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1 | Background

1.1 | INTRODUCTION

The City of Pickering is undertaking a neighbourhood planning exercise as required under the Central Pickering Development Plan for the neighbourhoods within Seaton. This neighbourhood planning exercise will result in detailed neighbourhood plans and policies to guide the form and nature of development in accordance with the Central Pickering Development Plan. This includes protection of the natural heritage system; integration of cultural heritage resources; provision for a full range of housing opportunities; creation of walkable mixed-use neighbourhoods, and establishment of densities which can support transit. These neighbourhood plans and policies will be approved by the City of Pickering and incorporated into the City’s Official Plan.
As part of this work, the Central Pickering Development Plan requires background work in a number of areas, one of which is the Whitevale Road Corridor Heritage Conservation Study. BRAY Heritage has been retained to assess the potential for expanding the existing boundary of the Whitevale Heritage Conservation District. This component of the project is in response to the directive from the Council of the City of Pickering (January 23, 2006) stating that, “for the Central Pickering Area, Council shall recognize the heritage character of the Whitevale Road Corridor and require design of new development to be compatible with the existing heritage features and sites...” and to act upon the recommendation by Heritage Pickering to consider “a potential extension of the heritage conservation district designation through Seaton along Whitevale Road, from the east limit of the existing heritage conservation district to Sideline 16, extending one half concession in width north and south of Whitevale Road and including Whitevale Road itself (the “Study Area’”).

Further in that directive is a Council resolution to have City staff undertake a heritage conservation (district) study of this area, but it is our understanding that this has not been pursued. Also, the CPCP provides cultural heritage polices for Seaton that will impact both the existing Heritage Conservation District (HCD) Study and Plan and any potential expansion of that District. It is in this context that the current study will provide the following tasks:

- Review the HCD Study and Plan in the context of the current policies and guidelines provided in the PPS, the OHA and the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit.
- Review previous inventories and evaluations of cultural heritage resources in Seaton, focusing on the Whitevale Road corridor and including the corridor from the eastern limit of the existing HCD (Sideline 26) to the eastern limit of Seaton (Sideline 16).
- Conduct further site analysis, site visits, and research, as needed, to provide an overall assessment of cultural heritage resources within this study area.
- Assess the impact of the CPDP policies and the developers’ neighbourhood plans and draft plans on these resources.
- Propose strategies and guidelines for treatment of the Whitevale Road corridor for inclusion within the neighbourhood plans and draft plans.
- Propose strategies and guidelines for mitigating impact and integrating heritage resources for inclusion within the neighbourhood plans and draft plans.
1.2 | REVIEW OF THE WHITEVALE HCD PLAN AND RELATED HERITAGE RESOURCE STUDIES PURPOSE

The cultural landscape of Seaton has been extensively studied over the years during which it has been in Provincial ownership. The relevant background studies for the current study include, but are not limited to, the following:

- The Hamlet of Whitevale Heritage Conservation District Study: Background Report (Unterman McPhail, August, 1989)
- The Hamlet of Whitevale Heritage Conservation District Study: The District Plan (Unterman McPhail, June 1990)
- Seaton Cultural Heritage Resources Assessment (Hough Stansbury Woodland Naylor Dance, July 1994)
- Seaton Built Heritage Assessment (André Scheinman, November, 2004)
- Cultural Landscape Assessment, Central Pickering: Seaton Lands (Wendy Shearer, February 28, 2006)
- Thematic Study and Phase I Evaluation of ORC Properties in Pickering (Contentworks, March, 2009)
- Phase II Evaluation of Residences on Whitevale Road, Pickering (2 reports) (Contentworks, March, 2009)
These reports were reviewed in the context of the cultural heritage policies of the CPDP. Also reviewed were preliminary results from the archaeological resource assessment being conducted by ASI.

The results of these studies can be summarized as follows:

- The HCD Study gives the reasons for designation of Whitevale as being largely based on the hamlet’s rural setting in an agricultural landscape. The inclusion of farm complexes and fields east of the hamlet proper (to include the intersection of Whitevale Road and Sideline 26) is a result of this assessment of the hamlet’s heritage significance (Background Report, Section 6).

The Cultural Heritage Resources Assessment shows the variety and density of significant heritage resources along the Whitevale Road corridor, including buildings, cultural landscapes and archaeological sites (as well as natural resources), all of which relate to the area’s predominantly rural character. The composite evaluation of natural and cultural heritage resources shows that the Whitevale Corridor has the highest concentration of significant heritage resources, with the greatest integrity, of all of the Seaton area.

- The Built Heritage Assessment confirms the presence of many significant built heritage resources along the corridor and implies that most would be eligible for individual (Part IV) designation under the OHA.

- The Cultural Landscape Assessment integrates the built heritage assessment with the general assessment of cultural heritage resources by providing a more detailed inventory and evaluation of cultural landscapes within the corridor and proposing a set of development guidelines for integrating these resources within new development.

- The Thematic Study and Phases I and II Evaluations give a contextual assessment of the heritage significance of properties along the Whitevale Road corridor in general terms, and in more detail for the ORC properties specifically. The 3 reports assessed the existing properties along the corridor but not in the context of the development proposed in the CPDP. As in the previous studies, the recommendations favoured conservation of the entire context of rural roadscapes and farmsteads, including the agricultural landscapes stretching back on either side of the corridor.

All of these studies appear to be based on the assumption that the current HCD Plan policies and district boundary are to remain intact and that future development will be separated from the heritage resources in such a way as to preserve, wherever possible, the dominant character of an agricultural landscape.
1.3 | SUMMARY OF HERITAGE SIGNIFICANCE OF WHITEVALE HCD AND THE WHITEVALE ROAD CORRIDOR

The HCD Study and Plan were prepared over twenty years ago, before the CPDP and its development goals for Seaton, and before the amendments to the PPS and OHA. As a result, some interpretation is needed in order to determine the heritage significance of Whitevale Hamlet and the Whitevale Road Corridor as it would be defined in the current policy context. In advance of a more detailed assessment of heritage significance that would be based on information in the existing studies, and using the framework provided in the PPS and the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit, the following is a preliminary summary of heritage significance, in the form of a Heritage Character Statement.

WHITEVALE HAMLET HCD

Reasons for Designation (following the criteria in OHA Regulation 9/06):

- Architectural significance in the form of excellent examples of mid-to-late 19th century houses and farm complexes
- Historical significance via associations with the founding of Whitevale and with the main settlement period for the Pickering area
- Contextual significance for the scenic values of the cultural and natural landscape.

HERITAGE CHARACTER STATEMENT:

Whitevale Hamlet is an excellent example of mid-to-late nineteenth century Ontario village architecture, and Whitevale Road is closely associated with the hamlet's development and contains several significant nineteenth century buildings and cultural landscapes.

CHARACTER-DEFINING ELEMENTS:

Whitevale Hamlet HCD

- Placement of houses along contours of steep sided valley (hamlet)
- Concentration of trees along the river bank (hamlet)
- Cohesive, compact geometry of settlement grid (hamlet) contrasting with natural topography, river course and farm fields
- Vestiges of previous industrial uses (hamlet)
- Concentration of vernacular 19th century housing, primarily in 1-2½ storey frame structures (hamlet)

Whitevale Road Corridor

- Rural cross section of Whitevale Road (narrow pavement, open ditches, roadside vegetation and mature tree planting, post and wire/board fencing)
- Undulating vertical alignment of Whitevale Road, following the existing topography
- Views of the natural and cultural landscape from Whitevale Road
- Ornamental and windbreak plantings associated with each farmstead
- Variety of architectural styles, materials, and ages of buildings
- Vestiges of related land uses (e.g. orchards, cemeteries, schools, shops) in built, cultural landscape and archaeological resources

The foregoing text summarizes the elements that would be most impacted by the type and scale of development proposed in the CPDP. A more comprehensive statement of significance, describing a broader range of built and cultural landscape resources, is found in the March, 2009 Phase II Evaluation report. A summary statement of significance from that report is provided below.

"Collectively, the farmsteads and landscapes of Whitevale Road and Sidelines 26 and 28 represent a significant cultural landscape which speaks powerfully of agrarian life in 19th-century Ontario, and the central role it played in the history of the Province. While many of the other farmsteads and individual farmhouses and barns in the Pickering study area are fine buildings, of local interest, and of ongoing merit as residences, they do not individually stand out from their contemporaries for their heritage value, nor do they collectively possess the integrity and cohesiveness so striking on the Whitevale Road. Too many elements have been lost in these other areas, and too many intrusions of modern structures (such as those surveyed in this study) have limited properties and groups of properties outside of the Whitevale area to meet the minimum criteria of being “heritage” for the purposes of ORC."

(Contentworks, March 2009, Phase II Evaluation, p. 13)

It is clear from the foregoing summaries of heritage significance that much of the heritage value of the Whitevale Road corridor inheres in its integrity as a rural cultural landscape. With the development proposed in the CPDP, that integrity will be fundamentally altered. While new development can replace some of the incompatible 20th century buildings that the ORC study mentions, and thus improve the overall design standard of the corridor, the road will now pass through an urbanized setting, not farmland. Within the CPDP, therefore, what can remain of heritage value could be the core buildings in each of the significant farmsteads along the corridor, and the roadscape of the corridor itself. It is to these remaining heritage resources that the current study now turns.

Consideration of the Whitevale Road corridor being designated as a Heritage Conservation District will be made in the following sections, as part of discussions of integrating the corridor’s cultural heritage resources within the neighbourhood plans. Alternatives to designation as an HCD will also be discussed.
1.4 HERITAGE RESOURCE POLICIES IN THE CPDP AND CURRENT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS

The CPDP has as one of its eight goals the conservation of cultural heritage resources; “The integration of cultural heritage into the new community fabric by drawing on the legacies of original aboriginal and European occupations” (CPDP, p. 20). As laid out in the Cultural Heritage objectives (Section 4.2), the ways in which this goal can be achieved in the Whitevale Road corridor include the objective to “protect and conserve significant cultural heritage features and integrate them into new urban and agricultural communities and into the Natural Heritage System” (ibid. p. 38). Note that in Section 5 of the CPDP, Implementation, all terms used in the CPDP text to describe heritage resources are the same definitions used in the PPS (ibid, p. 75).

The objectives contained in Section 4.2, as they pertain to the Whitevale Road corridor, can be summarized as follows:

- A general presumption in favour of in-situ conservation and rehabilitation of significant cultural heritage resources (4).
- An overall guideline for new development “on or adjacent to protected cultural heritage properties to be of an appropriate scale and character, where the heritage attributes of such properties are conserved (9).

Policies stemming from the above include:

- Neighbourhood plans that, where feasible, integrate cultural heritage landscape features (1 a), using the 2006 cultural landscape assessment report as a guide (1 e)
Neighbourhood plans that incorporate built heritage resources, with consideration to designation under the OHA (1 f)

Ensure that development adjacent to the Whitevale Hamlet HCD be compatible with the District’s heritage attributes (2 a-d)

Inventory, evaluation and protection in-situ wherever possible of significant archaeological resources (3-9)

In subsequent sections, the relationship of the Cultural Heritage goals, objectives and policies to the other elements of the CPDP is shown, as follows:

In Section 4.3, Agriculture, hamlets are to continue their historic social and service function is support of the agricultural activities in the agricultural reserve. Infill and mixed uses are permitted in hamlets, including Whitevale.

In Section 4.5, Transportation, upgrades to existing sidelines and Concession roads are to consider the heritage attributes of those routes (4.5.3 Policies, 7. p. 57) introduction, b) and the Whitevale Road corridor is to be given special consideration for its heritage resources, including avoidance of widening, conservation of heritage resources, and consideration of the recommendations of a Whitevale Road Corridor Heritage Conservation Study (c). Note: the current study is the study to which this policy refers.

In Section 4.6, Servicing, there is no mention made of locating storm water management ponds away from significant cultural heritage resources, although the policies stipulate that such ponds must avoid natural heritage resources.

In Section 4.8, Housing and Mixed Use, there are neighbourhood planning policies that allow for variation in lot sizes to accommodate natural or cultural heritage features (6 g).

In Section 5, Implementation, the wording appears to indicate that the policies of the CPDP supersede those of the PPS, Planning Act and Heritage Act, although the CPDP is to be read “in conjunction with” the PPS and Planning Act (p. 75). Should this be the case, the existing HCD Designation for Whitevale Hamlet would not be considered binding.

The urban design guidelines for cultural heritage (Schedule 9, p. 110) deal only with built heritage and recommend three typical conservation strategies: retention in situ (via restoration or rehabilitation) of significant built heritage resources or, relocation, or documentation and salvage of components for reuse. No guidelines are provided for cultural heritage landscapes or sites of archaeological potential.

Typical neighbourhood plans and draft plans of subdivision as submitted by consultants working for the developers are at a level of generality that makes it difficult to determine if they have considered the foregoing objectives and policies for conservation and proposed integration of cultural heritage resources or made provision for new development to be compatible with such resources. The extent of this integration will be reviewed below, in Section 3.3 | Conservation Strategies for Heritage Resources in the Whitevale Road Corridor.
FIGURE 4: CENTRAL PICKERING PLANNING AREA NEIGHBOURHOODS (P 79, CPDP) (MODIFIED BY AUTHOR)
2 | Corridor Resource Inventory & Assessment

2.1 | BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCES

The following is a summary of the information found in existing inventories and evaluations of buildings along the Whitevale Road corridor east of Whitevale Hamlet. Some of the properties are within the boundary of the Whitevale Hamlet HCD but most are east of that boundary in the remainder of the corridor, as far as the eastern boundary of Seaton. The information summarized below is taken from the HCD Background Report (August, 1989), the District Plan (June, 1990), the Seaton Cultural Heritage Resources Assessment (July, 1994), the Seaton Built Heritage Assessment (2004) and the 3 ORC Phase I and II Evaluations (March, 2009). Reference is also made to the City of Pickering Municipal Register (March, 2008). Each of these properties is regarded as being significant as a result of a rating in the foregoing evaluations of at least Very Good or even Excellent. For details refer to the descriptions in the studies referred to above.

Municipal addresses are provided for each, and numbers in brackets refer to the inventory listing numbers in the 1994 resources assessment text and mapping, but do not include the reference numbers used in the ORC Phase I and II Evaluations. “BHF” refers to Built Heritage Features and includes houses and outbuildings. Properties with an asterisk * merit further assessment for potential heritage value. “Register” indicates listing on the City of Pickering Register of heritage properties. “ORC Heritage Resource” refers to the entire property: “CR” refers to buildings within the site that are Contributing Resources.
From this listing and assessment it is clear that significant built heritage resources are found on both sides of the corridor from just east of the hamlet (within the HCD) to the corridor’s easterly limit. Although these resources relate to farmsteads and are therefore widely spaced, there are some concentrations of significant buildings. Clusters appear near the intersections of Sidelines with the corridor. The most important of these clusters involves properties in the immediate vicinity of Whitevale Road and Sideline 28 (Nos. 72, 73, 74 and 76). Another cluster is in the vicinity of Sideline 26 as it crosses the corridor (Nos. 10, 11, 66, 69) and another near the intersection of Sideline 24 (Nos. 7, 8, 17, 18).

**SIGNIFICANT BHF’s EAST OF WHITEVALE WITHIN THE HCD**

**#615 (76) - Henry Major House**

1 storey frame (1820s) and stone addition (1850s) and frame barn (1850); ORC Heritage Property, house and barn CRs

**#650 (75)**

1.5 storey frame house (1860); ORC no heritage value*
#3250 Sideline 28 (74) - William Turner House

2 storey frame and stone (pre-1850); Register, ORC Heritage Property

#700/3215 Sideline 28 (73) - Whitevale School

1 storey brick (1865); Register, CR

#750 (72) - James White House

1.5 storey stone (1861); Register, ORC Heritage Property
#825 (69) - Thomas Stephenson House (The Grange)

2 storey frame (1855); Register, ORC Heritage Property

#3185 Sideline 26 (66) - Hugh Pugh House (Pennybank)

1.5 storey stone and brick (1851); Register, ORC Heritage Property, house CR

#860

Barn (1890); Not heritage*
SIGNIFICANT BHF’s EAST OF THE HCD

#940 (11) - John Major House

1.5 storey stone and frame (1822); ORC Heritage Resource, house and barn (1870) CRs

#1050 (10) - Clergy Reserve/Aaron Albright House

1.5 storey brick (1861); Register, ORC Heritage Property, 3 outbuildings CRs

#1125 (18) - John Tool II House/King’s College/Splatt House

2.5 storey brick (1870); Register, ORC Heritage Property, house and barn (1920) CRs
#1130 (8) - Nathaniel Hastings House

1.5 storey stone (1840); Register, ORC Heritage Property, house and barn (1870) CRs

#1200 (7) - W. Brignal House

2 storey brick (1877); Register, ORC Heritage Property, house and garage (1920) CRs

#1255 (17) - John Tool House

1.5 storey stone (1850s; ruin), barn (1870); Register
#1390 (6) - Joseph Willson House

1.5 storey stone (1851); Register, ORC Heritage Property, house CR

#1415

Barn (1870); ORC Heritage Property

#1450 (5) - Francis Linton House

1.5 storey log (1861); Register, ORC Heritage Property, house CR
#1505 (15) – Caspar Willson House

1.5 storey brick (1861); Register, Part IV designated

#3285 Sideline 20 (4) – John Hastings House

1.5 storey brick and stone (1861)

#1585 (14) – Edward Willson House

1.5 storey frame house and outbuildings (1860s); ORC further research required, house and outbuildings CRs
#1690 (2) - Hubbard/Thompson-Glen House

1.5 storey log (1840s); Register, Part IV designated, ORC Heritage Property, house and barns (1890-1900) CRs

*(East of Brock Road, south side)* (65)

*Early log structure within 20th C. 1.5 storey frame, not on Register or owned by ORC*
2.2 | CULTURAL LANDSCAPES, VIEWS AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The 1994 Assessment report rated the entire landscape on both sides of the Whitevale Road corridor from Whitevale Hamlet to Brock Road as being of Very High significance, with the section east of Sideline 24 having the highest integrity. The following components of this rural landscape have been identified in the 1990 HCD Plan and in the Cultural Landscape Assessment (2006) as having distinctive value and being in addition to lands within natural heritage areas. “CLU” refers to Cultural Landscape Units which, in most cases, are the farmstead (farmhouse, outbuilding, and related landscape elements and vegetation). Significant views are noted in the 1994 Resource Assessment and the 2006 Landscape Assessment (the views also relate to larger viewsheds that typically extend to the mid-point of the Concession). Archaeological information is taken from 1994 Resource Assessment (cemeteries) and the Seaton Neighbourhood Planning Review. Euro-Canadian sites are farmsteads adjacent to Whitevale Road; First Nations sites have been taken into account but not identified on the report mapping, for reasons of confidentiality.

The significant cultural landscapes within and abutting the corridor are, for the most part, related to farmsteads and, of these, the core areas of significance are the entrance lane and farmhouse (with their related plantings), barns and other outbuildings in the vicinity of the farmhouse, and windbreak plantings. The farmsteads noted above are identified as having “significant landscape context” (Shearer 2006, p. 13), or the highest level of integrity. Of note is the overlap between significant built heritage resources and significant cultural landscapes: the identified farmsteads also contain significant buildings. Also notable is the importance of the high point on the corridor, found at the intersection of Whitevale Road and Sideline 26: it has the greatest concentration of significant views. Significant views are also found at Sideline 28 and at Mulberry Lane. Archaeological sites tend to be related to significant farmsteads (Euro-Canadian sites). First Nation sites have been recorded but are not delineated on the mapping.
FIGURE 6: ORC PROPERTIES (ORC, FEBRUARY 2010) (MODIFIED BY THE AUTHOR)
CLU's WITHIN THE HCD

#700/3215 Sideline 28

Former school property (perimeter trees)

Unopened road allowance

(Sideline 28) tree line (Maples)

Roadscape

(Whitevale Road) tree lined, rural cross section
**CLU's EAST OF THE HCD**

**#940 (11)**

![Image of Farmstead (plantings and outbuildings)]

**#1050 (10)**

![Image of Farmstead (plantings and outbuildings)]

**#1125 (18)**

![Image of Farmstead (plantings and outbuildings)]

**#1450 (5)**

![Image of Farmstead (plantings and outbuildings)]

**VIEWS**

**Whitevale Road and North Road**

![Map of Southwest to West Duffins Creek](image)

**Whitevale Road and Sideline 28**

![Map of South to West Duffins Creek](image)
Whitevale Road and Sideline 26

South-Southwest to Lake Ontario; South to Toronto Skyline; Southwest to West Duffins Creek

Whitevale Road Corridor

South to creeks

Whitevale Road and Mulberry Lane

East from Sideline 26

West from Sideline 20
ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

Whitevale Cemetery

(Also has cultural landscape value)

Hastings Cemetery

Lamoreaux Cemetery
3 | Corridor Conservation & Development Strategies

3.1 | PRINCIPLES, GOALS & OBJECTIVES

At the preliminary stages of preparing a conservation and development strategy for the Whitevale Road corridor, it is important to establish the framework within which such strategies are to be prepared. The framework is based on best practices in heritage conservation, as reflected in the federal Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada as well as in the planning policies of the Provincial Policy Statement, the Ontario Heritage Act, and the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit. Policies found in the Central Pickering Development Plan generally follow these best conservation practices.

The basic principle of the Whitenvale Hamlet HCD is change management that respects the identified heritage attributes of the District. Goals and objectives for conservation and development within the Whitenvale Hamlet HCD are found in the Heritage Conservation District Plan, Section 3.1: guidelines are found in Section 3.2.2. Although written in 1990, this framework is still relevant within the context of current heritage policy and practice. The remainder of the Plan contains detailed guidelines for the building and landscape works within the District, all of which are also still relevant.

Central to the HCD Plan’s conservation goals is the principle of conservation of heritage resources in situ, and preservation of the rural character of the hamlet. The intent is to keep as much of the surrounding rural land as possible in order for the hamlet to appear in its relevant setting.
3.2 | POTENTIAL DESIGNATION OF WHITEVALE ROAD CORRIDOR AS A HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT

The other aspect of this review is to comment on the advisability of pursuing designation of the Whitevale Road corridor as a Heritage Conservation District under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act. Criteria for District designation are found in the Ontario Heritage Tool Kit. The preconditions for studying potential designation – historical and documentary research, field studies and public participation – have largely been met by existing reports. The evaluation of the corridor’s cultural heritage resources and attributes remains to be done. The following is a preliminary review of the corridor in terms of the criteria contained in Part 3 of the Tool Kit:

- **Historical association:**
  - The corridor is an historic route (Conc. line 5) associated with the early settlement of the area, and containing the properties developed by early settlers

- **Architecture:**
  - Significant built heritage resources contribute to an understanding of various construction periods

- **Vernacular design:**
  - The significant built heritage resources are important local and regional examples of well-crafted buildings using local materials

- **Integrity:**
  - Significant built heritage resources are contained within intact farmstead complexes

- **Architectural details:**
  - There are a few examples of local interpretations of regional/national architectural styles (e.g. cat slide roof, dichromatic brick)

- **Landmark status or group value:**
  - The former school could be considered a local landmark at an important intersection

- **Landscapes and public open spaces:**
  - The Whitevale corridor roadscape is an important surviving example of a local rural road

- **Overall spatial pattern:**
  - The spatial relationship of farmsteads along the corridor contribute to the scale of the corridor

- **Land-use:**
  - The corridor is the spine within a distinctive rural farming landscape

- **Circulation network and pattern:**
  - The surviving system of open and unopened road allowances is intact from the late 19th century
Boundary and other linear features:
   - There are many examples of surviving boundary features, both along the corridor and around and between farmsteads

Site arrangements:
   - The farmsteads retain their functional arrangements of buildings and landscape elements

Vegetation patterns:
   - The farming landscape contains the usual elements of woodlots, watercourses, farm fields, hedgerows and the tree-lined roadway

Historic views:
   - The views along the undulating route of Whitevale Road remain, and there is an important viewing point for area-wide views at the intersection of Sideline 26

The boundary of the potential district would be more difficult to define, but could be determined by the viewsheds from each side and the functional boundaries of the individual farmsteads. In that case, the boundary would be approximately one half concession deep on each side of the corridor, to the rear woodlots behind each 50 acre parcel fronting the corridor.

The probable rationale for extending the HCD boundary eastwards, potentially as far as Sideline 16, would have the following components if it related to the existing rural setting:

- Concentration of significant cultural heritage resources – built heritage features, cultural landscape units, and archaeological resources – having a high degree of integrity
- Intact viewsheds along the road and to the north and south
- Rural landscape character of the existing roadscape
- Historical, architectural and contextual links between the corridor and Whitevale Hamlet, and with Seaton/Pickering as a whole

Reviewing the responses to each of these criteria would indicate that, at first glance, the corridor is well suited for designation as a Heritage Conservation District. The largely intact late-19th to early 20th century rural landscape, largely due to the removal of development capability by Provincial expropriation for the airport lands, has provided the corridor with a varied and visually coherent rural agricultural roadscape. The March 2009 ORC report concludes that designation as an HCD would be an appropriate management response for ORC properties (Contentworks, p. 13). However, with the approval of the CPDP, the lands along the corridor will be changed from their current state to that of components of urban neighbourhoods. In other words, there will no longer be a farming landscape around the individual heritage resources.
FIGURE 8: SCHEDULE 2 - LAND-USE PLAN (P 90, CPDP) (MODIFIED BY AUTHOR)
Whereas the Hamlet Heritage Open Space to the east of Whitevale will provide a buffer between the hamlet and adjacent development, in the rest of the corridor, the removal of this rural setting places the heritage resources within or adjacent to development that ranges in type from low or medium density residential to higher density mixed use nodes. The fragmentation of the corridor’s cultural landscape removes many of the reasons for designation that would otherwise have made the corridor eligible for district designation. As a result, the preliminary recommendation is to pursue options other than district designation as a means of conserving the remaining elements of the corridor roadscape. These options could include, but not be limited to:

- Part IV designation of significant built heritage resources (and cultural landscapes, where applicable) on individual farmsteads, including the farmhouse and associated vegetation and, in some cases, potentially including the entire working farm (fields, hedgerows, barns and other outbuildings)
- Part IV designation of significant cultural landscapes (e.g. cemeteries)
- Designation of the corridor as a Scenic Road
- Application of development and urban design guidelines for compatible new infill along the corridor (similar to those proposed in Neighbourhood Plans 1&2), using the existing built form and landscape layouts as prototypes
- Creation of a new residential district within which to place relocated significant built heritage resources (similar to the Markham heritage subdivision)

### 3.3 CONSERVATION STRATEGIES FOR HERITAGE RESOURCES IN THE WHITEVALE ROAD CORRIDOR

In this context, the realization of the CPDP will require the careful integration of the most significant elements of the existing rural landscape within new low-medium density development, and the related transportation network. To do so, the neighbourhood plans and draft plans will need to identify new road corridors so that they do not directly impact such resources, and require adjacent housing and other land uses to be designed to be compatible with the existing buildings and their associated landscapes.

There are several general strategies for meeting these objectives:

- **Buffering**: screening new development from view from the heritage property through planting or fencing
- **Integration**: locating new development adjacent to heritage properties in ways that respect the property’s heritage attributes
- **Restoration**: conservation of the heritage property and reinstating missing original elements of the building and landscape
— **Relocation**: moving a heritage building to a new site where it can be conserved and re-used
— **Documentation and salvage**: if a heritage property cannot be retained, recording of the property prior to demolition and salvage of important components of the physical fabric (for archaeological sites, Stage 4 documentation, excavation and removal of artifacts)

These strategies can be applied to each of the Neighbourhood Plans, with the choice of strategy(s) being dependant upon the characteristics of the heritage resources found within that Plan area (note: the location of all heritage resources discussed below is approximate, based on existing mapping, and requires further research in order to determine property boundaries).

The following text is a summary and assessment of each of the neighbourhood plans submitted by the landowners. The intent of this review is to assess the degree to which each of the neighbourhood plans addresses the heritage policies of the CPDP, and to make recommendations for ways in which each plan can better do so.

**NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS 1 & 2**
FIGURE 9: COMPILED NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS WITH WHITEVALE ROAD CORRIDOR CULTURAL RESOURCES (MODIFIED BY THE AUTHOR)
SUMMARY OF DEVELOPER’S SUBMISSION

Moreso than in the other proposed Neighbourhood Plans, the planning text for the landowner’s proposed Neighbourhood Plans 1&2 spells out more specific responses to the many heritage resources found within this neighbourhood. The developer’s proposed Neighbourhood Plans address the CPDP policies and guidelines for cultural heritage with the heritage buffer zone and by ensuring that new development reflects the hamlet’s “existing character…particularly…east of the Hamlet along Whitevale Road” (Sect. 3.2, p. 8). Text in Section 4.4.3 Whitevale Hamlet Transition (pp. 17-18) outlines proposed heritage guidelines (as summarized in a Heritage Conservation Compliance Statement) that include:

- Landscape buffer east of the hamlet to the watercourse
- Compatible land uses in the buffer, such as organic agriculture and small scale recreational activities
- Diverting traffic around the hamlet, via a re-aligned North Road and a southern by-pass
- Conserving the existing right-of-way of Whitevale Road, minimizing impact on existing trees, heritage buildings and heritage roadscapes
- Retaining heritage buildings on Whitevale Road and Sideline 28 “on their own generous sites” (note: it is not confirmed which properties these are, but it is assumed to mean at least the two properties outlined on the Neighbourhood Plan land use schedule)
- Where possible, placing “complementary uses” adjacent to heritage properties
- Urban design guidelines for new development that “specifically address the type of housing, lot frontages, facades and architectural elements which should be provided in order to complement the existing character of the community”
- In the Appendices (4.5, p. 9), more detailed guidelines are proposed for “Transitional Design from Whitevale” including:
  - Single detached housing only along Whitevale Road to “reflect the same housing typology as the hamlet”
  - Massing, roofline and façade elements in new housing to reflect those elements as found in the existing hamlet
  - “historic buildings should be conserved on their own large lots and be integrated into the new Neighbourhood fabric”
  - The Whitevale Hamlet HCD Plan and guidelines “should be respected”
  - The impact of new development on existing trees on heritage properties should be minimized as much as possible
Preliminary Analysis

In order to meet the objectives for heritage stated in the developer’s submission, the proposed Neighbourhood Plans 1&2 should take into account the following:

- Neighbourhood Plan #1 contains Euro-Canadian archaeological sites on farmsteads within the HCD boundary, north and south of Whitevale Road, in the Hamlet Heritage Open Space and Community Recreation Centre lands. The Plan area also appears to include a significant built heritage resource (#76)
- Neighbourhood Plan #2 contains both First Nations and Euro-Canadian archaeological sites (cabin site and farmsteads, respectively) as well as significant built heritage resources (#s 72, 73, 74) and a significant view SW from the intersection of Sideline 28. Also contained in the Natural Heritage System between Neighbourhoods 1 and 2 is a 1.5 storey frame farmhouse on a large property (650 Whitevale Road, #75).

From the Neighbourhood Plan land use map, it appears that all of the features within Plan #1 can be conserved in situ, since they are within buffer or recreational lands.

Both farmstead 74 and the former school at 73 appear to be conserved in situ, with their immediate surrounding landscape acting as a buffer to adjacent new development. However, this buffer is probably too small to be effective. Farmstead 72 is located within the Natural Heritage System (NHS) and could be conserved in situ, with a larger portion of its surrounding landscape preserved. The neighbourhood plan should recognize through policies or land use designations the heritage properties within the NHS. This house is of local and regional significance (James White House) relating to the founding and naming of Whitevale, thus it should be made conserved within the Whitevale Corridor and Neighbourhood #2, whether it remains in residential use or is converted to another use. Note that ORC owns all of the heritage properties in these Neighbourhoods: 750/#72, 3215 Sideline 28/#73, 3250 Sideline 28/#74, 650/#75, and 615/#76. The neighbourhood plans and subsequent draft plans will need to show land uses that are compatible with the existing heritage resources and lotting patterns that are of similar frontage dimensions and front yard setbacks to those found on existing heritage properties. The Whitevale Road corridor should be conserved in its existing rural cross section, with narrow paved roadway, open ditches and mature roadside trees and other vegetation.
SUMMARY OF DEVELOPER’S SUBMISSION

This proposed Neighbourhood Plan, along with those of several of the following Neighbourhood Plans, contains few cultural heritage policies. The only mention of cultural heritage refers to the objective of excavating and protecting (or removing?) archaeological artifacts found on site (Section 3 b), p. 3).

PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

From an examination of the land use plan, it appears that this proposed Neighbourhood Plan may contain the Whitevale Cemetery as well as several significant built heritage resources (Nos. 11, 67 and 69) as well as the most significant views found along the corridor, at the intersection of Sideline 26. Note that both of the built heritage resource properties are owned by ORC. No. 875 (68) Whitevale Road, a frame house situated in the Natural Heritage System, has been inventoried and evaluated as not having heritage value.

The cemetery appears to have been included within an area slated for residential development: it must be conserved in situ and excluded from development. It also appears that the arterial road aligned with Sideline 26 has been diverted westward before the intersection with Whitevale Road, in order to avoid built heritage resource #11, but the property is within a medium density residential area at the intersection and it is not clear how it could be integrated, nor is medium density development contemplated in the CPDP in this location. Built heritage resource #69...
appears to be located within a low density residential area, alongside a Natural Heritage System. Given that #11 and #69 are significant built heritage resources and #11 is also a significant cultural landscape, their conservation in situ is important and should be addressed in the detailed planning and design of this Neighbourhood. No. 69 could be included within an expanded boundary of the adjacent Natural Heritage System or incorporated within an institutional site. Existing vegetation on each site should be retained and enhanced in order to provide a buffer. As noted below, provision should be made to preserve significant views in this area through careful placement and massing of new development and/or creation of public open space from which to appreciate the views, something the current plans do not do. The Whitevale Road corridor should be treated in the same way as is recommended in the previous Neighbourhood Plans.

SUMMARY OF DEVELOPER’S SUBMISSION

As in the previous Plan, this proposed Neighbourhood Plan makes reference only to the excavation of archaeological resources. From examining the land use plan, it appears that this Plan area contains a significant built heritage resource (No. 66). This property appears to be located just east of the proposed arterial road extending Sideline 26 south of Whitevale Road. The property is owned by ORC.
PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

The property is proposed by the landowner’s Neighbourhood Plan to be located within a medium density residential area at the intersection and it is not clear how it could be integrated. The medium density residential designation was not contemplated in the CPDP for this area. Key views south and west from this intersection exist within this neighbourhood but, in a medium density context, it is not clear how they will be conserved. One option would be to relocate the heritage buildings to a nearby site within a low density residential area, however, this is not recommended. Given the size and character of the farmstead complex, it would be preferable to replace the higher density node at this location with lower density development consistent with the CPDP and/or an institutional use or public open space adjacent to the conserved built heritage resource. Views could be conserved through the location of a park at the south-west corner of the intersection of Sideline 26 and Whitevale Road. As in the previous Neighbourhood Plans, the Whitevale Road corridor should be conserved in its rural state.

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 5

SUMMARY OF DEVELOPER’S SUBMISSION

As in the previous Plan, archaeological resource excavation is the only response to cultural heritage mentioned in the text. From an examination of the land use plan, it appears that there are three significant built heritage resources (Nos. 7, 8 and 10) within the Plan area. Nos. 7 and 8 are owned by ORC.
PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

The landowner’s proposed Neighbourhood Plan appears to wrap development around the properties associated with Nos. 8 and 7 (i.e. the farmhouse and the landscape in its immediate vicinity, but not including the farm outbuildings on #8) and terms them “heritage lots”. No. 10 appears to be primarily located in the Natural Heritage System west of this Neighbourhood, but overlaps portions of a low density residential area and a stormwater management pond. Consideration should be given to expanding the conserved property around No. 8 in order to include the related plantings and outbuildings, and No. 10 should be conserved as a farm complex (farmhouse, plantings and outbuildings). If possible, it should be integrated in this form within the low density residential area as park or institutional space. Here, as in all of the proposed Neighbourhood Plans, treatment of the existing road right-of-way in the Whitevale Road corridor has not been addressed. As will be seen in the study recommendations, the Whitevale Road corridor should be retained as a rural cross-section, as recommended for the previous Neighbourhood Plans.

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 6

SUMMARY OF DEVELOPER’S SUBMISSION

The landowner’s proposed Neighbourhood Plan 6 has the same short policy relating to cultural heritage as do the previous 3 Plans. From examination of the land use plan, it appears that this Plan area contains two significant built heritage resources (Nos. 17 and 18), one of which (No. 18) is also a significant cultural landscape. Nos. 17 and 18 are also owned by ORC.
PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

Conservation of cultural heritage resource No. 18 should be confirmed by its inclusion within the proposed development, and the conserved property should include the related plantings and outbuildings. No. 17 appears to be part of a Local Node, a concentrated area of mixed uses adjacent to major roads. It is not clear how this farmstead can be integrated within such an area and the medium density land use should be reconsidered and a lower density use put there instead. However, conservation of No. 17 is dependant upon an assessment of its condition, since it was already in a ruinous state when surveyed in 2006: it is assumed for the purposes of this report that the resource cannot be conserved in situ and that elements should be recorded and salvaged. The existing rural cross-section should be retained on the Whitevale Road corridor, as recommended for the previous Neighbourhood Plans.

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 7
SUMMARY OF DEVELOPER’S SUBMISSION

This proposed Neighbourhood Plan includes policies for addressing both cultural heritage resources and archaeological resources (separate policies). A cultural heritage assessment is proposed to be prepared as part of the draft plan of subdivision and the proposed development is to reflect the results of that assessment (Section 4.5, p. 16). The proposed archaeological resource policies (Section 4.6, p. 16) reflect the results of the Stage 4 archaeological assessments for the Plan area and focus on respectful treatment of archaeological resources, monitoring of work in the Natural Heritage System by licensed archaeologists, and First Nations consultations.

PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

From an examination of the landowner’s proposed Neighbourhood Plan, it appears that this Neighbourhood contains, or is adjacent to Natural Heritage Systems, containing two significant built heritage resources (Nos. 5 and 6). Nos. 5 and 6 are owned by ORC. The barn at No. 1415 Whitevale Road has also been noted as a heritage resource.

No. 6 appears to be located slightly overlapping the edge of the Natural Heritage System immediately west of the Plan boundary but almost entirely within a stormwater management pond. No. 5 appears to be just outside the eastern boundary of the Plan, in the Natural Heritage System, although the farm outbuildings area within a medium density residential area. This medium density designation is more extensive than that shown in the CPDP and it is not clear how these resources would be integrated within that form of development. In both cases, their conservation as farmsteads (house, plantings and outbuildings) is warranted. The barn at No. 1415 is entirely located within a medium density residential area which again is much more extensive than contemplated by the CPDP. The barn may not be significant enough to merit conservation in situ. An alternative approach would be to record and dismantle the existing structure.
SUMMARY OF DEVELOPER’S SUBMISSION

This landowner’s proposed Neighbourhood Plan has the same policies for cultural heritage and archaeological resources as does Neighbourhood Plan 7. From examination of the land use plan, it appears that this Neighbourhood contains two significant built heritage resources (Nos. 14 and 15), and significant archaeological resources. Also of note is the property at 3190 Mulberry Lane (outside of corridor) that has been evaluated in the 1994 and 2006 reports as having historical, architectural and contextual heritage significance.

PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

No. 15 appears to be located at the western edge of the Plan, south of Whitevale Road and west of Mulberry Lane, adjacent to the Natural Heritage System. Overlapping portions of this property appears to be an
area of archaeological significance, now shown as being a low density residential area in the landowner’s proposed Neighbourhood Plan. Also of note is the farmstead located at the northwest corner of Sideline 20 and Whitevale Road (3285 Sideline 20). This house has not been inventoried or evaluated but appears to be a mid-19th century frame and stone house with heritage value, on a property containing an early barn (with stone foundation), bounded by mature trees. Within the landowner’s proposed Neighbourhood Plan, No. 14 is shown as being situated in a low density area.

It is our understanding that the archaeological site located within the corridor has been identified and the site merits conservation in situ. That being the case, the proposed low density development in that area will likely need to be replaced by some other form of open space or non-intensive use in the revised Neighbourhood Plan. The southern site, if outside the Plan’s development area, may be able to be retained in situ. Built heritage resource No. 15 likewise could be integrated within the low density residential area, as could Whitevale Road. Those portions of the Whitevale Road corridor that are west of the intersection with the Whitevale Road Bypass should be conserved in their current rural cross-section, as recommended above.

**NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS 14 & 15**

The Province of Ontario has retained a consulting firm to prepare neighbourhood plans for Neighbourhoods 14 and 15. As of the time of this writing, the proposed neighbourhood plans have not been prepared.

**PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS**

In advance of reviewing Neighbourhood Plan 14, it appears from the CPDP land use plan that significant built heritage resource No. 65 is located west of the Plan area, within the Natural Heritage System, and that two mid-late 19th century farmstead archaeological sites are located just south of Whitevale Road, near the eastern edge of Seaton.

Conservation of the farmstead in situ is likely possible. Conservation of the archaeological resources will most likely involve some form of Stage 4 mitigation.

In advance of reviewing Neighbourhood Plan 15, it appears from the CPDP land use plan that significant built heritage resource No. 2 is within what is likely to be a Community Node. There may also be archaeological resources, such as the cemetery (identified only in the 1994 assessment) and the sites of former buildings at the Brock Road intersection, the former crossroads community of Thompson’s Corner (not shown in Seaton Neighbourhood Planning Review of Euro-Canadian archaeological resources). Resource No. 2 is part of a large property owned by ORC. Conservation of this resource will be a challenge to integrate this small house and its heavily treed surroundings within a
mixed use, higher density development. Relocation may have to be considered in this case, preferably to a low density residential area in a nearby Neighbourhood (e.g. Neighbourhood 8). Conservation of the archaeological resources will most likely involve some form of Stage 4 mitigation.

3.4 | PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The conservation and development principles found in the CPDP appear to support the overall goals and objectives found in the HCD Plan. The hamlet has been given a substantial buffer to the east as far as the first Natural Heritage System. Even so, the former Heritage Conservation District boundary has been effectively reduced such that, beyond the buffer and watercourse, the hamlet is to be surrounded by new development, not farm fields, as was the case when the HCD Plan was prepared. However, infill within the boundary of the District is to be compatible with the existing development and rural character is to be conserved within the buffer zone and adjacent natural heritage systems. Also, the CPDP policies have regard for the heritage policies of the PPS and the OHA, thus it appears that both the conservation of existing heritage resources and infill with new development are to be guided by these planning policies.

The cultural heritage resources of the Whitevale Road corridor have been identified and assessed in several previous studies. The current review of the Neighbourhood Plans is the next step in taking what is known about these heritage resources and applying it to a review of the Neighbourhood Plans. The following is an initial set of observations regarding the ways in which heritage has been addressed in these Plans and recommendations for future strategies to improve integration of heritage resources in the process of refining these Plans.

- Part IV designation of individual farmsteads should be applied to the remaining ORC properties (other than the two already designated), prior to these properties being sold (assuming that they will not be retained in Provincial ownership). The Province should also proceed with this designation if the properties are to remain in Provincial ownership. This will ensure conservation of these significant built heritage resources. Whitevale Cemetery should also be designated under Part IV as a cultural heritage landscape. Other significant built heritage resources now included within private lands should also be considered for Part IV designation or, at least, have heritage easements applied to conserve the resource’s heritage attributes. In situ conservation of built heritage and cultural landscape resources should be a first priority, and missing or deteriorated heritage elements of the physical fabric should be restored, as part of a detailed conservation plan for each property. The Province should take an active role in this conservation activity.
Scenic road designation should also be pursued as a first priority, with accompanying urban design guidelines for new infill and for integration of heritage resources within new development, and for the location, grading and rights-of-way for new road and servicing infrastructure. The existing rural cross-section, with open ditches, roadside trees, vegetation and fencing, should be conserved along with the existing vertical alignment, and these heritage attributes should be identified and included within the scenic road designation, using the 2006 cultural landscape assessment as a basis.

New roads designed to cross the Whitevale Road corridor will have to be designed carefully in order to minimize their impact on the heritage attributes of the road right-of-way. The undulating vertical alignment of the existing Road may be adversely affected by the gradients required to match those of the crossing roads: every effort needs to be made to avoid major re-grading of Whitevale Road at each of these road crossings.

Medium density development shown at intersections in the landowner’s proposed Neighbourhood Plans will have a marked impact on the rural qualities of the roadway, even more so than will the proposed low density development, if located immediately adjacent to the corridor. Rather than be an urban setting, the corridor should be lined with a combination of low density residential, oriented to face the corridor, and roadside vegetation (existing and new, compatible, infill plantings), existing farmsteads and public open space. New residential development facing the corridor should reflect the generous setbacks and screen plantings of the heritage farmsteads.

Placement of new stormwater management ponds must be done in such a manner as to avoid physical and visual impact on significant heritage resources. These ponds may be screened from view from the corridor, as long as views of the heritage resources from the corridor are not obscured.

Community uses, including buildings and sports fields, are permitted uses in the Hamlet buffer. In order to preserve the rural character of the buffer, such uses should be limited to outdoor recreational facilities and of a small scale and non-intrusive nature, since the intent of the hamlet buffer designation is to provide an open space buffer.

New infill development along the corridor should take design cues from the existing farmhouses. New low density residential development should be oriented to the corridor, not back-lotted, to continue the orientation pattern of the existing structures, and should form a transition to higher density development located north and south of the corridor.

Although existing hedgerows, fencing and other farm-related plantings are not to be considered as impediments to development in each of the Neighbourhoods, every opportunity should be taken to integrate such landscape features with development wherever feasible.
Conservation of significant built heritage resources in the corridor should entail more than simply saving the building. In each case, the building and its immediate setting are of heritage significance and should be treated as a unit. Wherever possible, the house, the tree-lined drive, the gardens, windbreaks, and outbuildings, should be conserved as a whole. Since these farmsteads are relatively small in size, such a conservation strategy should have minimal impact on the development potential of the adjacent neighbourhood and will help conserve the rural character of the Whitevale Road corridor.

All cemeteries identified in this study must be conserved in situ.

In light of the foregoing assessment and in the context of these recommendations, the cultural heritage policies and guidelines of all proposed Neighbourhood Plans should be substantially expanded and improved.

Opportunities for conserving at least one complete working farm within the corridor area should be pursued, most likely within the Hamlet buffer zone but also, potentially, within the Natural Heritage Systems or as part of community recreation lands or school sites.

Opportunities for interpreting the history of the corridor should be pursued, including street naming, interpretive plaques on key sites (e.g. the former schoolhouse, and the properties of important early settlers), walking and driving tours.

The heritage resources and views associated with the intersections of Sidelines 28 and 26 should be assessed in greater detail and conserved within the detailed designs of the adjacent Neighbourhood Plans.

Neighbourhood Plan #1 includes the eastern portion of the Whitevale Hamlet Heritage Conservation District. Low density residential development, as well as the relocated extension of North Road, is now within the HCD boundary. A comprehensive conservation and development strategy, with detailed urban design guidelines, should be prepared for the proposed development within the District, and new residential development as well as the road network should be carefully sited to avoid existing heritage resources and provide a compatible setting for these resources, having regard for the policies and guidelines of the 1990 HCD Plan.

Should any significant built heritage resources have to be relocated, they should be placed within adjacent Neighbourhoods or, where possible, on vacant sites within the Whitevale Hamlet HCD or adjacent Hamlet Heritage Open Space.
As for the potential designation of the corridor as a Heritage Conservation District, it appears that most of the rural context of the farmsteads along the corridor will be fundamentally changed into an urban setting, resulting in the fragmentation of the formerly coherent cultural landscape. The result will be a series of individual heritage sites separated by new development of varying types and scales. It does not appear that the criteria for designation as an HCD can be met within the proposed development and thus designation as an HCD should not be pursued.

There is also the issue of the validity of the section of the existing HCD that is east of Whitevale Hamlet Heritage Open Space but is now included within Neighbourhood #1. It remains to be determined if the impact of new development in this portion of the HCD would make the municipality consider de-designating this portion of the HCD, as it may no longer meet the reasons for designation as stated in the 1990 HCD Plan. Should de-designation be considered for that portion east of the Hamlet Heritage Open Space designation, then individual cultural heritage resources (buildings and landscapes) now within that portion of the HCD should have their property boundaries confirmed and the properties should be designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.

In conclusion, the next steps in refining the Neighbourhood Plans should treat the Whitevale Road corridor as a preserved slice of the existing rural landscape. In order to do so, such Plans should provide the corridor with the existing width retaining the existing rural cross section and related vegetation, along with significant cultural heritage resources (farmsteads and archaeological sites). The corridor’s undulating vertical alignment should be retained and significant views from the corridor should be retained and celebrated. Adjacent development should provide a transition from the preserved roadway to the built form of the adjacent neighbourhoods. This means that public open space as well as low density residential development, modeled on the architectural styles and forms of existing farmsteads, and spaced apart to match the rural typology of the existing roadscape, should be the types of development permitted in these transitional areas. If the Neighbourhood Plans can accomplish this transition, then the Whitevale Road can become a welcome contrast to the new development found elsewhere in Seaton and, in this way, become both a scenic route and a learning landscape, both displaying and interpreting the rich history of this part of Pickering.
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