781-1820*. Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation, Hagersville.

Mississauga Golf and Country Club

Report Minute Book. William Perkins Bull Fonds: From Hemisphere to Hamlet Collection. Peel Art Gallery, Museum, and Archives (PAMA).

Mollenhauer, J.

1981 *Mississauga Golf and Country Club, 1906-1981*. Heritage Press, Mississauga.

PAMA

Plan of the Indian Reserve, River Credit 1849. Region of Peel Map and Plan Collection. PAMA.

Percy, John, and Sabeen Abbas, eds,

2007 *Celebrating 40 Years of History at the University of Toronto Mississauga*. University of Toronto Mississauga.

Riendeau, R.

1985 *Mississauga: An Illustrated History*. Windsor Publications Ltd.

Robertson, J.R.

1908 *Robertson's Landmarks of Toronto : A Collection of Historical Sketches of the Old Town of York, from 1792 until 1837, and of Toronto from 1834 to 1908*. Toronto.

Ryerson, E.

1883 *The Story of My Life: Being Reminiscences of Sixty Years' Public Service in Canada*. , ed George J. Hodgins. William Briggs, Toronto, ON.
<https://archive.org/details/storyofmylife00ryeruoft/mode/2up>.

The Landplan Collaborative Ltd., Goldsmith Borgal & Company Ltd., Architects Ltd., North South Environmental Inc., and Geodata Resources Inc.

2005 Cultural Landscape Inventory: City of Mississauga. City of Mississauga.

http://www5.mississauga.ca/pdfs/Cultural_Landscape_Inventory_Jan05.pdf.

Toronto Golf Club

Toronto Golf Club. *Toronto Golf Club's History*.
<https://www.torontogolfclub.com/Membership/History>.

Toronto Golf Club. *Colt Course - 18 Hole*.
<https://www.torontogolfclub.com/Membership/History>.

Toronto Star Weekly

1914 March 21.

Tremaine, G.C.

1859 Tremaine's Map of the County of Peel. George C. Tremaine, Toronto.

University of Toronto Mississauga

2020 Fact Sheet. <https://www.utm.utoronto.ca/about-us/fact-sheet>.

Unknown

1919 Part Lots 22 & 23, Registered Plan B-88 Blocks ADEFGHIKLMO, Registered Plan C-89 Lots 1 & 13 to 16, Remaining after Plan A-23. PAMA RPB-88 and C-89.

Walker and Miles

1877 Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Peel, Ont. Walker and Miles, Toronto.

Weeks, V.M.

1993 *Lorne Park: Dreams of Long Ago*. Verna Mae Weeks, Chesley, Ontario.

Wilkinson, M.

2019 Mississaugua Golf and Country Club. October 1.

Wybenga, D.

2019 History of the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation May 22, Hagersville.

Appendix K: Low Stone Walls

Table 8: Low Stone Wall Recommendations

Location	Ownership	Recommendation
29 Mississauga Road North	Straddle	Attribute of Mississauga Scenic Route C.H.L.
41 Mississauga Road North	N/A ¹²	Attribute of Mississauga Scenic Route C.H.L.
1203 Mississauga Road	Private	Attribute of Mississauga Scenic Route C.H.L.
1357 Mississauga Road	N/A ¹³	Attribute of Mississauga Scenic Route C.H.L.
1375 Mississauga Road	Public	Attribute of Mississauga Scenic Route C.H.L.
1462 Mississauga Road	Public	Attribute of Mississauga Scenic Route C.H.L.
1470 Mississauga Road	Public	Attribute of Mississauga Scenic Route C.H.L.
1476 Mississauga Road	Public	Attribute of Mississauga Scenic Route C.H.L.
1955 Mississauga Road	Public	Attribute of Mississauga Scenic Route C.H.L.
1965 Mississauga Road	Public	Attribute of Mississauga Scenic Route C.H.L.
1993-1993 Mississauga Road	Straddle	Attribute of Mississauga Scenic Route C.H.L.
1996 Mississauga Road	Public	Attribute of Mississauga Scenic Route C.H.L.
2006 Mississauga Road	Public	Attribute of Mississauga Scenic Route C.H.L.
2105 Mississauga Road	N/A	Wall not extant. Remove from Inventory of Cultural Heritage Landscapes.
2137 Mississauga Road	Public	Attribute of Mississauga Scenic Route C.H.L.
2165-2241 Mississauga Road	Private	Attribute of Mississauga Scenic Route C.H.L.
1205 Stavebank Road	Public	Attribute of Mineola Neighbourhood, West C.H.L.
1211 Stavebank Road	Public	Attribute of Mineola Neighbourhood, West C.H.L.
1220 Stavebank Road	Public	Attribute of Mineola Neighbourhood, West C.H.L.
1232 Stavebank Road	Public	Attribute of Mineola Neighbourhood, West C.H.L.
1238 Stavebank Road	Public	Attribute of Mineola Neighbourhood, West C.H.L.
1242 Stavebank Road	Straddle	Attribute of Mineola Neighbourhood, West C.H.L.
1251 Stavebank Road	Private	Attribute of Mineola Neighbourhood, West C.H.L.
1341 Stavebank Road	Public	Attribute of Mineola Neighbourhood, West C.H.L.
1375 Stavebank Road	Private	Attribute of Mineola Neighbourhood, West C.H.L.
1182 Clarkson Road North	Public	Remnant only. Remove from Inventory of Cultural Heritage Landscapes.

¹² The City was unable to assess ownership due to dense trees.

¹³ The City was unable to assess ownership due to dense trees.

Location	Ownership	Recommendation
1188-1190 Clarkson Road North	Private	Three adjoining properties. Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report recommended for properties to determine if Part IV designation is warranted.
1029 Indian Road	Public	Remnant only. Remove from Inventory of Cultural Heritage Landscapes.
1048 Indian Road	N/A	Remnant only. Remove from Inventory of Cultural Heritage Landscapes.
1049 Indian Road	Public	Remnant only. Remove from Inventory of Cultural Heritage Landscapes.
1207 Lorne Park Road	Private	Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report recommended for property to determine if Part IV designation is warranted.
1331 Nocturne Court	Public	Landscaping feature, not of cultural heritage value. Remove from Inventory of Cultural Heritage Landscapes.
2148 Shawanaga Trail	Public	Attribute of Mississauga Scenic Route C.H.L.
2149 Shawanaga Trail	Straddle	Attribute of Mississauga Scenic Route C.H.L.
553 Temagami Crescent	N/A ¹⁴	Attribute of Mississauga Scenic Route C.H.L.
1585 Wateska Blvd.	Public	Attribute of Mississauga Scenic Route C.H.L.

¹⁴ Ownership information was not available.