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Executive Summary

The Executive Summary summarizes only the key points of the report. For a complete account of the results and conclusions, as well as the limitations of this study, the reader should examine the report in full.

In February 2017, The Municipal Infrastructure Group (TMIG) retained Golder Associates Ltd. (Golder) on behalf of Durham Region to conduct a Cultural Heritage Assessment Report as part of a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment for proposed improvement of the intersection of Taunton Road (Regional Road 4) and Regional Road 57, Municipality of Clarington. Golder’s report identified 2432 Taunton Road as a property of potential cultural heritage value or interest and recommended a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) be conducted to determine whether conservation or mitigation measures were required as part of the intersection improvements. The 1.6-hectare property includes a storey-and-a-half brick farmhouse possibly built in the late-19th century, and a gambrel-roofed timber frame barn that partially encroaches on the public right-of-way.

TMIG subsequently retained Golder to conduct the CHER in August 2018 with a scope of study limited to investigation and evaluation of the barn since it is within the right-of-way and the only structure to be impacted by the proposed project. Following guidelines provided by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, this CHER identifies the applicable heritage policies and guidance, summarizes the property’s geographic and historical context, provides a description of existing conditions and a comparative analysis of the barn, and an evaluation of the barn using the criteria prescribed in Ontario Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act.

This CHER concludes that:

- **The barn does not have cultural heritage value or interest, and is not considered a potential heritage attribute of 2432 Taunton Road.**

Golder therefore recommends that:

- **The barn can be demolished with no further study or documentation prior to road improvements within the public right of way.**

To meet Golder’s corporate goals for environmental sustainability, it is also recommended that as much useable material from the barn be salvaged rather than be deposited in landfill.
Study Limitations

Golder Associates Ltd. has prepared this report in a manner consistent with the guidance developed by the Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, Culture Division, Programs and Services Branch, Heritage Program Unit, subject to the time limits and physical constraints applicable to this report. No other warranty, expressed or implied is made.

This report has been prepared for the specific site, design objective, developments and purpose described to Golder Associates Ltd., by TMIG (the Client). 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 the Client. No other party may use or rely on this report or any portion thereof without Golder Associates Ltd.’s express written consent. If the report was prepared to be included for a specific permit application process, then upon the reasonable request of the Client, Golder Associates Ltd. 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 Associates Ltd. The report, all plans, data, drawings and other documents as well as electronic media prepared by Golder Associates Ltd. are considered its professional work product and shall remain the copyright property of Golder Associates Ltd., who authorizes only the Client 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. The Client 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 Associates Ltd. The Client acknowledges the electronic media is susceptible to unauthorized modification, deterioration and incompatibility and therefore the Client cannot rely upon the electronic media versions of Golder Associates Ltd.’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 the Client in the design of the specific project.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

In February 2017, The Municipal Infrastructure Group (TMIG) retained Golder Associates Ltd. (Golder) on behalf of Durham Region to conduct a Cultural Heritage Assessment Report as part of a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment for proposed improvement of the intersection of Taunton Road (Regional Road 4) and Regional Road 57, Municipality of Clarington. Golder’s report identified 2432 Taunton Road as a property of potential cultural heritage value or interest and recommended a Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (CHER) be conducted to determine whether conservation or mitigation measures were required as part of the intersection improvements. The 1.6-hectare property includes a storey-and-a-half brick farmhouse possibly built in the late-19th century, and a gambrel-roofed timber frame barn that partially encroaches on the public right-of-way (Figure 1).

TMIG subsequently retained Golder to conduct the CHER in August 2018. Following guidelines provided by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS), this CHER provides:

- A background on the purpose and requirements of a CHER, and the methods used to investigate and evaluate cultural heritage resources;
- An overview of the property’s geographic context, and its documentary and structural history;
- An inventory of built and landscape elements on the property and an evaluation of the barn for cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI) using the criteria prescribed in Ontario Regulation 9/06 (O. Reg 9/06); and,
- Recommendations for future action.
2.0 SCOPE & METHOD

The scope of the CHER was limited to the barn as it is within the right-of-way and the only structure to be impacted by the proposed project, and was conducted with the objectives to:

- Determine if the barn meets the criteria for CHVI as prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06 and could be considered a potential heritage attribute of 2432 Taunton Road; and,
- Recommend next steps based on the results of the O. Reg. 9/06 evaluation.

To meet the study’s objectives, Golder:

- Searched archival and secondary sources to understand the property’s land use history;
- Reviewed applicable municipal heritage policies and consulted with local municipal planners responsible for heritage;
- Conducted field investigations of the barn’s interior and exterior and farmhouse exterior, as well as the setting and nearby properties to identify any heritage attributes and to understand the wider built and landscape context;
- Evaluated the barn for cultural heritage value or interest; and,
- Developed recommendations for future action based on applicable international, federal, provincial, and municipal conservation guidance.

Several primary and secondary sources, including historic maps, aerial imagery, photographs, research articles, and local histories were compiled from the Ontario Archives, local history collections, and online sources.

Field investigations were conducted on November 5, 2018 by Cultural Heritage Specialist Ragavan Nithiyanantham (M.A., CAHP), which included photo-documenting the interior and exterior of the barn, the exterior of the farmhouse, and surrounding setting with a Samsung Galaxy S8. A Canadian Inventory of Historic Buildings Recording Form (Parks Canada Agency 1980) was used to document the structures, and the setting was recorded in written notes. This report primarily uses the terms presented by Noble & Cleek (2014) for barn form and construction and Sobon (2004) for timber-framing.

This desktop research and field data was compiled to provide sufficient background to inform evaluation of the property using the criteria prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06 (described in Section 3.2.3 and provided in Section 6.0). The report sections relevant to each criterion are listed in Table 1.

**Table 1: Report organization in relation to the O. Reg. 9/06 criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O. Reg. 9/06 general criteria</th>
<th>Report Sections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Design value or physical value</td>
<td>5.2 &amp; 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Historical value or associative value</td>
<td>2.1, 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Contextual value</td>
<td>2.1, 4.1, 5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other widely recognized provincial, national, and international manuals related to evaluating heritage value were also consulted for ‘best practice’ approaches, including:

- *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties – Heritage Identification & Evaluation Process* (MTCS 2014);
- *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada* (Canada’s Historic Places 2010);
- *Well-Preserved: The Ontario Heritage Foundation’s Manual of Principles and Practice for Architectural Conservation* (Fram 2003);
- *The Evaluation of Historic Buildings and Heritage Planning: Principles and Practice* (Kalman 1979 & 2014);

### 2.1 Record of Consultation

Table 1 lists the results of consultation conducted for this CHER.

**Table 2: Results of consultation.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Date of Contact</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laura Hatcher, MCIP, RPP Heritage Planner, Heritage Planner, MTCS</td>
<td>October 10, 2018. Email and telephone: Golder requested clarification on the requirement to conduct a CHER as part of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment</td>
<td>October 10, 2018. Telephone &amp; email: Ms. Hatcher confirmed the CHER is within the scope of a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment as per the Municipal Class EA Manual.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Addington, Planner II, Special Projects Branch Municipality of Clarington</td>
<td>November 14, 2018. Email: Golder queried if the municipality has any information on the barn and whether it is considered a cultural heritage resource.</td>
<td>November 15, 2018. Email: Mr. Addington stated that he had discussed the barn with Brandon Weiler at Durham Region and that he had not identified any concerns. He stated that from a zoning perspective it would be a non-conforming structure and is concerned about its structural integrity. He also noted that there was no information on the barn on file and that it is not currently listed on the municipal cultural heritage inventory.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.0 POLICY FRAMEWORK

The property is subject to a number of federal, provincial and municipal heritage planning and policy regimes, as well as guidance developed at the federal and international level. Although these have varying levels of priority, all are considered for decision-making in the cultural heritage environment. The relevant guidance, legislation, and policies are described below.

3.1 Federal and International Heritage Policies

No federal heritage policies apply to the property, but many provincial and municipal policies align in approach to the Canada’s Historic Places Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada (Canada’s Historic Places 2010), which was drafted in response to international and national agreements such as the 1964 International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (Venice Charter), 1979 Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance (Burra Charter, updated 2013), and 1983 Canadian Appleton Charter for the Protection and Enhancement of the Built Environment. The national Standards and Guidelines defines three conservation ‘treatments’ — preservation, rehabilitation, and restoration — and outlines the process, and required and recommended actions, to meet the objectives for each treatment for a range of cultural heritage resources.

At the international level, the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) has developed guidance for identifying and conducting heritage impact assessments for world heritage properties, which provide general advice for all historic assets (ICOMOS 2011).

3.2 Provincial Legislation & Policies

3.2.1 Environmental Assessment Act and Municipal Class Environmental Assessments

The Environmental Assessment Act (EAA) was legislated to ensure that Ontario’s environment is protected, conserved, and wisely managed. Under the EAA, ‘environment’ includes not only natural elements such as air, land, water and plant and animal life, but also the ‘social, economic and cultural conditions that influence the life of humans or a community’, and ‘any building, structure, machine or other device or thing made by humans’. To determine the potential environmental effects of a new development, the Environmental Assessment (EA) process was created to standardize decision-making. For municipal road, water, and wastewater projects this decision-making is streamlined in the ‘Class’ EA process, which divides routine activities with predictable environmental effects into four ‘schedules’ (Government of Ontario 2014; MCEA 2015).

3.2.2 Planning Act and Provincial Policy Statement

The Ontario Planning Act (1990) and associated Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 (PPS 2014) provide the legislative imperative for heritage conservation in land use planning. These identify conservation of resources of significant architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological, or scientific interest as a provincial interest, and PPS 2014 recognizes that protecting cultural heritage and archaeological resources has economic, environmental, and social benefits, and contributes to the long-term prosperity, environmental health, and social well-being of Ontarians. The Planning Act serves to integrate this interest with planning decisions at the provincial and municipal level, and states that all decisions affecting land use planning ‘shall be consistent with’ PPS 2014.

The importance of identifying and evaluating built heritage and cultural heritage landscapes is recognized in two sections of PPS 2014:
Section 2.6.1 – ‘Significant built heritage resources and significant heritage landscapes shall be conserved’;

Section 2.6.3 – ‘Planning authorities shall not permit development and site alteration on adjacent lands to protected heritage property except where the proposed development and site alteration has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved.’

PPS 2014 defines significant as resources ‘determined to have cultural heritage value or interest for the important contribution they make to our understanding of the history of a place, an event, or a people’, and conserved as ‘the identification, protection, management and use of built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes, and archaeological resources in a manner that ensures their cultural heritage value or interest is retained under the Ontario Heritage Act.’ Adjacent lands are defined as ‘those lands contiguous to a protected heritage property or as otherwise defined in the municipal official plan’. Built heritage resources, cultural heritage landscapes, heritage attributes, and protected heritage property are also defined in the PPS:

- **Built heritage resources**: a building, structure, monument, installation or any manufactured remnant that contributes to a property’s cultural heritage value or interest as identified by a community, including an Aboriginal [Indigenous] community. Built heritage resources are generally located on property that has been designated under Parts IV or V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, or included on local, provincial and/or federal registers.

- **Cultural heritage landscapes**: a defined geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Aboriginal [Indigenous] community. The area may involve features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or association. Examples may 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, viewsheds, natural areas and industrial complexes of heritage significance; and areas recognized by federal or international designation authorities (e.g., a National Historic Site or District designation, or a UNESCO World Heritage Site).

- **Heritage attribute**: the principal features or elements that contribute to a protected heritage property’s cultural heritage value or interest, and may include the property’s built or manufactured elements, as well as natural landforms, vegetation, water features, and its visual setting (including significant views or vistas to or from a protected heritage property).

- **Protected heritage property**: property designated under Parts IV, V or VI of the *Ontario Heritage Act*; property subject to a heritage conservation easement under Parts II or IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*; property identified by the Province and prescribed public bodies as provincial heritage property under the Standards and Guidelines for Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties; property protected under federal legislation, and UNESCO World Heritage Sites.

For municipalities, PPS 2014 is implemented through an Official Plan, which may outline further heritage policies (see Section 3.3).

### 3.2.3 The *Ontario Heritage Act* and *Ontario Regulation 9/06*

The Province and municipalities and are enabled to conserve significant individual properties and areas through the *Ontario Heritage Act (OHA)*. Under Part III of the *OHA*, compliance with the *Standards and Guidelines for the*
Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties is mandatory for Provincially-owned and administered heritage properties and holds the same authority for ministries and prescribed public bodies as a Management Board or Cabinet directive.

For municipalities, Part IV and Part V of the OHA enables the council to ‘designate’ individual properties (Part IV), or properties within a heritage conservation district (HCD) (Part V), as being of ‘cultural heritage value or interest’ (CHVI). Evaluation for CHVI under the Ontario Heritage Act is guided by Ontario Regulation 9/06 (O. Reg. 9/06), which prescribes the criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest. The criteria are as follows:

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.

If a property meets one or more of these criteria, it may be eligible for designation under Part IV, Section 29 of the OHA.

Designated properties, which are formally described¹ and recognized through by-law, must then be included on a ‘Register’ maintained by the municipal clerk. At a secondary level, a municipality may ‘list’ a property on the register to indicate its potential CHVI. Importantly, designation or listing in most cases applies to the entire property, not only individual structures or features. The Municipality of Clarington maintains a heritage register that indicates properties designated under Part IV of the OHA.

### 3.2.4 Provincial Guidance

As mentioned above, heritage conservation on provincial properties must comply with the MTCS Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Provincial Heritage Properties, but this document can also be used as a ‘best practice’ guide for evaluating cultural heritage resources not under provincial jurisdiction. For example, the

¹ The OHA defines ‘heritage attributes’ slightly differently than PPS 2014; in the former, heritage attributes ‘means, in relation to real property, and to the buildings and structures on the real property, the attributes of the property, buildings and structures that contribute to their cultural heritage value or interest’.

The Province, through the MTCS, has also developed a series of products to advise municipalities, organizations, and individuals on heritage protection and conservation. Detailed guidance on identifying, evaluating, and assessing impact to built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes is provided in the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit series. Of these, Heritage Evaluation provides advice on how to organize the sections of a CHER, and the available sources of information to consider when evaluating a property.

The Ontario Heritage Tool Kit partially, but not entirely, supersedes earlier MTCS advice. Criteria to identify cultural landscapes is provided in greater detail in the Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments (1980:7), while recording and documentation procedures are outlined in the Guideline for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments (1992:3-7).

3.3 Municipal Heritage Policies

3.3.1 Durham Region

The Region’s goal for cultural heritage, as outlined in its Official Plan is “to preserve and foster the attributes of communities and the historic and cultural heritage of the Region Section 2.1.3). It also encourages lower-tier municipalities to develop policy to conserve, protect and enhance the built and cultural heritage resources of the Region and to use the tools of the Ontario Heritage Act.

3.3.2 Municipality of Clarington

The Municipality of Clarington goal for cultural heritage in the Official Plan is “to promote a culture of conservation that will support cultural achievements, foster civic pride, strengthen the local economy and enhance the quality of life for Clarington residents in the conservation, restoration and utilization of the Municipality’s cultural heritage resources” (Section 8.1.1). Its objectives for cultural heritage include the conservation, protection and maintenance of cultural heritage resources including:

- Structures, sites and streetscapes of cultural heritage value or interest;
- Significant archaeological and historic resources;
- Significant landscapes, vistas and ridge-lines (Official Plan Section 8.2.1).

The Official Plan identifies cultural heritage resources as human-made or natural features, including structures, objects, neighbourhoods, landscapes and archaeological sites that have been identified as significant by the local municipality or the province for being meaningful components of a community’s cultural heritage or identity. The Official Plan further defines built heritage resources as: one or more significant buildings, structures, monuments, installations or remains associated with architectural, cultural, social, political, economic or military history and identified as being important to a community. These resources may be identified through designation or heritage conservation easement under the Ontario Heritage Act, or listed by local, provincial or federal jurisdictions.

The Municipality of Clarington maintains a Register that includes properties individually designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, properties designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act, and properties included due to concern for the future of the property. The latter does not include 2432 Taunton Road.
4.0 GEOGRAPHICAL AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT

4.1 Geographical Context
The property is located east of the Greater Toronto Area, approximately 10 km north of Lake Ontario, and within the Municipality of Clarington of Durham Region. It is approximately 6.5 km north of the community of Bowmanville, 1.3 km southeast of the hamlet of Hampton, and is 165 m west of the intersection of Taunton Road (Regional Road 4) and Regional Road 57. It is within the South Slope physiographic region of Ontario, an area south of the Oak Ridges Moraine (Chapman and Putnam 1984:172-174) where soils are drumlinized till of predominantly fine sandy loam with good natural drainage. Immediately east of the property is a creek flowing south that is a branch of the Bowmanville/Soper Creek watershed.

4.2 Historical Context

4.2.1 Darlington Township, County of Durham
The property is within what was part of Crawford’s Purchase, or series of treaties made in 1784, 1787 and 1788 between the Mississaugas and the Crown. As described by Morris (1943: 17-18), Crawford’s Purchase extends:

From the mouth of the Trent River to [the] Toronto Purchase and back from Lake Ontario to Lake Simcoe and Rice Lake was purchased from the Mississa[aug]a… [and] includes the County of Northumberland, excepting the northeast corner, Durham, the southern part of Ontario, and the east part of York.

Following the Toronto Purchase of 1787, the area of southern Ontario that had formed part of the old Province of Quebec was divided into four political districts: Lunenburg, Mechlenburg, Nassau and Hesse. These became part of the Province of Upper Canada (present-day Ontario) in 1791 and were renamed the Eastern, Midland, Home, and Western Districts, respectively (Archives of Ontario 2015). The property was within the former Nassau District, then later the Home District, which originally included all lands between an arbitrary line on the west running from Long Point on Lake Erie to Georgian Bay, and a line on the east running north from Presqu’ile Point on Lake Ontario to the Ottawa River. Each district was further subdivided into counties and townships; the property was within the former Darlington Township and Durham County.

Survey of Durham County began as early as 1792 and continued well into the 19th century. Early communities included Bowmanville, the Village of Newcastle, and Port Hope, and were linked to the larger centers of York, Kingston and Montreal by the King’s Road, also called Danforth Road or Kingston Road (now Highway 2). Darlington Township was initially surveyed by Samuel Wilmot under the direction of Augustus Jones between 1791 and 1792 (Belden & Co. 1878). Shortly thereafter the first settlers arrived and included John Burk, John Tull and Roger Conat (Squair 1927: Belden & Co. 1878), who arrived at Port Darlington from the United States on October 2, 1794 to take advantage of the promise made by Lieutenant-Governor John Graves Simcoe to grant 200 acres of free land to each male over eighteen years old (OG 2014). As with other townships along the north shore of Lake Ontario, Darlington became home to many United Empire Loyalists (UEL) as well as immigrants from elsewhere in the British Empire.

In 1805 the first sawmill was opened in the Town of Darlington Mills (now Bowmanville) and was quickly followed by several other mills. Settlement of the township began slowly at first with only 118 individuals residing in the area by 1810 but during the 1830s a large influx of English, Scotch, Irish, Canadian, and American families had increased the population by 1842 to 3,000, with an additional 500 inhabitants living in Bowmanville (Smith 1846). By this point, six grist mills, nine saw mills, and one distillery were operating within the township.
Throughout the mid-19th century, Darlington’s population continued to grow, with enumerations for the township and the community of Bowmanville totalling 8,005 in 1855. This growth, combined with the arrival of the Grand Trunk Railway in 1856, prompted the community of Bowmanville’s incorporation as a town in 1858. During the second half of the 19th century the Town of Bowmanville became a vital and prosperous community, representing a major market facility for the township, and supporting a diverse industrial sector including three carriage factories, one furniture factory, one farm tool factory, one pump factory, one plough and iron foundry, one marble and granite works, one tannery, as well as numerous mills, blacksmith shops, and workshops. By 1880, the population of Bowmanville had reached 3,237 but the surrounding township had declined to 5,170 inhabitants (Dodds 1880; Ontario Agricultural Commission 1881).

Although largely dependent on services offered in the Town of Bowmanville, the remainder of Darlington Township still supported merchants, three cheese factories, one woollen factory, flouring mills, and grist mills in the rural communities and post office villages of Hampton, Tyrone, Enniskillen, Haydon, Salina, and Enfield. The Village of Hampton, which developed during the last quarter of the 19th century experienced only modest growth in the 20th century.

On January 1, 1974, approximately half of Durham County was merged with Ontario County to create the Region of Durham, now called Durham Region, and the townships of Darlington and Clarke were amalgamated with the Town of Bowmanville and the village of Newcastle as the Town of Newcastle. In 1993, the Town of Newcastle was renamed the Municipality of Clarington.

4.2.2 2432 Taunton Road

The property is the south portion of Lot 15, Concession 5, in the former Darlington Township, Durham County, now the Municipality of Clarington, Durham Region. For the property history outlined below most information was obtained through land registry records in the form of the abstract index to deed records from 1851 onwards, available online through the ONland System

Land registry records record that in 1851 Irishman Robert Parks acquired the north third of Lot 15, Concession 5, at that time covering 66 and two-thirds acres. Two years later, John Parks acquired the centre third of Lot 15, Concession 5, and in 1855 Thomas Parks purchased the south third, all measuring 66 and two-thirds of an acre each. This arrangement also appears on undated patent plan (Figure 2). The 1861 census makes no mention of John Parks, but do list Thomas and his wife Jane, and Robert Parks with his wife Mary/Margret are listed, and the Tremaine map from the same year shows Robert, John, and Thomas as still owning the three portions of the lot (Figure 3).

The abstract index to deed records shows that Thomas Parks and his wife took out two mortgages from a Robert McQuaid for £150.00 and $1151.00, both of which were repaid, and this suggests Thomas was clearing and building on the lot. In 1870 there was a legal claim lodged against John and Thomas Parks, but the outcome was not recorded.

In 1872 Thomas Parks sold a 2-acre portion to Eliza Oliver, a subdivision shown on the 1878 map of Darlington Township approximately where the house and barn stand on the property today (Figure 4). Two years later Thomas sold the rest of his property to John Cowling, who is also listed on the 1878 map. John Cowling then took out a mortgage from Thomas Parks for $1,900.00 that was re-paid by 1880. This mortgage may also indicate that construction or development was being carried out on the property.
Eliza Oliver had sold his two acres to John Cowling by 1893, who appears to have held the property until 1910 or 1911, when his estate was sold to William Cowling for the sum of $1 dollar. However, only 53.19 acres were transferred to William, with the additional few acres transferred on March 11, 1911 to Mary Jane Cowling.

The earliest available air photo dates to 1927 and shows the extant house and barn (Figure 5). These are also depicted on topographic maps from 1930 onward with little change except for refined detail in their scale and orientation. Aerial photos after 1954 show the transition of the area from predominately agricultural to residential on estate lots (Figure 6 to Figure 9). Today the property primarily serves as a residence and the barn is not used for agricultural purposes.

![Figure 2: Undated patent plan with the property outlined in red.](image-url)
Figure 3: The property as depicted on the 1861 Tremaine Map.

Figure 4: The 1878 County Atlas map indicating a subdivided lot with structure (Belden 1878).
Figure 5: 1927 aerial photo of the property.

Figure 6: 1930 national topographic series map showing two structures near the road (Department of National Defence 1930).
Figure 7: 1964 aerial photo showing field divisions.

Figure 8: 1969 topographic map showing the barn and house, and residential development in the surrounding area (Department of Energy, Mines and Resources 1969).
Figure 9: 1976 topographic map indicating the barn as an outbuilding (Department of Energy, Mines and Resources 1976).
5.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS

5.1 Setting

The property can be characterized as rural residential, surrounded on the north and west by agricultural lands and environmentally protected lands and residential lots to the south and east. Fronting Taunton Road are mature trees and a ditch while all other lot boundaries are lined with fencing (Figure 10 to Figure 12). The house has an approximately 8 m setback, while the south portion of the barn is partially within the existing Taunton Road right of way. To the north are fallow and overgrown fields and on the east the ground slopes gently toward the creek (Figure 13).

Figure 10: View of the property facing northeast from south side of Taunton Road.

Figure 11: View facing east from Taunton Road from west of the property; the barn is indicated with an arrow.
Figure 12: View facing west on Taunton Road from east of the intersection; the roof of the barn is indicated with an arrow.

Figure 13: Panoramic view facing east from north of the barn.

5.2  Built Environment
5.2.1  Farmhouse
The farmhouse is a vernacular form with storey-and-one-half main block with low gable rood, and a set-back side wing with ‘saltbox’ type roof. On the principal façade of the main block is a gabled lucarne at the second level and three-sided bay on the first level, while on the wing is a closed porch filling the setback and a single storey addition on the north (Figure 14 to Figure 18). Both the porch and addition have a shed roof and are covered in horizontal siding.
An investigation of the interior was not within the scope of this evaluation, but it can be speculated from the placement of the bay and the entirely stretcher bond masonry that the house is log or wood construction later clad in red brick, and that the bay was originally a central entrance.

Figure 14: South façade and east end walls of the house.

Figure 15: South façade.
Figure 16: West end wall and south façade.

Figure 17: North façade with addition and blind window, and west end wall.
5.2.2 Barn
5.2.2.1 Exterior

The barn is approximately 20 m east of the farmhouse, and oriented with its long axis perpendicular to Taunton Road. It has three structural bays and two levels, and measures 15.24 m (50 feet) long by 9.3 m (30 feet 5 inches) wide (Figure 19 to Figure 24).

The north and south end, and west side of the barn stand on a foundation of random rubble with some coursing and large quoin stones forming the northeast corner. In places the foundation has been repaired or parged in cement, although at the southwest corner a large section has been removed, exposing the double-wythe construction. The east foundation wall is cast-in-place concrete with the clear impressions of the wood forms.

Both sides and ends of the barn are clad in red-painted vertical board, and at the north and south ends the boards of the gable overlap those of the wall, creating a horizontal line below the level of the eaves. The barn’s ‘Swedish’ gambrel roof is covered in metal sheeting and has projecting eaves and verges with plain soffit and fascia. An unusual dormer on the northwest side of the roof may have been a feed chute rather than a window, and there are two tall lightning protection rods on the roof ridge.

As it is built into the slope side, entrances on the east and north access the lower level, but on the west entry is directly to the second level. Three single-leaf entrances on the east side are now blind, and centred on the north end foundation is a single-leaf door (now removed). The principal entrance is a large vertical board sliding door centred on the west side that opens into the barn’s central bay.

Window fenestration is irregular throughout. The east end has six wide and horizontal sliding sash windows and a slightly offset loft door in the gable. On the west side is a wide fixed sash window placed low on the wall and near the southwest corner, and there is a tall blind window or chute door high on the wall near the northwest corner.
The north end has only a single window west of the door on the foundation, and a loft door in the gable. Between the south two doors on the east side are wide and blind fixed sash windows near the top of the foundation wall that have plain wood lug sills.

Figure 19: The barn’s south and east sides.
Figure 20: South side.

Figure 21: West and south sides.
Figure 22: North and west sides.

Figure 23: North side.
5.2.2.2 **Interior**

The barn’s three-bay timber frame construction is fully exposed on the interior and composed of four H-bents — one on each end and two forming the central bay — that are tied by a top plate on the east and west. All bent timbers are hand-squared, with smaller-width hand-hewn timbers or logs left in the round with bark still adhering used for girts on the side wall and studs on the end walls and joined with mortice and tenon secured with treenails. Sawn lumber was used for braces which support most joints except the interior sides of the central-north bent (Figure 25 to Figure 27). All structural members have a high number of redundant mortices or joints (Figure 28 and Figure 29).

The roof is supported by hand-squared canted purlin posts that are mortised into hewn purlin plates, and all are further supported by short and long braces, the latter of which are dimensional lumber. Common rafters of dimensional sawn lumber connect to the plate with outside birdsmouth joints.

Over the south bay is a loft with widely spaced framing in dimensional lumber and enclosed in chicken wire, and beneath it the space is also enclosed by chicken wire and divided in two by a partition of boards and chicken wire. On the west half of the north bay is an open loft currently used to store tires (Figure 30).

From the lower level the large beams and puncheons of the floor can be seen, and these have log support posts that in some cases have shifted significantly. The floor in this level is both earth and poured concrete, and is partially covered by flood water-transported sediment and manure (Figure 31 and Figure 32).
Figure 25: View facing south from the north bay, showing the two central bents and canted purlin posts.

Figure 26: View facing south from the central bay of the timber framing and south loft.
Figure 27: Adze marks visible on the beam (foreground) and plate (top centre).

Figure 28: Northeast corner post with girt left in the round or squared (yellow) and redundant mortices (red).
Figure 29: View facing north from the south bay loft. The redundant birdsmouth joints on the beam (red) suggest it originally served as a plate in an earlier structure.

Figure 30: View of the central bay and north loft from the south loft.
Figure 31: Facing south from the north door of the first level puncheons, beams, and posts.

Figure 32: Facing west from the north door of water-deposited fill and rubble inside the first level.
5.2.3 Physical Condition

Since physical condition is not a criterion evaluated under O. Reg. 9/06 a detailed summary of the barn’s structural state is not included in the scope of this CHER. However, overall the condition can be characterized as fair to poor: while the upper level timber framing appears to be sound, the most critical issues include partial loss, mortar washout, and large cracks in the stone foundations and the substantial lean of the concrete portion. The posts supporting the second level floor are also far from plumb and may be compromised by water damage and decay from exposure to animal manure.

5.3 Interpretation

In exterior form and interior plan, the barn can be characterized as a Gambrel Type Central Ontario Barn (Ennals 1972). Based on the three-bay English barn, Central Ontario Barns are generally between 60 and 100 feet long, 40 to 50 feet wide, and either has a ramp providing access to the second level central bay, or is built into slope, leading to their common moniker ‘bank barn’ (Figure 33) (Ennals 1972:256). The central bay served as a drive floor, threshing floor, or work and equipment storage space, while the other two bays provided storage space or mows for hay, straw, or grain, as well as a granary. The first level was reserved for livestock, and feed could be dropped to them via chutes in the second level floor (Ennals 1972:258).

The only divergence the Taunton Road barn has from this type is the concrete walling of its east foundation and quoins at its northeast corner. These could indicate the first level was originally closer in form to a Pennsylvania German Barn type—which has an ‘overshot’ or ‘forebay’ second level on one side—that was later enclosed in concrete (Figure 34). Closer investigation however found no evidence of a setback wall inside the first level, and the quoins on the northwest corner could only mark the north side of an entrance in that location. Additionally, the interior division of space is also markedly different from a typical Pennsylvania German Barn, and Ennals found them to be primarily concentrated in Waterloo County (Ennals 1972:260-263).

Based on the historical aerial imagery, it is known the barn was built before 1927 and it may date to just before John Cowling repaid the mortgage for $1,900 in 1880. However, timber framing was used for barn construction into the first two decades of the 20th century including on stone foundations (Glassie 1974:195; Vlach 2003:21; Pullen 2004:57-60). What is known is that it had been constructed of salvaged timbers from an earlier barn, or possibly barns, that was likely of a different scale and form; evidence for this is the numerous redundant mortices as well as the purlin plate repurposed as a beam for the central-north bent. This, combined with the light framing technique to place the rafters in birdsmouths on the exterior side of the plate (Sobon 2004:35), suggest the barn was built from the late 19th century to early 20th century and may not be contemporaneous with house, which could be the structure depicted on the 1878 County Atlas (Figure 4). Use of salvaged timbers for barn construction was widespread in Ontario, as recycling was both expedient and cost effective (McIlwraith 1999:183).

A systematic survey for similar barns in the area was not conducted but within a 2.25 km radius south of 2432 Taunton Road are at least four farms with Gambrel Type Central Ontario Barns: 2448 Concession Road 4, 4021 Middle Road, 4432 Middle Road, and 4553 Middle Road (Figure 35 to Figure 38). With the exception of the structure at 4432 Middle Road, which may be of late 20th century date, the other barns are a larger scale, in a better state of preservation, and overall more representative of the late 19th to early 20th Gambrel Type Central Ontario Barn form, and in some cases are associated with residences, outbuilding complexes, and landscape features that more clearly define the area’s historic land use and agricultural character.
Figure 33: Plan and aspect of the Gambrel and Gable types of the Central Ontario Barn (Ennals 1968:19).

Figure 34: The Pennsylvania German Barn type with ‘overshot’ and setback wall at the first level (Ennals 1972:261).
Figure 35: 2448 Concession Road 4

Figure 36: 4021 Middle Road
Figure 37: 4432 Middle Road

Figure 38: 4553 Middle Road
6.0 CULTURAL HERITAGE EVALUATION

From the results of the historical research, field investigations, and comparative analysis the barn was evaluated to determine if it met the criteria for CHVI as prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06. The results of this evaluation are provided in the following subsections.

6.1 Design value or physical value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Meets criterion (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Evaluation rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type,</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>As a Gambrel Type Central Ontario Barn, the barn is neither rare nor unique as its type can be found in relatively high numbers across southern Ontario and the immediate area (see Section 5.3). There are no unusual or rare decorative features or joinery techniques employed for its construction, and its salvaged timbers exhibit hand shaping and dimensions that are commonly found in timber-frame barns of this modest scale. Its date of construction in the latter years of the 19th century or first two decades of the 20th century make it a late example of its type. Compared to other local examples, it is smaller than the average size for its type and its mix of salvaged and new material, the addition of a large section of concrete walling, and partial removal of foundation wall fabric has substantially reduced its integrity to serve as a representative example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expression, material or construction method.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The barn's joinery is well executed but does not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit. Some timbers have been left in the round and there are clear adze marks that in a more finely constructed building would have been planed away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>None of the barn’s mortice and tenon joinery demonstrates a high degree of technical achievement and since the salvaged members are of a modest dimension it would not have required a high level of technical skill to raise and secure the framing into position.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Historical value or associative value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Meets criterion (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Evaluation rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity,</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No evidence in the historical record indicates the Parks nor Cowling families had a significant role in the community’s history, and as the barn was constructed late in the 19th century or early 20th century it is not associated with the theme of pioneering settlement and early agricultural development of the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization, or institution that is significant to a community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Yields, or has the potential to yield information that contributes to an</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The barn was constructed in a common type and materials and has no significant historical associations where further studies would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Meets criterion (Yes/No)</td>
<td>Evaluation rationale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understanding of a community or culture.</td>
<td></td>
<td>yield new information to contribute to a better understanding of the local community or culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to a community.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The barn's common type and construction does not demonstrate the work or ideas of any architect, builder, designer, or agricultural theorist significant to the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3 Contextual value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Meets criterion (Yes/No)</th>
<th>Evaluation Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) Is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>While the barn, along with the farmhouse, maintains the rural character of the area, it is not important to that character, and the area is increasingly, since the 1960s, transitioning from agricultural land use and character to dispersed rural residential.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>The agricultural function of the barn is linked to the surrounding historical land use but this does not represent a significant relationship for the area. Its historical, physical, and visual linkages to the farmhouse is possibly less than a century, as the two buildings are not contemporaneous, with the barn being a later addition. The barn is therefore not vital to understanding the history and architecture of the farmhouse, if it is later evaluated as a potential cultural heritage resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Is a landmark.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Although a prominent structure on the roadscape when approaching the Taunton Road/ Regional Road 57 intersection from the west, the barn is not considered a local landmark.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4 Results of Evaluation

The preceding evaluation has determined that the barn located at 2432 Taunton Road and within the Taunton Road existing ROW:

- Does not meet any criteria for cultural heritage value on interest prescribed in O. Reg. 9/06.

Based on this evaluation, a statement of CHVI has not been prepared.
7.0 SUMMARY STATEMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In February 2017, TMIG retained Golder on behalf of Durham Region to conduct a Cultural Heritage Assessment Report as part of a Municipal Class Environmental Assessment for proposed improvement of the intersection of Taunton Road (Regional Road 4) and Regional Road 57, Municipality of Clarington. Golder’s report identified 2432 Taunton Road as a property of potential cultural heritage value or interest and recommended a CHER be conducted to determine whether conservation or mitigation measures were required as part of the intersection improvements. The 1.6-hectare property includes a storey-and-a-half brick farmhouse possibly built in the late-19th century, and a gambrel-roofed timber frame barn that partially encroaches on the public right-of-way.

TMIG subsequently retained Golder to conduct the CHER in August 2018 with a scope of study limited to investigation and evaluation of the barn since it is within the right-of-way and the only structure to be impacted by the proposed project. Following guidelines provided by the MTCS, this CHER identifies the applicable heritage policies and guidance, summarizes the property’s geographic and historical context, provides a description of existing conditions and a comparative analysis of the barn, and an evaluation of the barn using the criteria prescribed in Ontario Regulation 9/06 of the Ontario Heritage Act.

This CHER concludes that:

- **The barn does not have cultural heritage value or interest, and is not considered a potential heritage attribute of 2432 Taunton Road.**

Golder therefore recommends that:

- **The barn can be demolished with no further study or documentation prior to road improvements within the public right of way.**

To meet Golder’s corporate goals for environmental sustainability, it is also recommended that as much useable material from the barn be salvaged rather than be deposited in landfill.
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