



TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM:

To: Jeremy Vink MCIP RPP
Manager of Planning
Development Services
Township of Woolwich
24 Church Street West
Elmira, ON N3B 2Z6
via email at jvink@woolwich.ca

From: Marcus R. Létourneau
Managing Principal, Letourneau Heritage Consulting Inc.
Suite 400 - 837 Princess Street
Kingston, Ontario K7L 1G8

Subject: Review of Updated CHIS (May 2020) and Accompanying
Cover Letter, Shantz Station Pit, LHC File LHC0189

Date: June 12, 2020

At the request of the Township of Woolwich, Letourneau Heritage Consulting Inc. (LHC) has reviewed the revised CHIS (dated May 2020) and the accompanying cover letter (dated 2 June 2020) for the Shantz Station Pit.

Based upon the review, LHC is satisfied with the revisions, and recommends acceptance of the revised CHIS. It should be noted that the report still refers to the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries (MHSTCI) as the Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport (MTCS). This does not change the content or recommendations but should be corrected going forward. Similarly, it is recommended in listing policies that the Regional Policies come before the Township of Woolwich's policies, but again, this does not change the content or recommendations.

There are only three outstanding points. These can be addressed by a follow-up letter.

- 1) LHC strongly recommends that the Conservation Plan include a specific Temporary Protection Plan as part of its conservation approaches. This Conservation Plan, once developed, should be reviewed by the Township.
- 2) Slight clarification should be provided whether the property boundaries of the subject lands fall within the Maryhill CHL. While Figure 12 shows that the extraction area is outside the boundary, it is not clear if the properties are. If the properties do fall within the area, additional information should be provided outlining the relationship of the properties to the CHL. While the proposed project does not appear to have a significant impact (based upon the analysis provided), it should nonetheless be acknowledged if the broader lands fall

within the CHL. (The report seems to refer to the subject lands and extraction area interchangeably – please see the language in Section 7.3.3 Conclusion).

- 3) Within the Alternative Approaches Discussion (Section 8.1) the “do nothing” option discussion should be reworded to focus upon impacts to **cultural heritage** resources rather than the benefit of aggregate extraction.

We trust this helps you in your decision-making process, and as always, if there are any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,



Marcus R. Létourneau, PhD, MCIP, RPP, CAHP
Managing Principal, Senior Heritage Planner,
Létourneau Heritage Consulting Inc.