EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Archaeological Services Inc. was contracted by AECOM, Markham, on behalf of the Toronto Transit Commission, to conduct a cultural heritage assessment for the proposed Light Rail Vehicle Fleet Maintenance and Storage Facility, in the City of Toronto, Ontario. The study area includes the area located north of the existing Ashbridges Bay Wastewater Treatment Plant, west of Leslie Street and south of Lake Shore Boulevard East. In addition, the study area consists of the Leslie Street corridor between Lake Shore Boulevard East and Queen Street for the establishment of connecting tracks between the proposed LRV Fleet Maintenance and Storage Facility and the existing streetcar tracks along Queen Street.

Eight identified cultural heritage resources were identified along the northern portion of the study area, along Leslie Street between Queen Street East and Lake Shore Boulevard East. The proposed connecting tracks to Queen Street East follows the current road right-of-way and is confined to the alignment of the current Leslie Street right-of-way, and therefore it is not expected that any heritage resources should be displaced. Further, related construction activities are expected to have minimal direct and indirect impacts on identified cultural heritage resources.

Based on the results of the field review and identification of potential impacts, the following mitigation measures are recommended:

1. Construction activities should be planned so as to ensure that associated vibration impacts do not adversely impact resources set in close proximity to road right-of-ways.

2. Where any identified, above ground, cultural heritage resources are to be affected by loss or displacement, further research should be undertaken to identify the specific heritage significance of the affected cultural heritage resource and appropriate mitigation measures should be adopted.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) was contracted by AECOM, Markham, on behalf of the Toronto Transit Commission (TTC), to conduct a cultural heritage assessment for the proposed Light Rail Vehicle (LRV) Fleet Maintenance and Storage Facility, in the City of Toronto, Ontario (Figure 1). The study area includes the area located north of the existing Ashbridges Bay Wastewater Treatment Plant, west of Leslie Street and south of Lake Shore Boulevard East. In addition, the study area consists of the Leslie Street corridor between Lake Shore Boulevard East and Queen Street for the establishment of the connecting tracks between the proposed LRV Fleet Maintenance and Storage Facility and the existing streetcar tracks along Queen Street (Figure 2).

The purpose of this report is to present a built heritage and cultural landscape inventory of cultural heritage resources identified in the study area. This research was conducted under the project direction of Rebecca A. Sciarra, Heritage Planner.

Figure 1: Location of the study area

Base Map: NTS Sheet 30 M/11 (Toronto)
Figure 2: Overview of the study area.

Source: AECOM
2.0 BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT CONTEXT

2.1 Approach and Methodology

This cultural heritage assessment considers cultural heritage resources in the context of improvements to specified areas, pursuant to the Environmental Assessment Act. This assessment addresses above ground cultural heritage resources over 40 years old. Use of a 40 year old threshold is a guiding principle when conducting a preliminary identification of cultural heritage resources (Ministry of Transportation 2006; Ministry of Transportation 2007; Ontario Realty Corporation 2007). While identification of a resource that is 40 years old or older does not confer outright heritage significance, this threshold provides a means to collect information about resources that may retain heritage value. Similarly, if a resource is slightly younger than 40 years old, this does not preclude the resource from retaining heritage value.

The proposed fleet maintenance and storage facility and the establishment of connecting tracks along Leslie Street have the potential to affect cultural heritage resources in a variety of ways. These include the loss or displacement of resources through removal or demolition and the disruption of resources by introducing physical, visual, audible or atmospheric elements that are not in keeping with the resources and/or their setting.

For the purposes of this assessment, the term cultural heritage resources was used to describe both cultural landscapes and built heritage features. A cultural landscape is perceived as a collection of individual built heritage features and other related features that together form farm complexes, roadscapes and nucleated settlements. Built heritage features are typically individual buildings or structures that may be associated with a variety of human activities, such as historical settlement and patterns of architectural development.

The analysis throughout the study process addresses cultural heritage resources under various pieces of legislation and their supporting guidelines. Under the Environmental Assessment Act (1990) environment is defined in Subsection 1(c) to include:

- cultural conditions that influence the life of man or a community, and;
- any building, structure, machine, or other device or thing made by man.

The Ministry of Culture is charged under Section 2 of the Ontario Heritage Act with the responsibility to determine policies, priorities and programs for the conservation, protection and preservation of the heritage of Ontario and has published two guidelines to assist in assessing cultural heritage resources as part of an environmental assessment: Guideline for Preparing the Cultural Heritage Resource Component of Environmental Assessments (1992), and Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments (1981). Accordingly, both guidelines have been utilized in this assessment process.

The Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments (Section 1.0) states the following:

When speaking of man-made heritage we are concerned with the works of man and the effects of his activities in the environment rather than with movable human artifacts or those environments that are natural and completely undisturbed by man.
In addition, environment may be interpreted to include the combination and interrelationships of human artifacts with all other aspects of the physical environment, as well as with the social, economic and cultural conditions that influence the life of the people and communities in Ontario. The *Guidelines on the Man-Made Heritage Component of Environmental Assessments* distinguish between two basic ways of visually experiencing this heritage in the environment, namely as cultural landscapes and as cultural features.

Within this document, cultural landscapes are defined as the following (Section 1.0):

The use and physical appearance of the land as we see it now is a result of man’s activities over time in modifying pristine landscapes for his own purposes. A cultural landscape is perceived as a collection of individual man-made features into a whole. Urban cultural landscapes are sometimes given special names such as townscape or streetscapes that describe various scales of perception from the general scene to the particular view. Cultural landscapes in the countryside are viewed in or adjacent to natural undisturbed landscapes, or waterscapes, and include such landuses as agriculture, mining, forestry, recreation, and transportation. Like urban cultural landscapes, they too may be perceived at various scales: as a large area of homogeneous character; or as an intermediate sized area of homogeneous character or a collection of settings such as a group of farms; or as a discrete example of specific landscape character such as a single farm, or an individual village or hamlet.

A cultural feature is defined as the following (Section 1.0):

...an individual part of a cultural landscape that may be focused upon as part of a broader scene, or viewed independently. The term refers to any man-made or modified object in or on the land or underwater, such as buildings of various types, street furniture, engineering works, plantings and landscaping, archaeological sites, or a collection of such objects seen as a group because of close physical or social relationships.

Additionally, the *Planning Act* (1990) and related *Provincial Policy Statement (PPS)* make a number of provisions relating to heritage conservation. One of the general purposes of the *Planning Act* is to integrate matters of provincial interest in provincial and municipal planning decisions. In order to inform all those involved in planning activities of the scope of these matters of provincial interest, Section 2 of the *Planning Act* provides an extensive listing. These matters of provincial interest shall be regarded when certain authorities, including the council of a municipality, carry out their responsibilities under the *Act*. One of these provincial interests is directly concerned with:

2.0 …protecting cultural heritage and archaeological resources for their economic, environmental, and social benefits.

Part 4.5 of the *PPS* states that:

Comprehensive, integrated and long-term planning is best achieved through municipal official plans. Municipal official plans shall identify provincial interests and set out appropriate land use designations and policies. Municipal official plans should also coordinate cross-boundary matters to complement the actions of other planning authorities and promote mutually beneficial solutions.
Municipal official plans shall provide clear, reasonable and attainable policies to protect provincial interests and direct development to suitable areas.

In order to protect provincial interests, planning authorities shall keep their official plans up-to-date with this Provincial Policy Statement. The policies of this Provincial Policy Statement continue to apply after adoption and approval of a municipal official plan.

Those policies of particular relevance for the conservation of heritage features are contained in Section 2-Wise Use and Management of Resources, wherein Subsection 2.6 - Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Resources, makes the following provisions:

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

A number of definitions that have specific meanings for use in a policy context accompany the policy statement. These definitions include built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes.

*Built heritage resources* mean one or more buildings, structures, monuments, installations or remains associated with architectural, cultural, social, political, economic, or military history, and identified as being important to a community.

*Cultural heritage landscapes* mean a defined geographical area of heritage significance that has been modified by human activities. Such an area is valued by a community, and is of significance to the understanding of the history of a people or place. Examples include farmscapes, historic settlements, parks, gardens, battlefields, mainstreets and neighbourhoods, cemeteries, trailways, and industrial complexes of cultural heritage value (*PPS 2005*).

In addition, significance is also more generally defined. It is assigned a specific meaning according to the subject matter or policy context, such as wetlands or ecologically important areas. With regard to cultural heritage and archaeology resources, resources of significance are those that are valued for the important contribution they make to our understanding of the history of a place, an event, or a people (*PPS 2005*).

Criteria for determining significance for the resources are recommended by the Province, but municipal approaches that achieve or exceed the same objective may also be used. While some significant resources may already be identified and inventoried by official sources, the significance of others can only be determined after evaluation (*PPS 2005*).

Accordingly, the foregoing guidelines and relevant policy statement were used to guide the scope and methodology of the cultural heritage assessment.

### 2.2 Data Collection

In the course of the cultural heritage assessment, all potentially affected cultural heritage resources within the study corridor are subject to inventory. Short form names are usually applied to each resource type, (e.g. barn, residence). Generally, when conducting a preliminary identification of cultural heritage resources, three stages of research and data collection are undertaken to appropriately establish the potential for and existence of cultural heritage resources in a particular geographic area.
Background historic research, which includes consultation of primary and secondary source research and historic mapping, is undertaken to identify early settlement patterns and broad agents or themes of change in a study area. This stage in the data collection process enables the researcher to determine the presence of sensitive heritage areas that correspond to nineteenth and twentieth century settlement and development patterns. To augment data collected during this stage of the research process, federal, provincial, and municipal databases and/or agencies are consulted to obtain information about specific properties that have been previously identified and/or designated as retaining cultural heritage value. Typically, resources identified during these stages of the research process are reflective of particular architectural styles, associated with an important person, place, or event, and contribute to the contextual facets of a particular place, neighbourhood, or intersection.

A field review is then undertaken to confirm the location and condition of previously identified cultural heritage resources. The field review is also utilized to identify cultural heritage resources that have not been previously identified on federal, provincial, or municipal databases.

Several investigative criteria are utilized during the field review to appropriately identify new cultural heritage resources. These investigative criteria are derived from provincial guidelines, definitions, and past experience. A built structure or landscape is identified as a cultural heritage resource that should be considered during the course of the environmental assessment, if the resource meets a combination of the following criteria:

- It is 40 years or older;
- It is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method;
- It displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit;
- It demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement;
- The site and/or structure retains original stylistic features and has not been irreversibly altered so as to destroy its integrity;
- It has a direct association with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that is significant to: the City of Toronto; the Province of Ontario; Canada; or the world heritage list;
- It yields, or had the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of: the City of Toronto; the Province of Ontario; Canada; or the world heritage list;
- It demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist builder, designer, or theorist who is significant to: the City of Toronto; the Province of Ontario; Canada; or the world heritage list;
- It is important in defining, maintaining, or supporting the character of an area;
- It is physically, functionally, visually, or historically linked to its surroundings;
- It is a landmark;
- It illustrates a significant phase in the development of the community or a major change or turning point in the community’s history;
- The landscape contains a structure other than a building (fencing, culvert, public art, statue, etc.) that is associated with the history or daily life of that area or region; or
- There is evidence of previous historic and/or existing agricultural practices (e.g. terracing, deforestation, complex water canalization, apple orchards, vineyards, etc.).

If a resource satisfies an appropriate combination of these criteria, it will be identified as a cultural heritage resource and is subject to further research where appropriate and when feasible. Typically,
further historical research and consultation is required to determine the specific significance of the identified cultural heritage resource.

When identifying cultural heritage landscapes, the following categories are typically utilized for the purposes of the classification during the field review:

- **Farm complexes**: comprise two or more buildings, one of which must be a farmhouse or barn, and may include a tree-lined drive, tree windbreaks, fences, domestic gardens and small orchards.

- **Roadscapes**: generally two-lanes in width with absence of shoulders or narrow shoulders only, ditches, tree lines, bridges, culverts and other associated features.

- **Waterscapes**: waterway features that contribute to the overall character of the cultural heritage landscape, usually in relation to their influence on historic development and settlement patterns.

- **Railscapes**: active or inactive railway lines or railway rights of way and associated features.

- **Historical settlements**: groupings of two or more structures with a commonly applied name.

- **Streetscapes**: generally consists of a paved road found in a more urban setting, and may include a series of houses that would have been built in the same time period.

- **Historical agricultural Landscapes**: generally comprises a historically rooted settlement and farming pattern that reflects a recognizable arrangement of fields within a lot and may have associated agricultural outbuildings and structures.

- **Cemeteries**: land used for the burial of human remains.

Results of data collection are contained in Section 3.0; while Sections 4.0 and 5.0 contain conclusions and recommendations with respect to potential disruptions and displacements of identified heritage resources.

### 3.0 BUILT HERITAGE RESOURCE AND CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPE ASSESSMENT

#### 3.1 Introduction

This section provides a brief summary of historic research and a description of identified above ground cultural heritage resources that may be affected by the proposed fleet maintenance and storage facility and the establishment of connecting tracks along Leslie Street. A review of available primary and secondary source material was undertaken to produce a contextual overview of the study corridor, including a general description of Euro-Canadian settlement and land-use.
3.2 Township Survey and Settlement

The history of the Township of York as a territorial division began in 1791 when Augustus Jones surveyed the township. The first land patents were granted in 1796 and by 1813 all of the township lands had been parcelled. By 1802 the township, bounded by the Humber River and Etobicoke Township to the west and sharing a border with Scarborough Township to the east, had a grist mill, two saw mills and two taverns. In 1801 the combined population of York, Etobicoke and Scarborough Townships and the Town of York numbered only 678 although by 1840 the population of York Township numbered more than 5,000 and this trend in growth and development continued throughout the 1880s.

In its first 30 years, the Township of York was a rolling and well wooded countryside. The centre of the township was present day Yonge Street and Eglinton Avenue or Eglinton Village. Eglinton Avenue, which was surveyed as the township’s baseline, was at that time known as Baseline Road, and the crossroads community had a number of services including four hotels and a Masonic Hall. Yonge Street was settled on both sides and one mile south of Eglinton the Davis family ran a pottery business (in the community later known as Davisville). A large number of suburban residences were constructed along the Davenport Ridge, an early Aboriginal trail. Seaton village lay immediately north of the city limits while to the west Parkdale (incorporated in 1889) was an emerging suburb and High Park was established adjacent to Etobicoke township’s Humber Bay resort. The few early township mills multiplied along the east side of the Humber River (the west side being Etobicoke Township) and during the 1840s three saw mills operated on the Black Creek between Wilson and Sheppard Avenue. These mills supplied the needs of farmers in nearby communities. Other villages in the township and their years of incorporation included Weston (1882), Brockton (1884), Yorkville (1884), Toronto Junction and East Toronto (1887), and North Toronto (Eglinton and Davisville combined, 1889). The villages of Riverdale, Rosedale, the Annex, Seaton Village, and Sunnyside were all annexed directly to Toronto during the 1880s.

Historically, the proposed new LRV fleet maintenance and storage facility is located in the former Township of York (southeast part), within Ashbridge’s Bay. Lake filling for industrial uses claimed most of the marshlands that characterized Ashbridge’s Bay in the early part of the twentieth century. The connecting tracks to Queen Street East are located on Park Lot 11, Broken Front Concession, in the former Township of York (southeast). Leslie Street divides Lot 11 in half. The “Park Lots” were 100 acre tracts of land which were reserved by Lieutenant Governor Simcoe and granted primarily to government officials and members of the Executive Council as compensation for loss of improvements made by them on premises which they occupied while the seat of government was located at Newark (Niagara). Lot 11 was patented to Benjamin Mosley in 1796.

Benjamin Mosley was a native of Pennsylvania who came to Upper Canada with his father, Sergeant George Mosley, who served in the 45th Regiment and also in the Engineer’s Department as artificer during the Revolutionary War. George Mosley had died sometime before 1797, while Benjamin was noted as a resident of York from 1797 until as late as 1816. He was overseer of highways in 1799, 1804, 1806 and 1811. Mosley was a carpenter by trade. He repaired the Rouge River Bridge in 1813, and was ordered to examine the state of the Humber River Bridge the same year (Firth 1962:291; Mosser 1984:106, 113; Centennial of the Settlement of Upper Canada, 215 and 311).

The historic settlement of Leslieville developed in the mid nineteenth century along Queen Street at the northern limits of the study area. Leslieville was described in 1873 as “a thriving post village...contain[ing] a telegraph office, the Toronto nurseries covering 150 acres, several brickfields, and 8 stores.” The population in 1873 was 400 (Crossby 1873:171). Leslieville was annexed by the City of Toronto in 1884.
3.3 Review of Historic Mapping

The 1878 *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of York, Ontario* was reviewed to determine the potential for the presence of cultural heritage resources within the study area (Figure 3). The western portion of the Park Lot 11 was occupied by the Toronto Nurseries, which was owned and operated by George Leslie & Sons. No property owners or features are illustrated on the east half of the lot. It should be noted, however, that not all features of interest were mapped systematically in the Ontario series of historical atlases, given that they were financed by subscription, and subscribers were given preference with regard to the level of detail provided on the maps. Moreover, not every feature of interest would have been within the scope of the 1878 *Atlas*.

According to the 1910 *Fire Insurance Plan*,¹ the land south of Lake Shore Boulevard had not yet been filled in, and the area north of Lake Shore Boulevard and east of Leslie Street was marsh. A number of brick and frame buildings, likely belonging to an industrial complex, were indicated east of Leslie Street and south of present day Eastern Avenue. A few frame buildings, mostly residences, fronted on to Leslie Street on the east side between present day Eastern Avenue and Queen Street and on the west side near Queen Street. Brick buildings were indicated to the east and west of the Leslie Street and Queen Street intersection.

Figure 3: The study area overlaid on the map of York (Southeast) Township in the 1878 *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of York*.

¹ Goad’s 1910 *Fire Insurance Plan of the City of Toronto* was viewed at the City of Toronto Archives. It is not reproduced here due to copyright.
3.4 Existing Conditions

In order to make a preliminary identification of existing built heritage and cultural landscape resources within the study corridor, the Ministry of Culture’s Ontario Heritage Properties Database and the City of Toronto’s Inventory of Heritage Properties were consulted. These heritage resource inventories were consulted in order to determine the existence of previously identified cultural heritage resources in the study area and to collect any relevant information. A review of the City of Toronto’s inventory revealed that there is one previously identified heritage resource located in the study area. No properties located within or adjacent to the study area limits have been designated under the Ontario Heritage Act.

A field review was then undertaken by Lindsay Popert, Assistant Heritage Planner at ASI, on October 21, 2009, to confirm the location and condition of previously identified resources and to identify additional cultural heritage resources. The results of the database research and field review are itemized in Table 1, while Figure 4 provides location information for each feature.

### Table 1: Previously Identified Built Heritage Resources (BHRs) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHLs) in the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description/Comments</th>
<th>Photograph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BHR 1</td>
<td>1227 Queen St. E.</td>
<td>This two and a half storey brick commercial building dates to the mid to late nineteenth century. The building was constructed in the Italianate style and features a hipped roof, dormers, large overhanging eaves supported by ornate cornice brackets and second storey windows that have segmental hood molds. This building is shown on the 1910 Plan and is currently occupied by the Duke of York pub. Listed on the City of Toronto’s Inventory of Heritage Properties.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="BHR 1 Photograph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHR 2</td>
<td>1233-35 Queen St. E.</td>
<td>This two storey brick industrial building likely dates to the early twentieth century. The building features two second storey bay windows on the front façade, decorative brick work and concrete-brick quoining, an assortment of single windows and windows grouped into triplets on the west façade, interior brick chimney and a one storey addition to the east and west of the main building. Identified during field review.</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="BHR 2 Photograph" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| BHR 3 | Industrial | 77 Leslie St. | This one storey industrial concrete block building features a brick front, central garage door flanked by two multi-paned windows with concrete sills, and windows on the side elevations that have been blocked in with concrete.  
*Identified during field review.* |
|---|---|---|---|
| BHR 4 | Industrial | 29-A Leslie St. | This two storey brick structure features a flat roof, multi-paned windows, interior brick chimney, and a modern one storey extension to the north. The building dates to the first half of the twentieth century.  
*Identified during field review.* |
| BHR 5 | Commercial | 27 Leslie St. | This one storey garage/auto body repair shop dates to the early twentieth century. The building exhibits some Arts and Crafts design influences with its projecting, half-timbered and stucco gable roof, stucco cladding with red brick window and door surrounds, and brick quoining. Most recently operated as S & S Motors Inc.  
*Identified during field review.* |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| BHR 6        | 20 Mosley St.                  | This two and three storey former brick warehouse with concrete foundations and window sills likely dates to the first part of the twentieth century. The building has been rehabilitated and features new windows.  
*Identified during field review.* |
| CHL 1        | East side of Leslie St., south of Memory Lane | This row of two storey housing features a mix of modern and potentially nineteenth century residential construction. Some of the dwellings appear to have undergone major renovations; however, it is possible that they originally date to the late nineteenth or early twentieth centuries. This is suggested by the presence of a row of frame dwellings that are shown on the 1910 Plan with the same setback and position as these houses identified during field review. The structures feature new windows and synthetic siding, interior brick chimney and concrete foundations. |
| CHL 2        | West side of Leslie St., between Mosley St. and Eastern Ave. | This area features a residential subdivision of circa 1920s-1930s semi-detached dwellings of the same or similar design that either front on to Leslie St or are immediately adjacent. The subdivision features brick houses with a combined gable and flat roof, shed dormers, interior brick chimneys, and arched brick voistsors over first storey windows. The roof line is quite unique.  
*Identified during field review.* |
4.0 CONCLUSIONS

Historic research revealed that the southern portion of the study area were formed during early to mid twentieth century land making operations, completed by a series of lake-filling projects at Ashbridges Bay. The northern portion of the study area has an urban land use history relating to the historic settlement of Leslieville dating to the mid 1800s, with the majority of the existing built environment dates to the early to mid 1900s. The results of background historic research, a review of historic mapping, the consultation of provincial and municipal heritage inventories and a field review indicate that there are a total of eight cultural heritage resources in the study area. The following provides a summary of field work findings:

- A total of six built heritage resources were identified in the study area, which include two commercial structures (BHR 1 & 5) and four industrial structures (BHR 2 – 4, BHR 6);
- A total of two cultural heritage landscapes were identified in the study area, both of which are residential streetscapes (CHL 1 – 2);
- There are no features located in the study area which are designated under the Ontario Heritage Act;
- One feature is listed on the City of Toronto’s heritage inventory (BHR 1); and
- The identified resources represent early twentieth century land use and development in this part of the City of Toronto.

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

The eight identified cultural heritage resources are located along the northern portion of the study area, along Leslie Street between Queen Street East and Lake Shore Boulevard East. The proposed connecting tracks to Queen Street East follows and is confined to the alignment of the current Leslie Street right-of-way, and therefore it is not expected that any heritage resources should be displaced. Further, related construction activities are expected to have minimal direct and indirect impacts on identified cultural heritage resources.

Based on the results of the field review and identification of potential impacts, the following mitigation measures are recommended:

1. Construction activities should be planned so as to ensure that associated vibration impacts do not adversely impact resources set in close proximity to road right-of-ways.

2. Where any identified, above ground, cultural heritage resources are to be affected by loss or displacement, further research should be undertaken to identify the specific heritage significance of the affected cultural heritage resource and appropriate mitigation measures should be adopted.
Figure 4: Location of Built Heritage Resources (BHR) and Cultural Heritage Landscapes (CHL) in the Study Area
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