Heritage Resources Self Assessment

Toronto Zoo Anaerobic digester

Riepma Consultants Inc. August 2013

Heritage Resources

1.0 Introduction

1.1 Purpose

This report is provided as part of the Renewable Energy Approval for the proposed 500kW anaerobic digester to be constructed at the Toronto Zoo. An archeological report prepared by the Toronto Region Conservation Authority is be submitted separately.

1.2 Project Location

The location of the proposed 500kW biogas plant is shown on the drawing in Appendix 1. The land required is currently part of the zoo's composting operation and will occupy an area of approximately $50m \times 100m$ (5000 sq. m. or 1.3 acres) of the site. The digester will replace the zoo's current composting operation.

It is located on the east side of Meadowvale Road, south of Beare Road and is described as Lot 3, Concession 3.

The site is located on an isolated peninsula of land located between wooded slopes down to Meadowvale Road on the west, the existing composting operation and a hydro corridor in the valley to the south and the Rouge River valley to the east. See also the air photo located in Appendix 1. To the north is a vacant field used for overflow parking and further north are overflow parking lots associated with the zoo.

The site of the Biogas plant is located on part of the lands now graded and used for the composting operation. It is flat and devoid of vegetation cover. The area slopes slightly to the south and is over 200 meters from the water's edge of the Little Rouge River.

1.3 Surrounding Land Uses

The nearest structure is a restored brick farmhouse (Pearce House) located some 250m to the north east and is used as the Rouge Valley Conservation Centre. The nearest residential area is located 850 meters to the south west on the opposite side of Meadowvale Road. The nearest home is located 320 meters to the west. Appendix 1 demonstrates the land use within 300m of the site. Lands immediately to the north of the site have been graded and are used for overflow parking for the Zoo.

2.0 Table 19 Heritage Assessment

As part of the Renewable Energy Approval for the anaerobic digester to be constructed at the Toronto Zoo the authorizations required in Reg. 359/09 s.19 table were obtained.

Copy of O. Reg. 359/09, s. 19, Table.

Item	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Document	Appendix
	Description of property.	Person or body whose authorization is required.	Type of authorization required to be submitted.		
1.	A property that is the subject of an agreement, covenant or easement entered into under clause 10 (1) (b) of the Ontario Heritage Act.	Ontario Heritage Trust.	renewable energy project	Letter Ontario Heritage Trust May 2, 2011	2
2.	A property in respect of which a notice of intention to designate the property to be of cultural heritage value or interest has been given in accordance with section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act.	gave the notice.	If, as part of the renewable energy project, the alteration of the property or the demolition or removal of a building or structure on the property is proposed, consent to alter the property or demolish or remove the building or structure.		3
3.	A property designated by a municipal by-law made under section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act as a property of cultural heritage value or interest.	Municipality that made the by-law.	If, as part of the renewable energy project, the alteration of the property or the demolition or removal of a building or structure on the property is proposed, consent to alter the property or demolish or remove the building or structure.		3
4.	A property designated by order of the Minister of Culture made under section 34.5 of the Ontario Heritage Act	Minister of Culture.	, · · · ·	MTC Letter April 4, 2011	4

	as a property of		consent to alter the property		
	cultural heritage		or demolish or remove the		
	value or interest of		building or structure.		
	provincial				
	significance.				
5.	A property in respect	Minister of Culture.	If, as part of the renewable	MTC Letter April	4
	of which a notice of		energy project, the	4, 2011	
	intention to designate		alteration of the property or		
	the property as		the demolition or removal of		
	property of cultural		a building or structure on		
	heritage value or		the property is proposed,		
	interest of provincial		consent to alter the property		
	significance has been		or demolish or remove the		
	given in accordance		building or structure.		
	with section 34.6 of				
	the Ontario Heritage				
	Act.				
	Act.				
6.	A property that is the	Municipality that	Authorization to undertake	Toronto Email	3
	subject of an	entered into the	any activities related to the	March 31, 2011	
	easement or a	easement or	renewable energy project		
	covenant entered	covenant.	that require the approval of		
	into under section 37		the municipality that		
	of the Ontario		entered into the easement		
	Heritage Act.		or covenant.		
7.	A property that is	Municipality that	If, as part of the renewable	Toronto Email	3
	part of an area	made the by-law.	energy project, the	March 31, 2011	
	designated by a		alteration of the property or		
	municipal by-law		the erection, demolition or		
	made under section		removal of a building or		
	41 of the Ontario		structure on the property is		
	Heritage Act as a		proposed, a permit to alter		
	heritage conservation		the property or to erect,		
	district.		demolish or remove a		
			building or structure on the		
			property.		
			property.		
8.	A property	Minister of Culture.	If, as part of the renewable	MTC Letter April	4
	designated as a		energy project, the	4, 2011	
	historic site under		excavation or alteration of		

Regulation 880 of the	the property of historical	
Revised Regulations	significance is proposed, a	
of Ontario, 1990	permit to excavate or alter	
(Historic Sites) made	the property.	
under the Ontario		
Heritage Act.		

3.0 Regulation 9/06 Analysis

Section 2 of the regulation states that: A property may be designated under section 29 of the 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. The subject property is a flat vacant, open field used as a compost operation for the zoo. The compost operation is not of heritage significance. This criteria is not met.
 - ii. displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or The subject property is a flat vacant, open field used as a compost operation for the zoo and contains no structures. This criteria is not met.
 - iii. demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement. The compost operation is significantly below the environmental and operational standards currently applicable for such installations. There is no significant period technology at this site that should be protected for heritage purposes. This criteria is not met.
- 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, This site directly associated with the manure handling process of the Toronto Zoo which is a significant institution in Toronto and beyond. However the composting process is not significant to the community and it in fact is considered to be detrimental. This criteria is not met.
 - ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or The composting operation on the site does not meet this criteria. It does not contribute to the community or to culture
 - iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community. The composting operation on the site does not meet this criteria.
- 3. The property has contextual value because it,
 - i. is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area, The compost operation does not support the character of the area which is a mix of wooded and open fields and parking lots.

- ii. is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or While the compost operation is linked functionally to the Zoo because it processes the waste from the Zoo, it does not contribute to the contextual value of the area. In fact it detracts from the environmental quality of the area visually and due to its surface water impact.
- iii. is a landmark The compost site is not a landmark as the site is not highly visible and sheltered from the view of the public.

4.0 Heritage Impact Assessment

This analysis indicates that there are no heritage resources on the site of the project. In addition there are no heritage resources in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project. As a result the proposed Renewable Energy Project will have no heritage impact on the subject property or lands in the vicinity. As a result no mitigation measures are required.

The Toronto Zoo, the operator of the area and the TRCA, the owner of the land, both have not indicated any concerns with respect to heritage resources. As the site is relatively remote public access to the area will be limited.

Location Plan

Ontario Heritage Trust

City of Toronto

Ministry of Culture