



## SCOPED HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

### 3300 MISSISSAUGA RD., MISSISSAUGA ON

Author: Rick Mateljan Lic Tech OAA CAHP

March 17, 2026

#### Land Acknowledgement:

We acknowledge the lands, which constitute the present-day City of Mississauga as being part of the Treaty Lands and Traditional Territory of the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation, Haudenosaunee and the Huron-Wendat First Nation. We recognize the ancestors of these peoples as the inhabitants of these lands since time immemorial. The City of Mississauga is home to First Nations, Métis and Inuit peoples.

#### 1.0 Introduction

This Heritage Impact Statement deals with an existing building at 3300 Mississauga Rd., Mississauga ON. It is required to support a Demolition Permit application to allow the demolition of the building and the clearing of the property. No development is proposed at this time, and following demolition the site will remain vacant until a development proposal is determined. The purpose of the demolition is that the building is derelict, unsightly and poses a hazard to members of the public.

The Governing Council of the University of Toronto, acting through the University of Toronto Mississauga (UTM) owns this building and several adjacent buildings. Their desire is to create a land assembly for future development of their campus but the form of that development is not determined at the present time.

The site is located in the Mississauga Road Scenic Route Cultural Landscape recognized and regulated by the City of Mississauga.

The Cultural Landscape Inventory defines and describes the fundamental characteristics of this Landscape as follows:

*“Mississauga Road is one of Mississauga’s oldest north-south transportation corridors and has historically connected some of the City’s oldest communities, including Port Credit, Erindale, and Streetsville. While the roadway extends the entire north-south extent of Mississauga, the Mississauga Road C.H.L. runs from Lakeshore Road West in the south to Britannia Road in the north. In the southern half of the C.H.L., the road follows an Indigenous trail along the top of bank of the Credit River. This C.H.L. is known for its scenic quality with views to the Credit River and associated valley, varied topography and land use, significant residential neighbourhoods, and mature trees and natural vegetation..”*

*(Conserving Heritage Landscapes – Cultural Heritage Landscape Project – ASI Heritage Consultants )*

## 1.1 Terms of Reference

The City requires that at a minimum a Cultural Landscape Heritage Impact Statement must include the following (note items indicated with a ~~strike through~~ are not required in this instance per City of Mississauga Heritage Staff):

### 1. General requirements:

- location map
- a site plan of existing conditions, to include buildings, structures, roadways, driveways, drainage features, trees and tree canopy, fencing and topographical features
- a written and visual inventory (photographs) of all elements of the property that contribute to its cultural heritage value, including overall site views. For buildings, internal photographs and floor plans are also required.
- ~~-a site plan and elevations of the proposed development~~
- ~~-for cultural landscapes or features that transcend a single property, a measured streetscape drawing is required, in additions to photographs of adjacent properties~~
- qualifications of the author completing the report

### 2. Property information:

- ~~-list of property owners from Land Registry Office~~
- ~~-building construction date, builder, architect/designer, landscape architect and personal histories~~
- current property owner information must be redacted
- research must be sufficient to make recommendation #6
- The City of Mississauga recognizes the historic and continued use of the land now known as Mississauga by the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation, the Haudenosaunee Confederacy the Huron-Wendat and Wyandotte Nations. As such all HIAs must include recognition of Indigenous history and settlement and where appropriate, address Indigenous cultural heritage interests in the surrounding area. Specific attention should be paid to possible traditional use areas as well as sacred and other sites, which could exist on or near the property.

### 3. Arborist Report

- When trees are a heritage attribute, and it is also required as part of the site plan process, an arborist report is required. Current property owner information must be redacted.

### 4. Impact of Development or Site Alteration:

- destruction of any, or part of any, significant heritage attributes or features
- removal of natural features, including trees
- alteration that is not sympathetic, or is incompatible, with the historic fabric and appearance
- shadows created that alter the appearance of a heritage attribute or change the viability of an associated natural feature, or plantings, such as a garden
- isolation of a heritage attribute from its surrounding environment, context or a significant relationship
- direct or indirect obstruction of significant views or vistas within, from, or of built and natural features
- a change in land use where the change in use negates the property's cultural heritage value

*-land disturbances such as change in grade that alter soils and drainage patterns that adversely affect cultural heritage resources*

#### 5. Mitigation Measures:

- alternative development approaches*
- isolating development and site alteration from the significant built and natural heritage features and vistas*
- design guidelines that harmonize mass, setback, setting and materials*
- limiting density and height*
- allowing only compatible infill and additions*
- reversible alterations*
- buffer zones, site plan control, and other planning mechanisms*

#### 6. Recommendation:

- the consultant should provide a recommendation as to whether the subject property is worthy of heritage designation in accordance with the heritage designation criteria per Regulation 9/06, Ontario Heritage Act*
- The following questions must be answered in the final recommendation of the report:*
- Does the property meet the criteria for heritage designation under Ontario Regulation 9/06, Ontario Heritage Act?*
- If the subject property does not meet the criteria for heritage designation then it must be clearly stated as to why it does not*
- Regardless of the failure to meet criteria for heritage designation, does the property warrant conservation as per the definition in the Provincial Policy Statement.*

#### 7. Qualifications:

*-The qualifications and background of the person completing the HIA will be included in the report. The author must be a qualified heritage consultant by having Professional standing with the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP) and/or clearly demonstrate, through a Curriculum Vitae, his/her experience in writing such Assessments or experience in the conservation of heritage places. The Assessment will also include a reference list for any literature cited, and a list of people contacted during the study and referenced in the report.*

### **1.2 Addressing the Cultural Landscape or Feature Criteria:**

(criteria specific to Mississauga Road Scenic Route Cultural Landscape)

#### Cultural Heritage Value:

- Design/Physical Value: Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a landscape*
- Design/Physical Value: Aesthetic/Scenic reasons*
- Historical/Associative Value: Direct association with a theme, event, person, etc.*
- Historical/Associative Value: Contributes to an understanding of a community/culture*
- Contextual Value: Important in defining character of an area*
- Contextual Value: Historically, physically, functionally or visually linked to surroundings*

### Community Value:


- Pride and Stewardship
- Public Space
- Local History
- Genius Loci
- Tourism
- Planning

### Historical Integrity:

- Land Use
- Built Elements
- Vegetation
- Cultural Relationship
- Natural Features
- Natural Relationships
- Views

## 2.0. General Requirements

### Location map:



**Site Plan:**

**SITE PLAN SHOWING IRREGULAR CONFIGURATION OF LOT AT REAR**

**Property owners:**

The Governing Council of the University of Toronto, acting through the University of Toronto Mississauga is the present property owner. Per City of Mississauga staff detail of previous property owners is not required in this scoped report.

**Context:**

The site is bordered by Mississauga Rd. and the UTM campus to the east, by the newer single family home development of Barchester Crt. to the west, and by older single family development on Mississauga Rd. to the north and south.

**Existing conditions on site:**

This is a traditional lot approx.. 30m wide along the west side of Mississauga Rd., north of Dundas St. W. The site is notable because of its odd configuration at the rear (likely caused by a later severance to create the Barchester Rd. subdivision) but otherwise unremarkable. The property slopes up from the street but then drops toward the rear of the site. The only available topographic map is from the City of Mississauga and is graduated at 5m intervals, so not that accurate, but this reveals that the site drops at least 5m from the high point at the north-east corner of the site to the low point at the south-west corner of the site. The property is moderately treed especially around the perimeter, appearing to be a mix of residual original forest and newer specimen planting. There is only one structure on the property, a single family home with attached garage.

**Existing home:**

This is a one-storey brick dwelling that was likely built in the 1950's or early 1960's. This configuration was typically known as a "ranch bungalow" and was very common in suburban developments across North America in the post-WW2 period. The siding enclosed garage on the south side may be an original carport that was subsequently enclosed. Windows and doors are original, which is unusual in a home of this vintage. The home takes advantage of the sloping site by featuring a walkout basement at the rear. The property is presently vacant and is in an extreme state of disrepair. The site is treed as noted above but there are no significant natural features apparent.

The house in its present condition is unable to be occupied and beyond the scope of practical repair. Buildings in this state often attract criminal activity, and in this case it has been broken into at least once and all of the copper plumbing stripped from it, as well as suffering general vandalism. It appears to be infested by raccoons and other vermin. It is unsightly from the street and presents a safety risk to members of the public, as well as to UTM staff who manage and patrol it. There is no practical reason that it be maintained.




FRONT ELEVATION



GARAGE SIDE ELEVATION



**REAR ELEVATION**



**INTERIOR VANDALIZED AND ROBBED OF COPPER**



**NOTE MOULD ON WALLS, VANDALISM**



**INTERIOR VANDALIZED AND ROBBED OF COPPER**

## 2.1 Site History

Per City of Mississauga staff analysis of site history is not required in this scoped report. The City of Mississauga building department records do not contain any permit information for this property.

### 2.11 Pre-Contact History

Although there is significant First Nations history associated with the Credit River, there is no known history associated with this site. Maps of known Pre-Contact Archaeological Sites, Cultural Affiliations and known Archaic Sites do not show any relationship to this site<sup>1</sup>

## 3.0 The proposal

Per City of Mississauga staff analysis of proposed development is not required in this scoped report. As indicated above, no development is proposed at this time.

---

<sup>1</sup> Dieterman, F. A. (2002). *Mississauga: The First 10,000 Years*

### 3.1 Cultural Heritage Analysis

The existing house is an intact example of mid 20<sup>th</sup> century residential architecture. There is some cultural interest here but homes of this type were built in great numbers in the post WW2 period and many still exist. They are neither rare nor remarkable.

### 3.2 Views

There are no significant views into or out of the property.

### 3.3. Landscape Analysis

There is minimal designed landscaping consisting of a driveway, some various walkways and shrubbery around the house. None of this is remarkable or unusual.

### 3.4 Mitigation Measures

Given that no development is proposed at this time, there are no mitigation measures necessary to consider. The site will be returned to it's natural condition until such time as there is a development proposal.

## 4.0 Addressing the Mississauga Road Scenic Route Cultural Landscape Feature or Criteria

### Cultural Heritage Value or Interest: (Ontario Heritage Act 9/06 criteria)

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.

**Analysis:** *Minimal impact. The building to be demolished is typical of many thousands of such dwellings that were popular during the mid 20<sup>th</sup> century and were built extensively across sub-urban and semi-rural Ontario. As such it is part of an identifiable trend and group, but it is neither rare, unique or representative in a significant way. Buildings of this type rarely displayed high levels of craftsmanship or technical achievement and none is apparent here.*

*The removal of the existing building represents a loss of building fabric on the street but not to a significant extent.*

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.

**Analysis:** *Minimal impact. The house proposed to be removed is a remnant of the original development of the site and part of the mid-20th century formative period of development of Mississauga and its removal represents a loss of this history but there is nothing to indicate that this house is of any greater interest than the many surviving examples of this style elsewhere in the City.*

*The property has associative value because of its association with the infilling and sub-urbanization of Mississauga in general and Mississauga Rd., in particular during the mid-20th century. This value is very limited, however, because it is shared by so many buildings on the street and in the greater community. There is no known association with any builder, designer or theorist important to the 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.

**Analysis:** *Minimal impact. The streetscape along this part of Mississauga Rd. reflects a layering of architectural styles as the original mid-20<sup>th</sup> century homes have been replaced by newer and larger homes.*

*By virtue of its history and method of development, Mississauga Rd. exhibits a wide variety of architectural styles and building forms. This has been exacerbated in recent years because of a steady attrition of early and mid-20<sup>th</sup> century dwellings and the area must be considered to be transitional in nature.*

*The existing building cannot be considered to be singularly important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of the area. It is not physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings. It is not a landmark.*

**Community Value:**

Pride and Stewardship: The community demonstrates a high degree of pride and stewardship in the area (heritage designations, plaques, voluntary upkeep)

**Analysis:** *This community does demonstrate a high degree of pride and stewardship in this area but nothing significantly associated with this building. This building is derelict and unfit for occupation.*

Public Space: The area is a site of frequent or longstanding public gatherings or events

**Analysis:** *Not applicable. There is no history of public use.*

Local History: the place is written about in local histories or spoken about through local stories or lore

**Analysis:** *The majority of development in this area is mid-20th century. There is no significant written local history or lore.*

Genius Loci: People refer to the area as having a distinctive atmosphere or pervading 'sense of place'

**Analysis:** *There is a distinctive atmosphere about this place and it is generally regarded as being a premium residential area comprised of wealthy homes on generous lots. The presence of UTM is a significant factor in the distinctiveness of this place. The building proposed to be demolished does not contribute to this and its removal will not affect the sense of place.*

Tourism: The area is promoted as a tourist destination

**Analysis:** *Not applicable. There is no tourist element here.*

Planning: The area has been identified through another planning process as being unique

**Analysis:** *This area is identified as unique in the Mississauga Official Plan because of the presence of the UTM campus.*

**Historical Integrity:**

Land Use: The landscape has had continuity in use and/or a compatible use (agricultural, commercial, residential, or institutional)

**Analysis:** *There is a continuity of use since the mid-20th century.*

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.

**Analysis:** *Not applicable. There are no built elements on the site with the exception of the building proposed to be demolished.*

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.

**Analysis:** *Not applicable. The extant vegetative elements are associated with this individual property. There are no vegetative elements that transcend individual lots.*

Cultural Relationships: The relationships between historic buildings and other built and designed elements (yards, fields, paths, parks, gardens, etc.) are intact

**Analysis:** *Not applicable. There are no designed elements in this community that transcend individual lots.*

Natural Features: Prominent natural features (cliff, stream, vegetation, landform, physiography, soils, etc.) remain intact

**Analysis:** *The prominent features on this site are the remnant original forest and the naturally sloping site. These are not affected by the proposed building demolition.*

Natural Relationships: The historical relationships to prominent natural features still exist both for the site as a whole and within the site

**Analysis:** *Not applicable. There are no significant historical relationships to the natural features. The proposed building demolition does not change any relationship that might exist.*

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)

**Analysis:** *Not applicable. There are no extant significant views in this part of the Landscape.*

**Conclusion:**

The existing building at 3300 Mississauga Rd. is of minimal associative, contextual and architectural value. None of these individually or collectively rise to the level that it meets the requirements for designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.

The building is derelict and a danger to the public. There is no likelihood that it would ever be repaired to be put back to use as a private residence. It should be demolished.

## 5.0 Provincial Policy Statement:

Under the Provincial Policy Statement,

“Conserved: means the identification, protection, use and/or management of cultural heritage and archaeological resources in such a way that their heritage values, attributes and integrity are retained.”

*Analysis:*

*Under this definition, 3300 Mississauga Rd. does not warrant conservation.*

**Appendix 1:** CV for Rick Mateljan

**Appendix 2:** Floor Plans (Read Jones Christoffersen Ltd.)

**Appendix 3:** Property Survey

**Appendix 4:** contour lines map

**RICK MATELJAN** B. A. Lic. Tech. OAA CAHP  
 118 – 482 South Service Rd. E., Oakville, ON  
 (t) 416 315 4567 (e) rick.mateljan@smda.ca

## curriculum vitae

---

### Education:

#### **Trinity College, University of Toronto**

- B. A. (4 year) (Specialist English, Specialist History)

#### **Ryerson Polytechnic University**

- detailing of residential and institutional buildings, OBC, technical and presentation drawing

#### **Royal Architectural Institute of Canada Syllabus Program**

- program of architectural education through practical and design studio experience

### Employment:

---

2010 - Present

#### **SMDA Architects Ltd. (Partner)**

- (formerly Strickland Mateljan Design Associates Ltd.(2010-2018), formerly SMDA Design Ltd.(2019-2025)
- architectural design practice specializing in custom residential and small commercial /institutional projects, land development consultation, residential infill, adaptive re-use, heritage conservation
- contract administration, tendering, site review for private and institutional clients
- heritage and urban design consulting for complex infill projects
- responsible for management, business development, marketing and project delivery
- extensive experience with building technical issues, integration of building systems, barrier-free issues, change of use issues, Ontario Building Code
- extensive experience in multi-disciplinary team environments
- extensive experience in municipal approvals, heritage approvals
- Ontario Association of Architects licence with terms, conditions and limitations
- qualified to give expert testimony on matters of Urban Design and Heritage Conservation to Ontario Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT) (2019)

2001 - 2010

#### **Gren Weis Architect and Associates, Designer and Project Manager**

- design, design development, conceptual, working and presentation drawings, project co-ordination, site review, liaison with authorities having jurisdiction
- extensive client, consultant and building site involvement
- specialist at Municipal Approvals, Site Plan and Re-zoning approvals
- specialist at renovation and conservation of Heritage buildings, infill developments in Heritage communities

1993-2001

**Diversified Design Corporation, Owner**

- conceptual design, design development, working drawings, approvals for custom residential, institutional and commercial projects
- construction management and hands-on construction

---

**Recent professional development:**

2022	Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (Building Specialist)
2019	OAA Conference, Quebec City PQ
2018	Ontario Heritage Association Conference, Sault St. Marie ON
2017	RAIC/OAA Conference, Ottawa ON
2017	Ontario Heritage Association Conference, Ottawa ON
2012	OAA – Admission Course
2011	Ontario Heritage Association Conference, Cobourg ON
2010	Georgian College – “Small Buildings”
2010	Successfully completed Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing “Small Buildings” and “Designer Legal” examinations
2010	Successfully completed OACETT professional practice exam
2008	First appearance before the Ontario Municipal Board
2007	OAA – Heritage Conservation in Practice
2006	RAIC – Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada

---


**Activities:**

2022-present	Member, OAA Integration Committee
2016-2019	Member, OAA Practice Committee
2015-present	Guest critic, Centennial College Architectural Technology Program
2014-2015	Guest critic, University of Waterloo Architectural Practice Program
2012-2022	Member, Board of Directors, OAAAS (President from 2018)
2011-2016	Member and contributing writer, Editorial Committee, OAA Perspectives magazine
2008-2015	Member, Board of Directors of Oakville Galleries (President 2011-2013)
2007-2020	Member, Mississauga Heritage Advisory Committee (vice-chair 2015-2019), member of the Heritage Award jury and Heritage Property Grant Panel
1995-2001	Member, Oakville Local Architectural Conservation Advisory Committee and Oakville Heritage Review Committee (Chair from 1998)
2001-2004	Alternate Member, Oakville Committee of Adjustment (appointed but never called to serve)


---

**Memberships:**


Ontario Association of Architects (OAA)  
 Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals (CAHP)  
 (former) Ontario Association of Applied Architectural Sciences (OAAAS)




**KEY PLAN**



**3300 MISSISSAUGA RD - GROUND FLOOR PLAN**  
2  
D3  
1/75



**3300 MISSISSAUGA RD - BASEMENT PLAN**  
1  
D3  
1/75



**3300 MISSISSAUGA RD - ROOF PLAN**  
3  
D3  
1/75

**DEMOLITION NOTES:**

1. ABATE ALL DESIGNATED SUBSTANCES AS PER PRE-DEMOLITION OSS.
2. REMOVE AND DISPOSE OF ALL EXISTING DEBRIS AND WASTE PRODUCTS THAT ARE PRESENT IN THE WORK AREA.
3. REMOVE AND DISPOSE OF ALL EXISTING CABINETS, MILLWORK, APPLIANCES, SINKS, TOILETS, BATH TUBS, ETC.
4. REMOVE AND DISPOSE OF ALL ARCHITECTURAL FINISHES INCLUDING EXISTING FLOORING, WALL FINISHES, AND FIREPLACES.
5. REMOVE AND DISPOSE OF ALL EXISTING MECHANICAL AND ELECTRICAL SERVICES INCLUDING LIGHTING, PLUMBING, HVAC, ETC.
6. REMOVE AND DISPOSE OF ALL EXISTING STRUCTURAL ELEMENTS INCLUDING ROOF, FLOOR, AND WALL FRAMING AND FOUNDATIONS.

**LEGEND:**

- ELECTRICAL PANEL
- MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT
- WASHING MACHINE
- DRYER

No.	Revision	Date	By
2.	ISSUED FOR TENDER	Nov. 21, 25	J.H.
1.	ISSUED FOR CLIENT REVIEW	Oct. 3, 25	J.H.

**Drawing Notes**

1. All drawings, plans, models, designs, specifications and other documents prepared by Read Jones Christoffersen Ltd. ("RJC") and used in connection with this project are instruments of service for the work shown on them (the "Work") and as such are and remain the property of RJC whether the Work is executed or not, and RJC reserves the copyright in them and in the Work executed from them, and they shall not be used for any other work or project.
2. These drawings are "design drawings" only. They may not be suitable for use as shop drawings. Use of these drawings as base drawings for "shop drawings" is not permitted unless written permission containing certain conditions and limitations is obtained from RJC. The work "as constructed" may vary from what is shown on these drawings.
3. Use of these drawings is limited to that identified in the Resolution column. Do not construct from these drawings unless marked "Issued for Construction" by RJC in the Revision column, and then only for the party noted. The drawings shall not be used for "tracing", "copying", or "re-draw" unless so indicated in the Revision column. "Printed" or "Copied" drawings are not complete and any prices based on such drawings must allow for this.

Seal

---

Project Name  
**3300 & 3324 Mississauga Rd.  
Mississauga, Ontario**

**BUILDING DEMOLITION**

Sheet Title


**3300 MISSISSAUGA RD. - FLOOR PLANS**

Drawn By R.T. Scale 1/75  
Designed By J.H. Date November, 2025

RJC Project Number **TOR.142700.0001**

Sheet Number Revision

**D3**



**PLAN 43 M-1385**

FORM 1 SHEET NO. 1 OF 1 REGISTERED IN THE LAND REGISTRY OFFICE FOR THE LAND TITLES ACT 1974 (S.O. 1974, REG. NO. 43) ON 25th DAY OF 1974. THE PLAN IS A PART OF THE PLAN OF SUBDIVISION OF PART OF LOT 3, RANGE 2, NORTH OF DUNDAS STREET IN THE CITY OF MISSISSAUGA REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF PEELE. THE PLAN IS A PART OF THE PLAN OF SUBDIVISION OF PART OF LOT 3, RANGE 2, NORTH OF DUNDAS STREET IN THE CITY OF MISSISSAUGA REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF PEELE. THE PLAN IS A PART OF THE PLAN OF SUBDIVISION OF PART OF LOT 3, RANGE 2, NORTH OF DUNDAS STREET IN THE CITY OF MISSISSAUGA REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF PEELE.

*M. J. Radwin*  
 M. J. Radwin  
 M. J. Radwin

**PLAN OF SUBDIVISION OF PART OF LOT 3, RANGE 2, NORTH OF DUNDAS STREET**

FORMERLY IN THE GEOGRAPHIC TOWNSHIP OF TORONTO, COUNTY OF PEELE, NOW IN THE CITY OF MISSISSAUGA REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF PEELE

SCALE 1:400

**David B. Seales Surveying Ltd.**  
 SURVEYORS

**METRIC**  
 DISTANCES SHOWN ON THIS PLAN ARE IN METERS AND MILLIMETERS UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED.

APPROVED BY THE REGISTRAR OF LANDS AND SURVEYING ON 25th DAY OF 1974.

*[Signature]*  
 REGISTRAR OF LANDS AND SURVEYING  
 MISSISSAUGA

**NOTE**  
 THIS PLAN AND INSTRUMENT ARE SUBJECT TO THE SURVEY ACT AND TO ANY AMENDMENTS THEREIN AND TO THE REGULATIONS MADE THEREUNDER.

- LEGEND**
- 1. BOUNDARY
  - 2. EASEMENT
  - 3. EASEMENT
  - 4. EASEMENT
  - 5. EASEMENT
  - 6. EASEMENT
  - 7. EASEMENT
  - 8. EASEMENT
  - 9. EASEMENT
  - 10. EASEMENT
  - 11. EASEMENT
  - 12. EASEMENT
  - 13. EASEMENT
  - 14. EASEMENT
  - 15. EASEMENT
  - 16. EASEMENT
  - 17. EASEMENT
  - 18. EASEMENT
  - 19. EASEMENT
  - 20. EASEMENT
  - 21. EASEMENT
  - 22. EASEMENT
  - 23. EASEMENT
  - 24. EASEMENT
  - 25. EASEMENT
  - 26. EASEMENT
  - 27. EASEMENT
  - 28. EASEMENT
  - 29. EASEMENT
  - 30. EASEMENT
  - 31. EASEMENT
  - 32. EASEMENT
  - 33. EASEMENT
  - 34. EASEMENT
  - 35. EASEMENT
  - 36. EASEMENT
  - 37. EASEMENT
  - 38. EASEMENT
  - 39. EASEMENT
  - 40. EASEMENT
  - 41. EASEMENT
  - 42. EASEMENT
  - 43. EASEMENT
  - 44. EASEMENT
  - 45. EASEMENT
  - 46. EASEMENT
  - 47. EASEMENT
  - 48. EASEMENT
  - 49. EASEMENT
  - 50. EASEMENT
  - 51. EASEMENT
  - 52. EASEMENT
  - 53. EASEMENT
  - 54. EASEMENT
  - 55. EASEMENT
  - 56. EASEMENT
  - 57. EASEMENT
  - 58. EASEMENT
  - 59. EASEMENT
  - 60. EASEMENT
  - 61. EASEMENT
  - 62. EASEMENT
  - 63. EASEMENT
  - 64. EASEMENT
  - 65. EASEMENT
  - 66. EASEMENT
  - 67. EASEMENT
  - 68. EASEMENT
  - 69. EASEMENT
  - 70. EASEMENT
  - 71. EASEMENT
  - 72. EASEMENT
  - 73. EASEMENT
  - 74. EASEMENT
  - 75. EASEMENT
  - 76. EASEMENT
  - 77. EASEMENT
  - 78. EASEMENT
  - 79. EASEMENT
  - 80. EASEMENT
  - 81. EASEMENT
  - 82. EASEMENT
  - 83. EASEMENT
  - 84. EASEMENT
  - 85. EASEMENT
  - 86. EASEMENT
  - 87. EASEMENT
  - 88. EASEMENT
  - 89. EASEMENT
  - 90. EASEMENT
  - 91. EASEMENT
  - 92. EASEMENT
  - 93. EASEMENT
  - 94. EASEMENT
  - 95. EASEMENT
  - 96. EASEMENT
  - 97. EASEMENT
  - 98. EASEMENT
  - 99. EASEMENT
  - 100. EASEMENT

**OWNER'S CERTIFICATE**

I, the undersigned, being the owner of the land shown on this plan, do hereby certify that the information given in this plan is true and correct and that I have no objection to the same being used for the purposes for which it is intended.

DATED this 25th day of 1974.

*[Signature]*  
 ROBERT GEORGE HORTON

**OWNER'S CERTIFICATE**

I, the undersigned, being the owner of the land shown on this plan, do hereby certify that the information given in this plan is true and correct and that I have no objection to the same being used for the purposes for which it is intended.

DATED this 25th day of 1974.

*[Signature]*  
 ROBERT GEORGE HORTON

**OWNER'S CERTIFICATE**

I, the undersigned, being the owner of the land shown on this plan, do hereby certify that the information given in this plan is true and correct and that I have no objection to the same being used for the purposes for which it is intended.

DATED this 25th day of 1974.

*[Signature]*  
 ROBERT GEORGE HORTON

**SURVEYOR'S CERTIFICATE**

I, the undersigned, being a duly qualified and licensed surveyor, do hereby certify that I have surveyed the land shown on this plan and that the same is true and correct and that I have no objection to the same being used for the purposes for which it is intended.

DATED this 25th day of 1974.

*[Signature]*  
 DAVID B. SEALES

<b>David B. Seales Surveying Ltd.</b>		184-97	
SURVEYORS		184-97	
184-97		184-97	

M1385

M1385

