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Executive Summary

Kingston Inner Harbour:
A Cultural Heritage Landscape Pilot Study

Kingston, on the shores of Lake Ontario, has always had a connection to the lake and surrounding rivers. These features of the landscape have shaped the course of human history in the area and are a significant part of local cultural heritage. The harbour areas of the city, combined with the connection local people have with the water, constitute a maritime cultural heritage landscape. This study focuses on one section of Kingston’s harbours, the Inner Harbour, at the mouth of the Cataraqui River and the southern entrance/exit of the Rideau Canal.
This study uses the inventory and evaluation approach developed by the Unites States National Parks Service for assessment of the cultural heritage landscape. It uses other analytic criteria developed for the Region of Waterloo and the five historic themes of the Parks Canada System Plan to frame and evaluate the significance of the landscape. The maritime nature of the landscape was further defined by seven categories of maritime activity.

Research into the broad historical context of the harbour illustrates how Kingston has been connected to the maritime environment at many points through its history. This context places the study area within a larger local maritime context and ties this study area into the much larger Lake Ontario, Rideau Canal and St. Lawrence River landscapes/waterscapes.

Heritage elements found around the Inner Harbour illustrate the five main historic themes of the Parks Canada System Plan, demonstrating the area’s significance within Canadian history.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peopling the Land</td>
<td>• Archaeological evidence of First Nations settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Archaeological evidence and historical evidence of early French and British settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Port facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Residential areas, including Barriefield Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Economies</td>
<td>• Industrial sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Landscape modifications for industrial and harbour uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rail lands along the harbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The La Salle Causeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Abandoned vessels in the harbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wharves, docks, drydock and other maritime structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing Canada</td>
<td>• Fort Frontenac (the historic French and British fort and the contemporary Canadian Army Command and Staff College)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• H.M.C.S. Cataraqui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Social and Community Life</td>
<td>• Place names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Barriefield Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressing Intellectual and Cultural Life</td>
<td>• First Nations burial ground on Belle Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Historic and contemporary leisure activity around the river, such as the Kingston Rowing Club and Cataraqui Canoe Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Traditional and contemporary maritime skills practiced at Metalcraft Marine and the Kingston Sail Loft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study area is a rich landscape of maritime connections. This table summarizes the maritime cultural heritage landscape processes and components in the Inner Harbour study area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Evidence of Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use and Activities</strong></td>
<td>- Subsistence: First Nations hunting/fishing sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Institutional: Fort Frontenac, Tête Du Pont Barracks, HMCS <em>Cataraqui</em>, CFB Kingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Industrial: Davis Drydock, Metalcraft Marine, Kingston Sail Loft, Cotton/Woollen Mill building, Davis Tannery site, Queen City Oil Company depot building and retaining wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Transportation: Rideau Canal, La Salle Causeway bridge and wharves, former rail lands in Douglas Fluhrer Park, Kingston Marina, Anglin Bay wharves, abandoned ship wrecks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Residential: Barriefield Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Recreational: Douglas Fluhrer Park, Green Bay Parkette and CFB green space on Green Bay, Place D’Armes walk, Cataraqui Canoe Club, Kingston Rowing Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patterns of Spatial Organization</strong></td>
<td>- Land creation through fill around Anglin Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Rail lines along the western shoreline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response to the Natural Environment</strong></td>
<td>- The Barriefield Village adapted to the slope of the hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The Barriefield rock cut changed the landscape for transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Barriefield quarry sites modified the landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Water lots on the western shore were filled in as a convenient dump and to create more land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Shoreline stabilization along the western shore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cataraqui Park, a former dump site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Traditions</strong></td>
<td>- British Military followed by Canadian Military: Tête Du Pont Barracks, HMCS <em>Cataraqui</em>, CFB Kingston, Fort Frontenac walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Maritime traditions, Kingston Sail Loft and Metalcraft Marine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Evidence of Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulation Networks</strong></td>
<td>- Cataraqui River and Rideau Canal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- La Salle Causeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Land creation for rail lines and gravel road bed on western shore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Narrow entrance to Anglin Bay (former site of rail bridge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- City and village street grid pattern based on shoreline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boundary Demarcations</strong></td>
<td>- Cataraqui River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- La Salle Causeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vegetation related to Land Use</strong></td>
<td>- Vegetation illustrates the decline of industry and growth of residential/recreational uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Buildings, Structures and Objects</strong></td>
<td>- Metalcraft Marine building, south of Davis Drydock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Queen City Oil building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Woollen Mill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Barriefield boathouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settlement Clusters</strong></td>
<td>- Industrial buildings and structures along the western shore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Barriefield Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Inner Harbour and Kingston Marina, wharves, docks, vessels and wrecks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archaeological Sites</strong></td>
<td>- Fort Frontenac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 14 abandoned vessels in the river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small Scale Elements</strong></td>
<td>- Fort Frontenac walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Angrove's foundry manhole cover in Douglas Fluhrer Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Continuing Uses</strong></td>
<td>- Barriefield Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Metalcraft Marine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Kingston Marina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Landscape elements connected to the maritime environment are associated with events that made significant contributions to the broad patterns of history and are associated with the five historic themes. Landscape elements are closely associated with the lives of individuals or families who are significant to the area. The landscape embodies distinctive characteristics of a maritime community. Landscape elements demonstrate close and harmonious relationships between the natural and domestic. Landscape elements yield information important to our understanding of prehistory or history. One part of the landscape, Belle Island, is strongly associated with the spiritual and cultural traditions of First Nations peoples.

Recommendations for preservation of the Kingston Inner Harbour Cultural Heritage Landscape include:

- Consult the local community about the area’s significance, boundaries and community value in order to define the area’s significance.
- Consult the local community for ideas on management and conservation of this landscape.
- Identify this area as a cultural heritage landscape and as a special policy area in the City of Kingston Official Plan.
- Require landscape impact assessments for new development in the area to ensure the maritime cultural landscape is not adversely affected.
- Ensure park master plans and park area management plans in the area address the significant maritime cultural heritage embodied in the landscape.
- Financial incentives such as heritage grants should be developed with a focus on preserving elements of the landscape that reflect the maritime cultural landscape.
- Conserve and reconstruct the remaining wharves and docks that have fallen into disrepair. Preserve the manufactured shoreline areas at old industrial sites to preserve the maritime industrial past of the area.
- Maintain the natural contours in the landscape to retain the patterns of spatial organization of a landscape that is oriented to the river.
- Ensure that street names in the study area that reflect the maritime heritage of the area, such as significant persons and geographical features can not be changed without consideration of the impacts on the cultural landscape.
- The Davis Dry Dock should be designated a heritage property under the Ontario Heritage Act. However the designation by-law should be structured so that designation does not adversely affect the function of the property for boatbuilding, the modern expression of boatbuilding on the property is as important for the cultural heritage landscape as the sites history is.
- Public interpretation about the significant maritime history of the area and the cultural landscape should be developed as a part of efforts to conserve the landscape.
- Wherever possible the maritime nature of the area should be enhanced and celebrated.
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1

Introduction

Introduction and Purpose

A maritime cultural heritage landscape is a unique blend of terrestrial and underwater elements that include cultural relics in our communities, collections of shipwrecks and other cultural elements below the surface of local lakes, rivers and oceans and intangible values such as viewscapes and traditions associated with a “seafaring” past. A maritime cultural landscape is easy to overlook until it is damaged, at which point it is too late to preserve. For marine regions identifying and protecting a community’s maritime cultural landscape is an important part of preserving that community’s identity. Preserving cultural heritage landscapes has become a more significant part of heritage planning since 2005, after amendments to the Ontario Heritage Act and changes to the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement. Additional changes to the Provincial Policy Statement in 2014 further strengthened policies regarding cultural heritage. However understanding cultural landscapes and how to protect them is not well understood in Canada and maritime cultural landscapes are even less appreciated.

Kingston Ontario has a long and significant connection to Lake Ontario with many elements of local heritage preserving this maritime past. The city is home for many maritime activities with
many associated cultural values.

Kingston’s harbours cover a large geographic area and are part of a much larger system of hydrogeological, ecological and cultural interaction with the Great Lakes, St. Lawrence River and Rideau Canal. There are many harbour areas around Kingston. These harbour areas can be found in Deadman Bay and Navy Bay in the east; the Cataraqui River to the Kingston Mills Lock to the north; Cataraqui (Elevator) Bay in the west; the North shores of Wolfe and Simcoe Islands, including Garden Island in the south; Portsmouth Harbour; The Outer Harbour around downtown Kingston; and, the Inner Harbour at the mouth of the Cataraqui River (see Figure 1-1). These areas contain part of a UNESCO World Heritage Site, several National Historic Sites, most of the city of Kingston’s waterfront and includes many shipwrecks and abandoned vessels. These harbour areas cover Kingston’s historic port and significant areas of historic naval, industrial and commercial

![Image](image.jpg)

**Figure 1-1.** Map of Kingston Harbour areas.
activity related to the city’s maritime past.

This study is a pilot project and cannot document the entire cultural landscape of the previously defined harbour areas; the study documents cultural heritage landscape elements for a sub section of the harbour area, the Inner Harbour. For this pilot study, the Inner Harbour is the Cataraqui River from the LaSalle Causeway in the south, the east and west sides of the river including relevant elements of Barriefield village, the Inner Harbour neighbourhood and ends at Belle Park/Belle Island to the north (see Figure 1-2 for the outline of the study area).

This study identifies and evaluates features that may support the identification of the area as a Cultural Heritage Landscape (CHL) under the terms of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and answer the question, does Kingston’s Inner Harbour make up a cultural heritage landscape? This study makes some recommendations relating to future preservation of significant cultural heritage landscape elements of Kingston’s harbours.

**Figure 1-2.** Map of the Kingston Inner Harbour, study area is within the red section.
Introduction to Cultural Heritage Landscape

Cultural Heritage Landscape

A cultural landscape is the combination of the natural landform combined with human-created spaces, such as buildings, that define a particular region or space (Hayden 2000, ix). Wherever people have been, a cultural landscape can exist but most often people associate cultural landscapes with places between wilderness and the city, such as parks, rural pastoral places, villages and gardens (Alanen 2000, 3). Cultural landscapes can be planned such as a park, cemetery, planned community or can develop as a vernacular landscape based on multiple layers of time and cultural activity (Alanen 2000, 5) such as an historic city centre, farm complex or harbours. A cultural landscape can be at a very specific location or cover a vast territory, but is created and evolves through the perceptions, history, traditions, experiences, values, artifacts and places of the people who live there. “The complete story of a landscape encompasses the activities and perceptions of each individual interacting with that landscape” (Ford 2009, 25).

The most widely used definition of cultural landscapes comes from the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS). The Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention states that “cultural landscapes are cultural properties that represent the "combined works of nature and man" designated in Article I of the Convention. They illustrate the evolution of human society and settlement over time, under the influence of the physical constraints and/or opportunities presented by their natural environment and of successive social, economic, and cultural forces, both external and internal” (UNESCO 1992, 85).

ICOMOS divides cultural landscapes into three categories, the clearly-defined landscape, the organically-evolved landscape and the associative landscape. The clearly defined landscape was
designed and created intentionally by people. The organically evolved landscape has developed by association with and in response to its natural environment in response to an initial social, economic, administrative, and/or religious imperative. These landscapes reflect that process of evolution in their form and component features. They fall into two sub-categories:

- A relict (or fossil) landscape, where an evolutionary process came to an end at some time in the past but where significant distinguishing features are still visible in material form.
- A continuing landscape that retains an active social role in contemporary society closely associated with a traditional way of life and where the evolutionary process is still ongoing. This landscape shows significant material evidence of its evolution over time.

The associative cultural landscape includes powerful religious, artistic or cultural associations of the natural element rather than material cultural evidence, which may be insignificant or even absent (ICOMOS 2009, 7-8).

In the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada a cultural landscape is “defined as 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 natural and human-influenced social, economic and cultural processes” (Parks Canada 2010, 49).

Maritime Cultural Landscape

“The history of the shore is seamless, with humans moving easily from water to land, utilizing resources throughout” (Ford 2009, 1). A maritime cultural landscape can be compared to a terrestrial cultural heritage landscape but often covers larger areas and deals specifically with maritime culture. The simplest understanding of a maritime cultural landscape “comprises the whole network of sailing routes, old as well as new, with ports and harbours along the coast, and its related constructions and remains of human activity, underwater as well as terrestrial. In this way it mirrors
the entire range of maritime economies, that is, mariculture” (Westerdahl 1992, 6). An expanded understanding of maritime cultural landscape is “a life mode and includes all possible combinations of subsistence strategies at the sea” and the social factors of this life are the most significant (Westerdahl 2011, 337).

Maritime cultural landscapes incorporate human activity and expression above the water surface and below, and the terrestrial zone around the shoreline. The maritime cultural landscape bridges the boundaries between land and sea (Tuddenham 2010, 9). There is no human culture under water and very few cultures on the water so the maritime cultural landscape is a terrestrial landscape with expression tied to the natural landscape under, on and over the sea, lake or river. Shipwrecks and maritime artifacts and infrastructure under water and in the littoral zone are a form of deposition (Westerdahl 2011, 339) of the cultural landscape. This submerged material is remembered or rediscovered and is a tangible and yet intangible part of the maritime cultural landscape. The material is tangible because it was an important part of the historic environment and still exists and is intangible because it is not accessible or visible to most people except some scuba divers, or through pictures, video and through stories that have been recorded or as part of local folklore. The intangibility of shipwrecks and other human materials under water and the way they are remembered, recorded make them part of the cognitive landscape (Westerdahl 2011, 339).

The maritime cultural landscape is not different from any other cultural landscape but is a way of categorizing the landscape to more clearly understand the many elements of a seafaring or maritime way of life (Tuddenham 2010). The maritime cultural heritage landscape is a tool for understanding the maritime community both within itself and tied into a broad regional, territorial and natural network. Most elements of this landscape can be found in terrestrial environments along the edges of waterways while some elements of the landscape exist on, under or over the water.
A harbour area is very much a maritime cultural landscape. In the case of Kingston, there are elements of the cultural heritage landscape of the harbours that would be ignored by a strictly terrestrial focus. This extends the cultural heritage landscape beyond traditional boundaries and incorporates viewscapes, artefacts underwater and seasonal expressions of cultural heritage that may be missed in a traditional cultural heritage landscape study. The identification of these unique cultural heritage landscape elements for Kingston’s harbours have been taken into account throughout the study.

Westerdahl divides aspects of the maritime cultural landscape into several categories. These then can be fit into the three types of cultural landscapes defined by UNESCO. The various aspects of maritime cultural landscapes are; the landscape of sustenance (subsistence), the economic landscape, the resource landscape, the transport landscape, the territorial landscape, the cognitive landscape and the ritual landscape. These aspects of the maritime cultural landscape link and overlap with each other intimately.

- **The sustenance landscape** is humans taking food resources from the maritime environment for basic subsistence.
- **The economic landscape** involves a broader economic focus, taking resources from the water but includes terrestrial components and resources as well, that are used or transported by people within a maritime culture as part of their economic system. This includes commercial fishing and connections to places like logging and agricultural areas that are inextricably tied to maritime transport.
- **The resource landscape** includes maritime and terrestrial resources gathered and used for maritime activities and artifacts, timber for shipbuilding or rock and minerals for tools.
- **The transport landscape** includes ships (through wrecks), trading routes, harbours and structures constructed to facilitate the transport of goods.
- **The territorial landscape** is political and often associated with defense and aggression; this aspect of the landscape can be found in warship wrecks, defensive works such as submerged blockages to harbours or terrestrial forts facing out over the water.
- **The cognitive landscape** is a remembered landscape of nature, portage routes, shoals, headlands, islands, etc… and can often be found in place names. The cognitive landscape
must also include other less tangible aspects of the maritime landscape including skills, tradition, superstition and story.

- *The ritual landscape* which includes special places such as rocks, headlands, islands etc… sacred or ritual activities associated with fish or other sea animals and ritual associated with going to sea or preparing a vessel for the water (Westerdahl 2011, 339).

Each of these cultural landscape elements depends on a person’s intimate knowledge of the natural submerged landscape and is very much part of the cognitive landscape and what connects the terrestrial maritime cultural landscape and the submerged landscape. The various elements of the maritime cultural landscape are significant for defining how relicts in the landscape fit within a cultural landscape but are also important in defining historical context and themes in identifying what can be part of the landscape.

**State of Practice, Cultural Heritage Landscapes in Ontario**

In Ontario there are three main legislative tools that promote cultural heritage landscape identification and protection, the *Ontario Heritage Act*, the *Environmental Assessment Act* and the *Planning Act* through the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). Only the PPS specifically refers to cultural heritage landscapes. Municipalities have used various methods based on these tools to conduct and evaluate cultural heritage landscapes in the province.

**Policy Context**

*Ontario Heritage Act*

The *Ontario Heritage Act* provides municipalities with three tools to conserve cultural heritage landscapes. If the landscape is on a single property it can be designated under Part IV of the Act (OHA Part IV s. 29). A landscape that is a grouping of properties can be designated as a Heritage Conservation District under part V of the Act. These two methods of protection are the strongest tools available. The third method allows a municipality to list on their Municipal Heritage Register a cultural heritage landscape as an individual or grouping of non-designated properties
(OHA Part IV s. 27). This provides a lesser level of protection than a designated property or Heritage Conservation District but requires owners to give 60 days’ notice before demolition or removal of buildings and may require a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment during a heritage review process.

Archaeological resources are also protected under part VI of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Part VI requires anyone conducting archaeological fieldwork to have a licence granted by the Minister (OHA Part VI s. 48) and allows property to be designated for archaeological and historical significance (OHA Part VI s. 52). This is relevant for a cultural heritage landscape where archaeological sites are part of the landscape.

*Regulations 9/06 and 10/06*

*Regulation 9/06* and *Regulation 10/06* under the *Ontario Heritage Act* list criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest and criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest of provincial significance. These criteria are used in determining cultural heritage value or interest for designating locally and provincially significant heritage sites.

*Regulation 9/06* lists the 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, s. 1 (2)).

Regulation 10/06 lists the following criteria for sites of provincial significance:

1. The property represents or demonstrates a theme or pattern in Ontario’s history.

2. The property yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of Ontario’s history.

3. The property demonstrates an uncommon, rare or unique aspect of Ontario’s cultural heritage.

4. The property is of aesthetic, visual or contextual importance to the province.

5. The property demonstrates a high degree of excellence or creative, technical or scientific achievement at a provincial level in a given period.

6. The property has a strong or special association with the entire province or with a community that is found in more than one part of the province. The association exists for historic, social, or cultural reasons or because of traditional use.

7. The property has a strong or special association with the life or work of a person, group or organization of importance to the province or with an event of importance to the province.

8. The property is located in unorganized territory and the Minister determines that there is a provincial interest in the protection of the property. O. Reg. 10/06, s. 1 (2).

These criteria can be used in determining significance for cultural heritage landscapes.

Environmental Assessment Act

In the Part I of the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act, the definition of the environment includes built heritage and other structures built by humans and the social and cultural conditions that influence the life of humans or communities. The act requires Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments, which include cultural heritage landscapes as part of an Environmental Assessment before a decision to proceed with a major public sector project.
Planning Act

The Planning Act includes the conservation of features of significant architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological and scientific interest as a matter of Provincial interest (Planning Act Part 1 s. 2.2.d). Details about cultural heritage policy are articulated in the Provincial Policy Statement, however section 34 of the Planning Act, on zoning by-laws allows municipalities to pass by-laws prohibiting the use of any land and building buildings or structures on land that is the site of significant archaeological resources (Planning Act Part V s. 34.3.3). Zoning by-laws can also be used to restrict land use or building buildings or structures for purposes set out in the by-law, which can include protection of a cultural heritage landscape.

Provincial Policy Statement (2014)

The Provincial Policy Statement issued under section 3 of the Planning Act defines a cultural heritage landscape as:

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 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, mainstreets and neighbourhoods, cemeteries, trailways, viewsheds, natural areas and industrial complexes of heritage significance; and areas recognized by federal or international designation authorities” (MOMAH 2014, 40).

Section 2.6 of the PPS addresses cultural heritage and archaeology. Section 2.6 states:

2.6.1 Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.

2.6.2 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential unless significant archaeological resources have been conserved.

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*.

2.6.4 Planning authorities should consider and promote archaeological management plans and cultural plans in conserving cultural heritage and archaeological resources.

2.6.5 Planning authorities shall consider the interests of Aboriginal communities in conserving cultural heritage and archaeological resources. (MOMAH 2014, 29).

This section of the PPS specifically addresses cultural heritage landscapes, while also advocating for archaeological management plans and cultural plans in conserving cultural heritage resources and requiring consultation with First Nations, all of which are relevant tools for identification, management of and ultimately conservation of many cultural heritage landscapes.

Section 1.7.1.d of the PPS also addresses cultural heritage landscapes as contributing to a community’s sense of place and defining a community’s character as an element of economic prosperity (MOMAH 2014, 19-20).

**Ontario Cultural Heritage Landscape Studies**

The Ontario Heritage Toolkit includes, in the *Heritage Resources in the Land Use Planning Process* document, a section devoted to cultural heritage landscapes. This tool describes types of landscapes and identifies ways to identify, define the significance of, evaluate and conserve them (Ontario Ministry of Culture 2006). Municipalities across Ontario had already begun cultural heritage landscape studies well before the province developed this toolkit to assist.

**Scope of Report**

The Kingston harbours cultural heritage landscape study examined the Inner Harbour of Kingston Ontario. This study was focused on Euro-Canadian history (1608 CE to the present) but includes First Nations research where relevant. The study focuses on the Cataraqui River from Belle Island to the La Salle Causeway and includes significant places on both east and west shores.
Report Structure

This report contains six chapters: an introduction, a chapter describing the method used to inventory and evaluate the cultural heritage landscape, a chapter outlining a broad historical context for Kingston’s harbours, a chapter on identification of CHL elements, a chapter evaluating the landscape and a concluding chapter with some recommendations for further work.
This chapter discusses the precedents and describes the methods used to conduct this cultural heritage landscape (CHL) study. Many of the CHL evaluation tools and studies done in Ontario are based on work done by the National Parks Service (NPS) in the United States. This paper used this fundamental work along with similar work done by or for several Ontario municipalities as the foundation for this method. The National Parks Service method for identifying and evaluating a cultural heritage landscape is divided into two sections; identification of cultural heritage landscape elements and evaluation of those elements for significance, integrity and for boundaries. This report uses this method to ask the question, does the Kingston Inner Harbour constitute a maritime cultural heritage landscape?

Another method for documenting cultural heritage landscapes is the landscape character assessment. This method involves describing landscape character types and/or areas, identification of key characteristics and mapping landscape character types and/or areas (Tudor 2014, 15).
Methodological Precedents

National Parks Service

The National Parks Service published National Register Bulletin # 30 in 1989 (revised 1999) a set of guidelines for evaluating and documenting rural historic landscapes. This document has become a starting point for many of the CHL studies and evaluation tools used in North America. Identification involves finding eleven characteristics of the landscape, four processes that shape and organize the physical landscape and seven components that are tangible features evident in the landscape. These processes and components are tangible evidence of the people who have occupied, used and changed the landscape and reflect their beliefs, attitudes, traditions and values. Not all processes and components will show up in every landscape but when they can be identified and linked a landscape can be read as a unified whole (McClelland et al 1999). The landscape survey looks for these processes and components which are….

Processes include categories of:

- land use and activities;
- patterns of spatial organization;
- response to the natural environment; and,
- cultural traditions.

Components include examples of:

- circulation networks;
- boundary demarcations;
- vegetation related to land use;
- buildings, structures and objects;
- clusters (groupings of buildings [or structures], or settlement areas);
- archaeological sites; and,
- small-scale elements (e.g. fences, gateposts, trees, or other repeated elements) (McClelland et al 1999).

Identification involves a description of historic context and a cultural and natural history of the area being studied. This is followed by a landscape survey using the eleven characteristics to identify potential cultural heritage landscape elements. NPS guidance on how to identify and
document the characteristics can be found in Appendix 1. Once the identification is complete the cultural heritage landscape elements of the area are evaluated based on the eleven characteristics to define the landscapes significance, assess historical integrity and select boundaries.

**Ontario Cultural Heritage Landscape Studies**

Several different approaches to identification and evaluation of cultural heritage landscapes are used in Ontario. The National Parks Service method of identification and evaluation of cultural heritage landscapes is one method that has been modified and used by several places in Ontario since it was first written in 1989 (Scheinman, 2006). The Town of Caledon, Region of Waterloo, Ontario Ministry of Culture, Town of Goderich, and Town of the Blue Mountains are some of the agencies that have most recently used variations on this approach (Scheinman 2003, Regional Municipality of Waterloo and Heritage Resources Centre 2004, Ontario Ministry of Culture 2005, Scheinman 2006, Jonas *et al* 2009, Envision 2009, Region of Waterloo 2013). The Region of Waterloo is a leader in developing inventory and evaluation tools for cultural heritage landscapes through the *Cultural Heritage Landscapes in Waterloo Region: A Framework for Inventory, Assessment and Policy Development* by André Scheinman. The Town of Goderich has undertaken a cultural heritage landscape study for its harbour using the Region of Waterloo framework as a guide; this is one example of a cultural heritage landscape study applied to a harbour area. Other cultural heritage landscape studies from Ontario where the waterfront, a harbour or maritime environment are important elements of the landscape include the Rideau Corridor Landscape Strategy (Dillon Consulting Limited 2012); the Town of the Blue Mountains Cultural Heritage Landscape Assessment Report (Envision 2009); Norfolk County’s Lakeshore Special Policy Area Secondary Plan Cultural Heritage Landscape and Built Heritage Study (Unterman McPhail Associates 2007); and, Mississauga’s Cultural Landscape Inventory (Mississauga Community Services 2005).
Within the City of Kingston there are no cultural heritage landscapes that have been formally designated but several designated properties, heritage areas and sites can be considered cultural heritage landscapes under the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement’s definition as “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” (PPS 2014, 40). The designated properties, heritage areas and sites within the city that can be considered a cultural heritage landscape include:

- MacDonald Park, Newlands Pavilion, Richardson Bath House;
- Rockwood House and associated buildings;
- Frontenac County Courthouse;
- Cataraqui Cemetery;
- Old Sydenham Ward;
- Lower Princess St.;
- Portsmouth Village;
- Alamein Drive;
- Village of Westbrook;
- St. Lawrence Ward;
- Market Square; and,
- Barriefield Village (Didrickson 2014)

Many National Historic Sites in the city can be considered cultural heritage landscapes including:

- The Rideau Canal
- The Kingston Fortifications
- The Kingston Penitentiary
- Kingston’s War of 1812 shipwrecks

**Kingston Harbours Cultural Heritage Landscape Study Method**

A cultural heritage landscape for Kingston’s harbours is an organically evolved landscape and an associative landscape from a maritime perspective. This landscape includes built heritage, archaeological sites, a relict landscape of past processes and continuing landscape features. Kingston’s harbours are an organically evolved landscape because this area reflects the settlement and development of the community, the industry and commerce of the city, continued operation of
the harbour and changing uses of the local population towards the area. The associative maritime landscape can be found in landscape elements tied to the river and lake environment of the harbour.

The process for identification and evaluation of a cultural heritage landscape involves conducting research on the physical and cultural/historic landscape, doing a survey of the landscape looking for evidence of the components and processes of the landscape and making a case based on this research and survey that a cultural landscape exists. This is followed by an evaluation/analysis of the case based on established criteria and conclusion that it is or is not intact or significant.

Identification

Identification of this cultural heritage landscape involved historic research to find potential elements of the CHL and a landscape survey to find potential sites. It included:

- Developing historical context,
- Physiographic description of the landscape,
- Conducting historical research,
- Surveying the landscape.

The identification of the landscape is written up under the processes and components categories of the landscape and uses the documentation of landscape characteristics guidelines from the National Parks Service as a guide (see Appendix 1).

Historic Context

Historic Context involved historic research to determine important themes and associations. Relevant local histories include *Kingston: Building on the Past for the Future* (Osborne and Swainson 2011), *Personalizing Place: In Defence of Local History The Kingston Case* (Swainson 2011) and *Kingston! Oh Kingston!* (Smith, 1987). The Parks Canada System Plan themes (Parks Canada 2009) have been used for evaluation of the harbour landscape. The various elements of the maritime cultural landscape identified by Westerdahl (2011, 339; see page 7) were instrumental in
identifying maritime cultural landscape associations through the area’s history and on the ground in the study area. The Parks Canada themes overlap with Westerdahl’s parts of the landscape and have been used as a framework for understanding how the themes are found in the landscape.

**Physiographic Description of the Landscape**

The physiographic description of the landscape is based on geology information from the Miller Museum of Geology at Queen’s University, *Birds of the Kingston Region* (Wier 2008), the City of Kingston Environmental Assessment report for the Third Crossing (Lalande *et al* 2012) and visual survey of the study area.

**Historical Research**

The identification of this landscape involved historical research including consulting maps, land records, photographs and publications including primary and secondary sources such as the above mentioned local histories and in this case relevant reports for heritage, environmental and archaeological studies that have been done for the area such as the *Barriefield Village Heritage Conservation District Plan* and amendments, the environmental assessment including heritage assessment and various archaeological assessments done for the Third Crossing of the Cataraqui River that cover the study area. This research included consulting the Canadian Register of Historic Spaces and the Kingston Heritage Properties Register. Historical research pertains to the general study area to identify sites, artifacts, persons or associations of significance for the landscape.

**Landscape Survey**

A landscape survey is done to find and document elements of the historic and relevant natural landscape that still exist. This includes photograph and written documentation of places, structures, viewscapes and artifacts of these landscape elements. The identification of cultural heritage landscape elements requires describing the landscape, documenting the processes and components
of the landscape that are visible on the ground (see page 16) and discussion of the site context in relationship to the study area, including surrounding lands and views to and from the study area which are essentially unchanged from the past (Scheinman 2006, 15). The identification of cultural landscape elements included a description of what part of maritime cultural landscape, as identified by Westerdahl (see page 7); the element is part of for later evaluation. The identification chapter ends with a summary description of the historic place that makes up the study area. This description follows the Parks Canada guidelines for writing a description of a historic place for a statement of significance for the Canadian Register of Historic Places (Parks Canada 2011).

Evaluation

Evaluation of a cultural heritage landscape involves:

- Defining significance,
- List heritage attributes,
- Assessing historical integrity,
- Defining boundaries.

Significance Criteria

Evaluation of this landscape involved applying criteria for evaluating the design, history and context of the study area. The significance criteria for evaluating an organically evolved and associative cultural landscape developed for the Region of Waterloo have been used for this project:

For Organically Evolved Landscapes and Associative Cultural Landscapes

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; or,
B. Is closely associated with the lives of individuals and/or families who are considered significant to the history of the area; or,
C. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a particular settlement pattern or lifeway whether derived from ethnic background, imposed by the landscape, was the practice of a specific historic period or a combination of the above; or,
D. Manifests a particularly close and harmonious longstanding relationship between the natural and domestic landscape; or,

E. Has yielded or is likely to yield information important to prehistory or history; or,

F. Is strongly associated with the cultural and/or spiritual traditions of First Nations or any other ethnic and/or religious group (Scheinman 2006, 15).

The Province of Ontario developed Regulations 9/06 and 10/06 under the *Ontario Heritage Act* in 2006; however these regulations apply to real property instead of groupings of heritage attributes as in a cultural heritage landscape. The intent of the significance criteria in these regulations as a method of evaluating cultural heritage value and/or interest and the fact that these criteria would be used on individual properties within a cultural heritage landscape make them relevant to a CHL evaluation. In the case of an organically evolved or associative landscape the historical or associative value criteria and the contextual value criteria from Regulation 9/06 (Page 9) and all of the criteria in Regulation 10/06 (Page 10) are similar to the six criteria used by the Region of Waterloo. Where relevant the criteria from regulations 9/06 and 10/06 will supersede the Region of Waterloo criteria for assessing property within a cultural heritage landscape and should be utilized as part of a CHL evaluation, however this study did not assess individual properties within the study area and therefore did not use Regulations 9/06 and 10/06 as part of the evaluation process. The Region of Waterloo cultural heritage landscape evaluation criteria have been applied to the study area through the evaluation process. As sites are identified through historic research or landscape survey the question; does this site meet any of the above significance criteria, have been asked of them. To be considered significant as part of the CHL the site must meet one or more of the criteria (Scheinman 2006, 15). Elements of the landscape identified as part of a maritime landscape have also been used to add a maritime lens to the evaluation. Elements of the landscape from the processes and components of the landscape
as well as continuing uses and the historic context have been evaluated against each of the six criteria.

**Character-Defining Elements/Heritage Attributes**

Character-Defining Elements are “the materials, forms, location, spatial configurations, uses and cultural associations or meanings that contribute to the heritage value of an historic place, which must be retained in order to preserve its heritage value” (Parks Canada 2010, 253). They are tangible and intangible features that express the heritage values associated with the cultural heritage landscape (Parks Canada 2011, 14). Heritage attributes are features of the property, building(s), and/or structures that contribute to the property’s cultural heritage value or interest (OHA Definitions), and must be retained to conserve that value. These elements are the most significant parts of the cultural heritage landscape and must be conserved in order to maintain its integrity. Character-Defining Elements must still exist and provide a clear link between the heritage value and place (Parks Canada 2011, 14). Character-Defining Elements/Heritage Attributes have been identified through the research and landscape survey of the inventory process and have been listed in the statement of significance. Heritage value can be tied to the study area’s historic themes. The Character-Defining Elements are elements of the landscape that illustrate the historic themes of the study area and are important enough to the landscape that without them the link between the theme and place is broken. As the study area has been evaluated as a maritime cultural heritage landscape, the heritage attributes were also filtered through the lens of the maritime landscape.

**Demonstration of Integrity**

Application of significance criteria is followed by a demonstration of integrity. Integrity is influenced by the size of the site, the number of inter-relationships between the elements, the range of land uses and extent of vegetative or shoreline change. Some loss of integrity is expected over time but “key individual elements, both built and landscape which still clearly reflect the historic
period and/or the organic evolution from which their heritage significance derives” (Scheinman 2006, 16) must remain. In order to determine integrity the following questions must be considered for organically evolved and associative cultural landscapes (Scheinman 2006, 16):

- Is the site continuing in the same use and/or compatible use? Compatible here refers to a use that doesn’t require the altering of key elements and their inter-relationship.
- Is there continuity of ownership or occupation of the site, dating to an historic period?
- Have buildings and other built elements such as survived in their original form and in relatively sound condition?
- Are historic complexes and their relationships to other elements such as yards and fields [and moorings] intact?
- To what extent have other built elements such as fences, walls, paths, bridges, corrals, pens [wharves, docks, slips] survived?
- Does the historical relationship to prominent natural features, e.g. cliff, stream, still exist both for the site as a whole and within the site?
- Are ‘designed’ plantings such as hedgerows, windrows, gardens, shade trees still discernible and is their traditional relationship to buildings, lanes, roadways, walks and fields still discernible?
- How closely does the existing view of the site compare to the same view captured in a historic photo?
- Do ruins and overgrown elements still convey a clear message? (Scheinman 2006, 16).

Boundaries

Boundaries of the cultural heritage landscape can be defined after identification and preliminary evaluation of the landscape. This process refines the general study area and can be based on historical legal boundaries, boundary markers, paths that separate places, natural features, vegetation, and changes in the pattern of development or the edges of new development but will contain the area of historic integrity (Scheinman 2006, 17-18). In the case of this cultural heritage landscape study, historic research into past use of harbour areas, examination of historic aerial photographs and analysis of maps, such as fire insurance maps and the existing heritage elements found during landscape survey reveal where the boundaries are.
Limitations

Project Scope

This Kingston Inner Harbour cultural heritage landscape study is a pilot project aimed at examining one section of Kingston’s harbour to explore the inventory and evaluation method of the National Parks Service and Region of Waterloo on a maritime environment. The history and geography of the study area is rich and complex and due to time and resource constraints has not been examined in great detail. The survey of the landscape has been limited to terrestrial public places; survey by boat would have been beneficial. The boundaries of the study area were chosen early in the project to keep the project manageable, this partially pre-empted using the research and evaluation of the landscape to define boundaries as should have been done. This project is limited to identification and evaluation of the study area as a cultural heritage landscape and does not address assessing community value for the landscape.

Community Value or Interest

The Provincial Policy Statement states that a cultural heritage landscape must be “identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community” (Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing 2014, 40). The next step in evaluating this cultural heritage landscape is to demonstrate its value to the community. Cultural Heritage Landscapes in Waterloo Region: A Framework for Inventory, Assessment and Policy Development lists several other tools to assess value including….

- Images from the landscape appearing in local business promotions,
- Widely recognized landmarks from with the landscape boundaries,
- A high degree of community pride and stewardship through historic plaques and voluntary upkeep of heritage features,
- Place names that reflect the landscape,
- Elements of the landscape are widely photographed or included in local artworks,
- Written local histories,
- Accounts of local historical lore are able to be recounted easily,
- The landscape area hosts longstanding public gatherings and events or are favoured locations for community celebrations (Scheinman 2006, 18).
Acknowledgement of the area’s significance or value in municipal plans or policies can reveal community value. Consultation with the local community and heritage groups is the next step in assessing value or interest by the community (Scheinman 2006; Shipley and Feick 2009) but for this initial study evaluation of community value through the above elements and through community consultation has been recommended as a follow-up project due to time and resource constraints.

**Recommendations**

Based on the research to identify and evaluate the Kingston Harbours area as a cultural heritage landscape this study has finished off with recommendations for conservation of this area as a cultural heritage landscape and recommendations about further work and tools to conserve the landscape.
3 Historical Context of Kingston’s Harbours

3.1 Historical Context Overview

The historical context is intended to convey a broad sense of history and tie the local history to significant historical themes that affect the inventory and evaluation of the cultural heritage landscape. The context examines a larger geographical and temporal scope than the main study area, covering much of Kingston and the surrounding lake and shoreline environment (see Figure 3-1).

The main study area for this project is the Inner Harbour (the area in the red box on Figure 3-1 and illustrated in Figure 3-2).

**Figure 3-1.** Map of Kingston’s Harbour between Wolfe Island and the mainland up river to Kingston Mills and from Collins Bay to Howe Island
This context is intended to provide an overall sense of the maritime history and to establish how Kingston’s harbours fit within the main historic themes of the area. For this pilot project the Parks Canada System Plan themes have been used as relevant heritage themes for this study area.

The themes are…

- Peopling the Land,
- Developing Economies,
- Governing Canada,
- Building Social and Community Life, and
- Expressing Intellectual and Cultural Life.

This historic context also ties elements of local history to types of the maritime cultural landscape as identified by Westerdahl (see page 7). There are seven parts to a maritime cultural landscape identified by Westerdahl…

- the subsistence landscape;
- the economic landscape;
- the resource landscape;
- the transport landscape;
- the territorial landscape;
- the cognitive landscape; and,
- the ritual landscape (Westerdahl 2011, 339).

The broad historic context that follows is a narrative and is followed up with a summary linking the history to themes and elements of the maritime landscape.
3.2 Broad Historic Context

3.2.1 Prehistoric

First Nations peoples have been moving through and living in the Kingston area continuously since at least the late Paleo period circa 12000-10000 BP (Before Present). The entire area around the mouth of the Cataraqui River has high potential for pre-contact First Nations sites and 37 registered sites were reported in the 2012 Environmental Assessment for the Third Crossing of the Cataraqui River (Lalande et al 2012, 38-39). First Nations peoples in the centuries before contact with Europeans tended to travel in small groups through the area using fishing stations or campsites along main waterways and congregated at seasonal village sites further inland for part of the year and would re-visit these sites regularly for centuries (Gromoff 2014). The best known pre-contact sites close to the study area are the Kingston Outer Station site a Late Middle Woodland period seasonal village site circa 700 CE (Current Era) 1500 CE, Belle Island a Middle Woodland period (c. 1000 CE – C. 1400 CE) fishing and hunting settlement and burial ground (CARF, 2013a) and two Woodland campsites or fishing stations near Fort Frontenac (Gromoff 2014). During the Late Woodland and Proto-Historic periods in the centuries just before and during contact with Europeans, this part of Ontario was probably part of the territory used by the Huron, but due to close proximity to enemy Iroquoian groups south of the St. Lawrence River and toward the western end of Lake Ontario, this area was probably only visited occasionally (CARF, 2013b). There is high potential in areas along the river that have not been disturbed for development to find more evidence of prehistoric First Nations peoples. The known and probable First Nations sites in this area reflect the subsistence and ritual landscape and fit within the themes of Peopling the Land, Developing Economies and Expressing Intellectual and Cultural Life.
3.2.2 French Settlement

French explorers and fur traders were among the first European peoples to visit the Kingston area using the lakes and rivers for transportation. Samuel de Champlain was in the area in October of 1615 (Smith 1987, 17). As the fur trade in North America developed and various first nations peoples allied with European powers the importance of a French presence on Lake Ontario grew and in 1673 Governor Frontenac and René-Robert Cavelier, Sieur de La Salle travelled to the mouth of the Great Cataraqui River to treat\(^1\) with the north shore Iroquois and gained access to crucial fur trade routes in what is now Ontario (Osborne and Swainson 2011, 9-10). The first incarnation of Fort Frontenac was built in 1673 on the western shore of the Great Cataraqui River and Lake Ontario, a strategic location intended to protect French interests along the lake and control the Iroquoian peoples, potential enemies, and to provide a base for further French mission and settlement in the Western reaches of New France (Bazely 2007a, 4). The fort was strategically located where the lake and St. Lawrence River meet with a safe harbour in the Cataraqui River which La Salle used, building several small decked sailing vessels for fur trading and military purposes (Smith 1987, 4, 8, 9, 23). The fort was added to and strengthened at least three times over the next 85 years demonstrating the significance the site held to French authorities but in 1758 a British attack under the command of Lieutenant-Colonel Bradstreet took the fort and ended French control of the area (Bazely 2007a, 8).

The French settlement at Cataraqui reflects the economic landscape, the transport landscape, the territorial landscape and the cognitive landscape. French settlement further fits within themes of Peopling the Land, Developing Economies and Governing Canada.

---

\(^1\) Treat: The action or an act of treating, or discussing terms; parley, negotiation; agreement; treaty (Oxford English Dictionary).
3.2.3 Early British Settlement

The British in 1758 took Fort Frontenac from the French and destroyed French shipping on Lake Ontario and after the French defeat on the Plains of Abraham outside of Quebec City and the subsequent Treaty of Paris in 1763; the area became part of British North America (Osborne and Swainson 2011, 15-16). Fort Frontenac was controlled by the British from about 1760 and Carleton Island to the South was an important transhipment and military location during the American War for Independence (1775-1783) but there was no official British settlement at Cataraqui until 1783 when the area was selected as a town site to be the centre of the region (Osborne and Swainson 2011, 18). Carleton Island had been ceded to the Americans so the British needed a new strategic and settlement location on the north shore of the lake. The old site of Fort Frontenac was appropriate (Swainson 2011, 16-17). In 1783, the first group of Loyalists arrived at Cataraqui to establish a settlement (Osborne and Swainson 2011, 23). From its beginning as a British settlement, the town was dominated by the port and maritime commerce due to the importance of military transhipment, shipbuilding and a naval presence at the centre of the local economy (Swainson 2011, 17). Figure 3-3 illustrates Cataraqui in 1783.

Commerce at Cataraqui changed from military supplies through fur and potash to food goods and consumer goods (Swainson 2011, 17). By 1787, there was a ferry across the mouth of the Cataraqui River owned by Richard Cartwright who also constructed a wharf, warehouses and homes on the

Figure 3-3. Cataraqui in 1783 by J. Peachey, LAC MIKAN 2895300.
East side of the river (Bazely 2007b, 4-5). Cartwright, John Forsythe, Robert Macaulay, John Kirby and Thomas Markland were all important merchants in this new community (Swainson 2011, 17). In 1788, the name of the settlement at Cataraqui was changed to Kingston and private commercial craft were officially allowed to operate on Lake Ontario. Richard Cartwright had Lady Dorchester built in 1789 and the Kingston merchants moved their wharves and warehouses to the Lake Ontario shore, investing in the creation of a new commercial harbour for their business (Osborne and Swainson 2011, 40-41).

This early period of British settlement reflects the Parks Canada themes of Peopling the Land, Developing Economies, Building Social and Community Life and Governing Canada. The initial settlement was built by the military but quickly grew as a commercial centre, two significant influences for the organization of the community. The landscape elements of this early period include the economic landscape as the community developed a commercial port, the resource landscape as local natural resources were used to build the community, the territorial landscape illustrated through the military adaptations to the environment and the transport landscape as the port was built.

3.2.4 Military and Naval Influences

As the village of Kingston grew based on the maritime commerce and transhipment role of the port, the military and naval presence in Kingston remained an essential part of the community. Old Fort Frontenac was repaired in 1783; a naval dockyard was created on Point Frederick in 1790 and during the War of 1812 several fortifications were built around the harbour including blockhouses on Point Henry, Point Frederick and Murney Point (Bazely 2007b, 10; Canada’s Historic Places 2009). This military presence was followed by the more permanent installations of the Rideau Canal, Fort Henry and the Martello Towers between 1826 and 1848 (Parks Canada 2005, 6-8).
These fortifications were built to protect Kingston’s harbour (Parks Canada 2007, 3-4) and by extension to protect the activities of the port.

The military and naval presence in Kingston remained important going through several stages of decline and revival to the present day. The dockyard closed and re-opened several times and finally became the Royal Military College of Canada in 1874 (Government of Canada 2009), HMCS *Cataraqui* was established on the East shore of the Cataraqui River in 1941 (National Defence 2006) and shipbuilding for the navy continued off and on at various sites until after the Second World War. The military and naval history of Kingston is part of the Governing Canada theme and the territorial and transport landscapes.

### 3.2.5 Nineteenth Century Port

The 19th century port in Kingston was a thriving place shaping the rest of the community. The port influenced the economic and social development of the city, joining the Great Lakes, Rideau Canal and St. Lawrence River. This port was an essential point of transshipment between points west to places to east and the city’s own hinterland via the Rideau Canal and St. Lawrence River. “Kingston was for generations an important point of transshipment for water-borne traffic” (Swainson 2011, 246). The city had a significant shipbuilding, ship repair and salvage industry in the port. Garden Island was an important port for the timber trade (Swainson 2011, 246). Goods...
went down the St. Lawrence or up the Rideau Canal and people and luxury goods came upstream for points further west, disembarking from river vessels in Kingston to transfer to lake vessels for the rest of the journey (Swainson 2011, 246). “The waterfront was marked by elevators, wharves, warehouses, and a miscellany of shipping” (Swainson 2011, 247). These structures indicate a vibrant and growing port.

By the late 19th century the port had seen significant changes due to new locks along the St. Lawrence River and the advent of rail transportation which had significant impacts on maritime trade (Osborne and Swainson 2011, 222). The port continued to evolve with enhanced shipbuilding and outfitting capacity and continuing transshipment. Goods could be transferred from ship to rail in the port and; as ship technology improved, the size of vessels quickly outgrew the St. Lawrence locks so goods still had to be moved from large to small vessels (Osborne and Swainson 2011, 222-223). The transshipment and ship building and repair industries were so important in the 1880’s and 1890’s that several new grain elevators were built along the outer harbour (Osborne and Swainson 2011, 224) and the Federal government built the Kingston Dry Dock in 1890 (Canada’s Historic Places 2008). The harbours also saw the beginnings of recreation on the water in the 19th century with regattas, a canoe club and yacht club (Johnston 2014, 2).

The history of the 19th century port illustrates the Parks Canada themes of
Peopling the Land, Developing Economies and Building Social and Community Life as people moved to and through Kingston to settle the country and grow the local and national economies. This part of the port’s history reveals the economic landscape, resource landscape and transport landscape in port developments that enhanced the harbour for economic use.

3.2.6 Rideau Canal

Figure 3-6. Map of the Rideau Canal route (in red). Kingston to Ottawa.

The Rideau Canal officially opened in 1832 as a military transportation route but was designed for commercial traffic. For a few years, the canal was the easiest way to transport goods between Montreal and Kingston. In 1846 when new locks along the St. Lawrence River opened; use of the canal for large scale transportation declined. The canal facilitated opening up land between Kingston and Ottawa for settlement. Eventually, as roads and rail developed the canal became known for its recreational and scenic value and finally for its historic integrity (Parks Canada 2012).
The canal terminating in Kingston was a significant part of the harbour shaping the growth of the city and surrounding areas. The canal is part of the Governing Canada and Developing Economies themes. The landscape elements of the canal include the transport landscape as a transport route, the territorial landscape as a large military works project and part of the cognitive landscape as the canal replaced, followed and in some cases inundated earlier transportation routes.

### 3.2.7 Railway

Rail came to Kingston in the mid-1850 with the construction of Kingston’s Outer Station built by the Grand Trunk Railway (GTR). This was the final section joining the GTR’s line between Toronto and Montreal and opened on October 27, 1856 (Dillon et al., 2006, p.8). This rail line and station connected Kingston to the rest of the country by rail and led to the development of industry along the Inner Harbour, Cataraqui River and north of the city of Kingston. Track was laid along the shore of the river between 1872 and 1884 when the Kingston and Pembroke Railway (K&P) began construction from the waterfront north towards Sharbot Lake (Page, 2007). Rail lines along the harbour areas spurred industrial use but also began to harm the maritime traffic in passengers, freight and packages (Osborne and Swainson 2011, 222) and led to changes in the shape of the shoreline. The rail lines along the harbour are part of the transport landscape and fit within the Developing Economies theme.

### 3.2.8 Twentieth Century

By the beginning of the 20th century the port of Kingston had seen some significant investment but the port still had some significant deficiencies, including limited infrastructure for larger vessels and competition from Canadian ports further west and American ports in larger cities for ship wintering business and ship building and repair business. Every time the Welland Canal was improved by altering the route or adding width and depth allowed larger ships from the upper lakes
down to Lake Ontario and Kingston’s role as a transhipment port was revitalized. As a result of the 1887 improvements to the Welland Canal and the new dry dock built from 1890 to 1892 the early 20th century was promising for Kingston as a port city. However the port did need improvement because the outer harbour was exposed to westerly gales and was relatively shallow with many private wharves, elevators and industry, leaving little room for further port development (Osborne and Swainson 2011, 224-225). Kingston planned on becoming the “Foot of the Lakes Terminal”, constructing a large deep water port for transhipment, repair and wintering over in the Inner Harbour. This terminal was never created but some harbour improvements were completed such as the replacement of the 1828 Cataraqui Bridge with the La Salle Causeway (1917), and harbour dredging in the early 20th century (Osborne and Swainson 2011, 228). New elevators were built in Kingston, along the Outer Harbour, during the 20th century including one for Canada Steamship Lines in Cataraqui Bay to the west of Kingston in 1929.

The early 20th century saw steady growth of the shipbuilding and repair industry in Kingston along with the growth of other waterfront industry. The Kingston Dry Dock was leased to a private company, the

![Figure 3-7. The Corvette HMCS Belleville side launch at the Kingston shipyards in 1944. Marine Museum of the Great Lakes 1984.0006.0063.]
Company in 1910. The dry dock was extended in 1929 and modified in 1955 due to a need to fit larger vessels inside. During the First World War, the shipyard built trawlers for naval purposes and during the Second World War the shipyard built 12 corvettes.

In the Inner Harbour, the Davis Drydock Company built ships boats and lifeboats for the navy in World War One (MacLachlan 1999) and Canadian Dredge and Dock built tugs, gates vessels, derricks and barges for the Navy during World War Two (Ouderkirk and Gillham 2002, 79). These yards were busy for commercial purposes before, between and after the wars but the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway in 1959 allowed ships to bypass Kingston and go to larger ports with more and bigger facilities for repair, wintering over or construction. These shipyards eventually closed down, the Kingston Shipbuilding Company in 1968 and Canadian Dredge and Dock in 1980 (Ouderkirk and Gillham, 79). Boatbuilding was re-established in the Inner Harbour in 1989 when Metalcraft Marine moved its operations to Anglin Bay and the Kingston Marina (Metalcraft Marine Inc. 2014).

The latter half of the 20th century saw dramatic change on Kingston’s waterfront with the collapse of the transhipment industry and the decline in shipbuilding and closure of most industry along the waterfront. This rather rapid change from significant industrial centre to derelict space offered the city opportunity for dramatic changes. Much of this former industrial land was sold to private developers and hotels and high-rises took the place of coal piles and grain elevators (Swainson 2011, 253). Other sections of land were sold for development but development was delayed and the land lay vacant and deteriorating for decades. Some stretches were retained for public use: the pumping station at Ontario and West Streets became a city museum and the Kingston Dry Dock was leased to the Marine Museum of the Great Lakes, a private not-for-profit museum. Parks were created such as Confederation Park in 1967 and a city marina was built adjacent to it in
1986 (Swainson 2011, 254). The waterfront went through a dramatic change from an industrial and commercial space that was a fundamental part of building the city to a place for private living and public enjoyment. This change continues along all parts of the cities harbours. The maritime landscape during the 20th and early 21st century was and is strongly associated with the economic landscape, the transport landscape, the territorial landscape and the cognitive landscape.

The 20th century saw a dramatic rise and fall of the industrial and commercial function of the port of Kingston and changes to a place dominated by residences and recreational pursuits. The history of the harbours during the 20th century is dominated by the theme of Developing Economies as the harbour and harbour works facilitated trade, commerce, new engineering, shipbuilding, transportation and labour. The Parks Canada themes of Peopling the land, Building Social and Community Life, and Expressing Intellectual and Cultural Life are also covered reflecting residential patterns, people’s relationship to the environment, recreational and sport use of the waterfront. The theme of Governing Canada can be demonstrated through wartime naval shipbuilding and permanent naval presence in the harbour since 1941.

3.3 Historic Themes

The five main themes of the Parks Canada System Plan are relevant for the Kingston area. There are several National Historic Sites within and around the study area including the Rideau Canal National Historic Site, The Kingston Fortifications National Historic Site and the Fort Frontenac National Historic site, so these themes are being used extensively in the Kingston area already. The themes of Developing Economies and Governing Canada are strongly reflected at these sites with subthemes of Technology and Engineering, Communications and Transportation, and Military and Defense. These are illustrated through the port and naval facilities and the naval and commercial history of the city. The themes of Peopling the Land, Building Social and Community
Life, and Expressing Intellectual and Cultural Life can be found in the settlement and development of Kingston, the way communities around the harbours have organized and how people have and continue to use the harbours. Table 3-1 links heritage themes and the broad historic context.

Table 3-1. Linking Heritage Themes and Broad Historic Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Historic Context: Event, Artifact or Trend supporting themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peopling the Land</strong></td>
<td>Local history clearly demonstrates the peopling of the area and impacts this has had on the landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• First Nations peoples, hunting, fishing and gathering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• French fort at Cataraqui started European settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Late 18th century; British military and Loyalists move to Kingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Growth of a British military presence and civilian town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Kingston’s growth from a small town to modern city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developing Economies</strong></td>
<td>The history of developing economies for Kingston has been linked to the harbour through transportation, engineering, labour and trade. First Nations Hunting and Gathering, early economic system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• French Fur Trade using the fort to control the business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Early British trade exported resources and imported consumer goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Early British residents begin building ships, wharves, warehouses and a bridge for commercial uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rideau Canal facilitates economic growth for the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Railways link Great Lakes trade to new markets and enhance Kingston’s transshipment role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 20th century harbour improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 20th century large manufacturing linked to the harbours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Governing Canada</strong></td>
<td>A military/naval presence has been in Kingston since Europeans first arrived and has been instrumental in shaping the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fort Frontenac and French shipbuilding for territorial control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Royal Navy Dockyard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rideau Canal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Fort Henry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Martello Towers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Naval Shipbuilding at the dockyard and later shipyards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• H.M.C.S. Cataraqui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Social and Community Life</strong></td>
<td>As the harbour front developed different communities arose, labourers, residents, different immigrant groups and military communities all shaping the community life of Kingston.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• British/Loyalist citizens build a port town in the late 18th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 19th century port uses bring new communities of people to Kingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 20th century changes away from industrial to residential waterfronts changing adjacent communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expressing Intellectual and Cultural Life</strong></td>
<td>Local shoreline history demonstrates expressions of spirituality at the First Nations burial ground on Belle Island and sport and leisure through recreational pursuits along the water including sport, parks and museums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• First Nations burial ground (spirituality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Waterfront recreation, sailing, paddling, regattas etc…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Developing waterfront parks and museums</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Maritime Landscape Elements

The heritage themes overlap with the components of a maritime cultural landscape identified by Westerdahl (2011, 339, see page 7) which help frame the maritime components in the landscape. Elements of each part of the maritime cultural landscape can be found in Kingston’s harbours as demonstrated through the historic context. This leads to the specific identification and evaluation of cultural heritage landscape elements in the study area.

Table 3-2. Maritime Landscape Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subsistence Landscape</td>
<td>- Archaeological evidence of First Nations Peoples presence in the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Archaeological evidence of early European settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Landscape</td>
<td>- The history of the goods that moved through the harbour including fish, timber, grain and other resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Built improvements to the harbour that have shaped the landscape, such as the La Salle Causeway, the dump under Cataraqui (Belle) Park, the created land along the western shore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Landscape</td>
<td>- Evidence of, history of and continuing shipbuilding in the Inner Harbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- History of fishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Evidence of industry around the Inner Harbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Landscape</td>
<td>- The entire harbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Wrecks and abandoned vessels in the harbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Remnants of shipbuilding facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Wharves and docks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Other maritime infrastructure such as bollards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Territorial Landscape</td>
<td>- Military and naval installations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Warship wrecks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Landscape</td>
<td>- Kingston Sail Loft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Metalcraft Marine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Street names associated with the river and lake environment and community maritime history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ritual Landscape</td>
<td>- First Nations burial ground on Belle Island</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identification of the Kingston Inner Harbour Cultural Heritage Landscape

4.1 Kingston Inner Harbour Landscape Inventory Overview

Identification of the Inner Harbour cultural heritage landscape involved a description of the study area’s natural and cultural history through a physiographic description of the landscape and an inventory of CHL processes and components. Inventory of the processes and components of the landscape reveals the specific local history of the study area. This inventory documents what remains of the area’s tangible and intangible cultural heritage.

Figure 4-1. Map of the Kingston Inner Harbour, study area is within the red section.
Kingston’s Inner Harbour is located at the mouth of the Cataraqui River at the junction of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River in Kingston Ontario. The Inner Harbour is the southern end of the Rideau Canal and part of a UNESCO World Heritage Site and National Historic Site of Canada. It contains one of Ontario’s oldest Heritage Conservation Districts in Barriefield Village, several other properties designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act* (see Figure 4-2) and several places of maritime historic interest such as the Davis Drydock, La Salle Causeway and Fort Frontenac. The Inner Harbour was a ship graveyard holding the remains of fourteen documented 19th and 20th century vessels. Several components of a maritime cultural heritage landscape from land use activities, ships, industry and transport infrastructure are found in this area. Visual evidence of the past maritime nature and continuing maritime uses in the Inner Harbour further indicate that this is an excellent candidate for a cultural heritage landscape.

### 4.2 Physiographic Description of the Landscape

The rocks of the Kingston area and mouth of the Cataraqui River consist of metamorphic and igneous rock over 1.1 billion years old and sedimentary limestone laid down about 500 million years ago at the bottom of a sea. Much of the rock laid down in the last 460 million years has eroded away. There have been four ice ages scouring the landscape over the last 2 million years with the
last one ending around 11000 years ago. The Great Lakes were formed during the last ice age as the ice scooped out the rock around former river valleys and the weight of the ice pushed the depressions deeper (Badham 2012). Most of the rock in the study area is sedimentary limestone of the Napanee Plain but the Barriefield hill see Figure 4-3), a significant element of the landscape, is limestone over a hard quartzite and gneiss a much older rock (Badham 2014).

**Figure 4-3.** Barriefield rock cut showing the hill’s geology. B. Holthof 2014

The Inner Harbour study area contains mixed forests with species such as:

- Eastern White Pine *Pinus strobus*,
- Red Pine *Pinus resinosa*,
- Eastern Hemlock *Tsuga Canadensi*,
- Yellow Birch *Betula alleghaniensis*,
- Sugar Maple *Acer saccharum*,
- Red Maple *Acer rubrum*,
- Red Oak *Quercus rubra*,
- Basswood *Tilia Americana*,
- White Elm *Ulmus Americana*,
- Eastern White Cedar *Tuja occidentalis*,
- Largetooth Aspen *Populus grandidentata*,
- Beech *Fagus grandifolia*,
- White Birch *Betula papyrifera*,
- White Ash *Fraxinus Americana*,

Cattail marshes are substantial on the Napanee Plain including the Greater Cataraqui River marsh south of Kingston Mills (Weir 2008, 21). The marsh and buffering forest are a provincially significant wetland and area of scientific and natural interest (Lalande *et al* 2012, ps-4). The water in the Cataraqui River is slow moving with an average depth of 1.2 metres and tends to freeze over in December until April, freezing and thawing in place (Lalande *et al* 2012, ps-4). The river and
shoreline contain habitat for many terrestrial and aquatic species. This includes feeding and nesting areas for 206 bird species 21 of which nest in the marsh, 26 fish species spawn in the river and use it as a nursery and 16 amphibian and reptile species live along the river (Lalande et al 2012, ps-5).

Visual survey of the study area (see Figure 4-4) illustrates an environment shaped by the Cataraqui River with low marshy areas along the western shore and steep slopes along parts of the eastern shore with some low lying areas around Green Bay and the Canadian Forces lands near the La Salle Causeway. The landscape has thick trees and brush in some former industrial areas on both sides of the river that have since closed. A new natural environment is growing up on brownfield sites and park lands and residential areas along the river appear to have healthy mature trees. Barriefield hill is a dominant natural feature on the landscape.

The Rideau Canal channel is closer to the east side of the river and passes east of Belle Island reflecting the deeper water along the eastern edge of the river. The western side of the river aside from Anglin Bay and the Kingston Marina is fairly shallow but clear of marshy areas except very close to the shore. The shoreline around Anglin Bay and the La Salle Causeway has been filled in with a lot of hard surface with piles, sheet metal and larger rocks placed to create a new shoreline. The hard surfaces and unnatural shoreline appear to be lightly colonized by natural species.
4.3 Processes

4.3.1 Land Use and Activities

*Northern Section, Belle Island/Belle Park*

First Nations campsites and a burial ground have been found through archaeological investigation at Belle Island indicating a subsistence and ritual use around the mouth of the Cataraqui River in prehistoric times. The Island was patented to William McLean, in 1803, who used the surrounding marshland as pasture and hayfield. There was a short lived homestead on the island from 1863-1881 (CARF 2013b). The City of Kingston then used the marsh as a municipal landfill from 1952 until 1974 (City of Kingston 2014). After closing the landfill the city used the new land and island to create Cataraqui Park (more commonly known as Belle Park) (City of Kingston 2014). This part of the landscape has been used for ritual, subsistence, agriculture, landfill and recreation. All land uses except recreation are historic or prehistoric and tied to the maritime nature of the site.

*Western Section, the Inner Harbour*

The earliest European use of the lands along the Cataraqui River was due to the area’s strategic location for a fort and settlement to project French influence over the region. Fort Frontenac was next to a protected harbour and good shipbuilding site. The riverine portion of the study area has been used as a harbour for centuries. The harbour has also been a large ship graveyard. When the British took Fort Frontenac from the French in 1758 the French had seven ships in the harbour (nine according to the British) all of which were captured. Two were kept to transport supplies and the rest were burned in the inner harbour (Bazely 2005, 6). Over time, part of the bay was filled in, burying the vessels, one of which was partially uncovered during construction of Normandy Hall in 1954 and is housed at the Marine Museum of the Great Lakes. The British military first created new land along the western shore of the Inner Harbour to reduce the swamp
near their barracks at Place D’Armes (Bazely and Moorhead 2005, 5). Private businesses started up around what is now Anglin Bay on water lots using some of the new land created by the military and creating more by dumping waste into the bay. The land north of Ontario St. and east of Wellington St. including the site of the Kingston Marina and Douglas Fluhrer Park is on these water lots, which were used for industrial, commercial and transportation uses.

The land around Anglin Bay has had an industrial character since the British Military Board of Ordnance first began using it as a wood yard in 1783. The military set up stables, a parade ground, engineer’s houses and shops. The Tête de Pont Barracks were built by 1820. The spit of land out into the river was the site of a scowman’s house by 1797 to facilitate river crossings. A brewery was on site by 1793 and a tin and copper manufactory by 1815. By 1829, land fill had started and the new land was first used as a fuel yard. In 1854 a hay, wood and cattle market on Place D’Armes was operating (Bazely and Moorhead 2005, 5-10).

The GTR railroad line crossed the inner bay on a causeway in 1857. In 1867 Captain Robert Davis founded the Davis Drydock company and built a dry dock in 1889, which still exists (McLachlan 1999). Davis Dry Dock was sold to S. Anglin and Co. in 1928 and the site was used as a fuel store, coal yard, lumber yard and continued as a boat yard; all uses that required access to the harbour. In 1931 Canadian Dredge and Dock Company moved to Kingston to work on the St. Lawrence Ship Canal and purchased the Davis Dry Dock in 1933. Canadian Dredge and Dock continued boatbuilding on the site and used the location as headquarters for work on the St. Lawrence Seaway in the 1950’s. They closed Kingston operations in 1980 (Ouderkirk and Gillham 2002, 79). Metalcraft Marine moved to the site in 1989 and continues shipbuilding on site (Metalcraft Marine 2014). Other industrial sites along the western shore of the inner harbour that relied on water access include the cotton mill (Woolen Mill), Davis Tannery, and the Queen City Oil Company depot.
Many of the people who worked in the marine environment including captains, mates, crew, shipbuilders, wharfingers lived around the Inner Harbour. The family of Captain John Irwin, one of Kingston’s many Great Lakes captains lived in the vicinity of Rideau and North Streets in the late 1800’s and were close to many other mariners (Ivey 2014, 179).

The former rail and industrial lands have been changed into recreational places including a park and waterfront paths. The river’s edge is also home to the Kingston Rowing Club since 1979 and Cataraqui Canoe Club.

The western shores of the Inner Harbour have been used for military, industrial, disposal, transportation, recreation and residential uses throughout the years.

**Southern Section, the Bridge**

The first bridge across the Cataraqui River was completed in 1829. Before this time various ferries offered the only way across the river. The Cataraqui Bridge was replaced in 1917 by the La Salle Causeway, a causeway consisting of 2 approaches, 2 wharfs and three bridges (Public Works and Government Services Canada 2014). This site is a continuing transportation use.

**Eastern Section, Barriefield**

The British presence on the East side of the Cataraqui River began with the military establishment of a wharf in 1784 and the naval dockyard in 1788. Rural lots were laid out by 1786 and in 1814 Richard Cartwright, owner of Lot 21, subdivided and laid out village lots (Scheinman *et al* 1992, A2-2). The village was named in 1820 after Commodore Robert Barrie, the commissioner of the naval dockyard (Bray 1972, 5). Barriefield was home to many people who worked at the naval dockyard (Pittsburgh 1989, 5) and became home to at least seven boat building outfits (Patterson 1989, 93) and several commercial fishermen (Pittsburgh 1989, 5).
An 1869 Ordnance map of Barriefield (Figure 4-5) shows a quarry and wharf at the north end of the village. A sawmill also operated on Green Point.

The east shore of the Inner Harbour is also home to H.M.C.S. Cataraqui, one of seven Great Lakes Naval Reserve divisions. Created in 1941, H.M.C.S. Cataraqui has moved around Kingston over the years and was based on the shores of the Inner Harbour from 1959-1972 and from 1992 to the present.

The east shore of the study area has maritime residential, industrial and resource land uses. The village was largely residential with many residents working at the naval dockyard or in other maritime pursuits. The shoreline was home to boat builders, a sawmill and commercial fishermen and the close proximity of limestone to the shore was ideal for quarrying stone. The boatbuilding, other industry or resource-based land uses are historic but the village continues as a residential site.

*Cataraqui River Watercourse*

The Inner Harbour became the graveyard for many wooden and a few metal hulled vessels from the late 19th and early 20th centuries. These vessels were the remains of the ageing fleet of Great Lakes schooners, barges and steamers. There are fourteen vessels left in the harbour, but by the 1920’s at least forty vessels were abandoned in this graveyard (Moore 1995, 21-22).
The study area contains the southern end of the Rideau Canal, a historic transportation route that continues as a recreational transportation route and National Historic and World Heritage Site.

The water course was an important transportation route and disposal site for ships and waste from shoreline businesses. The transportation use of the watercourse continues but ship and waste disposal/landfill were historic uses.

### 4.3.2 Patterns of Spatial Organization

The terrestrial part of the study area divides into three main sections, Cataraqui Park (also known as Belle Park) to the north, Barriefeld to the east and the Inner Harbour to the west of the area. Cataraqui Park is arranged with golf course and walking trails. The park connects with the rest of the study area by provision of places to view the river and shorelines.

The Inner Harbour or western section has been shaped by the land fill of the nineteenth century. The street and lots surveyed in the late eighteenth century run parallel to the shoreline. The landscape was further shaped by the railroad running along the

**Figure 4-6.** Remains of an abandoned vessel in the Inner Harbour. B. Holthof 2014

**Figure 4-7.** Western shore of the Inner Harbour from 1969 illustrating effects of the railway on the shoreline
shoreline and across the causeway around Anglin Bay. The railway shaped how the shoreline developed and the subsequent patterns of land use along the shore.

Barriefield Village, on the eastern part of the study area was also shaped by the shore. The original settlement lots were laid out perpendicular to the river’s edge and subsequent village lots continued this pattern. The village is laid out in a traditional grid pattern.

4.3.3 Response to the Natural Environment

Barriefield Hill as a dominant landscape feature has required people to adapt to the environment and build on the slope or leave it in a relatively natural state. The exception to this is the Barriefield rock cut for Hwy 2 a large alteration of the landscape to ease transportation. The shore has had relatively little modification, some shoreline stabilization has been done to mitigate erosion but the shape of the shore is similar to the shoreline from prehistoric times. Up from the shore modifications have been made on a limited scale, land has been levelled for home construction and paths have been created. An 1869 Ordnance map (see figure 4-5 on page 50) shows a quarry and wharf northwest of St. Mark’s Anglican Church in Barriefield. The quarry was a larger scale modification to the shore. The lots, streets and homes in Barriefield run parallel and perpendicular to the shore and slope along the edge of the hill and much of the stone is from local quarries.

On the western side of the study area the streets were surveyed parallel and perpendicular to the shoreline following the shape of the river. The original spit of land where the French built Fort Frontenac protected the mooring in behind from the lake and was at the shortest distance for boats to cross the river. This location was the best part of the landscape for human use. The water lots along Anglin Bay where the Davis Dry Dock, Douglas Fluhrer Park, Place D’Armes residences and Normandy Hall exist today are all on land created since the late 1700’s altering the natural landscape. Cataraqui Park is another area of filled land over a large section of the Great Cataraqui
Marsh. The area south of Cataraqui Park to the north end of Douglas Fluhrer Park has had some shoreline stabilization work done, large rocks placed to prevent erosion and the addition of a boat launch and docks. Figures 4-8 through 4-12 illustrate shoreline modification over time.

**Figure 4-8.** Kingston’s Inner Harbour shoreline overlay.

Google Map 2014 (colour sections) with 1816 shoreline and town in black illustrating shoreline change over 2 centuries. The 1816 map is from Library and Archives Canada MIKAN no. 4136179, drawn by Lieut. A.T.E. Vidal Royal Navy, under the direction of Captain Wm. Fitz Wm. Owen.
Figure 4-9. Inner Harbour 1801 before shoreline modification. Library and Archives Canada NMC 16334.

Figure 4-10. 1860 Anglin Bay with the first half century of land fill. Library and Archives Canada MIKAN 4140369.

Figure 4-11. 1900 Map section showing further land fill, J.G. Foster and Co Publishers.

Figure 4-12. 1965 Nautical Chart 1421 section showing land fill and modern shoreline of Anglin Bay.
4.3.4 Cultural Traditions

The dominant culture of the Inner Harbour study area is British. The area was first settled by Loyalists and has a strong connection to the British military as illustrated through the name of the village and street names in Barriefield, James St., George St. Knapp St, Wellington St and Sharman’s Lane all prominent British military and Loyalist local figures. Many of the people who lived around the Inner Harbour can be identified with a maritime or mariner’s culture. Research into the family and neighbourhood of Captain Irwin indicates a community of sailors in the area (Ivey 2014, 180). Many of the early residents of Barriefield were similarly connected to the Dockyard.

Some of these maritime cultural traditions can still be found in the area. The Kingston Sail Loft on Rideau St. continues a tradition of sail making craftsmanship that includes traditional sail making and modern sail making. Metalcraft Marine also continues and modernizes boatbuilding in the Inner Harbour. The company uses a historic dry dock and buildings on site that have been connected to boat building for generations.

![Figure 4-13. Kingston Sail Loft. B. Holthof 2014](image)
4.4 Components

4.4.1 Circulation Networks

The primary circulation network in the study area is the Cataraqui River and Rideau Canal which makes up most of the study area and cuts through the centre. The river has been a circulation route for at least 11,000 years and the canal was completed in 1832 and has been in continuous operation since.

The Bridge across the river is the next part of the circulation network. The site of the La Salle causeway, built in 1916, has been a bridge site since 1828 allowing easy access across the river. From 1783 until 1828 a series of ferries and rowboats were used in the vicinity of the current bridge for transportation.

On the west side of the river, the remains of the railway can be seen in the land fill that makes up Douglas

Figure 4-14. Cataraqui Bridge c. 1893 Queen’s University Archives.

Figure 4-15. La Salle Causeway, bascule lift bridge. B. Holthof 2014
Fluehrer Park and along the gravel road along the park at the end of Wellington St. The modern shoreline along the park was the edge of the berm supporting the rail line to downtown Kingston. The narrow mouth of the entrance to Anglin Bay was the site of a swing bridge that allowed the railway to cross as it went downtown. The rail line and embankment was built in 1858-1859.

City streets and lots along the western shores of the inner harbour and in Barriefield village run down to the water and along the water’s edge. This grid pattern was laid out off the shoreline demonstrating the importance of the shore to the development of the city. The names of streets reflect the maritime/river/canal connections of the study area. Place D’Armes, Barrack St., Ordnance St. all have military connections; while Rideau St., Cataraqui St. and River St. all reflect the areas connection to the river. In Barriefield, Navy Way runs along the shoreline past H.M.C.S. Cataraqui. Knapp St. and Sharman’s Ln. in the village are named for people from the village who were boat builders and Green Bay Rd. along the shore connects the village to Green Bay.

Each of these elements of the circulation network are tied to the maritime nature and heritage of the harbour contributing to the cultural landscape.

4.4.2 Boundary Demarcations

The Cataraqui River is one boundary through the study area. The division of the river allowed two very different communities to develop opposite each other. The La Salle Causeway is another boundary, dividing the river from the lake. The causeway limits water flow and boat traffic. Small boats can go under one of the bridges but larger vessels or masted vessels must wait until the bridge lifts to allow them through.
4.4.3 Vegetation Related to Land Use

Historic photos and paintings show a nineteenth and early twentieth century landscape along the Inner Harbour and Barriefield with limited vegetation (Figure 4-16 and 4-18). Through the twentieth century trees grew up along the shore and on residential properties in Barriefield (Figure 4-17). As industry moved away from the shoreline the abandoned properties that were left filled with shoreline flora (Figure 4-19).

Figure 4-16. An 1857 painting by W.F. Friend showing a Barriefield landscape with few trees.

Figure 4-17. Barriefield 2014, illustrating extensive tree cover. B. Holthof 2014.
Figure 4-18. 1925 aerial photograph of the Inner Harbour with few trees. (LAC PA-43932).

Figure 4-19. Inner Harbour 2014 illustrating more shoreline vegetation than in the past. B. Holthof 2014.
4.4.4 Buildings, Structures and Objects

The Inner Harbour study area has a rich collection of waterfront industrial buildings, structures and objects. Barriefield contains homes that are significant for their architecture and history and were home to people who worked at the dockyard or in maritime industries based in the village. The river contains significant structures such as the La Salle Causeway and the Rideau Canal.

Buildings

The Metalcraft Marine building to the south of the dry dock is used to build aluminium boats and has been a boat shop and sail makers loft in the past. The Queen City Oil building also known as the Imperial Oil warehouse at the bottom of North St. was built around 1908 as an oil and kerosene storage building. The building was designed by William Newlands who also designed the Richardson Beach pavilion and Kingston Dry Dock buildings (Duerkop 2007). This building has a strong connection to the rail lands along the inner harbour. The Cotton/Woolen mill on Cataraqui St. began manufacturing cotton textiles in 1879 closing in 1966 (McKendry 2009). Air photos from the 1920’s show a large wharf next to the cotton mill building.

Figure 4-20. Imperial Oil warehouse. B. Holthof 2014

---

2 The Rideau Canal may not have much of a physical structure as it is part of the natural river through the study area. However the canal is a presence in the landscape and navigation markers and underwater dredging of parts of the channel are tangible evidence of the canal.
In Barriefield a boathouse and shed sit on the shores of Green Bay. Aerial photos show a boathouse on this site since at least 1953. H.M.C.S. Cataraqui, established in 1941, has moved around Kingston several times moving into a purpose built facility on the shores of the Inner Harbour in 1992.

Structures

The Rideau Canal is one of the most significant structures in the study area. The La Salle Causeway crosses the southern end of the study area allowing river crossings and access to the canal. The causeway is one of the most visible and important structures in the Inner Harbour. The Davis Drydock was built on the western shores of the Inner Harbour. It dates from 1878 is 61 metres long, 14 metres wide and 4.3 metres deep with a timber bottom, concrete sill and sheet steel sides. It is still used today.
Objects

The Kingston Marina has a 75 ton crane that was brought to the site by Canadian Dredge and Dock after using it during construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway (Metalcraft Marine 2014). The crane is still used by the Kingston Marina.

4.4.5 Settlement Clusters

The western side of the Inner Harbour reflects an industrial and commercial past with continuing and the remains of factory and industrial sites along the shoreline. The Davis Drydock, site of Metalcraft Marine and the Kingston Marina is the southern end of the historic industrial cluster which extends north to the Davis Tannery site. Most of the industrial structures line the shore but some structures are inland as far as Rideau St. near the Woollen Mill. The residential structures of the area are often newly built on former industrial lands or are smaller single and row houses from the areas working class past. The streets are perpendicular to the water’s edge reflecting the importance of the waterfront in laying out the town.

The eastern side of the study area contains Barriefield village, a heritage conservation district that preserves the early 19th century village landscape and character of the initial settlement. Many of the houses are historic buildings. The streets follow a 19th century grid pattern and follow the contours of the landscape where necessary.
The harbour is a cluster of wharves, docks, and vessels, a custom continuing from the seventeenth century. The remains of fourteen vessels abandoned in the river show the past extent of the harbour and the docks in Anglin Bay and the Kingston Marina reflect the modern harbour.

4.4.6 Archaeological Sites

There are several known archaeological sites around the harbour. Including, a Middle Woodland First Nations burial ground on Belle Island and fishing stations near Fort Frontenac. Historic sites include the earliest French and British sites on Lake Ontario at Fort Frontenac. There is high potential for more sites from the Pre-Contact First Nations, French, British and early Canadian periods.

The fourteen abandoned vessels in the river have been registered as archaeological sites (see Figure 4-24). They represent a period of ship abandonment in the nineteenth and early 20th centuries and the development of a ship graveyard in the Inner Harbour.
4.4.7 Small Scale Elements

The ruins of Fort Frontenac are a monument to the French period of settlement in Kingston. The strategic location of the fort at the junction of the river and lake and location at the foot of Lake Ontario was an important factor in French and subsequent British settlement of the area. There are some elements of the industrial past remaining in the Inner Harbour area. Angrove’s foundry was on the site of the current Macdonald-Cartier building at 49 Place D’Armes. The foundry is gone, but a manhole cover made by Angrove’s is on the shoreline in Douglas Fluhrer Park. Bollards and oil pipes from the Anglin fuel dock can still be found at the entrance to Figure 4-25. The remains of Fort Frontenac. B. Holthof 2014.

Figure 4-26. Map showing the approximate location of small scale elements in the landscape
4. IDENTIFICATION OF THE KINGSTON INNER HARBOUR CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPE

Anglin Bay. These elements, the Angrove’s manhole cover, the large bollards and the oil pipes are all that remain of certain industrial uses that were significant features on the past landscape.

4.4.8 Continuing Uses

The Inner Harbour study area has several distinct components that were historically and still are focused on the harbour/river. Barriefield Village as a heritage conservation district has retained its nineteenth century character and focus on the water and continues as a residential place. The western side of the Inner Harbour has retained an industrial character with remnants of the area’s rail and industrial history visible on the shore. Industrial use of the site continues at the Davis Drydock with Metalcraft Marine and a smaller scale, craftsman type, industrial activity occurs at the Kingston Sail Loft. The Kingston Marina is a continuation of the mooring function of the Inner Harbour and facilitates many other functions of a port including vessel storage and wintering over functions, vessel repair, fuel and security. Former rail lands have converted to park and shoreline walking trails have developed over the rail beds, altering the method of transportation but retaining the fundamental transportation function of the space. Transportation is the most significant continuing use. The La Salle Causeway facilitates transportation across the river and the bascule lift
bridge part of the causeway allows access to and from the river and Rideau Canal. The river remains an avenue for transportation although the nature of boating traffic has changed from commercial to recreational. The canal is still a transportation route and has gained importance for its historical significance through designation as a World Heritage Site and National Historic Site.

4.5 Historical Context and Inventory Summary

The historical context of Kingston demonstrates a long tradition as a community with close ties to the lake and river. The Inner Harbour study area reveals a landscape that contains significant connections between human use and experience with the land and water. The river was a ship graveyard. The western shore was industrial and rail lands because of access to a protected harbour. The eastern shore was closely tied to boatbuilding and the naval dock yard. The river has been a barrier but has also been a significant transportation route. The river has always been central to the human connection with the landscape. Street and place names reflect geographical connections to the river or significant persons connected to maritime activity.

There are artifacts from the industrial and maritime past of the area extant on the ground or in the water of this study area and continuing uses connect people to the maritime landscape. There is further evidence through archaeology, historic research and landscape survey that the land and water in the Inner Harbour study area has been used for subsistence, economic development, resource use, transportation, territorial control, ritual and other expressions of maritime cultural activity. Evidence from the landscape survey, the processes and components on the ground, can demonstrate the five historic themes for this area (See Table 4-1).
Table 4-1. Maritime Landscape Elements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peopling the Land</td>
<td>• Archaeological evidence of First Nations settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Archaeological evidence and historical evidence of early French and British settlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Port facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Residential areas, including Barriefield Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Economies</td>
<td>• Industrial sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Landscape modifications for industrial and harbour uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rail lands along the harbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The La Salle Causeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Abandoned vessels in the harbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wharves, docks, drydock and other maritime structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governing Canada</td>
<td>• Fort Frontenac (the historic French and British fort and the contemporary Canadian Army Command and Staff College)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• H.M.C.S. Cataraqui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Social and Community Life</td>
<td>• Place names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Barriefield Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressing Intellectual and Cultural Life</td>
<td>• First Nations burial ground on Belle Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Historic and contemporary leisure activity around the river, such as the Kingston Rowing Club and Cataraqui Canoe Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Traditional and contemporary maritime skills practiced at Metalcraft Marine and the Kingston Sail Loft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The study area is a rich landscape of maritime connections. The following tables (Table 4-2 & 4-3) summarize the processes and components of the Inner Harbour cultural heritage landscape.

Table 4-2. Maritime Landscape Processes of Kingston’s Inner Harbour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Process</th>
<th>Evidence of Processes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Activities</td>
<td>• Subsistence: First Nations hunting/fishing sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Institutional: Fort Frontenac, Tête Du Pont Barracks, HMCS Cataraqui, CFB Kingston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Industrial: Davis Drydock, Metalcraft Marine, Kingston Sail Loft, Cotton/Woollen Mill, Davis Tannery site, Queen City Oil Company depot building and retaining wall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transportation: Rideau Canal, La Salle Causeway bridge and wharves, former rail lands visible in Douglas Fluhrer Park, Kingston Marina, Anglin Bay wharves, abandoned ship wrecks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Residential: Barriefield Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recreational: Douglas Fluhrer Park, Green Bay Parkette and CFB green space on Green Bay, Place D’Armes walk, Cataraqui Canoe Club, Kingston Rowing Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterns of Spatial Organization</td>
<td>• Land fill around Anglin Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rail lines along the western shoreline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Street alignment based on the shoreline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to the Natural Environment</td>
<td>• The Barriefield Village adapted to the slope of the hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Barriefield rock cut changed the landscape for transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Barriefield quarry sites modified the landscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Water lots on the western shore were filled as a convenient dump and to create land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Shoreline stabilization along the western shore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cataraqui Park, a former dump site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Traditions</td>
<td>• British Military followed by Canadian Military: Tête Du Pont Barracks, HMCS Cataraqui, CFB Kingston, Fort Frontenac walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maritime traditions, Kingston Sail Loft and Metalcraft Marine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-3. Maritime Landscape Components of Kingston’s Inner Harbour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Component</th>
<th>Evidence of Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Circulation Networks | • Cataraqui River and Rideau Canal  
• La Salle Causeway  
• Land fill for rail lines and gravel rail bed on Western shore  
• Narrow entrance to Anglin Bay (former site of rail bridge)  
• City and village street grid pattern based on shoreline |
| Boundary Demarcations | • Cataraqui River  
• La Salle Causeway |
| Vegetation related to Land Use | • Current vegetation illustrates the decline of industry and growth of residential/recreational uses |
| Buildings, Structures and Objects | • Metalcraft Marine building, south of Davis Drydock  
• Queen City Oil Building  
• Woollen Mill  
• Barriefield boathouse  
• H.M.C.S. Cataraqui  
• Rideau Canal  
• La Salle Causeway  
• Davis Drydock  
• Kingston Marina 75 ton crane |
| Settlement Clusters | • Industrial buildings and structures along the western shore  
• Barriefield Village  
• Inner Harbour and Kingston Marina, wharves, docks, vessels and wrecks |
| Archaeological Sites | • Fort Frontenac  
• 14 abandoned vessels in the river |
| Small Scale Elements | • Fort Frontenac walls  
• Angrove's foundry manhole cover in Douglas Fluhrer Park  
• Bollards at the entrance to Anglin Bay  
• Oil pipes at the entrance to Anglin Bay |
| Continuing Uses | • Barriefield Village  
• Metalcraft Marine  
• Kingston Marina  
• Kingston Sail Loft  
• La Salle Causeway  
• Rideau Canal |

Historic research and landscape survey have revealed processes and components in the landscape. Evaluation of the landscape in chapter 5 involves applying significance criteria to the processes and components.
5 Evaluation of the Kingston Inner Harbour Cultural Heritage Landscape

Cultural Heritage Landscape evaluation involves defining significance, listing the heritage attributes, assessing the historical integrity and defining the boundaries of the landscape.

5.1 Statement of Significance

5.1.1 Significance Criteria

The significance criteria for the Kingston Inner Harbour CHL examines if the landscape:

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; or,

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

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

D. Manifests a particularly close and harmonious longstanding relationship between the natural and domestic landscape; or,

E. Has yielded or is likely to yield information important to prehistory or history; or,

F. Is strongly associated with the cultural and/or spiritual traditions of First Nations or any other ethnic and/or religious group (Scheinman 2006, 15).

These criterion help to identify heritage values, reflecting historic value, cultural value, ecological value, spiritual value and social value.
5.1.1.1 Heritage Values as Determined through Significance Criteria

Appendix 2. is a series of tables, one for each criterion, that evaluate the processes and components of the landscape and continuing uses against each criterion.

The landscape of the inner harbour includes processes and components associated with events that made significant contributions to the broad patterns of history (Criterion A.). First Nations archaeological sites in the study area are evidence of early human use of this place; this is followed by evidence for early European settlement and the establishment of the city, demonstrating the theme Peopling the Land. The military land uses around the mouth of the river including Fort Frontenac and the Tête du Pont Barracks were land uses connected to significant historical events while the ruins of Fort Frontenac and the French and early British archaeological sites in the area are largely connected to the military use, territorial control, early settlement and governance of the nation. This military presence continues at the contemporary Fort Frontenac and at H.M.C.S. Cataraqui. This continuing use has kept military and naval cultural traditions tied to the theme of Governing Canada present in the study area. The industrial land uses around the harbour and vegetation that remains and resulted from the rise and fall of industry in the area are tied to the theme of developing economies and represent the significance of historical economic development in Kingston. The Rideau Canal as an important transportation route that helped to open up the hinterland and is tied to military history, governance of Canada, peopling the land and developing economies and tied to significant events in the broad pattern of Canadian and local history. These elements of the landscape reflect historical value.

Historical value tied to persons of historical significance (Criterion B.) can be found in the landscape of the inner harbour study area. Louis de Buade, Comte de Frontenac and René-Robert Cavelier, Sieur de La Salle are both associated with the early French military uses of the land.
represented by the archaeological site and remaining walls of Fort Frontenac. La Salle is also remembered in the area through the fact that the La Salle causeway is named for him. The settlement of Barriefield including the residential nature of the village cluster and pattern of spatial organization is largely associated with the first land owner, Richard Cartwright, a person of significance to the early settlement of Ontario. The Rideau Canal an important component of 19th century national and local circulation networks is linked to a historic figure of Colonel John By. These individuals are significant for their contributions to the development of the nation.

On the western side of the harbour the industrial lands and history of the area, including the Davis Dry Dock and Tannery are closely associated with the Davis family. The Imperial Oil warehouse was designed by the architect William Newlands. The Anglin family is remembered through Anglin Bay and the artifacts left from their ownership of the lands around the bay including the oil pipes and bollards. These individuals and families have been prominent in Kingston history and are remembered through the buildings, structures, clusters of activity and small scale elements left in the landscape associated with them. These persons and families are tied to Kingston’s industrial history.

The landscape of the inner harbour embodies several distinctive characteristics of settlement patterns or lifeways that are connected to the maritime nature of the environment (Criterion C.). The earliest land use in the area by Europeans was military and economic and was a response to the natural environment. The location of Fort Frontenac and subsequent settlement was a distinctive settlement pattern that supported the French control of the area and utilized the natural strategic location at the mouth of the Cataraqui River. This original military arrangement shaped subsequent settlement and use of the area. The confluence of the Cataraqui and St. Lawrence Rivers and Lake
Ontario, the high points to the west and flat lands to the east and protected harbour in what is now Anglin Bay made this area ideal for French and then British settlement and territorial control.

The maritime and industrial uses of the inner harbour along the western shore are associated with maritime commerce and industry. Evidence for this history remains in the buildings, structures and objects left in the landscape including wharves and the remains of wharves and the industrial buildings oriented to the water. The land fill, rail line and pattern of spatial organization oriented to the water along the shore and the use of the protected bay [now Anglin Bay] for ship and boat building reflect the industrial nature of the area that is inextricably linked to the maritime environment. This industrial maritime nature is a response to the environment as a suitable place for these activities, and is a practice reflective of a specific historic period, the late 18th through middle of the 20th centuries. The use of Anglin Bay for boat and ship building from the 17th century to the present was a response to a suitable place in the environment and has since shaped subsequent land use and settlement patterns in the area leaving the western shores of the harbour for maritime and industrial uses. The rail line out in the harbour over a causeway was a distinctive transportation response to the local context where there was no space for the line anywhere else. Use of the Inner Harbour as a ships graveyard is a distinctive pattern of ship abandonment found in some 19th and 20th century port towns. The ships graveyard is a response to the natural environment and adjacent land uses. The rail line and ships graveyard reflect characteristics of 19th century progression of transportation and industry, the waterway as a resource to be used to move goods and dispose of waste.

Barriefield Village as a settlement was shaped by the landscape sloping up from the shore. The maritime nature of the community can be found in the orientation of the community to the shore and easy connections to the naval dockyard at Point Frederick.
The Inner Harbour study area has few areas that demonstrate a close and longstanding relationship between the natural and domestic landscape (Criterion D). The pattern of spatial organization in Barriefield Village is one such place; the village has evolved over 2 centuries and was originally organized oriented to the shore and up on the slope facing the river. The village of today has retained this relationship between the domestic and natural environment. Archaeological sites in the study area also reflect longstanding, close and harmonious relationships between the natural and domestic environment. The First Nations Burial Ground and camp site on Belle Island is well protected and has been part of the natural environment for hundreds of years. The ships graveyard in the Inner Harbour has become part of the natural environment settling into the sediment on the bottom of the river and providing shelter for local flora and fauna.

The Rideau Canal has dramatically altered the natural landscape north of Kingston Mills but the southernmost section is largely unchanged as a result of the canal. The Canal as a whole has changed the environment but has become naturalized and now displays a close and harmonious relationship, although this is outside of this project’s study area. Other significant circulation network components in the study area, including the La Salle Causeway and land fill to support industry and the rail line have been large intrusions into the landscape that do not reflect a harmonious longstanding relationship between the domestic and natural landscape. This is significant as these alterations are significant parts of the cultural landscape.

The Cataraqui River was the home to many people with significant ties to the Great Lakes. These groups can be a distinct subcultural groups of maritime peoples, including fishermen, sailors, wharfingers, and boat or ship builders. The cultural traditions of maritime peoples are often closely tied to the natural environment. However, further study into the relationship between these groups of people and the natural environment around the Inner Harbour is required to determine if this is
constitutes a longstanding close and harmonious relationship in this case and is a significant part of the cultural landscape of the Inner Harbour.

Processes and components of the landscape within the study area have already and continue to have potential to yield information important to the area’s prehistory or history (Criterion E). The First Nations land use on Belle Island as a camp site and burial ground has been investigated and yet still has the potential to yield further information about the area’s prehistory. There is also potential to find other First Nations archaeological sites along prehistoric shorelines around the study area. The river was likely an important component in prehistoric circulation networks although a study of this significance extends well beyond the scope of this study. Large sections of the study area around the Inner Harbour have been affected by historical and modern development and this activity has likely damaged, removed or capped evidence of First Nations archaeological sites and activity along with evidence of the earliest European settlement of the area.

Early French and British settlement sites and areas of military land use have yielded and could potentially yield information important to the history of Kingston and many of these sites and land uses are within this study area, including sites such as Fort Frontenac, the Tête du Pont Barracks, Barriefield Village and some of the earliest industry and ship building locations in the area around Anglin Bay. There is also potential to gain a better understanding of the early maritime nature of Cataraqui and Kingston through study of these sites.

There is evidence that the study area is associated with the cultural and or spiritual traditions of First Nations or any other ethnic or religious group (Criterion F) at the First Nations burial ground on Belle Island.
5.1.2 Heritage Attributes

Heritage Attributes or Character-Defining Elements are “the materials, forms, location, spatial configurations, uses and cultural associations or meanings that contribute to the heritage value of an historic place, which must be retained in order to preserve its heritage value” (Parks Canada 2010, 253). These attributes are the most significant parts of the cultural heritage landscape and must still exist and be conserved in order to maintain a clear link between the heritage value and place. The heritage attributes are elements of this landscape illustrate the historic themes of the study area, reflect the maritime nature of the landscape and are important enough to the landscape that without them the link between the theme and place is broken.

The Heritage Attributes of the Inner Harbour Cultural Heritage Landscape include:

- The Rideau Canal;
- Through navigation on the Rideau Canal;
- Fort Frontenac (ruins and contemporary);
- The Tête du Pont Barracks;
- H.M.C.S. Cataraqui;
- The La Salle Causeway;
- Davis Dry Dock;
- Boat and Ship building in the Inner Harbour;
- Historic industrial buildings on the western shore including,
  - 9 North St.;
  - Metalcraft Marine 347 Wellington St.;
  - The Woolen Mill, Cataraqui St.;
- The abandoned ship remains in the harbour;
- Anglin Bay;
- The spatial organization of Barriefield Village;
- Artifacts from the Inner Harbours industrial and maritime past including,
  - Bollards at the entrance to Anglin Bay
  - Oil Pipes at the entrance to Anglin Bay
  - Angrove's manhole cover in Douglas Fluhrer Park; and,
- First Nations archaeological sites;
5.2 Integrity

Integrity is influenced by a number of variables including: the size of the site, the number of inter-relationships between the elements, the range of land uses and extent of vegetative or shoreline change. Some loss of integrity over time is expected but key individual elements of the built environment and the landscape that still clearly reflect the historic period and/or the organic evolution from which their heritage significance derives must remain. The following questions are considered to assess integrity for organically evolved and associative cultural landscapes.

- Is the site continuing in the same use and/or compatible use? Compatible here refers to a use that doesn’t require the altering of key elements and their inter-relationship.
- Is there continuity of ownership or occupation of the site, dating to an historic period?
- Have buildings and other built elements survived in their original form and in relatively sound condition?
- Are historic complexes and their relationships to other elements such as yards and fields [and moorings] intact?
- To what extent have other built elements such as fences, walls, paths, bridges, corrals, pens [wharves, docks, slips] survived?
- Does the historical relationship to prominent natural features, e.g. cliff, stream, still exist both for the site as a whole and within the site?
- Are ‘designed’ plantings such as hedgerows, windrows, gardens, shade trees still discernible and is their traditional relationship to buildings, lanes, roadways, walks and fields still discernible?
- How closely does the existing view of the site compare to the same view captured in a historic photo?
- Do ruins and overgrown elements still convey a clear message? (Scheinman 2006, 16).

The Inner Harbour is a place filled with many uses. Some elements of the landscape have been in the same use for a very long time such as the boat building around Anglin Bay, mooring in the harbour and residential uses in Barriefield.

There is continuity of occupation at the Kingston Marina which one boat building company or another operating on the site since the early 19th century. There is also continuity of occupation at Fort Frontenac first by the British military followed by Canada’s military.
Many of the buildings in the study area dating from historic periods have survived in their original form and in relatively sound condition. Many 19th century homes in Barriefield have been preserved. The Woolen Mill building on Cataraqui St. has been adapted for other uses and restored with some additions. The contemporary Fort Frontenac has been maintained. The Davis Drydock is well maintained so that it can continue to be used. The La Salle Causeway has been maintained in good condition.

Historic complexes within the study area include the shipbuilding operations at the Kingston Marina, the La Salle Causeway and other industrial complexes. The Marina and boatbuilding operations have continued to evolve and are in use the complex is intact with many of the same features offered in the past including a boat building company on site, mooring facilities and boat repair facilities. The La Salle Causeway complex is intact with the lift bridge, two other stationary bridges and mooring facilities. Other industrial complexes include individual industrial sites like the Woolen Mill which had its own wharves. These are partially intact and the contemporary use of the site has maintained a relationship with the remains of these wharves by turning them into part of a pathway and lookout over the harbour. Most of the other industrial complexes have been removed from within the study area.

Some other built elements have survived. The remains of old docks are mostly gone although piles and in some cases the remains of decks can be seen under the water. Some wharves have been maintained such as the wharves around Anglin Bay and along the causeway. Other wharves such as the ones at the Woolen Mill have been allowed to deteriorate but are still visible. The route of the train tracks can still be seen on the ground in Douglas Fluhrer Park even though the tracks are long removed.
The most prominent natural feature in the study area is the Cataraqui River. The historical relationship of all of the areas around the river still exists. The streets are oriented to the river, buildings address the river and the river remains a navigable waterway. Two other prominent natural features include the Barriefield Hill and Belle Island. Barriefield Hill has always been an obstacle in the landscape, but this has been overcome with the Barriefield Rock Cut. The hill is now a park; the historic relationship has been changed but a relationship remains. Belle Island has remained very much as it has been since the first early settlers tired and failed to settle on the island. The island is a natural space in the study area and should remain so as a registered archaeological site and place of significance to First Nations peoples.

No designed plantings were found in the study area through the inventory process.

Views of the study area have changed significantly over time. Figures 4-12 though 4-17 (pages 56 to 59) illustrate some of the significant changes; the La Salle Causeway replacing the Cataraqui Bridge; significant tree growth and the addition of many homes in Barriefield changing a landscape that was once kept clear of vegetation into one covered; and, an environment on the western shores of the harbour devoted to industry, with ships, railway track, factories, industrial storage facilities and clear of vegetation into one with a lot of vegetation, increasing residential uses and very little industry.

The ruins in the study area convey a clear message. The ruins of Fort Frontenac were partially reconstructed to commemorate the existence of the fort. The ruins of 9 North St. also convey the industrial character of the area, especially when taken in context with the surrounding landscape including Kingston Marina, the Davis Dry Dock, Metalcraft Marine and the path the railway tracks followed next to the site. The remains of old wharves and the remains of abandoned ships in the
Inner Harbour can also be considered ruins and convey the former connection the industrial sites in the area had to the maritime environment and the maritime history of Kingston.

The integrity of the landscape is difficult to define for such a diverse environment. However, key individual elements of the built and natural environment remain. There have been significant changes in the landscape over time but the clusters of land uses have remained oriented to the river. The tradition of boat building has remained in the same location in the study area since the French controlled Fort Frontenac. There has been a military presence in the study area since 1783. A significant role for this military presence was due to the strategic nature of the site and to protect the site from naval attack. There is evidence of the connection between industrial and maritime uses of the Inner Harbour area most easily seen in the remains of wharves near prominent industrial sites. The maritime cultural heritage landscape of the Inner Harbour study area is intact.

5.3 Boundaries

The Kingston Inner Harbour Cultural Heritage Landscape study is a pilot project where boundaries have been chosen early in the identification process well before evaluation of the landscape was done; instead of as part of the evaluation as would be better practice. Further detailed research would be required to fully assess if the landscape extends beyond these preliminary boundaries. The boundaries that were chosen for this study area contain the east and west banks of the Cataraqui River from Belle Island in the north to the La Salle Causeway in the south. The study area includes the land between the river and Highway 15 in the East as far north as Barrett Ct. and contains Barriefield Village and HMCS *Cataraqui*. On the west side of the river the study area includes Fort Frontenac in the south and land between the river and Bagot St. to Belle Park in the North. Research into the history of the inner harbour and a site visit helped to inform the decision to
choose these boundaries. Initial research into the history of the area did not indicate that the maritime nature of the Inner Harbour area extended too far inland. Historic maps of the area including the maps in Figures 4-7 to 4-11 (pages 51 to 54) do not indicate maritime features much beyond the shoreline. The site visit on July 21st and 22nd 2014 confirmed the assessment of boundaries based on research and maps: very little of a maritime nature extended much beyond the boundaries chosen. A next step if this project were to be pursued further would be to consult with the community and reassess and refine these boundaries to better reflect elements of the landscape the community values.

5.4 Summary

Elements of the landscape around Kingston’s Inner Harbour meet various points on the evaluation criteria for determining a cultural heritage landscape. The heritage attributes of the area include tangible and intangible elements such as many of the historic buildings and artifacts in the area, historic and continuing uses of the waterway and surrounding places, navigation on the Rideau Canal, continuing maritime practices and cultural traditions and evidence of the maritime nature of the area surrounding the waterway. The site is large and diverse but all maritime cultural components link back to the river and are connected to other components of the landscape indicating a certain level of integrity to the landscape. The Inner Harbour does constitute a maritime cultural heritage landscape.
Conclusion and Recommendations

6.1 Summary

This study articulates a maritime cultural heritage landscape around Kingston’s Inner Harbour. The study introduced the concept of cultural heritage landscapes and maritime cultural landscapes; the development of cultural heritage landscape evaluation tools, in particular the inventory and evaluation approach of the National Parks Service; a historical and cultural context of the study area; and an inventory and evaluation of the landscape. The broad historical context of the harbour has illustrated how Kingston has been connected to the maritime environment at many points through its history. This context places the study area within a much larger local maritime context and ties this study area into the much larger Lake Ontario, Rideau Canal and St. Lawrence River landscapes/waterscapes.

This report identified the maritime cultural heritage landscape of the Kingston Inner Harbour by developing historical context, a physiographic description of the landscape, conducting historical research, and surveying the landscape by finding evidence of four processes and seven components of the landscape. The maritime nature of the landscape was further defined by seven categories of
maritime activity. Evaluation of the landscape involved applying evidence of processes and components of the landscape against six evaluative criteria and five historic themes.

The processes found in the landscape include:

- Land use and activities such as: remaining industrial sites like the Davis Dry Dock, Metalcraft Marine, the remaining manufacturing buildings along the waterfront; evidence for waterfront transportation at old wharf sites, the La Salle Causeway, created land along the old rail causeway; and remaining military and naval land uses.
- Patterns of spatial organization such as: land creation around Anglin Bay; the old rail lines; and street alignments to the water.
- Response to the natural environment such as: the way Barriefield is adapted to the slope; the created land on water lots around Anglin Bay; and, the former dump under Cataraqui Park.
- Cultural traditions such as: the continued military presence in the area; and ongoing maritime industry at Metalcraft Marine and the Kingston Sail Loft.

Components of the landscape include:

- Circulation networks such as: the Rideau Canal; the La Salle Causeway; and the former rail lines.
- Boundary demarcations such as: the Cataraqui River and La Salle Causeway.
- Vegetation related to land use such as: the naturalized waterfront and ornamental plantings in residential areas and naturalized through abandonment vegetation at former industrial sites.
- Buildings, structures and objects such as: the Davis Dry Dock; Woolen Mill; Kingston Marina crane; Barriefield boathouse; and H.M.C.S. Cataraqui.
- Clusters (groupings of buildings [or structures], or settlement areas) such as: industrial buildings along the western shore; Barriefield Village; and the cluster of abandoned vessel wrecks.
- Archaeological sites such as: Fort Frontenac; Belle Island; and the abandoned vessel wrecks.
- Small-scale elements such as: the walls of Fort Frontenac; bollards; and oil pipes.

These processes and components in the study area reflect different aspects of the maritime landscape which demonstrates the maritime culture of Kingston represented around the Inner Harbour. The seven aspects of the maritime landscape include: the sustenance landscape; the economic landscape; the resource landscape; the transport landscape; the territorial landscape; the cognitive landscape; and the ritual landscape.
Evidence for the **sustenance landscape** can be found at First Nations archaeological sites and inferred from historical research into the early European settlement around the Cataraqui River. The proximity of these sites to the water and Inner Harbour illustrates the importance of the river and lake for sustenance.

Evidence for the **economic landscape** can be found through historical research into the economy of the region, including fishing, parts of the timber trade and transhipment through the ports of Kingston. The creation of the La Salle Causeway and some dredging of the Inner Harbour, the history of the Kingston Marina Crane as a tool to build the St. Lawrence Seaway are landscape features tied to the economic landscape. This evidence demonstrates the importance of the maritime environment for economic development in Kingston and how Kingston was connected to the larger economic world through the port.

Evidence for the **resource landscape** can be found in historic research illustrating the shipbuilding history of the Inner Harbour area where resources were used for maritime activities and is represented at the Davis Dry Dock as tangible evidence of this activity and a site of continued shipbuilding.

Evidence for the **transport landscape** is the best represented element of a maritime landscape in the Inner Harbour. The harbour itself is evidence of the transport landscape. Alternations to the landscape to facilitate and link to maritime transportation, such as the created land of the rail causeway, wharves, and La Salle Causeway and the abandoned vessel wrecks and Rideau Canal are tangible parts of the transport landscape and documented historical evidence of maritime transport uses in the Inner Harbour study area is further evidence of this landscape. The harbour itself with all of the evidence for associated activities demonstrates the maritime cultural heritage of this part of Kingston, connecting the city to other maritime communities and the greater Lake Ontario environment.

Evidence for the **territorial landscape** can be found at military and naval sites around the Inner Harbour and the Rideau Canal. Military sites around Kingston are connected to naval activities, either as sites strategically located to protect the harbour or as places to construct and protect an offensive naval force or fleet of transport ships. After the strategic significance of the location became less important the landscape reflected this territorial ambition and naval traditions continued to be represented in the study area. Continuation of naval traditions and the preservation of sites important for naval purposes such as Fort Frontenac demonstrate the maritime heritage of the area.

Evidence for the **cognitive landscape** can be found in the orientation of streets parallel and perpendicular to the shore, the names of streets that reflect the areas geography; such as; Rideau, Cataraqui, River, etc.; or names of streets or places that remember persons with maritime significance; such as: Knapp, James, or Barrie. The cognitive landscape can also be found in continuing uses with maritime significance such as the Kingston Sail Loft and Metalcraft Marine. Street names and continuing uses reflect the ongoing maritime character of the Inner Harbour area.
Evidence for the *ritual landscape* can be found at the First Nations burial ground on Belle Island.

The Inner Harbour landscape contains processes that have impacted the landscape, components that can be found in the landscape and maritime cultural heritage elements that tie the landscape to maritime cultural expression. These various ways of documenting and understanding the landscape illustrate a place with significant maritime history represented in the landscape.

Evaluation of the landscape involved assessing the maritime elements (processes and components) of the landscape against six evaluative criteria which also involved assessing them as part of significant historical themes. The six criteria for evaluating organically evolved and associative cultural landscapes are:

A. Is [the landscape element] 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.
   [The central themes chosen for this study were the five central themes to the Parks Canada System Plan…
   • Peopling the Land
   • Governing Canada
   • Developing Economies
   • Building Social and Community Life
   • Expressing Intellectual and Cultural Life]

B. Is [the landscape element] closely associated with the lives of individuals and/or families who are considered significant to the history of the area?

C. [The landscape element] Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a particular settlement pattern or lifeway whether derived from ethnic background, imposed by the landscape, was the practice of a specific historic period or a combination of the above.

D. [The landscape element] Manifests a particularly close and harmonious longstanding relationship between the natural and domestic landscape.

E. [The landscape element] Has yielded or is likely to yield information important to prehistory or history.

F. [The landscape element] Is strongly associated with the cultural and/or spiritual traditions of First Nations or any other ethnic and/or religious group.
Many of the elements of the landscape within the study area meet the requirements of the evaluative criteria (see Appendix 2 for details). Landscape elements connected to the maritime environment are associated with events that made significant contributions to the broad patterns of history and are associated with each of the five themes. Landscape elements are closely associated with the lives of individuals or families who are considered significant to the area. The landscape does embody distinctive characteristics of a maritime community in many places. Landscape elements do demonstrate close and harmonious relationships between the natural and domestic, but also illustrates disharmonious relationships. Landscape elements do or are likely to yield information important to our understanding of prehistory or history. At least one part of the landscape, Belle Island, is strongly associated with the spiritual and cultural traditions of First Nations peoples.

6.2 Conclusions

6.2.1 Cultural Heritage Landscape

Historical research into the study area along with the inventory and evaluation process for this landscape confirms that the study area does constitute a maritime cultural heritage landscape. The terrestrial components of the study area are linked to the harbour/river which is a central focal point of the area. The maritime history of the area is demonstrated in the landscape. This is not one single type of landscape, it is not an industrial complex or residential enclave. Elements of the landscape cover long periods of history and different cultures with different norms, values and reasons for utilizing the space around the mouth of the Cataraqui River. These elements are connected through the ties each culture, land use and time period have with the maritime environment around the Inner Harbour.
The landscape is somewhat degraded. Industrial buildings have been removed, there is little visible evidence of industrial activities along the eastern shore, newer buildings block views from significant historical structures such as Fort Frontenac to the Inner Harbour area and there is little interpretation of the maritime past of this part of Kingston to keep memory alive. The Cataraqui River is a central focal point for the area due to the patterns of spatial organization and history associated with it, the Rideau Canal and the Inner Harbour. However the river is also a barrier for people; and developments on the east and west side have happened largely independent of each other. The maritime history of the harbour area links both sides of the river while the geographic nature of the harbour separates them. The maritime historical integrity of the area still exists but it is not well maintained.

The study area has been modified by human activity and is defined by the proximity to the Inner Harbour/Cataraqui River. This study assessed cultural heritage values through historical research and the inventory and evaluation of the landscape. However the scope of this project did not extend to surveying the community to assess community values or interests related to the maritime cultural heritage landscape of the Inner Harbour.

6.2.2 Implications for Planning

The Inner Harbour study area has several existing heritage conservation tools in place. Barriefield is a heritage conservation district and a number of other properties around the harbour are designated under the Ontario Heritage Act. The Cataraqui River is part of a National Historic Site and World Heritage site and the river is a Canadian Heritage River. The City of Kingston Official Plan also contains sections relevant to protecting cultural heritage and the Rideau Canal.

Parks Canada is committed to working with municipalities and the Province of Ontario to prevent uncontrolled development along the edge of the canal to protect the world heritage values of
the canal (Parks Canada 2005, 20-21). Elements of the Inner Harbour cultural heritage landscape that can be tied to the world heritage values of the Rideau Canal can be conserved with support from Parks Canada.

The City of Kingston Official Plan (OP) offers the most detailed support for conservation of this cultural heritage landscape. The OP states that “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). Cultural heritage resources includes cultural heritage landscapes; and they have been conserved, managed and marketed for their contributions to the City’s unique identity, history and sense of place. The Official Plan states that “care have been taken not to put the UNESCO World Heritage Designation at risk” (Section 2.8.9). Kingston has established policy that aims to conserve elements contributing to the natural and cultural heritage significance of the Rideau Canal.

Development is only permitted if potential adverse effects on cultural heritage of 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 overlooking the Rideau Canal must have regard for visual impact on the UNESCO World Heritage Site designation (Policy 3.9.18). 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).

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

- identify and protect the cultural heritage landscapes and built heritage resources directly associated with the canal;
• introduce design guidelines applied through the site plan control process for new development along the Rideau Canal;
• require that both the terrestrial and marine archaeological resources associated with the Rideau Canal be conserved;
• ensure that all development adjacent to or over the canal does not interfere with the safe and efficient navigation on the canal;
• prohibit any development or site alteration that would alter the size, shape and configuration of the canal system;
• require that development or site alteration on lands adjacent to the lock stations and the canal proper demonstrate that the cultural heritage resources have been conserved;
• ensure that development or redevelopment under the Planning Act be in accordance with the policies of Sections 3.10.A. and 9 of this plan;
• require that new bridge or public utilities crossings undertake satisfactory environmental assessments in accordance with the policies of this plan; and,
• continue to partner with Parks Canada to promote the Rideau Canal UNESCO World Heritage Site. (Amended by By-Law No. 2011-89, OPA #6).

Cultural heritage resources including cultural heritage landscapes have been valued and conserved and cultural heritage landscapes associated with the Rideau Canal have been identified and protected according to the City of Kingston Official Plan.

Policies to protect the World Heritage values of the Rideau Canal are limited to specific heritage attributes and there are no specific policies that address the Inner Harbour area as part of the Canal. Individual sites such as the La Salle Causeway and Fort Frontenac also have protections specific to each site that do not extend beyond those sites. The Inner Harbour has not been formally identified as a cultural heritage landscape by the City of Kingston and the area contains a large number of heritage properties and places with associated cultural heritage values. City of Kingston policy protects the values of the Rideau Canal and other places with heritage values but these policies do not protect or help conserve the cultural heritage landscape of the Inner Harbour because the holistic approach of a cultural heritage landscape has not been applied to the area.
The following planning tools are available to municipalities to protect significant cultural heritage landscapes:

- [create] Heritage conservation district policies, guidelines, & studies
- [create] Area design guidelines
- [set/use] Height and setback restrictions / site plan control
- [require] Landscape impact assessments
- [create] Secondary plan policies for special areas
- [create] Special zoning by-laws with heritage criteria overlay
- [enter into] Subdivision development agreements
- [create] Community improvement plans
- [create] Financial incentives
- [require] Landscape conservation plans
- [create] Park area / corridor area management plans (Ontario Ministry of Culture 2006b, Info Sheet #2. 5).

The municipality can also list or designate individual properties under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, put easements on specific properties or require heritage impact assessments.

In the case of maritime cultural heritage landscapes the geographic expanse of the landscape necessitates using multiple tools for conservation. Creation of a heritage conservation district may not be practical over such a large area, and in the case of Kingston’s Inner Harbour a heritage conservation district is already part of the landscape. Individual heritage designations will not suffice to conserve the landscape; however designation and listing individual properties and heritage easements are useful tools for specific properties within the landscape; especially on properties with maritime heritage elements that can be listed as part of the heritage attributes of the property for the designation. Area design guidelines, secondary plan policies, subdivision development agreements and community improvement plans are best employed in specific areas and the Inner Harbour contains too many different parts for any one of these tools to be employed over the entire area. The remaining conservation tools can be applied over the larger and different areas of the Inner Harbour study area. The entire City of Kingston is a site-plan control area already (By-Law No. 2010-217,
2006). Requiring landscape impact assessments, creating special zoning by-laws with a heritage criteria overlay, requiring or creating landscape conservation plans, financial incentives for property owners to conserve the landscape and creating parks or corridor areas can be applied or done anywhere in or over the entire maritime cultural heritage landscape. Cultural heritage landscapes can also be protected through specific statements in official plans requiring identification and associated policies to conserve the grouping of cultural heritage resources, such as in the Region of Waterloo Official Plan sections 3.G.5-3.G.7 (Region of Waterloo 2010, 47).

6.3 Recommendations

This study has examined the area around Kingston’s Inner Harbour and determined based on an inventory and evaluation approach that the area does constitute a cultural heritage landscape. The Inner Harbour cultural heritage landscape study was a pilot project and more work is necessary for the cultural heritage landscape to be considered significant, including consultation with the local community to assess the cultural heritage values and interest they may consider appropriate for the area. Recommendations for the Kingston Inner Harbour Cultural Heritage Landscape are as follows:

Ongoing Research

- Consult the local community for ideas on management and conservation of this landscape.
- Identify this area as a cultural heritage landscape and as a special policy area in the City of Kingston Official Plan.
- Map all maritime cultural materials and landscape elements for more detailed inventory and possible future analysis as a cultural landscape.

Municipal Planning Initiatives

- Identify this area as a cultural heritage landscape and as a special policy area in the City of Kingston Official Plan.
- Develop policies to conserve the maritime cultural heritage landscape elements for this special policy area.
- Require landscape impact assessments for new developments in the area to ensure the maritime cultural landscape is not adversely affected.
6. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- Ensure park master plans and park area management plans in the area address the significant maritime cultural heritage embodied in the landscape.
- Financial incentives such as heritage grants should be developed with a focus on preserving elements of the landscape that reflect the maritime cultural landscape.

**Landscape Conservation Initiatives**

- Conserve and reconstruct the remaining wharves and docks that have fallen into disrepair. Preserve the manufactured shoreline areas at old industrial sites to preserve the maritime industrial past of the area.
- Maintain the natural contours in the landscape to retain the patterns of spatial organization of the landscape that is oriented to the river.

**Heritage Initiatives**

- Ensure that street names in the study area that reflect the maritime heritage of the area, such as significant persons and geographical features can not be changed without consideration of the impacts on the cultural landscape.
- The Davis Dry Dock should be designated a heritage property under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. However the designation by-law should be structured so that designation does not adversely affect the function of the property for boatbuilding, the modern expression of boatbuilding on the property is as important for the cultural heritage landscape as the sites history is.
- Public interpretation about the significant maritime history of the area and the cultural landscape should be developed as a part of efforts to conserve the landscape.
- Wherever possible the maritime nature of the area should be enhanced and celebrated.

**6.4 Implications for Future Research**

This study of Kingston’s Inner Harbour has been a pilot project attempting to use the inventory and evaluation method to identify a maritime cultural heritage landscape. This study has focused on one specific part of Kingston’s harbours but the harbour encompasses several other areas and the maritime nature of the community extends well beyond the Inner Harbour. Other parts of Kingston’s overall harbour including, but not limited to, the Outer Harbour, Navy Bay, RMC, Fort Henry and Portsmouth Village should be studied in the context of a maritime cultural heritage landscape. Further study involving community consultation to assess what local people value about the area will enhance the evaluation of the sites significance to a community.
The method chosen for this study, the inventory and evaluation method developed by the National Parks Service, has distinct advantages. This method is relatively easy to apply by conducting a survey and identifying processes and components in the landscape and developing evaluation criteria and then applying them to the inventory. This method is straightforward for many cultural heritage landscapes. However, this method focuses on tangible elements of the landscape. It is relatively easy to apply in cases where the built form or large amounts of human artifacts exist or where landscape modifications have taken place but it is more difficult to incorporate intangible elements of the landscape, historic evidence that may not have left physical traces or traces that are no longer visible. These types of features figure strongly in a maritime cultural heritage landscape study. In the case of the Kingston Inner Harbour, this may not have been the most effective method of assessment. It may have been better to do a landscape character assessment (Tudor 2014) instead of taking the inventory and evaluation approach. Given more time and resources this study could have benefited from assessing the landscape character and incorporating the other parts of Kingston’s harbour into the study documenting all of the maritime features found around Kinston’s waterfront.

The evaluation criteria used for this study, developed for the Region of Waterloo, were useful for defining the significance of a cultural heritage landscape. These criteria are general and link to central historical themes which allow them to be applied to many different cultural heritage landscapes. This allows for a consistent approach in many different places and can be a useful tool for assessing different cultural heritage landscapes over a large geographical or political area such as a county. In the case of this study as a stand-alone pilot study of a maritime environment, these criteria were useful but could have been modified or supplemented to better reflect the maritime theme and unique character of the study area.
Cultural heritage landscape studies are challenging. These studies rely on the researcher as a cultural heritage expert to make judgements of the study area. Few tools have been developed to assist this type of research and there are several different approaches that can be taken in assessing the landscape. This is an area of cultural heritage planning methodology that needs to be further developed.

6.5 Closure

Kingston’s Inner Harbour has a long and significant maritime history. The study area is a maritime cultural heritage landscape that deserves further study and consultation with the local community on both sides of the river. Many parts of the area have strong heritage protections under federal management plans, the municipal official plan or heritage designations but the area also contains maritime heritage elements that could be easily lost through neglect, abandonment or a lack of awareness of this significant cultural history. This study has started documenting and evaluating the maritime cultural landscapes of Kingston to preserve some of this history and perhaps encourage further preservation and conservation in the future.
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Appendix 1: Documentation of Landscape Characteristics Chart


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Uses and Activities</td>
<td>Fields, pastures, orchards, open range, terraces, commons, cemeteries, playing fields, parks, mining areas, quarries, and logging areas.</td>
<td>• Describe principal and significant land uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify the tangible features related to land uses by type, general location, dates of use, condition, and related vegetation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Describe historic processes related to land use, such as mining, irrigation, lumbering, contour farming, or quarrying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Point out obsolete historic operations, ongoing traditional practices, or modern adaptations related to significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify threats to integrity, and indicate their location, extent, and impact on historic integrity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Identify areas having major importance or predominance, by location and type, and classify as historic or nonhistoric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>Features</td>
<td>Documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterns of Spatial Organization</td>
<td>Overall pattern of the circulation networks, areas of land use, natural features, clusters of structures, and division of property.</td>
<td>• Describe any patterns characterizing the landscape as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Relate patterns to land uses and activities, responses to nature, and cultural traditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Relate spatial organization to components, including vegetation, boundary demarcations, and circulation networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Describe and locate any areas where historic spatial organization is particularly visible or substantially lost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to the Natural Environment</td>
<td>Adaptations to climate and natural features seen in land use, orientation of clusters, construction materials, design of buildings, and methods of transportation.</td>
<td>• Describe the physical environment and ecological systems of the region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Describe the kinds of the features that have resulted from cultural adaptations or responses to the natural environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Identify natural features that have <strong>major importance</strong> or <strong>predominance</strong>, by name, type, and location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Traditions</td>
<td>Land use practices, buildings and structures, ethnic or religious institutions, community organization, construction methods, technology, trades and skills, use of plants, craftsmanship, methods of transportation, and patterns of land division.</td>
<td>• Describe land use practices, patterns of land division, institutions, building forms, workmanship, stylistic preferences, vernacular characteristics, use of materials, and methods of construction that have been influenced by cultural tradition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify the sources of cultural influences, and name specific individuals, such as artisans, builders, community leaders, or farmers, responsible for perpetuating or establishing such traditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Describe the kinds of features resulting from or exhibiting cultural traditions, and name, date, and locate the primary features reflecting such traditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>Features</td>
<td>Documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation Networks</td>
<td>Paths, roads, streams, or canals, highways, railways, and waterways.</td>
<td>• Describe the principal forms of transportation and circulation routes that facilitate travel within the landscape and connect the landscape with its larger region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Name, date, and describe principal or significant examples.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* Identify principal roadways and other transportation routes, by name, type, and location, and classify as contributing or non-contributing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Demarcations</td>
<td>Divisions marked by fences, walls, land use, vegetation, roadways, bodies of water, and irrigation or drainage ditches.</td>
<td>• Describe the ways in which land ownership and activities are physically divided within the landscape, and discuss the differences between historic and current practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Relate boundary demarcations to overall spatial organization and regional patterns of land division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify the predominant features that mark divisions within the landscape and locate important historic ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation Related to Land Use</td>
<td>Functional and ornamental trees and shrubs, fields for cropping, treelines along walls and roads, native vegetation, orchards, groves, woodlots, pastures, gardens, allees, shelter belts, forests, and grasslands.</td>
<td>• Describe principal, predominant, and significant vegetation, by type, condition, age, use, and general or specific location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Discuss changes that have occurred in vegetation since the period of significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Relate the function, massing, and details of vegetation to land uses and activities, cultural traditions, and response to the natural environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• For rotated crops, identify the general types of crops that might be grown over a period of several years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td>Features</td>
<td>Documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Buildings, Structures, and Objects | **Buildings:** residences, schools, churches, outbuildings, barns, stores, community halls, and train depots.  
**Structures:** dams, canals, tunnels, mining shafts, grain elevators, silos, bridges, earthworks, and highways.  
**Objects:** monuments, threshers, and cider mills. | • Describe the kinds of buildings, structures, and major objects present.  
• Relate the function, form, materials, and construction of buildings, structures, and objects to land uses and activities, cultural adaptations, and response to the natural environment.  
• Identify patterns and distinctive examples of workmanship, methods of construction, materials, stylistic influences, and vernacular forms.  
• Describe the condition of historic buildings and structures, and nature of additions and alterations.  
• Describe the principal and most important buildings, structures, and objects, by name, type, location, date, function, condition, methods of construction, materials, stylistic influence, and, if known, builder.  
• Discuss the impact of non-historic construction and alterations on historic integrity.  
* Identify all buildings and structures and principal objects, by location, name or number, and type, and classify as contributing or non-contributing. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Clusters             | Village centers, farmsteads, crossroads, harbors, and ranching or mining complexes. | • Describe the clusters, historic and non-historic, found in the landscape, by general location, function, scale, spatial arrangement, density, condition, and composition.  
• Discuss any patterns visible in the arrangement, location, or presence of clusters, and relate these to spatial organization, cultural traditions, response to the natural environment, and land uses and activities.  
• Identify principal, representative, or important examples, by name, type, function, and location.  
• Discuss the impact of non-historic development on historic integrity.  
* Identify all buildings, structures, and principal objects comprising clusters, by type and location, and classify as contributing or non-contributing. |
| Archaeological Sites | Road traces, reforested fields, and ruins of farmsteads, mills, mines, irrigation systems, piers and wharves, and quarries. | • Describe the types of archeological sites, their cultural affiliations, and the period of history or prehistory represented.  
• Indicate the extent of archeological sites within the landscape, their distribution, environmental setting, and general location.  
• Identify principal sites, by number or name and location, and describe surface and subsurface features, condition, disturbances, and any excavation or testing.  
* Identify all archeological sites, by site number or name, location, surface and subsurface characteristics, and condition. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Documentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small-scale elements</td>
<td>Foot bridges, cow paths, road markers, gravestones, isolated vegetation,</td>
<td>• Describe the kinds of elements that collectively add to the landscape's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fence posts, curbstones, trail ruts, culverts, foundations, and minor</td>
<td>setting, by type, function, general location, and approximate date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ruins.</td>
<td>• Relate these elements to historic patterns of land use, spatial organization,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cultural traditions, boundary demarcations, circulation networks, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vegetation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Discuss the extent to which the loss of these has cumulatively affected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>historic integrity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Significance Criteria Tables

The following six tables evaluate the significance of the Processes and Components of the Inner Harbour Cultural Landscape. Each table examines the processes and components against one of the criteria.

The significance criteria for the Kingston Inner Harbour CHL examines if the landscape:

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; or,

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

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

D. Manifests a particularly close and harmonious longstanding relationship between the natural and domestic landscape; or,

E. Has yielded or is likely to yield information important to prehistory or history; or,

F. Is strongly associated with the cultural and/or spiritual traditions of First Nations or any other ethnic and/or religious group.
**Table A2-1.** Significance Criteria A. Is associated with events that made significant contributions to the broad patterns of history, i.e., strong association with central themes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process/Component that meets the Criteria</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Activities (Process)</td>
<td>• Military land uses such as Fort Frontenac and the Tête du Pont Barracks reflect the strategic importance of the location and made significant contributions to the broad pattern of history connecting to the themes of <em>Governing Canada</em> and <em>Peopling the Land</em>.&lt;br&gt;• Industrial uses in the Inner Harbour including shipbuilding and rail lines connected downtown Kingston to other places and significantly shaped the landscape making contributions to the broad pattern of Kingston’s history, tied to the theme of <em>Developing Economies</em>.&lt;br&gt;• The Cataraqui River watercourse as the route of the Rideau Canal links the river to a significant building project and important transportation route. Tied to the themes of <em>Governing Canada</em>, <em>Developing Economies</em> and <em>Peopling the Land</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterns of Spatial Organization (Process)</td>
<td>• The Patterns of spatial organization around the Inner Harbour do not demonstrate associations with events that made significant contributions to the broad patterns of history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to the Natural Environment (Process)</td>
<td>• Fort Frontenac and the protected harbour in what is now Anglin Bay were chosen as the site of French settlement because of the harbour and strategic significance of a site on the St. Lawrence River and Lake Ontario. This location was very important for French governance on the Great Lakes and tied to the themes of <em>Peopling the Land</em> and <em>Governing Canada</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Traditions (Process)</td>
<td>• Most of the cultural traditions of the Inner Harbour area do not demonstrate associations with events that made significant contributions to the broad patterns of history. However the military presence at Fort Frontenac and H.M.C.S. Cataraqui have kept some military cultural traditions present in the study area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation Networks (Component)</td>
<td>• The Rideau Canal, central to the study area, is a significant component of the landscape and was a significant building project an important transportation route and was significant in 19th century transportation, governance of Canada and settling Eastern Ontario. The canal is tied to the themes of <em>Governing Canada</em>, <em>Developing Economies</em> and <em>Peopling the Land</em>. The canal is associated with events relating to the broad pattern of history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Demarcations (Component)</td>
<td>• Boundary demarcations in the study area do not demonstrate associations with events that made significant contributions to the broad patterns of history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation Related to Land Use (Component)</td>
<td>• Vegetation related to land use in the study area reflects the changing nature of industrial waterfront lands from periods of high activity through abandonment and change to residential and recreational uses. This broad historical trend may be a significant historical trend. The vegetation itself is not associated with events that made significant contributions to the broad pattern of history but the vegetation may represent a significant trend in people’s relationship to waterfront areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings, Structures and Objects (Component)</td>
<td>• The buildings, structures and objects of the study area do not demonstrate significant associations with events that made significant contributions to the broad patterns of history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process/Component that meets the Criteria</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters (Component)</td>
<td>• Clusters do not demonstrate significant associations with events that made significant contributions to the broad patterns of history.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Archaeological sites (Component)         | • First Nations archaeological sites in the study area reflect the earliest human settlement in Ontario. These sites are tied to the themes of *Peopling the Land*.  
• The early French and British archaeological sites in the study area reflect the earliest European settlement on the Canadian side of the Great Lakes and military sites. There is a strong tie to the themes of *Peopling the Land* and *Governing Canada* and is significant for its association with early Euro-Canadian history. |
| Small-Scale Elements (Component)         | • The ruins of Fort Frontenac represent a significant element of French history on the Great Lakes and are strongly associated with the themes of *Governing Canada* and *Peopling the Land*. The Fort Frontenac ruins are associated with events that made significant contributions to the broad patterns of history. |
| Continuing Uses                          | • The continued military presence in the study area has kept military and naval traditions present. This presence is associated with broad patterns of Canadian history. |
### Table A2-2. Significance Criteria B. Is closely associated with the lives of individuals and/or families who are considered significant to the history of the area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process/Component that meets the Criteria</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Land Use and Activities (Process)        | • The earliest military use of the Kingston area by the French are associated with Governor Frontenac and René-Robert Cavelier, Sieur de La Salle, who were both significant for local and national history.  
• The residential land use of Barriefield is associated with Richard Cartwright, who first owned and laid out the village lots. Cartwright was a significant businessman and prominent citizen in Kingston and Ontario’s early history.  
• Residential areas on the western side of the study area were first lived in by people who made their lives on the lakes, including Captain Irwin reflecting the significant maritime communities in early Kingston.  
• The Rideau Canal and associated transport uses is associated with Col. John By. |
| Patterns of Spatial Organization (Process) | • The pattern of spatial organization in Barriefield is closely associated with Richard Cartwright. |
| Response to the Natural Environment (Process) | • The local response to the natural environment is not associated with any particular individuals or families but is associated with generations of people who have lived or worked in the inner harbour area. |
| Cultural Traditions (Process) | • Cultural traditions in this study area are not directly associated with specific individuals or families. |
| Circulation Networks (Component) | • The Rideau Canal is associated with Col. John By.  
• The La Salle Causeway is named for René-Robert Cavelier, Sieur de La Salle. |
| Boundary Demarcations (Component) | • Boundary demarcations are not significantly associated with any specific individual or family of significance to the area. |
| Vegetation Related to Land Use (Component) | • Vegetation related to land use is not associated with any specific individual or family of significance to the area. |
| Buildings, Structures and Objects (Component) | • The Imperial Oil warehouse at the bottom of North St. was designed by the architect William Newlands.  
• The Davis Drydock is associated with the Davis family. |
| Clusters (Component) | • Part of the cluster of industrial lands along the western shores of the inner harbour is associated with the Davis family.  
• The village of Barriefield is associated with Richard Cartwright. |
| Archaeological sites (Component) | • The archaeological site of Fort Frontenac is associated with René-Robert Cavelier, Sieur de La Salle. |
| Small-Scale Elements (Component) | • The bollards and oil pipes at the entrance to Anglin bay are associated with the Anglin family, a family with a long history of business in the city. |
| Continuing Uses | • Continuing uses of the lands in the Inner Harbour Study area are not closely associated with the lives of individuals and/or families who are considered significant to the history of the area. |
Table A2-3. Significance Criteria C. Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a particular settlement pattern or lifeway whether derived from ethnic background, imposed by the landscape, was the practice of a specific historic period or a combination of the above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process/Component that meets the Criteria</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Land Use and Activities (Process)        | • The maritime and industrial land uses along the western shore of the Inner Harbour is directly associated with maritime commerce. The landscape in this area demonstrates distinctive characteristics of this maritime past in the large scale modifications of the shoreline, the wharves and remains of wharves in the waterway, the abandoned vessels wrecked in the Inner Harbour ships graveyard, and the industrial buildings, structures and objects that remain on the waterfront. These characteristic maritime components of the landscape are tied to the transport landscape and the economic landscape.  
  • The location of Kingston at the mouth of the Great Cataract River and Lake Ontario is a strategic location. High points to the east and land for farming to the west with views out to Lake Ontario that made this location ideal for military and naval uses. The fortifications in the study area and protected harbour in what is now Anglin Bay were significant characteristics of the landscape for the military and naval settlement patterns that developed. This reflects the territorial and governance concerns of the French and British at the time of settlement. |
| Patterns of Spatial Organization (Process) | • Barriefield Village as a settlement was shaped by the landscape sloping up from the shore. The residential pattern of settlement was shaped by the landscape and the maritime nature of the early community requiring access to the water to connect with the larger community on the western side of the river and to the inner harbour for fishermen and boat builders in the community and to connect to employment at the naval dockyard on Point Frederick.  
  • The western side of the Inner Harbour is largely land fill and industrial lands. The rail lines along the waters edge and over newly created land and the orientation of industrial buildings to the waters edge reflects characteristics of the 19th century progression of transportation and industry. The waterway was a resource to be used for transportation and waste disposal and a convenient place to create new land. This industrial pattern of spatial organization along the river is tied to the economic and transport landscapes. |
| Response to the Natural Environment (Process) | The location of the industrial lands, port facilities, bridge and residential areas around the study area were in part determined by the landscape.  
  • The location of Fort Frontenac met the needs of the French in establishing a fort for territorial control, part of the territorial and economic landscape, and set the stage for subsequent British military use and later civilian settlement.  
  • The protected bay in what is now Anglin Bay was an ideal spot for early shipbuilding and for a harbour protected from the westerly winds that made the early outer harbour dangerous. This landscape feature shaped all subsequent land use in the area by establishing the area as a place for shipbuilding and other industrial uses which led to the rail infrastructure and land creation in the area which was suited for industrial use.  
  • The layout and orientation of Barriefield Village was a response to the landscape, the village orientation in response to the river and position on the slope were determined by the natural environment. |
<p>| Cultural Traditions (Process) | • Cultural traditions do not appear to embody distinctive characteristics of a particular pattern or lifeway derived from ethnic background, imposed by the landscape or a specific practice of a historical period. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process/Component that meets the Criteria</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Circulation Networks (Component)</td>
<td>• The main circulation networks, the river and causeway do not appear to embody any distinctive characteristics of a particular pattern or lifeway. The development of streets in Kingston and Barriefield way from the shoreline does reflect a common 18th and 19th century pattern but this is not a distinctive feature. • The rail line built on a causeway out around Anglin Bay with a bridge over the entrance to the bay followed by land fill in the bay is an interesting feature of the circulation network in Kingston and appears to be a response to development and available land to introduce rail into Kingston.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Demarcations (Component)</td>
<td>• Boundary demarcations in the study area do not appear to embody distinctive characteristics of a particular pattern or lifeway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation Related to Land Use (Component)</td>
<td>• Vegetation related to land use does not appear to embody distinctive characteristics of a particular pattern or lifeway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings, Structures and Objects (Component)</td>
<td>• The industrial buildings and objects of the Kingston Inner Harbour embody the industrial nature of the area and reflect the 19th and early 20th century practice of creating industrial areas around ports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters (Component)</td>
<td>• The Inner Harbour study area does not demonstrate any clusters that embody any significant distinctive characteristics of a particular settlement pattern or lifeway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological sites (Component)</td>
<td>• The ships graveyard in the inner harbour is a distinctive pattern of abandonment found in some 19th and 20th century port towns and is a response to settlement patterns and human use of the landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-Scale Elements (Component)</td>
<td>• The small scale elements in the Inner Harbour study area do not embody any distinctive characteristics of a particular settlement pattern or lifeway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Uses</td>
<td>• Continuing uses of a maritime nature in the Inner Harbour study area do not embody and distinctive characteristics of a particular settlement pattern or lifeway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A2-4. Significance Criteria D. Manifests a particularly close and harmonious longstanding relationship between the natural and domestic landscape.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process/Component that meets the Criteria</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Activities (Process)</td>
<td>• Land use and activities in the study area do not manifest a particularly close and harmonious longstanding relationship between the natural and domestic landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterns of Spatial Organization (Process)</td>
<td>• The spatial organization of Barriefield Village has been well preserved from the early 19th century. The organization of the village fits within the natural landscape and has evolved for nearly 2 centuries manifesting a close, harmonious and longstanding relationship with the natural landscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to the Natural Environment (Process)</td>
<td>• The human response to the natural environment in the study area does not demonstrate a particularly close and harmonious longstanding relationship between the natural and domestic landscape. The relationship in this area has often been dissonant or one of neglect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Traditions (Process)</td>
<td>• The cultural traditions of the industrial and maritime communities in the study area have a long and close relationship with the natural landscape. People involved in boatbuilding, fishing, shipping and other maritime activities often make up a distinct subcultural group within a community and their distinct cultural traditions are closely tied to the natural environment. A more detailed study would be necessary to document this relationship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Circulation Networks (Component)          | • The Rideau Canal has dramatically altered the landscape of the Cataraqui River, however not within the study area. The canal does manifest a long and close relationship between the natural and domestic landscape. This relationship has become harmonious over time.  
• Other elements of the circulation network, the La Salle Causeway and former rail lines are dissonant intrusions, altering the natural landscape. |
<p>| Boundary Demarcations (Component)         | • Boundary demarcations do not demonstrate any harmonious, longstanding relationships between the natural and domestic landscape. |
| Vegetation Related to Land Use (Component) | • Vegetation related to land use is largely a result of abandonment or open space and does not reflect a harmonious and long standing relationship between the natural and domestic landscape. |
| Buildings, Structures and Objects (Component) | • Buildings, structures and objects do not manifest a harmonious or long standing relationship between the natural and domestic landscape. |
| Clusters (Component)                      | • Barriefield Village as a settlement cluster does demonstrate a long and harmonious relationship between the natural and domestic environments. The layout, the location and the way the village addresses the river reflect this relationship. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process/Component that meets the Criteria</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Archaeological sites (Component)        | • The archaeological site on Belle Island manifests a close and harmonious relationship with the natural landscape. The site is well protected although 20th century changes to the river and marsh have created some erosion problems for the site.  
• The abandoned vessels in the inner harbour demonstrate a close and harmonious relationship between the natural and domestic landscape. These vessels have settled into the sediment at the bottom of the river and have become part of the natural landscape providing shelter for some of the rivers fauna.  
• Other potential archaeological sites in the study area do not manifest a close or harmonious relationship between the domestic and natural landscape. |
| Small-Scale Elements (Component)        | • Small-scale elements in the study area do not manifest a particularly close and harmonious longstanding relationship between the natural and domestic landscape. |
| Continuing Uses                        | • Continuing uses in the study area do not manifest a particularly close and harmonious longstanding relationship between the natural and domestic landscape. |
Table A2-5. Significance Criteria E. Has yielded or is likely to yield information important to prehistory or history.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process/Component that meets the Criteria</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Land Use and Activities (Process)        | • The First Nations burial ground and camp sites in the study area have the potential to yield information important to the area’s prehistory.  
• The military and naval uses of lands within the study area have the potential to yield information important to the area’s history.  
• The industrial land uses in the study area have the potential to yield information relevant to the area’s history.  
• The residential land uses in the study area have the potential to yield information relevant to the area’s history.  
• All of the land uses in the study area have the potential to yield information important to the area’s prehistory or history through study of these land uses in relation to the maritime landscape. While the area’s history and the history of each land use is well known the history of the area as a maritime landscape is evident but not well studied. |
| Patterns of Spatial Organization (Process) | • The patterns of spatial organization in the study area are not likely to yield information important to prehistory or history in the study area. The patterns of spatial organization are traditional and well known. |
| Response to the Natural Environment (Process) | • The responses to the natural environment within the study area are common processes adapting to or modifying the natural environment as the situation warranted. The response to the natural environment is not likely to yield information important to the prehistory or history of the area. |
| Cultural Traditions (Process)            | • The cultural traditions evident in the study area are part of the dominant culture of the surrounding area. Cultural traditions are not likely to yield information important to the prehistory or history of the area. However specific maritime traditions as a subcultural tradition are not well documented and more study may reveal cultural traditions with some significance. |
| Circulation Networks (Component)         | • The circulation networks within the study area are not likely to yield new information important to prehistory or history.  
• The river as an element of a broad maritime circulation network is likely an important part of a prehistoric network but the study of the significance of the river extends well beyond the scope of this study area. |
<p>| Boundary Demarcations (Component)        | • Boundary demarcations have not and are not likely to yield information important to prehistory or history. There is nothing exceptional about boundary demarcations in the study area. |
| Vegetation Related to Land Use (Component) | • Vegetation related to land use has not and is not likely to yield information important to prehistory or history. The significance of vegetation related to land use in the study area is limited. |
| Buildings, Structures and Objects (Component) | • The buildings, structures and objects within the study area have not and are not likely to yield information important to the prehistory or history of the area. As individual elements in the landscape each building, structure or object is interesting and in some cases well documented but has limited potential for historic interest. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process/Component that meets the Criteria</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clusters (Component)</td>
<td>• Study of the settlement clusters, the cluster of industrial sites and abandoned shipwrecks could yield information important to the history of the study area. All of these clusters are related to the area’s maritime heritage and further study of the maritime history of the area is a potential area of historical interest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological sites (Component)</td>
<td>• Archaeological sites in the study area including Fort Frontenac, the abandoned ships and the campsite and burial ground on Belle Island have yielded and have the potential to yield important information on the area’s prehistory and history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-Scale Elements (Component)</td>
<td>• Small scale elements in the landscape do not have much potential to yield information important to the area’s prehistory or history as individual items. The small scale elements represent elements of the area’s military, industrial and maritime past and as such contribute to each cluster of land uses and activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Uses</td>
<td>• Continuing uses reflect the area’s maritime past but do not offer significant insights to yield important information on the area’s prehistory or history.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A2-6. Significance Criteria F. Is strongly associated with the cultural and/or spiritual traditions of First Nations or any other ethnic and/or religious group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process/Component that meets the Criteria</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Activities (Process)</td>
<td>● The First Nations burial ground is strongly associated with the cultural/spiritual traditions of first nations groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterns of Spatial Organization (Process)</td>
<td>● The patterns of spatial organization in the study area are not strongly associated with the cultural and/or spiritual traditions of First Nations or any other ethnic and/or religious group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to the Natural Environment (Process)</td>
<td>● The responses to the natural environment in the study area are not strongly associated with the cultural and/or spiritual traditions of First Nations or any other ethnic and/or religious group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Traditions (Process)</td>
<td>● Cultural traditions in the study area are not strongly associated with the cultural and/or spiritual traditions of First Nations or any other ethnic and/or religious group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation Networks (Component)</td>
<td>● Circulation networks in the study area are not strongly associated with the cultural and/or spiritual traditions of First Nations or any other ethnic and/or religious group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boundary Demarcations (Component)</td>
<td>● Boundary demarcations in the study area are not strongly associated with the cultural and/or spiritual traditions of First Nations or any other ethnic and/or religious group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation Related to Land Use (Component)</td>
<td>● No evidence that vegetation related to land use in the study area is strongly associated with the cultural and/or spiritual traditions of First Nations or any other ethnic and/or religious group has been identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings, Structures and Objects (Component)</td>
<td>● Buildings, structures and objects in the study area are not strongly associated with the cultural and/or spiritual traditions of First Nations or any other ethnic and/or religious group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters (Component)</td>
<td>● Settlement clusters in the study area are not strongly associated with the cultural and/or spiritual traditions of First Nations or any other ethnic and/or religious group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological sites (Component)</td>
<td>● The First Nations Burial ground on Belle Island is strongly associated with the cultural and spiritual traditions of First Nations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small-Scale Elements (Component)</td>
<td>● Small scale elements in the study area are not strongly associated with the cultural and/or spiritual traditions of First Nations or any other ethnic and/or religious group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing Uses</td>
<td>● Continuing uses in the study area are not strongly associated with the cultural and/or spiritual traditions of First Nations or any other ethnic and/or religious group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>