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Executive Summary

The Executive Summary highlights key points from the report only; for complete information and findings, as well as limitations, the reader should examine the complete report.

Golder Associates Ltd. (Golder) was retained by J. L. Richards & Associates Limited, on behalf of Utilities Kingston, to prepare a Heritage Impact Statement (HIS) for the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant located at 1756 Cana Boulevard in the City of Kingston, Ontario. It was built in 1973. The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant is not listed or designated under the [Ontario Heritage Act](#) and has not been identified by the City of Kingston as a property of interest. However, due to its proximity to the Rideau Canal UNESCO World Heritage Site, a HIS was required.

A site visit was undertaken on April 5, 2013, in conjunction with consultation with the City of Kingston Heritage Planning staff to scope the terms of the HIS.

The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant was evaluated against the criteria of Regulation 9/06. The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant was found to not be of cultural heritage value or interest. As a result, this report does not recommend listing or designating the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant under the [Ontario Heritage Act](#). The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant property was assessed as a potential cultural heritage landscape utilizing an evaluative tool developed by the Town of Caledon. It was determined that the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant landscape does not have cultural heritage significance and therefore cannot be considered a cultural heritage landscape.

The project undertaking involves replacing the existing extended aeration waste water treatment plant with a new treatment plant utilizing sequencing batch reactor technology for biological treatment. An equalization tank, screening, chemically-assisted tertiary filtration system, and a ultra-violet disinfection system will form part of the liquid train process. The existing building will be demolished once the new facility is in operation. The new facility will be located within the existing site boundary of the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant. The current design calls for a new building to be constructed to house the new tanks and process equipment for this upgrade. The footprint of the new building is expected to be larger than that of the existing, mainly because of the elevated configuration of the new sequencing batch reactor tanks as compared to the existing below-grade basins. Treatment facilities will be located within the interior of the new building, whereas the present facilities are open to the air. The new building is expected have a footprint in the range of 100-150 m², and will be a one-storey building. The exact building dimensions and layout are to be determined during the detailed design phase. Treated effluent from the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plan currently flows into a man-altered watercourse located a few metres north of the facility into Colonel By Lake. A new plant outfall is proposed to be located downstream of the existing outfall.

In considering the impact of the proposed project on the Rideau Canal World Heritage Site, the following are recommended to mitigate any adverse impact on the outstanding universal values of the Rideau Canal:

- The new Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant should be designed to fit within the existing site boundaries;

---

1 A Heritage Impact Statement (HIS) is also known as a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), a Cultural Heritage Impact Statement (CHIS), or a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA). All of these documents are understood to serve the same essential function.
The new building should be one storey in height;

The building enclosure should be designed to incorporate natural colours to blend in with the neighbourhood and landscape;

Evergreen vegetative screening is recommended to mask the visual impact of the new Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant from the Rideau Canal;

Parks Canada should be consulted regarding the project in accordance with the City of Kingston’s Official Plan policies; and,

Following the completion of construction activities, municipal heritage staff should be notified and inspect the property to ensure there are no unanticipated adverse impacts on the Rideau Canal.
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1.0 STUDY PURPOSE

Golder Associates Ltd. (Golder) was retained by J. L. Richards & Associates Limited, on the behalf of Utilities Kingston, to prepare a Heritage Impact Statement (HIS) for the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plan located at 1756 Cana Boulevard in the City of Kingston, Ontario. The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant is proposed for replacement with a new waste water treatment facility. The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant is not listed or designated under the Ontario Heritage Act, nor has it been identified by the City of Kingston as a property of interest. However, due to its proximity to the Rideau Canal, a HIS was required.

An HIS is a study to evaluate the impact of a proposed development or site alteration on heritage resources, and to recommend an overall approach to the conservation of the heritage values of the resource. The City of Kingston’s Heritage Impact Statement Requirements (2013) was utilized in the preparation of this report. In addition, to facilitate the evaluation of the property against the criteria within Regulation 9/06, the City of Kingston’s Evaluative Template for Determining Cultural Heritage Value and Interest was utilized. To examine the significance of the cultural landscape, Criteria for the Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes in the Town of Caledon (2003) as well as the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport Info Sheet #2: Cultural Heritage Landscapes which is part of Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process (2006) was used.

A site visit was carried out on April 5, 2013, by Dr. Marcus Létourneau and Kyle Gonyou. All photographs, unless otherwise noted, were taken by Golder on the date of the site visit. Ryan Leary, Senior Planner, Heritage & Urban Design, City of Kingston, was consulted in conjunction with the site visit to scope the terms of the HIS. Comments from the City of Kingston Heritage Planning staff were incorporated into this report.

1.1 Detailed Study Approach

In order to identify any potential impacts, three steps must be undertaken:

1) The scope, scale and nature of the cultural heritage resource must be adequately understood;

2) Planning must take into consideration the cultural heritage resource while be flexible enough to allow for the unexpected; and,

3) Interventions must respect and protect the heritage attributes (as defined by the governmental approval body) of the cultural heritage resource.

This report examines the proposed project at the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant to ensure that cultural heritage resources are adequately understood and to assist with the mitigation of any adverse impacts as a result of the new waste treatment facility.
1.2 Definitions

Adjacent Lands (Cultural Heritage): In terms of evaluating potential impacts of development and site alteration on protected heritage properties, means:

a) Contiguous (abutting properties);

b) A property that is separated from a heritage property by a narrow strip of land used as a right-of-way, walkway, green space, park and/or easement and whose recognized heritage attributes would be impacted by the proposed development or site alteration; and/or,

c) Those properties whose heritage attributes were identified within the following: a designation bylaw enacted under the Ontario Heritage Act; a heritage easement enacted under the Ontario Heritage Act; a Heritage Conservation District Plan; a World Heritage Site Management Plan; a National Historic Site’s Commemorative Integrity Statement, Management Plan, Federal Heritage Buildings review Office report, or Reasons for Designation; City of Kingston’s Official Plan; or, recognized heritage attributes that would be impacted by the proposed development or site alteration (City of Kingston 2011, 4).

Cultural Heritage Landscape: A defined geographical area of heritage significance that has been modified by human activities and is valued by a community. It involves a grouping(s) of heritage features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites and natural elements, which together form a significant type of heritage form, distinctive from its constituent elements or parts. Examples include, but are not limited to, heritage conservation districts (HCD) designated under the Ontario Heritage Act, villages, parks, gardens, battlefields, main streets and neighbourhoods, cemeteries, trailways, and industrial complexes of cultural heritage value (City of Kingston 2011, 9).

Cultural Heritage Resource: A human work or a place that gives evidence of human activity or has spiritual or cultural meaning, and which has been determined to have historic value. Cultural heritage resources can include both physical and intangible heritage resources, heritage properties, built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes, archaeological resources, paleontological resources, and both documentary and material heritage.

Cultural Heritage Value: The aesthetic, historic, scientific, cultural, social or spiritual importance or significance for past, present and future generations. The cultural heritage value of a cultural heritage resource is embodied in its character-defining elements, including its materials, forms, location, spatial configurations, uses and cultural associations or meanings.

Governmental Approval Body: This refers to any agency or division of a level of government that has the authority to approve works on a cultural heritage resource. This includes a Municipal Council and the Ontario Heritage Trust.

Heritage Attribute: The materials, forms, location, spatial configurations, uses and cultural associations or meanings that contribute to the cultural heritage value of a cultural heritage resource, which must be retained to conserve its cultural heritage value. For properties protected under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, the heritage attributes are “in relation to real property, and to the buildings and structures on the real property, the attributes of the real property, buildings and structures that contribute to their cultural heritage value or interest” (Ontario Heritage Act, Section 1). These are defined by a Governmental Approval Body.

HIS: Heritage Impact Statement. A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), a Cultural Heritage Impact Statement (CHIS), and a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) all serve the same essential function.
OHA: Ontario Heritage Act.

Regulation 9/06: This is the regulation under the Ontario Heritage Act which outlines the criteria against which all potential designations must be evaluated.

Significant: In regards to cultural heritage and archaeology, resources that are valued for the important contribution they make to the understanding of the history of a place, an event, or a people.

1.3 Heritage Resources

There are several different types of heritage resources and these resources are identified by a variety of governmental approval bodies. Properties owned or leased by the provincial government and prescribed public bodies (as defined in Regulation 157/10 of the Ontario Heritage Act) were not expressly considered in this report. The categories of sites assessed in this report may include the following:

**United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization:** The Rideau Canal World Heritage Site is designated by UNESCO. This designation does not convey any powers of oversight to UNESCO. Instead, the host nation assumes responsibility for the management of the site. Parks Canada is the approvals agency responsible for the Rideau Canal World Heritage Site.

**Canadian Heritage River System (CHRS):** The CHRS was established in 1984 with the mandate to conserve nationally significant rivers. Existing as a secretariat under the auspices of Parks Canada, the CHRS operates under existing federal, provincial, and municipal legislative/policy frameworks. A CHRS designation entails no new protective measures or review processes, although each river is examined every 10 years by the CHRS secretariat. The Rideau River was designated in 2000, and both its natural and cultural heritage resources were highlighted. In particular, the Rideau Canal system, with its engineering and local works, was highlighted as an important resource.

**Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada (HSMBC):** Through the HSMBC, the Minister of Environment, responsible for Parks Canada, has the authority to designate National Historic Sites (pertaining to a defined area), Events (pertaining to an idea or concept with spatial boundaries), and Persons. These designations are generally well documented. In addition to having “Reasons for Designation”, National Historic Sites often have Commemorative Integrity Statements and/or Management Plans. Events or persons designations are not included in this study.

**Federal Heritage Building Review Office (FHBRO):** FHBRO, part of Parks Canada, evaluates the cultural heritage value of federally owned and occupied buildings and maintains a “Register of the Government of Canada Heritage Buildings”. Unlike many other heritage programs, FHBRO is focused strictly on buildings. FHBRO’s jurisdiction does not apply to Crown Corporations such as railway stations.

**Ontario Heritage Trust Easement:** The Ontario Heritage Trust, an agency of the Government of Ontario, has the authority to enter into easement agreements to conserve cultural heritage resources. Changes to these resources require Ontario Heritage Trust approval.

**Ontario Heritage Act:** Properties in Ontario can be designated under the Ontario Heritage Act has having cultural heritage value or interest. A variety of different types of designation, with varying levels of protection, are available, including listing on a municipal register, pursuant to Section 27 of the Ontario Heritage Act, individual designation under Part IV, and designation as a Heritage Conservation District.
under Part V. Properties designated after 2005 must be evaluated against Regulation 9/06 to determine cultural heritage value or interest. In addition, a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, or similar, must be prepared to articulate the cultural heritage value of the property and identify heritage attributes that support those values. Designations under the *Ontario Heritage Act* prior to 2005 are grandfathered under the current legislation to provide protection. Designations are enacted at the local or municipal level. Additionally, heritage easements and maintenance agreements can be established under the authority of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

**Resources built pre-1973:** Both the Ministry of Transportation in its *Environmental Guide for Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes* (2007) and the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, in its *Screening for Impact to Built Heritage and Cultural Heritage Landscapes* (2010) checklist, employ a rolling 40-year rule to identify potential properties of cultural heritage values and interest as part of the Environment Assessment process. The intent of the 40-year rule is to allow a resource to age sufficiently so that it can be better contextualized and a wider perspective could be applied to it.

Air photographs, topographic maps, and published materials were used to identify pre-1973 resources at the subject site.

Not all of these categories were found to be present near the site location.
2.0 OVERVIEW OF PROPERTY

The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant is located at 1756 Cana Boulevard, in the City of Kingston, Ontario (Figures 1-2, pp. 5-6). The legal description is Part Lot 40, Concession 4, former Township of Pittsburgh, County of Frontenac, City of Kingston. The assessment roll number is 1011 090 050 19200. The property is less than 1 acre (0.5 hectare) in size. The survey of the property is included as Image 1, p. 8. The existing Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant, built in 1973, is under consideration for replacement.

The topography of the site can be generally described as low-lying and swampy. The site is situated in a topographic depression relative to the surrounding lands. It is located in the broader St. Lawrence Lowlands physiographic region, and the area surrounding the site makes up the western boundary of the Leeds Knob and Flat physiographic region (Chapman 1984). This region is typified by clay flats and rock knobs. Isolated Precambrian rock of the Frontenac Axis protrudes through some parts of the setting, primarily to the north and south-west of the site. A small, unnamed watercourse runs across the northern edge of the property. Cattails prosper around this creek, indicating the marshy conditions of the land.

The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant is located at the northerly end of Cana Boulevard, within the Kingston Mills hamlet. The Cana Subdivision is formed by Cana Boulevard, Marian Crescent, and Rochdale Drive, and is accessed via Kingston Mills Road. The Cana Subdivision is identified as a suburban, estate lot development. There are 32 single, detached dwellings in the Cana Subdivision. Most homes were constructed between 1954 and the 1970s, generalized as two phases of development. Properties feature mature vegetation.

Canal Drive, to the west, separates the Cana Subdivision from the Colonel By Lake, which is part of the Rideau Canal system. Single, detached dwellings are located on the west side of Canal Drive, which back onto Colonel By Lake; there are no dwellings located on the east side of Canal Drive. Properties feature mature vegetation.

The construction of the Rideau Canal and the dam at Kingston Mills significantly altered the area. Prior to any interventions, a series of waterfalls, known as Cataract Falls, were located at the present site of Kingston Mills. A mill dam was constructed at King’s Mills, later Kingston Mills, in 1784. The Rideau Canal dams and embankments were constructed in 1827–1832. The Cataract Flood Plain was flooded to a depth of 5.2 metres (17 feet), effectively creating Colonel By Lake. This was the most extensive flooding that resulted from the construction of the Rideau Canal.

The Rideau Canal system, including Colonel By Lake, is separated from the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant by a row of residential properties that front along Colonel By Lake, landscaped yards with mature vegetation, Canal Drive, and a ditch with mature vegetation. It is barely possible to see the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant from Cana Street with no green vegetation (Image 2, p. 9); it is highly unlikely that one could see the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant from Colonel By Lake in the summertime.

---

2 Analysis of historic aerial photographs reveals this watercourse existed prior to suburban development in this area; however, the construction of the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant altered the course and flow of this topographic feature.
Image 1: Legal survey of 1756 Cana Boulevard, the Cana Waste Water Treatment Facility. The parcel (in red) identified as Part 5 is the site of the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant (Source: J. L. Richards).
Image 2: Photograph of the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant taken from Canal Drive. Vegetation obstructs the view of the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant even in the early spring.
2.1 General Site History

Historical activity on the site was traditionally limited to farming. Originally part of the Government Mill Reserve of Kingston Township in 1782, the site did not enter into private ownership until the early nineteenth century (Patterson 1989, 22). The first recorded transfer of Lot 40 was the lease of the whole lot from George Hamilton to Robert and John Hamilton in 1817. The property was leased again to facilitate the construction of the Rideau Canal (1827–1832) and for the construction of the Grand Trunk Railway in 1856. However, ownership appears to have reverted to the Crown, as the property was granted in 1870 to Michael Flannigan by the Crown (Ontario Land Registry). In the 1870s, the property was subdivided and sold many times. However, by the late 1870s, Edward Bradden and Peter Cunningham emerged as major land owners in the area (Image 3, p. 11). At the junction of the Perth Road (Highway 15) and Kingston Mills Road, a settlement of Irish Catholic immigrants grew. This settlement was known as Cunningham’s Corners, honouring Peter Cunningham, but later became known as Code’s Corner (Patterson 1989, 38). In 1886, Edward Bradden donated land for the construction of a church and rectory. The cornerstone of a sandstone church was laid in 1887, and the Roman Catholic Parish of the Holy Name of Jesus was established in 1896 (Patterson 1989, 109). The community remained agriculturally-focused into the twentieth century (Image 4, p. 12).

In 1954, the Cana Home builders Cooperative organized by Rev. J. P. Ainslie of St. John’s Parish, Kingston, bought a piece of land close to the Holy Name of Jesus Church on which to build homes. Father Raby, pastor of the Holy Name of Jesus Christ, blessed this land (Holy Name). Under parish auspices, a suburban residential area was developed as a housing cooperative. Thirty-two of the 34 parcels in the Cana Subdivision have been developed use by the Cana Home Builders Co-Operative. The houses constructed range in style from post-War Cape Cod style to ranch bungalows, in a typical post-war suburban style. All of the houses are single detached units. Most properties feature mature landscaping and vegetation. It appears that dwellings were constructed in two phases: the first 13 homes were constructed immediately following the establishment of the plan of subdivision in 1954, the second phase followed in the 1970s (Images 5-6, pp. 13-14). By 1978, the Cana Subdivision achieved its full build-out (Images 7-9, pp. 15-17).
Image 3: This detail of the Pittsburgh Township map from J. H. Meacham’s *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the Counties of Frontenac, Lennox and Addington, Ontario* (1878) shows the future site of the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant (approximate location indicated in a red circle). In the 1870s, property around the site was part of a rapid series of transactions, transfers, and subdivisions. Edward Bradden is shown as the property owner of Lot 40, Concession IV of Pittsburgh Township.
Image 4: This aerial photograph from 1953 shows the future site of the Cana Subdivision. The land has remained in agricultural use since the nineteenth century. The future site of the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant is indicated with a red circle (Source: Queen's University).
Image 5: This detail of a topographic map of Kingston Mills (1972) shows the beginnings of the Cana Subdivision with the first 13 dwellings constructed. The approximate location of the future Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant is indicated in a red circle (Source: Queen's University).
This detail of the 1973 topographic map shows increased development in the Cana Subdivision, including the development of Rochdale Drive. The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant is not yet included on this topographic map; the future location is indicated in a red circle (Source: Queen’s University).
Image 7: By 1978, the Cana Subdivision has reached its present state of development. The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant is indicated on the air photo with a red circle (Source: Queen's University).
Image 8: View of a house on Cana Boulevard, part of the initial 1954 development of the Cana Subdivision.
A communal well system was established in the 1950s (see Image 9, above) and the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant was built in 1973 (Images 11-14, pp. 21-24 see Section 2.3, p. 19). The Waste Water Treatment Plant was privately maintained until it was transferred to the Ministry of the Environment. In 1991, it was transferred to Pittsburgh Township, and again to Utilities Kingston in 1998 as part of municipal amalgamation.

A detailed general site history can be found in the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (2010).

### 2.2 Contextualizing Post-War Intensification and Suburbanization

The development of the Cana Subdivision must also be understood within the context of Post-World War II suburban development. The widespread development of subdivisions transformed post-war urban landscapes, particularly in North America. As Hope notes, the Post-War Period was marked by a transformation of the housing construction industry (Hope 2005). In the Post-War Period, the industrialization of the housing construction industry resulted in greater standardization and specialization of tasks. Builders began to focus on larger scale developments rather than individual houses, and developed an assembly line approach to construction. As the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CHMC) noted, “the average house constructed in the 1940s [took] seven months and 2,400 site person hours. By the mid-1960s, the average house [took] eight weeks and 950 site person hours to build” (CMHC 2012). This was combined with a growing
reliance upon pre-cut lumber and application of economies of scale to the purchase of standard building elements and materials. The period from 1946–1965 was also marked by rapid population growth resulting from a significant number of births and post-war immigration, resulting in an increased demand for housing.

Post-War subdivisions were built at a much larger scale than previous developments, and new approaches to community development had to be established. Many subdivisions were entirely new communities, and their construction required a wider consideration of issues, such as the infrastructure development, open space development, and the provision of community amenities. The rectilinear street pattern was often abandoned for the curving streets and cul-de-sacs (Hope 2005). This new pattern reflected its reliance upon the automobile as the primary means of transportation. In Ontario, the development of Don Mills (1952–1962) as a new corporately developed community established the subsequent model for urban expansion (Wolfe 2004) (Image 10, p. 18). However, as Hodge and Gordon note, subsequent developments in Ontario often fail to embrace the “New Town” influences found in Don Mills, and have only focused on the land assembly, infrastructure development, and building lot models employed in the project (2008, 118).


The CHMC was instrumental in Canada’s post-war urban development. The consolidation of pre-existing housing legislation into the *National Housing Act* (1946) allowed for Federal Government to play a key role in the
development of national housing policy. Established in 1946, CMHC was created with a mandate “to house returning war veterans, and to lead the nation’s housing programs.” (CMHC 2012). They were also charged with the administration of the National Housing Act and the Home Improvement Loans Guarantee Act. (CHMC 2012) The inherited the responsibilities of Wartime Housing Limited (1941–1947) which built over 30,000 houses (based on standardized, inexpensive, sometimes pre-fabricated 1 ½-storey designs) for munitions workers, returning veterans and their families (Now House). This included its key role in the establishment of the community of Ajax. As Wolfe notes:

“CMHC’s role in promoting housing and planning, planning education and research, and public awareness...cannot be over-emphasized. In the field of housing, direct lending to the public and, later on, cost-sharing urban renewal with the provinces and the municipalities, public housing (1949) and loans for sewage treatment (1960) did much to modernize our cities” (Wolfe 2004).

As a result of their role in post-war mortgage lending, CMHC was able to implemented community development standards, plans, and projects, such as subdivision designs, zoning and construction standards (Wolfe, 2004). By the 1950s, the federal government became more engaged with community development through the provision of grants for urban renewal projects and for the development of municipally owned housing corporations, such as Regent Park in Toronto in 1950. By the 1960s, CMHC shifted its focus to municipal planning and development, and built the first co-operative housing project in Canada. Between 1964 and 1972, CMHC supported the development of 300 renewal plans (Wolfe 2004). It was at this point in Canadian history that the construction of multi-unit apartment buildings outpaced single family homes (CMHC 2012). By the 1970s, growing concerns with affordability resulted in the reduced lot sizes and increased density of developments (Wolfe 2004). Since the 1970s, CMHC has continued to play an important role in the development of Canadian communities. It has continued to develop financial programs and undertake research on housing best practices. In the last 10 years, it has focused on issues of homelessness, assisted housing and Aboriginal housing as well and sustainability issues.

The post-war subdivision has become an integral part of Canada’s urban fabric. As of 1996, most Canadians lived in neighbourhoods built after 1945 (Hodge and Gordon 2008, 112). These subdivisions were conceived holistically, and on a larger scale than previous housing developments. These projects signaled a marked departure from past practice, and shifted away from individual buildings to larger landscapes. There are few examples where these forms of landscapes have been identified. Both Kitchener and Kingston have recognized areas of post-war housing, and both have sought to examine them as a type of cultural heritage landscape; in Kitchener, the St Mary’s Area was designated as a heritage conservation district, and in Kingston the Alamein Drive neighbourhood was identified in the City’s Official Plan as a potential heritage conservation district. There have also been movements to look at other areas. In Don Mills, there is currently a movement to designate Neighbourhood 1 in Ajax as a Heritage Conservation District.

2.3 Description of the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant

The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant (Images 11-15, pp. 21-25) is located on a property at the northerly end of Cana Boulevard. A gravel driveway extends from the road to the waste water treatment facilities, which are set at rear (west) end of the property. The property is covered in scrub grass and low brush. Only grass on either side of the driveway appears to be regularly maintained. A small, unnamed creek runs to the north of the site. The effluent from the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant flows into this watercourse, and into Colonel By
Lake. The waste water treatment facilities are enclosed by a chain link fence that is topped by barbed wire. The surface of the enclosed area is covered in loose gravel and pockets of grassy vegetation. The main access gate is located at the east-end of the site, where the driveway is located. A weather monitoring station is mounted on a pole located at the northwest corner of the fenced area. A ditch and vegetation separate the Cana Waste Water Treatment from Canal Drive to the extreme west of the property.

A small building houses the electrical and mechanical systems of the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant, including the blower motors for aeration, chlorine disinfection equipment and station controls. It is a single storey square plan building built on a concrete slab on grade. The structure is clad in brown stretcher-bond brick. The roof is flat with metal parapet flashing. A downspout is located at the southeast corner of the structure. A chimney or ventilation stack is located on the western elevation. The only access point to the interior of the building is located at the west corner of the north elevation. It has a flat structural opening with no trim. The door is a single leaf with a rectangular louvered vent in the lower portion of the door. Danger and caution signs are posted on the door. A concrete stoop, flush with the ground level, is located at the door. There are no windows. Metering and lighting are affixed to the exterior of the structure on all elevations. A white sign with black lettering is attached to the eastern elevation, identifying the building as the “Cana Sewage Treatment Plant.”

The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant is a prefabricated extended aeration treatment facility providing secondary treatment and disinfection. A below grade tank, constructed of steel, contains the wastewater treatment process, including the wet well, aeration tank, the clarifier, and the chlorine contact tank. The elements are open to the air.
Image 11: General view of the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant from Cana Boulevard.
Image 12: East elevation of the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant, showing the view of the site from Cana Boulevard.
Image 13: North elevation of the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant, showing the access door to the building.
Image 14: West elevation of the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant.
Image 15: South/southwest elevation of the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant, showing the buried steel tank of the waste water treatment facilities.
3.0 LEGISLATIVE AND POLICY FRAMEWORK REVIEW

3.1 World Heritage Site

The United Nations Education Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) designated the Rideau Canal and associated fortifications as a World Heritage Site in 2007. This is the highest level of heritage designation. In anticipation, Parks Canada prepared the *Rideau Canal World Heritage Site Management Plan* (2005) which specifies how the world heritage value of the nominated property will be protected for present and future generations. The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value for the Rideau Canal has been attached as Appendix A.

The *World Heritage Site Management Plan* identifies the world heritage values that will be protected, the legislative and policy framework for the management of the property, the elements of the management system in place to protect the property, and mechanisms for monitoring and periodic reporting. It is a high-level management plan, in compliance with the requirements of the *World Heritage Convention*. The *World Heritage Site Management Plan* indicates that Parks Canada will need to ensure that any public works proposal will maintain the authenticity of the shoreline and cultural resources, as well as the environmental and scenic qualities of the Rideau Canal setting. Parks Canada is the steward of the World Heritage Site designation of the Rideau Canal.

The *Rideau Canal National Historic Site Management Plan* (2005) provides more specific direction for decision-making and the investment of financial and human resources regarding the Rideau Canal (Parks Canada 2006, 12).

3.2 National Historic Site of Canada

Under the *Parks Canada Agency Act*, Parks Canada is responsible for preparing management plans for National Historic Sites. Parks Canada was transferred the authority of the Rideau Canal in 1972 from the Ministry of Transportation. The *Rideau Canal National Historic Site Management Plan* (2006) establishes the long-term strategic direction for the management of the Rideau Canal National Historic Site of Canada. This plan ensures the commemorative integrity of the National Historic Site, guides appropriate public use, ensures the application of cultural resource management principles and practices in the decision-making process and conserves the natural values of the Rideau Canal.

The first *Rideau Canal National Historic Site of Canada Management Plan* was initiated in 1990 and completed in 1996. The *Rideau Canal National Historic Site Management Plan* was updated in 2005. Based on the recommendations of the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, the Rideau Canal was declared a National Historic Site because of the Canal system; the survival of a high number of original Canal structures such as locks, blockhouses, dams, weirs, and original lockmasters’ houses; and, the unique historical environment of the Canal system. Cultural heritage resources of the Rideau Canal are identified as engineering works, buildings, landscapes, archaeological sites, artifacts and archival resources associated with the military period, and post-military period operations. Cultural heritage resources directly related to the reasons for commemoration are of national significance and are identified as a level one resource. The Commemorative Integrity Statement for the Rideau Canal has been attached as Appendix B.

3 Parks Canada Guiding Principles and Operational Policies provide a framework for managing heritage properties under their jurisdiction. Cultural resources within a property are evaluated for management purposes in three categories: a "level one" resource is deemed to be of national historic significance in the custody of Parks Canada; a "level two" resource is not of national historic significance but may have historic value and thus considered a cultural resource; and, an "other resource" is determined to not meet criteria established for level one or level two resources and exempted from this policy.
The *Rideau Canal National Historic Site Management Plan* emphasizes the tourism and recreation values of the Rideau Canal, promoting the site as a unique cultural heritage experience. This is dependent on the Rideau Canal’s tradition as a fully functional navigable historic waterway. The *Rideau Canal National Historic Site Management Plan* emphasizes that the historic values, natural feature, scenic beauty, and diversity of the cultural landscapes of the Rideau Canal corridor constitute unique heritage character and should be respected by government, commercial interests, and private residents.

One of the roles of Parks Canada, as outlined in the *Rideau Canal National Historic Site Management Plan*, is to present the story of the Rideau Canal and its communities resulting in greater awareness, understanding, and appreciation of the heritage values of the Rideau Canal corridor. Parks Canada is also responsible for providing facilities and services to visitors to sites located along the Rideau Canal. As steward of the Rideau Canal, Parks Canada is also responsible for an ongoing program of monitoring, maintenance, and conservation of engineering works essential for the safe and reliable operations of the Canal and to ensure the commemorative integrity of the Rideau Canal resources. This role also includes liaising with local municipalities. For example, the City of Kingston has identified Parks Canada as a commenting agency in applications with the potential to impact the World Heritage Site designation of the Rideau Canal.

The natural environment of the Rideau Canal is considered to be an important aspect of its historic value, as included in the Commemorative Integrity Statement. The Historic Canal Regulations (SOR/93-220), the *Canadian Environmental Assessment Act*, the *Species at Risk Act*, the *Navigable Waters Protection Act* and the *Canadian Fisheries Act* provide a federal regulatory framework for protection of ecological values of the Rideau Canal lands and waters. Parks Canada’s primary interest in land use planning of lands adjacent to the Rideau Canal is the retention and enhancement of natural, cultural, and scenic values of the Rideau Canal waterfront lands that contribute to its heritage character.

The landscape adjacent to the Rideau Canal is visually, ecologically, and historically associated. Its management affects the Rideau Canal. *Rideau Corridor Landscape Strategy* outlines principles for good development in the document *10 Principles for Good Development*. The principles are:

1) Understand the landscape character;
4) Conserve wetlands;
5) Maintain a natural shoreline;
6) Setback development from the shoreline (30 metres);
7) Plan the site to retain natural vegetation;
8) Preserve historic buildings and cultural features;
9) Appropriate building designs;
10) Low impact dock design;
11) Minimize discharges to the Canal; and,
12) Seek further advice.
Building upon the World Heritage Site designation and the Canadian Heritage River System designation, Parks Canada has initiated a process to identify the cultural landscape of the Rideau Canal. Beginning in 2008, Parks Canada initiated a dialogue with provincial and municipal partners on what would become the Rideau Corridor Landscape Strategy. The Cultural Landscape of the Rideau Canal Corridor Phase II Study is forthcoming (anticipated March 2013).

### 3.3 Canadian Heritage Rivers System

The objective of the Canadian Heritage Rivers designation is to foster protection of outstanding examples of major river environments of Canada in cooperative systems of Canadian Heritage Rivers, and to encourage public understanding, appreciation, and enjoyment of their human and natural heritage.

The Canadian Heritage Rivers System was established by the federal, provincial, and territorial governments for the purpose of recognizing outstanding rivers of Canada. This initiative aims at ensuring these rivers will be protected and their significant heritage values will be enhanced for the long term benefit and enjoyment of Canadians. The Rideau Waterway was designated as a Canadian Heritage River System in 2000 for its outstanding human (cultural) heritage and recreation values. The nomination values for the Rideau Waterway have been attached as Appendix C. The Rideau Waterway: 2000–2012, Canadian Heritage River Monitoring Report found, “the Commemorative Integrity Statement calls the Canal a unique historical environment, including not only locks and dams but also wetlands, cottage areas, undeveloped shorelines, farms, small towns and village scenery. Taken all together, this waterway presents a living cultural landscape that is at once historic, scenic, natural, and man-made” (Parks Canada 2012, 6).

The Rideau Canal National Historic Site Management Plan has been recognized by the Canadian Heritage Rivers Board as the guiding direction for the management of the heritage and recreation values of the Rideau Waterway. The Rideau Canal National Historic Site Management Plan incorporates the Canadian Heritage Rivers System values attributed to the Rideau Waterway, as well as a commitment to maintain these values through the management actions of Parks Canada.

### 3.4 Ontario Legislation/Policy

Within Ontario, cultural heritage conservation is a matter of provincial interest. This understanding stems from not only the Ontario Heritage Act provisions, but also its expression within Section 2 of the Planning Act and other Ontario legislation such as the Cemeteries Act and the Environmental Assessment Act. Further, under the PPS, issued under Section 3 of the Planning Act, Sections 2.0 and 2.6 identify the conservation of cultural heritage (including archaeology) as a requirement.

As the PPS indicates, Ontario’s long-term prosperity, environmental health, and social well-being depend on protecting resources, including cultural heritage and archaeological resources. All planning decisions as well as any revised/new Official Plans within Ontario must be consistent with the PPS. In addition, all municipal projects must be consistent with the municipality’s Official Plan. As a result, provincial heritage policies and legislation must be appropriately considered and integrated as part of any project that may impact cultural heritage resources. However, it must also be noted that the PPS and an Official Plan must be considered in their entirety, and there is always a balancing of other matters of provincial interest such as transportation and intensification. Nevertheless, as this review is focused on cultural heritage matters, this report will highlight the applicable heritage policies.
For the purpose of this report, Policies 2.6.1 and 2.6.3 of the PPS are applicable. Significant built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes will need to be considered and appropriately conserved during this project. In the context of the PPS, heritage significance is understood as being expressed through the formal identification and endorsement by a governmental approval body. The phrase “conserved” is also understood to encompass a range of possible interventions.

In addition, the PPS is clear that works on properties adjacent to any cultural heritage resources will need to be evaluated to ensure that the character defining elements (or heritage attributes) of the cultural heritage resource will be protected through the process of changes.

These elements are identified within the formal designation documents for a cultural heritage resource, and can include: an Ontario Heritage Act Designation By-law, a FHBRO Report, a HSMB report, a Commemorative Integrity Statement, a National Historic Site or World Heritage Management Plan, and/or a Heritage Conservation District Plan and Guidelines document.

Any properties protected by the Ontario Heritage Act (under Section 27, Part IV, Part V, Part VI, or easement) must be evaluated against the Statement of Significance/Reasons for Designation (Ontario Heritage Act Section 29 (4)) for the property, and where required, any interventions on these properties will require municipal approval. Generally, works that will remove or irrevocably alter a character defining element are to be avoided. It should be noted that the Ontario Heritage Act’s applicability is limited to either the property or district boundary. The justification for adjacent review stems not from the Ontario Heritage Act, but from the PPS.

3.5 City of Kingston Policies

The City of Kingston has a number of policies that pertain to cultural heritage, including the City of Kingston Official Plan (2010, consolidation 2011). Policies contained within the Official Plan are in conformity with the general direction of the Rideau Canal World Heritage Site Management Plan and the Rideau Canal National Historic Site Management Plan. In addition to the management guidelines established in the Official Plan, the City of Kingston has adopted supplementary plans to guide the municipality. These include the Strategic Plan 2011–2014, the Culture Plan (2010), the Sustainable Kingston Plan (2011), and Planning for the Conservation of Archaeological Resources in the City of Kingston (2010).

The City of Kingston has also adopted several recognized cultural resource management protocols and charters, as identified below.

3.6 Official Plan

Cultural heritage resources will continue to be valued and conserved as part of the City’s defining character, quality of life, and as an economic resource (Section 2.3.7). Section 2.8.9 of the City of Kingston’s Official Plan states that cultural heritage resources, which includes protected heritage buildings, built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources, will be conserved, managed and marketed for their contributions to the City’s unique identity, history and sense of place in such a way as to balance heritage with environmental and accessibility concerns. These sentiments are emphasized as to not put the UNESCO World Heritage designation at risk. The balance that is indicated in Section 2.8.9 can be achieved through the cultural heritage-specific policies of Section 7. Section 7.1.7 allows the City to require the preparation of a HIS by a qualified person for any development proposal which has the potential to impact a cultural heritage resource. Furthermore, the City may permit development and site alteration on lands adjacent to a protected heritage property where the
proposed development and site alteration have been evaluated, and it has been determined through the preparation of a HIS that the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved (Section 7.2.5).

It should be noted that the City may permit development and site alteration on adjacent lands to a protected heritage property, such as the Rideau Canal, where the proposed development and site alteration has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated through the preparation of a Heritage Impact Statement that the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved (Section 7.2.5). This type of report may also show that works will not have an impact. The entire City of Kingston has been identified as a site plan control area (Section 9.5.3.1).

All municipal works, also referenced as public works projects, must conform to the *Official Plan*, including relevant heritage planning policies (Section 9.10.1). Infrastructure projects are required to ensure compatibility and minimize adverse effect on adjacent land uses. A Heritage Impact Statement, as identified in Sections 3 and 7 of the *Official Plan*, can be utilized to demonstrate that potential adverse effects to an adjacent heritage property have been mitigated. A principal goal of the *Official Plan* is to achieve compatibility of land uses and avoid adverse effects on adjacent properties. Uses should respect the quality of existing areas and provide for suitable transition between areas of differing uses, sensitivity, urban design treatment, and intensity in order to avoid or mitigate adverse effects (Policy 2.7). Mitigation measures have been outlined in the *Official Plan* (Policy 2.7.6). Mitigation measures may include:

a) Ensuring adequate setback and minimum yard requirements;

b) Establishing appropriate transition in building height, coverage, and massing;

c) Requiring fencing, walls, or berming to create a visual screen;

d) Designing the building in a way that minimizes adverse effects;

e) Maintaining mature vegetation and/or additional new landscaping requirements;

f) Controlling access locations, driveways, service areas, and activity areas; and/or,

g) Regulation locations, treatment, and size of accessory uses and structure, lighting, parking areas, garbage storage facilities and signage (Section 2.7.6).

Recognizing the significance of the World Heritage Site and National Historic Site designations, among others, the intention of the City of Kingston is to protect and enhance the natural and cultural heritage assets of the Rideau Canal, and to develop, in a sustainable way, its tourism potential. Within the *Official Plan*, the goal of policies, with regards to the Rideau Canal, is to recognize and protect the cultural heritage significance of the Rideau Canal and the fortifications associated with Kingston, and to support the significant role of the UNESCO World Heritage Designation as a scenic cultural, natural and tourism resource. To achieve this, the City has established policy that seeks to conserve elements contributing to the natural and cultural heritage significance of the Rideau Canal.

Shoreline and waterfront development or site alteration, as well as development or site alteration with the potential to visually impact the shoreline and waterfront, have been highlighted as elements that could potentially impact the significance of the Rideau Canal. Policy established in the *Official Plan* seeks to mitigate potential adverse effect of development or site alteration along the Rideau Canal by adopting a 30m setback or buffer zone adjacent to the Rideau Canal (Policies 2.8.9, 3.10.A.1).
From a cultural heritage perspective, development is only permitted if potential adverse effects on the Rideau Canal and its environs have been mitigated or if works have been demonstrated to have no impact, as demonstrated through a Heritage Impact Statement (Policy 3.10.A.6). All development individually or collectively overlooking the Rideau Canal must also have regard for visual impact on the UNESCO World Heritage Site designation (Policy 3.9.18). Additionally, Parks Canada has been identified in the City of Kingston’s Official Plan as a commenting agency in the review of development applications, in the context of the Rideau Canal Management Plans (Policy 3.10.A.4).

Together with Parks Canada, the City will recognize and protect the cultural heritage resource significance of the Rideau Canal by:

a) Identifying and protecting the cultural heritage landscapes and built heritage resources directly associated with the Canal;

d) Introducing design guidelines applied through the site plan control process for new development along the Rideau Canal;

e) Requiring that both the terrestrial and marine archaeological resources associated with the Rideau Canal be conserved;

f) Ensuring that all development adjacent to or over the Canal does not interfere with the safe and efficient navigation of the Canal;

g) Prohibiting any development or site alteration that would alter the size, shape and configuration of the Canal system;

h) Requiring that development or site alteration on lands adjacent to the lock station and the canal proper demonstrate that the cultural heritage resource will be conserved;

i) Ensuring that development or redevelopment under the Planning Act be in accordance with the policies of Sections 3.10.A and 9 of this Plan;

j) Requiring that new bridge or public utilities crossings undertake satisfactory environmental assessments in accordance with the policies of this Plan; and,

k) Continuing to partner with Parks Canada to promote the Rideau Canal UNESCO World Heritage Site (Section 7.3.A.1).

3.7 Municipal Documents

The City of Kingston’s Strategic Plan 2011–2014 identifies heritage as a key component to many initiatives of the city. These initiatives include the City’s Culture Plan (2010) and the Sustainable Kingston Plan (2011). The Culture Plan emphasizes management of heritage resources within Kingston. The Culture Plan identifies the need for a cultural heritage strategy that develops Kingston’s historical narrative, built heritage and natural heritage features into a broad based strategy for telling Kingston’s stories (Culture Plan 2010, 9). The Culture
Plan also emphasizes cultural tourism, heritage education, and building financial and organizational capacities. In the Sustainable Kingston Plan, the theme of history and heritage play a role in supporting the cultural vitality, which is one of the four pillars of sustainability. The thematic statement for the history and heritage theme states, “by including, protecting, respecting, and sharing our community’s unique cultural heritage, rich and diverse narratives, and local history, Kingstonians will have a better understanding of ourselves, others, and our world” (Sustainable Kingston Plan 2011, 19). Goals of the Sustainable Kingston Plan emphasize identification, protection, and enhancement of Kingston’s cultural heritage resources.

Planning for the Conservation of Archaeological Resources in the City of Kingston (2010) reduces the likelihood of unearthing unknown or unsuspected archaeological resources. It compiled an inventory of registered and unregistered archaeological sites within the City of Kingston, prepared an overview of the area’s settlement history as it pertains to archaeological resources, developed an archaeological site potential model, and reviewed current federal, provincial, and municipal planning and management guidelines for archaeological resources. The historic settlement of Kingston Mills has been identified as an Archaeologically Sensitive Area (ASA); however, the Cana Subdivision is not included in this identification. The Cana Subdivision, however, has been identified as an area of Composite Potential, which includes sites around environmental or cultural features, such as lakes, valleys, known archaeological sites, historic mills, or cemeteries.

3.8 Guidelines

In addition to these policies, the City of Kingston has also adopted conservation protocol to protect and conserve cultural heritage resources in accordance with the best available cultural resource management protocols and charters. This includes UNESCO and ICOMOS Conventions and Charters, Parks Canada’s Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada, and the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sports’ Eight Guiding Principles in the Conservation of Built Heritage Properties.

Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada provides an overview to the conservation decision-making process, conservation treatments, standards for appropriate conservation, and guidelines for conservation. In the context of the Standards and Guidelines, conservation is understood to embrace several key concepts including preservation, rehabilitation, and restoration. The terms are identified as follows:

- **Conservation**: all actions or processes that are aimed at safeguarding the character-defining elements of an historic place so as to retain its heritage value and extend its physical life. This may involve preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, or a combination of these actions or processes;

- **Preservation**: the action or process of protecting, maintaining, and/or stabilizing the existing materials, form, and integrity of an historic place, or of an individual component, while protecting its heritage value;

- **Rehabilitation**: the actions or processes of making possible a continuing or compatible contemporary use of an historic place, or of an individual component, while protecting its heritage value; and,

- **Restoration**: the action or process of accurately revealing, recovering, or representing the state of an historic place, or of an individual component, as it appeared at the particular period in its history, while protecting its heritage value (Parks Canada 2011).
The City of Kingston references the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport’s *Eight Guiding Principles in the Conservation of Built Heritage Properties* (2008) as a tool to help guide change to cultural heritage resources. These principles are intended to provide a basis for decisions concerning “good practice” in heritage conservation.

1) **Respect for documentary evidence**: do not restore based on conjecture. Conservation work should be based on historic documentation such as historic photographs, drawings, or physical evidence;

2) **Respect for the original location**: do not move buildings unless there is no other means to save them. Site is an integral component of a building or structure. Change in site diminishes the cultural heritage value considerably;

3) **Respect for historic materials**: repair/conserve – rather than replace building materials and finishes, except where absolutely necessary. Minimal intervention maintains the heritage content of the built resource;

4) **Respect for original fabric**: repair with like materials. Repair to return the resource to its prior condition, without altering its integrity;

5) **Respect for the building’s history**: do not restore to one period at the expense of another period. Do not destroy later additions to a building or structure solely to restore to a single time period;

6) **Reversibility**: Alteration should be able to be returned to original conditions. This conserves earlier building design and technique, e.g. when a new door opening is put into a stone wall, the original stones are numbered, removed and stored, allowing for future restoration;

7) **Legibility**: new work should be distinguishable from old. Buildings or structures should be recognized as products of their own time, and new additions should not blur the distinction between old and new; and,

8) **Maintenance**: with continuous care, future restoration work will not be necessary. With regular upkeep, major conservation projects and their high costs can be avoided.
4.0 EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL HERITAGE VALUES

4.1 Cultural Heritage Evaluation Framework

Heritage conservation in Ontario has seen some dramatic changes since 2005. In 2005, revisions to the Ontario Heritage Act and to the Provincial Policy Statement shifted the legislation and policy framework; heritage conservation was clearly articulated as a matter of provincial interest, and protecting cultural heritage resources was identified as a key consideration in the planning process. In support of the amendments of the Ontario Heritage Act, the Province established criteria for determining if a property is worthy of protection as a “designated” heritage property. Known as Regulation 9/06, this regulation states that a property may be designated under the Ontario Heritage Act if it meets one of the three following criteria:

1) “The property has design value or physical value because it,
   i) Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method,
   ii) Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or
   iii) Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.

2) The property 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 property 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.” O.Reg. 9/06

Under the Ontario Heritage Act, an evaluation is carried out on a property rather than on a building as the Ontario Heritage Act only protects real property.

To facilitate the evaluation of the property against the criteria contained within Regulation 9/06, the City of Kingston’s Evaluative Template for Determining Cultural Heritage Value and Interest was utilized. The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant Evaluation has been completed and is included as Appendix D to this report.

The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant was constructed for the purpose of proving sewage treatment facilities to the Cana Home Builders Co-Operative in 1973. As a result, the structure erected on the site is functional. It does not feature any notable elements and is not remarkable from a physical or design perspective.
The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant has historical or associative connections to the Cana Home Builders Co-operative and therefore the Roman Catholic Parish of the Holy Name of Jesus. It is known that the Cana Home Builders Co-Operative purchased part of Lot 40, Concession 4 of Pittsburgh Township in 1954. A subdivision of 34 parcels was created; 32 of which have been built upon. A communal well was established to service the subdivision in the 1950s. In 1973, the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant was constructed to service the needs of this small community. The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant is the smallest treatment plant in the City of Kingston.

Although the relationship between the Waste Water Treatment Plant and the community it services is an understood association, it is not of cultural heritage significance. The proportional scale of the community to the Waste Water Treatment Plant would indicate that any infrastructure project specifically associated with the Cana Home Builders Co-Operative would be default have some recognized association. It is unique for a community as small as Cana to have an independent waste water treatment plant; however, the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant itself does not communicate this significance.

The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant is functionally linked to surrounding properties by virtue of its facilities as a waste water treatment plant. This, however, does not constitute contextual value.

While the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant is associated with an identifiable community, it does not have cultural significance. It is not an important place to the local community.

The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant could be considered a landmark in the suburban development by virtue of differing use from surrounding residential dwellings. Any change or site alteration that maintains the existing use of the property would maintain this potential cultural heritage value.

Therefore the evaluation has determined that the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant does not demonstrate sufficient cultural heritage value or interest.

4.2 Cultural Heritage Landscape

Arguably all landscapes are cultural landscapes, due to their palimpsest-like nature that results in the overlaying of historic and contemporary uses and values. In applying the concepts of “cultural landscape” or “cultural heritage landscape” at an international, national, provincial, or local policy level, there is an inherent tension. The concept of “landscape” is dynamic and reflects a multiplicity of narratives. “Cultural heritage landscapes” are especially dynamic in meaning, values, and interpretation. Nevertheless, it must be addressed whether the property as it exists is worthy of conservation and those values implicit within the landscape are worthy of protection.

Cultural landscapes, and cultural heritage landscapes, are key concepts in the cultural heritage field, and the expression of these concepts can be found in a number of key documents. These documents are international, national, provincial, and local in scope. The landscapes themselves are often complex with overlapping meanings over large areas.

At the international level, the United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) has identified cultural landscapes as important elements of international patrimony. In 1992, the World Heritage Convention became the first international legal instrument to recognize and protect cultural landscapes (Akagawa and Sirisrisak 2008, 178). The definition of cultural landscape was intended to be broad, reflecting a
wide variety of potential landscapes and allowing additional and more complex nominations for World Heritage Sites. UNESCO has defined “cultural landscape” as:

…Cultural properties and represent the “combined works of nature and man” designated in Article 1 of the Convention. They are illustrative of the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence of physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of successive social, economic and cultural forces, both external and internal (UNESCO 2010).

As Dailoo and Pannekoek (2008) note, this understanding of the World Heritage Convention reflects an evolution of how heritage is understood as well as a reflection of the inseparability of the concepts of nature and culture.

UNESCO has identified three primary landscape types:

1) The most easily identifiable is the clearly defined landscape designed and created intentionally by man. This embraces garden and parkland landscapes constructed for aesthetic reasons which are often (but not always) associated with religious or other monumental buildings and ensembles.

2) The second category is the organically evolved landscape. This results from an initial social, economic, administrative, and/or religious imperative and has developed its present form by association with an in response to its natural environment. Such landscapes reflect the process of evolution in their form and component features. They fall into two sub-categories:
   a. A relict (or fossil) landscape is one in which an evolutionary process can to an end at some time in the past, either abruptly or over a period. Its significant distinguishing features area, however, still visible in material form; and,
   b. A continuing landscape is one which retains an active social role in contemporary society closely associated with the traditional way of life, and in which the evolutionary process is still in progress. At the same time it exhibits significant material evidence of its evolution over time.

3) The final category is the associative cultural landscape. The inscription of such landscape on the World Heritage List is justifiable by virtue of the powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations of the natural element rather than material cultural evidence, which may be insignificant or even absent (UNESCO 2008).

The importance of cultural landscapes is also reflected by the work of the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) Committee on Cultural Landscapes. This committee has defined “cultural landscape” as:

…Embracing a diversity of manifestations of the interaction between humankind and its natural environment. Cultural landscapes often reflect specific techniques of sustainable land-use, considering the characteristics and limits of the natural environment they are established in, and a specific spiritual relation to nature. Protection of cultural landscapes can contribute to modern techniques of sustainable land-use and can maintain or enhance natural values in the landscape. The continued existence of traditional forms of land-use supports biological diversity in many regions of the world. The protection of traditional cultural landscapes is therefore helpful in maintaining biological diversity (International Scientific Committee on Cultural Landscapes 2010).\(^6\)

---

\(^6\) In response to the World Heritage Nomination of the Rideau Canal, ICOMOS undertook an evaluation in 2006–2007, which included a detailed site inspection by an internationally recognized canal expert. The ICOMOS evaluation identified external development pressures as a key threat to the visual setting of the Rideau Canal, stating that, “the Canal is not under any major threat but that the incremental development over time could impact on the setting of the Canal; that the visual setting of the Canal needs clearer definition and appropriate protection to ensure the visual values of the setting are protected alongside environmental values; and the current rate of monitoring could be extended to include the wider setting of the Canal once key vistas and visual envelopes have been identified” (ICOMOS 2007).
At the national level, Parks Canada has identified landscapes as important cultural heritage resources. Parks Canada *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada* (2011) define a “cultural landscape” as follows:

…Any geographical area that has been modified, influenced or given special cultural meaning by people, and that has been formally recognized for its heritage value. Cultural landscapes are often dynamic, living entities that continually change because of nature and human-influenced social, economic and cultural processes (Parks Canada 2011, 49).

Under the *Provincial Policy Statement (PPS)* (2005), cultural heritage landscapes are defined as key considerations in all planning applications. The *PPS* is issued under the authority of Section 3 of the *Planning Act* and came into effect on March 1, 2005. All planning matters “shall be consistent with” the policy statements issued under the *Planning Act*.

The *PPS* defines a “cultural heritage landscape” as:

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

Echoing UNESCO’s identification of types of cultural landscapes, the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport has identified three main types of cultural heritage landscapes (MTCS 2006). The three main types of cultural heritage landscapes are:

- Designed landscapes: those which have been intentionally designed e.g. a planned garden or in a more urban setting, a downtown square;
- Evolved landscapes: those which have evolved through the use by people and whose activities have directly shaped the landscape or area. This can include a “continuing” landscape where human activities and uses are still on-going, or evolving e.g. residential neighbourhoods or mainstreets; or in a “relict” landscape, where even though an evolutionary process may have come to an end, the landscape remains historically significant e.g. an abandoned mine site or settlement area; and,
- Associative landscapes: those with powerful religious, artistic, or cultural associations of the natural element, as well as those with material cultural evidence e.g. a sacred site within a natural environment or a historic battlefield.

A central concept in heritage conservation is the protection of “significant” resources. Under the *PPS*, “significant” is defined as:

In regard to cultural heritage and archaeology, resources that are valued for the important contribution they make to our understanding of the history of a place, and event, or a people.

To determine a property’s significance, it must be evaluated by criterion that demonstrates the cultural heritage value of the resource in question. In some communities, such as Caledon, Ontario, a mechanism for
undertaking such an evaluation has been developed. For the evaluation of the cultural landscape associated with the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant, the Town of Caledon model will be applied. In Criteria for the Identification of Cultural Heritage Landscapes in the Town of Caledon, the report clearly indicates that “While... the response to cultural heritage landscapes is often initially intuitive, it is necessary to ensure that such areas, rather than simply being picturesque, have true heritage significance and have retained their essential integrity” (Town of Caledon 2003, 1). Indeed, to be identified as a cultural heritage landscape, a property must truly demonstrate heritage significance and integrity.

For determining heritage significance the following criteria are identified as those against which a potential cultural heritage landscape must be examined. Considering the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport’s definitions of a cultural heritage landscape, the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant site would be considered a designed landscape, as a suburban development, and as an evolved landscape, to acknowledge on-going human activities on the site. Based on the Town of Caledon’s criteria, there are nine potential indicators of cultural heritage value. These include:

a) Is associated with events that made significant contributions to the broad patterns of history (at any level – local, regional, national, etc.) i.e. strong association with central themes;

b) Is closely associated with the lives of individuals and/or families who are considered significant to the history of the area;

c) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a particular settlement pattern or lifeway whether derived from an ethnic background, imposed by the landscape, was the practice of a specific historic period or a combination of the above;

d) Manifests a particularly close and harmonious long-standing relationship between the natural and domestic landscape;

e) Has yielded or is likely to yield information important to prehistory or history;

f) Is strongly associated with the cultural and/or spiritual traditions of First Nations or any other ethnic and/or religious group;

g) Is a representative example of a distinctive style (trend, movement, or school of theory) tradition, time period, or method of construction;

h) Represents the work of a recognized master gardener, landscape architect, planner, architect, or horticulturalist; or,

i) Possesses high artistic values or, as a whole, represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction (Town of Caledon 2003).

In this case, the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant has an association with the Cana Home Builders Co-Operative, which constructed the facility in 1973. The property has historical associations with the Bradden family who owned the land in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The Cana Subdivision is also able, in general, to communicate post-war suburban planning ideals, as a practice of a specific historical period. However, it is not a good representative example of suburban development and there is no known associated planner or architect. Better examples of post-war suburban developments exist within the City of Kingston,
including Alamein Drive and Elliott Avenue. The property does not manifest a relationship between the natural and domestic landscape and is not recognized as possessing high artistic values. The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant property has limited potential to yield information important to prehistory or history.\(^7\) The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant and the Cana Subdivision is associated with the Roman Catholic Church, under the auspices of which the subdivision was constructed. The site has continued to change through the construction of homes and the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant, demonstrating characteristics of an evolved landscape, however of minimal significance.

As four criteria have been identified as potentially applicable, the next test that must be applied is integrity. These are several actions that can serve to undermine the integrity of a cultural landscape. These include the encroachment of some types of new development into the cultural landscape; through alterations such as public works including the widening of roadways, and the loss of significant elements of the property. In the case of the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant, the integrity of the cultural landscape has not been negatively impact; however, it remains to be of little significance.

As discussed above, significance plays a central role in determining cultural heritage value. The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant is not valued by the local community. It may be a cultural landscape, however, it is not a significant cultural heritage landscape of any nature and does not constitute any cultural heritage significance, therefore does not justify any level of protection.

### 4.3 Rideau Canal

When discussing the Rideau Canal, a number of names can be applied. Each naming convention reflects a different jurisdictional perspective in regards to the Rideau Canal. The following apply:

- **Rideau Canal World Heritage Site** is the site inscribed on UNESCO’s World Heritage List and includes the Rideau Canal and the Tay Canal, as well as Fort Henry and the Kingston Fortifications National Historic Sites. The Statement of Outstanding Universal Value has been attached as Appendix A.

- **Rideau Canal** is the Rideau Canal National Historic Site of Canada, which includes the navigable waterway system, including the engineering works and Parks Canada administered lands. The Commemorative Integrity Statement has been attached as Appendix B.

- **Rideau Waterway** is the waterway designated as a Canadian Heritage River which includes the Rideau Canal, the Rideau River in Ottawa and the Tay Canal. The Nomination Values have been attached as Appendix C.

- **Rideau Corridor** describes the broader setting of the Rideau Canal, including the communities, roadways and landscapes along its length that are visually, historically, social or economically associated with the waterway. *Cultural Landscape of the Rideau Canal Corridor Phase II Study* is forthcoming.

A 30-metre zone has been identified by the City of Kingston *Official Plan* and the *National Historic Site Management Plan* defines the sphere of influence for the Rideau Canal. Development with the potential to impact the views extending 30-metres inland from the Rideau Canal should be evaluated to ensure that development or

---

\(^7\) The Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (2010) determined the property and surrounding area consist of low-lying land with low potential for archaeological sites or discoveries. The lands immediately south of the existing Waste Water Treatment Plant were disturbed during construction, and subsequent demolition of septic tank and leaching bed. A Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment has not been recommended.
site alteration does not negatively impact the cultural heritage values or heritage attributes of the Rideau Canal. This HIS was initiated by the proximity of the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant to the Rideau Canal.

Existing vegetation obstructs a clear view of the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant when observed from Canal Drive (Image 16, p. 40). When combined with the existing residential properties between Canal Drive and the Canal, this effectively screens any visual impacts of the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant. As a result, there is minimal impact on views from Colonel By Lake and the Rideau Canal.

Image 16: View of the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant from Canal Drive. Natural vegetation screens the waste water treatment plant, mitigating views of the facility from Colonel By Lake.
5.0 DESCRIPTION OF THE OVERALL PROJECT

The future Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant will utilize the sequencing batch reactor process to treat wastewater received from the community. This plant will consist of a pumping well with two pumps that raise sewage to the process level, and through screening and grit removal systems. Wastewater would then remain in an aerated equalization tank until it could be pumped into one of the two sequencing batch reactor tanks for treatment. Following the sequencing batch reactors, wastewater would pass into another equalization tank before being injected with a coagulant and filtered through a sand filter. Finally, the effluent would be disinfected using UV light before being released to the watercourse. Solids generated in the sequencing batch reactor process would be stored onsite in a dedicated aerobic digestion tank and would be hauled away for further processing.

The new sequencing batch reactor plant will fit within the existing property boundary at the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant and would allow the existing plant to remain in service during the construction and commissioning of the new facility. The existing plant would then be taken offline and demolished once the new facility is in operation.

It is proposed that a new building will be built to house the new tanks and process equipment for this upgrade. The footprint of this new building is expected to be larger than that of the existing, mainly because of the elevated configuration of the new sequencing batch reactor tanks as compared to the existing below-grade basins. The new building would have a footprint in the range of 100-150 m², and will be a one-storey building. The exact building dimensions and layout are to be determined during the detailed design phase.
6.0 CONSIDERATION OF IMPACTS

The proposed project undertaking involves the demolition of the existing Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant.

Following the review of the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant property against the criteria of Regulation 9/06 using the Evaluative Template developed by the City of Kingston, it has been demonstrated that the property should not be listed or designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. As a result, there is no legislative reason from a cultural heritage perspective that the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant cannot be demolished.

Any potential significance and associations of the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant with the Cana Subdivision will be maintained in the construction of a replacement waste treatment facility. The replacement will maintain the functional connections and associations of the existing facility. The service area of the waste treatment facility is not anticipated to be expanded. The replacement of the existing Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant continues the function of the site.

The primary concern regarding the construction of a new Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant is the potential to impact the cultural heritage values of the Rideau Canal. This primarily concerns views to and from Colonel By Lake. However, no specific views have been identified as relevant to the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant. The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant is separated from Colonel By Lake by vegetation, a ditch, a road, mature landscaping, and detached residential dwellings along Canal Drive. Images 2 and 14 articulate the effectiveness of vegetative screening to curtain the western elevation of the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant.
7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Alternative Design Options

New construction that will have an adverse visual impact on the heritage attributes of cultural heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes should be mitigated by the design and site of the new construction. When considering the design of the new Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant, it is recommended that the building be designed to fit within the existing property boundaries and of a consistent scale, meaning a one storey building, where waste water treatment facilities are located inside. Although the exact building dimensions and layout will be determined during the detailed design phase, it is expected that the new building will have a footprint in the range of 100-150 m². The building enclosure should be designed to incorporate natural colours to blend in with the neighbourhood and landscape.

Additional vegetative screening should be planted to minimize any visual impact of the new Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant. Evergreens should be planted along the west boundary of the site to mitigate the visual impacts as a result of the new building construction. Evergreen vegetation material is suggested to provide year-round cover. Vegetation should be planted following the completion of construction. Should mature vegetation be removed during the construction process, such vegetative material should be replanted following the completion of construction activities.

7.2 Implementation and Monitoring

The planting of vegetative screening should be implemented.

Following the completion of construction activities, municipal heritage staff should be notified and inspect the property to ensure no unanticipated adverse impacts on the cultural heritage values of the Rideau Canal have been experienced.

7.3 Summary

In summary, the following actions are recommended:

- The new Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant should be designed to fit within the existing site boundaries;
- The new building should be one storey in height;
- The building enclosure should be designed to incorporate natural colours to blend in with the neighbourhood and landscape;
- Evergreen vegetative screening is recommended to mask the visual impact of the new Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant from the Rideau Canal;
- Parks Canada should be consulted regarding the project in accordance with the City of Kingston’s Official Plan policies; and,
- Following the completion of construction activities, municipal heritage staff should be notified and inspect the property to ensure there are no unanticipated adverse impacts on the Rideau Canal.
8.0 IMPORTANT INFORMATION AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS REPORT

This report has been prepared for the specific site, design objective, developments and purpose described to Golder by J. L. Richards & Associates Limited. The factual data, interpretations and recommendations pertain to a specific project as described in this report and are not applicable to any other project or site location. The information, recommendations and opinions expressed in this report are for the sole benefit of J. L. Richards & Associates Limited. No other party may use or rely on this report or any portion thereof without Golder’s express written consent. If the report was prepared to be included for a specific permit application process, then upon the reasonable request of J. L. Richards & Associates Limited, Golder may authorize in writing the use of this report by the regulatory agency as an approved user for the specific and identified purpose of the applicable permit review process. Any other use of this report by others is prohibited and is without responsibility to Golder. The report, all plans, data, drawings and other documents as well as all electronic media prepared by Golder are considered its professional work product and shall remain the copyright property of Golder, who authorizes only J. L. Richards & Associates Limited and approved users to make copies of the report, but only in such quantities as are reasonably necessary for the use of the report by those parties. J. L. Richards & Associates Limited and approved users may not give, lend, sell, or otherwise make available the report or any portion thereof to any other party without the express written permission of Golder. Golder acknowledges the electronic media is susceptible to unauthorized modification, deterioration and incompatibility and therefore of J. L. Richards & Associates Limited cannot rely upon the electronic media versions of Golder’s report or other work products.

Unless otherwise stated, the suggestions, recommendations and opinions given in this report are intended only for the guidance of J. L. Richards & Associates Limited in the design of the specific project.

This report is also subject to the following limitations:

- Soundsscapes, cultural identity, and sense of place analysis were not integrated into this report; and,
- The review of the policy/legislation was limited to that information directly related to cultural heritage management; it is not a comprehensive planning review and zoning was not examined.
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APPENDIX A
Rideau Canal World Heritage Site - Statement of Outstanding Universal Value
Rideau Canal World Heritage Site
Statement of Outstanding Universal Value

In concept, design, and engineering, the Rideau Canal is the most outstanding surviving example of an early 19th century slackwater canal system in the world and one of the first canals designed specifically for steam-powered vessels. It is an exceptional example of the transfer of European transportation technology and its ingenious advancement in the North American environment. A rare instance of a canal built primarily for strategic military purposes, the Rideau Canal, together with its ensemble of military fortifications, illustrates the significant stage in human history when Great Britain and the United States of America vied for the control of the northern portion of the North American continent.
APPENDIX B

Rideau Canal National Historic Site of Canada - Commemorative Integrity Statement
Rideau Canal National Historic Site of Canada

Commemorative Integrity Statement

In the case of the Rideau Canal, the designated place consists of lands and waters under the jurisdiction of Parks Canada including the bed of the Rideau Canal to the high water mark between the Ottawa River and the harbour in Kingston.

While the designated place describes the boundary of the Canal in terms of identifying the level on cultural resources, it is important to note that there are historic values of the Canal system and its environment that extend beyond the administered Canal lands and waters. Significant view sheds, visual linkages and associative values encompass a variety of urban, rural and natural areas adjacent to the Canal. The following identifies the associated lands of particular importance to the values of the Rideau Canal; these include but are not restricted to [abridged]:

- The views from the Canal and Canal lands to the heritage shore-lands and communities at Davis Lock, Jones Falls, Upper and Lower Brewers and Kingston Mills lockstations.

The Rideau Canal as a designated place is valued for:

- The engineering achievement of the construction of the canal;
- Its continuous seasonal operation since 1832;
- The survival and integrity of the Canal system with the majority of its original built resources intact;
- The continuity and integrity of the lockstations and the sense of a complete “system” that these stations convey;
- The historic, ecological and visual associations with the certain shore-lands and communities along the waterway which contributes to the unique historical environment of the Canal;
- The extensive wetlands and lakes of the Canal which reveal the relationship between Canal construction and the natural environment and which are an integral part of the unique historical environment of the waterway.

The designated place will be unimpaired or not under threat when:

- Through navigation of the Canal system is maintained to help assure the preservation of the unique historical environment and safeguard the level one cultural resources;
- The cultural resources related to the military period are safeguarded according to Parks Canada’s Cultural Resource Management [CRM] Policy;
- The existing manual mode of operations of locks, dams and weirs on the system is maintained;
- The visual relationship between the Canal and the heritage landscape in the central core of Ottawa remains evident and intact;
- The views and visual linkages which enhance the military character of the Kingston harbour landscape and portray the relationship between the fortifications, the harbour and the Canal remains evident and intact;
The heritage character of the corridor shore-lands are safeguarded from inappropriate development or uses;

The visual relationship between the Merrickville Blockhouse and the heritage landscape adjacent to the site remains intact;

The heritage character of those identified corridor communities are safeguarded;

The landmarks, view scapes and natural ecosystem features of the Canal’s islands, shore-lands and wetlands that are related to the construction of the Canal and which are part of the Canal’s unique historical environment are safeguarded;

The level one historic values of the designated place are effectively communicated to the public.
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Rideau Waterway Canadian Heritage River System

Nomination Values

The Rideau Waterway was designated as a Canadian heritage River for its outstanding human (cultural) heritage and recreation values. In the Rideau Waterway Nomination Document (1999), the cultural heritage values were described according to the themes outlined in A Cultural Framework for Canadian Heritage Rivers, 1997. These included the following:

- Rideau, A Landscape of Contrasts;
- Resource Harvesting: Aboriginal Peoples;
- Riparian Settlement: Siting of Dwellings;
- Water Transportation: River Navigation – Navigational Improvements;
- Water Transportation: River Navigation – Passenger and Commercial Transportation;
- Riparian Settlement: Community Adaptations to Rivers;
- Cultural and Recreation: Artistic Expression; and,
- Environmental Regulations: Early Flood Control Structures.

The Rideau Waterway Nomination Document identified Parks Canada’s Commemorative Integrity Statement for the Rideau Canal National Historic Site of Canada as a key tool through which to access the integrity of cultural heritage values of the Rideau Waterway. It provides a framework through which to report on the state of cultural heritage values.

The Rideau Waterway Nomination Document also described the Rideau Waterway’s recreation values according to themes, as follows:

- Boating;
- Fishing and hunting;
- Hiking;
- Swimming and water skiing;
- Nature appreciation; and,
- Heritage appreciation.

Because of its very nature as an engineered waterway with locks, dams and other man-made structures throughout the system, the Rideau could not be considered for nomination on its natural heritage values. According to CHRS natural integrity criteria, Canadian Heritage Rivers should not have any man-made impoundments within the nominated sections.
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Evaluation Form for Individual Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest
EVALUATION FORM FOR INDIVIDUAL PROPERTIES OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST

This document is designed to be compliant with the requirements of Section 27 of the Ontario Heritage Act R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18 and Ontario Heritage Act Regulation 9/06. It is also designed to address questions raised concerning cultural heritage value and interest under Section 2.6.1 and 2.6.3 of the Provincial Policy Statement (2005), under the Ontario Heritage Act R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18, and Section 2(d) of the Planning Act R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13.

Property Location
Civic Address: Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant
(1756 Cana Boulevard, City of Kingston, Ontario)

Evaluator: Kyle Gonyou, Golder Associates Ltd.

Date of Site Visit: April 5, 2013

Date Evaluated: April 15, 2013

This document is to be read in conjunction with the rest of the Heritage Impact Statement and in conjunction with the Built Structures Forms (attached). More detailed information about each of the various criteria is discussed in detail in these preceding parts of the Heritage Impact Statement.

ACTION: □ Add to Inventory □ Designate □ Take no action □ X Other: Not eligible for designation or listing under the OHA
CRITERIA: DESIGN AND PHYSICAL VALUE

Ontario Heritage Act Regulation 9/06 states the following:
A property may be designated under Section 29 of the [Ontario Heritage] Act if it meets one or more of the following criteria for determining whether it is of cultural heritage value or interest:

1. The property has design value or physical value because it:
   (i) Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method;
   (ii) Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit; and/or
   (iii) Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.

This document was developed to evaluate the physical and design attributes of a property identified as possibly having cultural heritage value or interest.

The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant is located on a property at the northern end of Cana Boulevard. A gravel driveway extends from the road to the waste water treatment facilities, which are set at rear (west) end of the property. The property is covered in scrub grass and low brush. Only grass on either side of the driveway appears to be regularly maintained. A small, unnamed creek runs to the north of the site. The effluent from the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant flows into this watercourse, and into Colonel By Lake. The waste water treatment facilities are enclosed by a chain link fence that is topped by barbed wire. The surface of the enclosed area is covered in loose gravel and pockets of grassy vegetation. The main access gate is located at the east-end of the site, where the driveway is located. A weather monitoring station is mounted on a pole located at the northwest corner of the fenced area. A ditch and vegetation separate the Cana Waste Water Treatment from Canal Drive to the extreme west of the property.

A small building houses the electrical and mechanical systems of the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant, including the blower motors for aeration, chlorine cylinders and station controls. It may be located above the wet well. It is a single storey square plan building. The basement of the structure is unknown; the foundation appears to be constructed of concrete. The structure is clad in brown stretcher-bond brick. The roof is flat with metal parapet flashing. A downspout is located at the southeast corner of the structure. A chimney or ventilation stack is located on the western elevation. The only access point to the interior of the building is located at the west corner of the north elevation. It has a flat structural opening with no trim. The door is a single leaf with a rectangular louvered vent in the lower portion of the door. Danger and caution signs are posted on the door. A concrete stoop, flush with the ground level, is located at the door. There are no windows. Metering and lighting are affixed to the exterior of the structure on all elevations. A white sign with black lettering is attached to the eastern elevation, identifying the building as the “Cana Sewage Treatment Plant.”

The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant is an extended aeration treatment facility. The wet well may be located within the building on the site. A below grade tank, constructed of steel, contains the wastewater treatment process, including the aeration tank, the clarifier, and the chlorine contact tank. These three main elements are open.

The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant was constructed for the purpose of proving sewage treatment facilities to the Cana Home Builders Co-Operative in 1973. As a result, the structure erected on the site is utilitarian with no ornamentation. It does not feature any notable elements and is not remarkable from a physical or design perspective.
HERITAGE IMPACT STATEMENT - CANA WASTE WATER TREATMENT PLANT

CRITERIA: HISTORICAL VALUE OR ASSOCIATIVE VALUE

Ontario Heritage Act Regulation 9/06 stated the following:

A property may be designated under Section 29 of the [Ontario Heritage] Act if it meets one or more of the following criteria for determining whether it is of cultural heritage value or interest:

2. The property 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.

This document was developed to evaluate the historical value or associative value attributes of a property identified as possibly having cultural heritage value or interest.

The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant has historical or associative connections to the Cana Home Builders Co-operative, and therefore the Roman Catholic Parks of the Holy Name of Jesus. Little information is available on the Cana Home Builders Co-Operative. It is known that the Cana Home Builders Co-Operative purchased part of Lot 40, Concession 4 of Pittsburgh Township in 1954. A subdivision of 34 parcels was created; 32 of which have been built upon. A communal well was established to service the subdivision in the 1950s. In 1973, the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant was constructed to service the needs of this small community. The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant is the smallest treatment plant in the City of Kingston.

Although the relationship between the Waste Water Treatment Plant and the community it services is an understood association, it is not of cultural heritage significance. The proportional scale of the community to the Waste Water Treatment Plant would indicate that any infrastructure project specifically associated with the Cana Home Builders Co-Operative would be default have some recognized association. It is unique for a community as small as Cana to have an independent waste water treatment plant; however the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant itself does not communicate this significance.
CRITERIA: CONTEXTUAL VALUE

Ontario Heritage Act Regulation 9/06 stated the following:

A property may be designated under Section 29 of the [Ontario Heritage] Act if it meets one or more of the following criteria for determining whether it is of cultural heritage value or interest:

2. The property 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. O.Reg. 9/06, s.1(2).

This document was developed to evaluate the contextual value of a property identified as possibly having cultural heritage value or interest.

The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant is functionally linked to surrounding properties by virtue of its facilities as a waste water treatment plant. This, however, does not constitute contextual value. In the replacement of the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant, the functional connection to the Cana Subdivision will be continued.

While the Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant is associated with an identifiable community, it does not have cultural significance. It is not an important place to the local community.

The Cana Waste Water Treatment Plant could be considered a landmark in the suburban development by virtue of differing use from surrounding residential dwellings. Any change or site alteration that maintains the existing use of the property would maintain this potential cultural heritage value.
**CRITERIA EVALUATION**

(1) **DESIGN VALUE**

How well does the place serve as a physical record of its time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STYLE / TYPE / TRADITION</td>
<td>What is strength of the place as an expression of a design style, design type or design tradition? What is the recognized design style, type of tradition? In the context of comparative places of this design style, type or tradition, how well does this place illustrate the style, type or tradition?</td>
<td>(1) Excellent (2) Very Good (3) Good / Contextual (4) Fair / Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNCTION (Technical and Scientific Achievement)</td>
<td>What is the strength of the place as an expression of a functional design approach that reflects the historic use(s) of the property? What is the historic functional design approach of the place? In the context of comparative places that use this functional design approach, how well does this place illustrate the functional design approach?</td>
<td>(1) Excellent (2) Very Good (3) Good / Contextual (4) Fair / Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FABRIC (Materials and Craftsmanship)</td>
<td>How well does the place serve as documentary evidence of historical materials and construction techniques? What the historical materials or construction techniques? In the context of comparative examples of these historical materials or construction techniques, how well does this place illustrate these materials or techniques?</td>
<td>(1) Excellent (2) Very Good (3) Good / Contextual (4) Fair / Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### (2) HISTORICAL / ASSOCIATIVE VALUE
How strong are the connections between the place and its related historic themes, cultural patterns, people, events or organizations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HISTORIC THEME</strong></td>
<td>What is the strength of the place’s association with a broad historic theme and/or with the historic evolution of the area?</td>
<td>(1) Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the associated historic theme?</td>
<td>(2) Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How significant is this theme or pattern in the history of the province or the community?</td>
<td>(3) Good / Contextual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the context of comparative places associated with this theme how well does this place illustrate the theme or pattern?</td>
<td>(4) Fair / Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PERSON / EVENT / ORGANIZATION</strong></td>
<td>What is the strength of the place’s association to an historic person, event or organization of significance?</td>
<td>(1) Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who or what is the historic person, event or organization?</td>
<td>(2) Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How significant is the person, event or organization in the community?</td>
<td>(3) Good / Contextual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the context of comparative places associated with this person, event or organization, how direct is the association with this place.</td>
<td>(4) Fair / Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULTURAL UNDERSTANDING / PATTERN</strong></td>
<td>How deeply does the place contribute to the understanding of a current or past community?</td>
<td>(1) Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What community is represented by the place and what kind and extent of knowledge does it provide concerning this community?</td>
<td>(2) Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How does it compare to other sites associated with this community?</td>
<td>(3) Good / Contextual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Fair / Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMBODIES IDEAS / CONCEPTS OF DESIGNER</strong></td>
<td>How closely is the place associated with a particular designer—architect, builder, landscape architect, engineer artisan, or theorist?</td>
<td>(1) Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In what ways does the place embody the ideas / concepts of a designer?</td>
<td>(2) Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How well does the place convey the designer’s concepts comparative to other places?</td>
<td>(3) Good / Contextual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Fair / Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CONTEXTUAL VALUE
How important is the place to the community?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCIAL MEANING</td>
<td>What is the social value of the place to an identifiable community?</td>
<td>(1) Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In what way is (or was) this place significant to an identifiable community (eg. Symbolic meaning, ongoing use for community or sacred events, etc.)</td>
<td>(2) Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the social, religious or geographic community that considers this place significant?</td>
<td>(3) Good / Contextual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the context of comparative places, how important is this place to the community?</td>
<td>(4) Fair / Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRONMENT</td>
<td>What strength of the place in contributing to the character of its surroundings?</td>
<td>(1) Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is the character of the place’s surroundings?</td>
<td>(2) Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How important is the place in contributing to the character of its surrounding? Is it a landmark?</td>
<td>(3) Good / Contextual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Fair / Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EVALUATION SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

In order for the property to be considered as having sufficient cultural value for placement on a Heritage Inventory it should have received the following accumulated minimum grades:

(1) Excellent - in any one criteria and/or
(2) Very Good - in any two criteria and/or
(3) Good / Contextual - in any three criteria

NOTE: Exceeding these levels may suggest the potential for immediate designation.

RECOMMENDATIONS (Transfer to cover sheet)

☐ List and Designate

☐ List

☐ No Further Action Required

☐ X OTHER – not eligible for designation or listing under the OHA
As a global, employee-owned organisation with over 50 years of experience, Golder Associates is driven by our purpose to engineer earth's development while preserving earth's integrity. We deliver solutions that help our clients achieve their sustainable development goals by providing a wide range of independent consulting, design and construction services in our specialist areas of earth, environment and energy.

For more information, visit golder.com