



ACC

ARCHAEOLOGICAL
CONSULTANTS CANADA

Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment

Proposed Development

13291 Airport Road, Kleinburg Station, Part of Lot 7, Concession 1, Geographical
Township of Albion, Town of Caledon, Regional Municipality of Peel, Ontario

Original Report

Prepared for:

Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism

Prepared by:

Archaeological Licensee: Kristy O'Neal, M.A., P066

Archaeological Consultants Canada

PO Box 81045 Ancaster, RPO Fiddlers Green

Hamilton, ON L9G 4X1

www.onarch.ca

info@onarch.ca

289.683.7844

PIF #: P066-0440-2024

Project No. 364-12-24

16 December 2024

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Archaeological Consultants Canada (ACC) was contracted by the Proponent to conduct a Stage 1 & 2 archaeological assessment, including background research and property survey, for a proposed development. An archaeological assessment was conducted during the pre-approval process and was required under the *Planning Act, R.S.O 1990*. The assessed area, or the “subject property”, is located at municipal address 13291 Airport Road and is legally described as Part of Lot 7, Concession 1, Geographic Township of Albion, Former County of Peel, now in the Town of Caledon, Regional Municipality of Peel, Ontario. The subject property measures 18.8 hectares (ha). The Proponent verified the subject property limits as defined within this report.

The Stage 1 & 2 assessment was conducted under Professional Archaeological License P066, held by Kristy O’Neal. Fieldwork was conducted under the direction of Leah Peacock (R1273). The Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) assigned Project Information Form (PIF) number P066-0440-2024 to this project. The licensee of ACC received permission from the Proponent to access the property and to conduct all required archaeological fieldwork activities including the removal of artifacts, as necessary. The property was accessed between November 27 and November 29, 2024.

Stage 1 background research indicated that the subject property has general archaeological potential due to the following factors:

- The subject property is largely comprised of well-drained land that is suitable for human habitation and agriculture
- One farmstead is shown within the subject property in 1877 historical mapping.
- The subject property is located adjacent to an early historical transportation route, Airport Road, to the west.
- Salt Creek is located south of the subject property.
- There is 1 archaeological site registered within 1 km of the subject property.

The subject property measures 18.8 ha. A visual property inspection determined that 0.63 ha of the subject property has been previously disturbed by modern construction activities and has low to no archaeological potential. 0.13 ha of the subject property consists of ponds and watercourses. 0.13 ha, less than 1%, of the subject property consists of Salt Creek. If impacts to these watercourses are proposed, marine archaeological potential may be evaluated through a separate process following the MCM’s 2016 *Criteria for Evaluating Marine Archaeological Potential* checklist.

18.04 ha of the subject property retained archaeological potential and was recommended for Stage 2 assessment. 9.27 ha of the subject property consisted of scrubland or manicured lawn and was assessed by test pit survey at 5 m intervals. 8.77 ha of the subject property consisted of agricultural field that was assessed by means of pedestrian survey at 5 m intervals. No artifacts or other archaeological resources were identified during the Stage 2 archaeological assessment.



The following recommendation is provided for consideration by the Proponent and by the MCM:

1. No artifacts or other archaeological resources were identified during the Stage 1 & 2 archaeological assessment. The subject property has now been fully assessed according to the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism's 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*. No further archaeological assessment of the property is required.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	6
PROJECT PERSONNEL.....	7
1.0 PROJECT CONTEXT	8
1.1 Development Context	8
1.2 Historical Context	9
1.2.1 Background Research	9
1.2.2 A Cultural Chronology for Southern Ontario	9
1.3 Archaeological Context	12
1.3.1 Natural Environment.....	12
1.3.2 Current Land Use.....	13
1.3.3 Previous Archaeological Investigations.....	13
2.0 FIELD METHODS.....	15
3.0 RECORD OF FINDS.....	17
3.1 Soils	17
3.2 Archaeological Resources.....	17
3.3 Documentary Record	17
4.0 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS	18
4.1 Potential for Archaeological Resources	18
4.2 Discussion	19
5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	21
6.0 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION.....	22
7.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES	23
8.0 IMAGES	26
9.0 FIGURES.....	30



LIST OF TABLES

1. General Cultural Chronology for Southern Ontario	10
2. Registered Archaeological Sites within 1 km of the Subject Property	14
3. Daily Fieldwork Conditions	15
4. Inventory of Documentary and Material Record	17

LIST OF FIGURES

1. Location of the Subject Property on a Topographic Map	
2. Location of the Subject Property on Tremaine's 1859 Map of the County of Peel, Canada West	
3. Location of the Subject Property on Walker & Miles' 1877 Illustrated Historical Atlas Map of Albion Township, County of Peel	
4. Location of the Subject Property on a Map of Peel County Soils	
5. Current Land Use of the Subject Property	
6. Aerial Imagery Showing the Results of the Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment of the Subject Property	



LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The following is a list of abbreviations and acronyms used throughout this report.

ACC	Archaeological Consultants Canada
CHVI	Cultural Heritage Value or Interest
cm	centimetre
ha	hectares
km	kilometre
m	metre
MCM	Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism
OASD	Ontario Archaeological Sites Database
PIF	Project Information Form
%	percent



PROJECT PERSONNEL

Project Manager:	Matthew Muttart, M.A., P1208
Professional License:	Kristy O’Neal, M.A., P066
Field Director:	Leah Peacock, B.A., R1273
Assistant Field Director:	Donny Vongphakdy
Field Technicians:	Maddie Eley Nicole Cholewka Emma Jepson Emily Ereist Victoria Wilson
Report Preparation:	Zack Cousineau, B.A., A1335
Graphics:	Zack Cousineau, B.A., A1335



Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment

Proposed Development

13291 Airport Road, Kleinburg Station, Part of Lot 7, Concession 1,
Geographical Township of Albion, Town of Caledon, Regional
Municipality of Peel, Ontario

1.0 PROJECT CONTEXT

1.1 Development Context

Archaeological Consultants Canada (ACC) was contracted by the Proponent to conduct a Stage 1 & 2 archaeological assessment, including background research and property survey, for a proposed development. An archaeological assessment was conducted during the pre-approval process and was required under the *Planning Act, R.S.O 1990*. The assessed area, or the “subject property”, is located at municipal address 13291 Airport Road and is legally described as Part of Lot 7, Concession 1, Geographic Township of Albion, Former County of Peel, now in the Town of Caledon, Regional Municipality of Peel, Ontario. The subject property measures 18.8 hectares (ha). The Proponent verified the subject property limits as defined within this report.

The objective of a Stage 1 background study is to provide information about the subject property’s geography, history, previous archaeological fieldwork, and current land conditions. A Stage 1 study evaluates the subject property’s archaeological potential in order to recommend appropriate strategies for the Stage 2 survey.

The objective of a Stage 2 property assessment is to document all archaeological resources present on the property and to make a determination about whether these resources, if present, have Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (CHVI). Archaeological resources consist of artifacts (Indigenous stone tools, pottery and subsistence remains as well as Euro-Canadian objects), subsurface settlement patterns and cultural features (post moulds, trash pits, privies, and wells), and sites (temporary camps and special purpose activity areas, plus more permanent settlements such as villages, homesteads, grist mills and industrial structures). If any archaeological resources are present that exhibit CHVI, a Stage 2 survey will determine whether these resources require further assessment and, if necessary, recommend appropriate Stage 3 strategies for identified archaeological sites.

The Stage 1 & 2 assessment was conducted under Professional Archaeological License P066, held by Kristy O’Neal. Fieldwork was conducted under the direction of Leah Peacock (R1273). The Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) assigned Project Information Form (PIF) number P066-0440-2024 to this project. The licensee of ACC received permission from the Proponent to access the property and to conduct all required archaeological fieldwork activities including the removal of artifacts, as necessary. The property was accessed between November 27 and November 29, 2024.

All fieldwork and reporting were completed using MCM's 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*. This report documents the research, the field methods and results, and the conclusions and recommendations based on the Stage 1 & 2 archaeological assessment. All documents and records related to this project will be curated at the offices of ACC, in accordance with subsection 66(1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (OHA).

1.2 Historical Context

1.2.1 Background Research

Stage 1 background research was conducted to determine the potential for finding and identifying archaeological resources including sites within the current subject property and to determine the necessity of conducting a Stage 2 survey. This is done by reviewing geographic, archaeological, and historical data for the property and the surrounding area. The background research was conducted to:

- amass all the readily available information on any previous archaeological surveys in the area.
- determine the locations of any registered and unregistered sites within and around the subject property.
- develop an historical framework for assigning levels of potential significance to any new sites discovered during fieldwork.

1.2.2 A Cultural Chronology for Southern Ontario

Over their thousands of years of occupation in the general region, Indigenous peoples have left behind, to a greater or lesser degree, physical evidence of their lifeway activities and settlements at many locations. Based upon a published synthesis of Indigenous cultural occupations (Wright, 1968). Table 1 is a general outline of the cultural history of southern Ontario that is applicable to the subject property. Ellis and Ferris (1990) provide greater detail of the distinctive characteristics of each time period and cultural group.

It is likely that Ontario was occupied soon after the retreat of the Ice Age glaciers. The earliest known human occupation in the area was during the Paleoindian period (between 12,000 and 9,500 years ago) wherein small groups of nomadic peoples hunted big game such as caribou in a cool sub-arctic climate. Sites are typically found near glacial features such as the shorelines of glacial lakes or kettle ponds which would have allowed access to the low-lying environments that were favoured by caribou and other wildlife. These people were few and their small, temporary campsites are relatively rare. Paleoindian sites are recognized by the presence of distinctive artifacts such as fluted projectile points, beaked scrapers, and graves and by the preference for light colored chert, such as Collingwood chert. The Paleoindian Period is divided into two sub-periods, Early Paleoindian, and Late Paleoindian.

Table 1: General Cultural Chronology for Southern Ontario

Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment
13291 Airport Road
Town of Caledon, R.M. of Peel, ON

PERIOD	SUBDIVISION I	SUBDIVISION II	YEARS BEFORE PRESENT	COMMENTS
PALEOINDIAN	Early Paleoindian	Fluted Point Horizon	12,000-10,500	big game hunters
	Late Paleoindian	Holcombe & Hi-Lo Horizons	10,500-9,500	small nomadic groups
ARCHAIC	Early Archaic	Side Notched Horizon	10,000-9,700	nomadic hunters and gatherers
		Corner-Notched Horizon	9,700-8,900	
		Bifurcate Horizon	8,900-8,000	
	Middle Archaic	Middle Archaic I/Stemmed Horizon	8,000-5,500	territorial settlements
		Middle Archaic II	5,500-4,500	polished ground stone tools
	Late Archaic	Narrow Point Horizon	4,500-3,500	
		Broad Point Horizon	4,000-3,500	
		Small Point Horizon (including Haldimand and Glacial Kame Complexes)	3,500-2,800	burial ceremonialism
WOODLAND	Early Woodland	Meadowood Complex	2,900-2,400	introduction of pottery
		Middlesex Complex	2,500-2,000	
	Middle Woodland	SW Ontario: Saugeen	2,300-1,500	long distance trade networks
		Western Basin: Couture	2,300-1,500	
	Transitional Woodland	SW Ontario:		
		Princess Point	1,500/1,400-1,200	incipient agriculture
		Western Basin:		
		Riviere au Vase	1500/1400-1200/1100	
	Late Woodland: Ontario Iroquois Tradition	Early: Glen Meyer	1200/100-750/700	transition to village life
		Middle I: Uren	720/700-710/670	large villages with palisades
		Middle II: Middleport	710/670-670/600	wide distribution of ceramic styles
		Late: Neutral	600-450	
	Late Woodland: Western Basin Tradition	Younge Phase	1200/1100-800	
		Springwells Phase	800-600	
Wolf Phase		600-450		
HISTORIC	SW Ontario Iroquois	Historic Neutral	450-350	tribal warfare
	European Contact	Initial Contact	380-300	tribal displacement
		European Settlement	200 >	European settlement
		First Nations Resettlement	200 >	

(Compiled from Adams, 1994, Ellis *et al.*, 1990, Wright, 1968)

People during the Archaic period (*circa* 10,000 to 2,800 years ago) were still primarily nomadic hunters, but they adapted to a more temperate climate. Groups were dispersed during winter months and converged around watercourses from the spring to fall in large fishing campsites. The Archaic period is characterized by the appearance of ground stone tools, notched, or stemmed projectile points. The Archaic Period is divided into three sub-periods, Early, Middle, and Late Archaic. During the Archaic Period, groups began to establish territorial settlements and introduce burial ceremonialism. There is a marked increase in the number and size of sites, especially during the Late Archaic period.



The Woodland period is distinguished by the introduction of pottery vessels for storage and cooking. Sites of the Woodland period (*circa* 3000 to 400 years ago) are usually the most numerous because the population levels in southern Ontario had significantly increased, especially along the shores of Lakes Erie and Ontario. The Woodland Period is also marked by the establishment of complex long distance trading networks. The Woodland Period is divided into three sub-periods, Early, Middle and Late Woodland. During the Late Woodland Period, there is increasing sedentarism and the establishment of horticulture, a reliance on tribal warfare, and the introduction of semi-permanent villages with large protective palisades. The Late Woodland period also envelops the emergence of Iroquoian tribes and confederacies.

The historic period (from A.D. 1650 to 1900) begins with the arrival of Euro-Canadian groups. Sites of this period document European exploration, trade, and the displacement and devastation of native groups caused by warfare and infectious disease. The most common sites of this period include Euro-Canadian homesteads, industries, churches, schools, and cemeteries.

While North America had been visited by Europeans on an increasing scale since the end of the 15th century, the first European to venture into what would become southern Ontario was Étienne Brûlé. Brûlé was sent by Samuel de Champlain in the summer of 1610 to consolidate an emerging friendship between the French and the First Nations, and to learn their languages and customs. Other Europeans would subsequently be sent by the French to train as interpreters. These men played an essential role in communications with the First Nations (Gervais and Rothe, 2004:182).

The late 17th and early 18th centuries saw the growth and spread of the fur trade, with the establishment and maintenance of trading posts along the Great Lakes. In 1754, hostilities over trade and the territorial ambitions of the French and the British led to the Seven Years' War, which ended when the French surrendered in 1760 (Smith, 1987:22). In addition to cementing British control over the Province of Quebec, the British victory over the French also proved pivotal in catalyzing the Euro-Canadian settlement process.

During pre-contact and early contact times, the vicinity of the subject property would have contained a mixture of deciduous trees, coniferous trees, and open areas. In the early 19th century, Euro-Canadian settlers arrived via easily accessible colonization routes and began to clear the forests for agricultural purposes. In the 19th and early 20th centuries, the subject property and surrounding land were primarily used for agricultural purposes. Mixed farming was common, with wheat crops and beef cattle dominating the landscape (Chapman and Putnam, 1984:177).

The subject property was historically located on Part of Lot 7, Concession 1, in the Township of Albion, County of Peel. In 1791, the provinces of Lower Canada and Upper Canada were created from the former province of Quebec by a British parliamentary act. Colonel John Graves Simcoe was appointed as the Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada and was tasked with governing and directing its settlement, as well as establishing a constitutional government based on Britain's model (Coyne et al, 1895:33).

Formerly part of the Home District, Peel County was formed in 1854, and was named after British Parliamentarian Sir Robert Peel (Mika & Mika, 1983:177). With increased pressure for settlement lands, the British Crown purchased what is referred to as the Mississauga Tract in 1805 from the Mississaugas. In 1818 the remainder of the Mississauga Tract was purchased, extending the northern boundary of Peel County to include what are now the Townships of Albion, Caledon and Chinguacousy. Settlement of the area began in the early 1800s but came to a standstill during the War of 1812. In 1819, an influx of Irish immigrants arrived and from then on, settlement continued to grow at a steady pace. Peel County became the Regional Municipality of Peel on October 15, 1973 (Mika & Mika, 1983:180).

Albion Township was first surveyed for settlement in 1819, with the earliest settlers arriving shortly after. Many of the early inhabitants traveled along Yonge Street into the newly opened townships. The first settler in Albion Township is believed to be William Downey, who purchased lands near Castlederg (Walker & Miles, 1877). By 1820, all the lots in Albion Township had been patented and by 1821, all the Crown and Clergy Reserve lots were leased. According to census data the population of Albion Township in 1821 was 110 persons, with 62 acres of land cultivated. By 1848 the population had increased to 3,567 and by 1871 it was estimated to be 4,857 (Walker & Miles, 1877).

Historical records and mapping were examined for evidence of early Euro-Canadian occupation within and near the subject property in the mid- to late 19th century. Tremaine's 1859 *Map of the County of Peel, Canada West* indicates that at that time Daniel Switzer owned the portion of Lot 7 within the subject property at the time (Figure 2). The property is depicted abutting now Airport Road, a historical transport route. According to the 1861 census, Daniel Switzer was a 66-year-old farmer who resided on Lot 7, Concession 1 in a 1 ½ story frame house (Library and Archives Canada, 1861).

Walker & Miles' 1877 map of Albion Township in the *Illustrated Historical Atlas of Peel County* indicates that James Dean now owned the portion of Lot 7 within the subject property. A structure and orchard are now depicted within the subject property along Airport Road. An additional structure is located just outside the subject property to the south (Figure 3). Salt Creek is now depicted through the southwest side of the subject property.

It should be noted that while one structure is illustrated within the subject property on the historical atlas maps, it does not necessarily mean that one or more structures were not present at that time, earlier or later. Not all features of interest were mapped systematically on the Ontario series of historical maps and atlases, given that they were financed by subscription, and subscribers were given preference regarding the level of detail provided on the maps (Caston, 1977:100). Given that the subject property fronts a historic concession road there is the potential for 19th century buildings to be present, depending on the level of disturbance.

1.3 Archaeological Context

1.3.1 Natural Environment



The subject property is located within the South Slope physiographic region of Ontario (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 113). This region includes the southern strip of the Peel Plain and the southern slope of the Oak Ridges Moraine (Chapman and Putnam 1984:172). The South Slope lies across limestone made up of the Verulam and Lindsay Formations and shales made up of the Georgian Bay and Queenston Formations. The region contains a variety of soils, some of which are excellent for agriculture. The dominant physiographic landform within the subject property is drumlinized till plain (MNDM, 2007).

The *Soils of Peel County* (Hoffman and Richards, 1953) indicates that there are three dominant surface soil types within the subject property (Figure 4). The majority of the subject property is made up of Chinguacousy clay loam. This soil is a dark greyish-brown clay loam that is characterized by few stones, smooth, gently sloping topography, and imperfect drainage. The southern portion of the subject property consists of Peel clay loam. This soil is a very dark grey clay loam that is characterized by being stonefree, smooth, gently sloping topography, and imperfect drainage. Lands along the southern edge of the subject property surrounding the watercourse consist of Bottom Land, alluvial soils with variable drainage that are made up of irregularly stratified soils.

Water has been identified as the major determinant of site selection and the presence of potable water is the single most important resource necessary for any extended human occupation or settlement. Primary water sources include, among others, lakes, rivers, creeks, and streams. Secondary water sources include intermittent streams, creeks, springs, marshes, and swamps. Past water sources, such as raised beach ridges, relic water channels, and glacial shorelines are also considered to have archaeological potential. Swamps and marshes are also important as resource extraction areas, and any resource areas are considered to have archaeological potential. The nearest water source is Salt Creek, which runs through the southern portion of the subject property.

1.3.2 Current Land Use

Figure 5 provides the current land use of the subject property. The subject property is currently used for residential and agricultural purposes. The surrounding properties are comprised of agricultural fields and scattered residential houses.

Fieldwork for the project was conducted on November 27 and November 29, 2024.

1.3.3 Previous Archaeological Investigations

1.3.3.1 Registered Archaeological Sites

Previously registered archaeological sites can be used to indicate archaeological potential. To determine if any previous assessments have yielded archaeological sites, either within or surrounding the current subject property, two main sources were consulted. These include the *Ontario Archaeological Sites Database* (OASD) and the *Public Register of Archaeological Reports*, both of which are maintained by MCM.

The OASD contains archaeological sites registered within the Borden system (Borden, 1952). The Borden system divides Canada into 13 km by 18.5 km blocks based on longitude and latitude. Each Borden block is designated with a four-letter label and sites identified within the block are numbered sequentially as they are registered. The subject property is located within the AkGw Borden block.

According to the OASD, no archaeological sites have been registered within the subject property, however, 1 site has been registered within 1 km of the subject property (MCM, 2024a). The nearest of these sites is over 300 m from the current subject property. One site is of Euro-Canadian cultural affiliation and includes a Blacksmith.

Table 2 lists the sites within 1 km along with the current CHVI for each site. CHVI is a term used by MCM and consultant archaeologists to describe archaeological resources that meet one or more criteria that recommend further fieldwork in MCM’s *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*. Under the OHA and its regulations, archaeological resources that have been determined to possess CHVI are protected as archaeological sites under Section 48 of the act. Information in Table 2 is provided by MCM through the OASD (MCM, 2024a).

Table 2: Registered Archaeological Sites within 1 km of the Subject Property

REG. #	NAME	TIME PERIOD	CULTURAL AFFILIATION	SITE TYPE	STATUS
AkGw-409	Robert Hodgson Blacksmith Shop	Post-Contact	Euro-Canadian	blacksmith shop	Unknown CHVI

Information concerning specific site locations is protected by provincial policy and is not fully subject to the *Freedom of Information Act*. The release of such information in the past has led to looting or various forms of illegally conducted site destruction. Confidentiality extends to all media capable of conveying location, including maps, drawings, or textual descriptions of a site location. MCM will provide information concerning site location to the party or an agent of the party holding title to a property, or to a licensed archaeologist with relevant cultural resource management interests.

1.3.3.2 Previous Archaeological Reports

A review of archaeological reports within the *Public Register of Archaeological Reports* indicated that no archaeological reports detailing previous archaeological fieldwork within the subject property have been entered into MCM’s register at the time this report was written (MCM, 2024b). There are no reports detailing previous fieldwork within 50 m of the subject property within the register. Reports were searched based on registered site information, historic lots and concessions, and nearby streets.

2.0 FIELD METHODS

The subject property measures 18.8 ha. The Stage 1 & 2 assessment were conducted concurrently between November 27 and November 29, 2023, with advance permission to enter the subject property obtained from the Proponent. Weather conditions during the assessment were excellent, Table 3 provides detailed weather conditions for each day of the assessment.

Table 3: Daily Fieldwork Conditions

DATE	WEATHER CONDITIONS	FIELD DIRECTOR
November 27, 2024	5°C, partly cloudy	Leah Peacock, R1273
November 29, 2024	2°C, overcast	Leah Peacock, R1273

The Stage 1 assessment of the subject property began with an on-site property inspection to gain first-hand knowledge of the geography, topography, and current condition of the property. The entirety of the subject property was accessible and was inspected. Appropriate photographic documentation was taken during the visual inspection. Coverage of the property was sufficient to identify the presence or absence of features of archaeological potential, meeting the requirements of Section 1.2 Standard 1 of the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*.

Areas of low to no archaeological potential include lands that have been previously disturbed, lands that have steeply sloping topography, and lands that are low-lying and permanently wet. 0.63 ha, 3.03% of the subject property, has been previously disturbed by intensive and extensive modern soil alterations, including for construction of a residential home with outbuildings and a driveway. 0.13 ha, 0.07% of the subject property consists of low-lying and wet marsh.

Approximately 0.13 ha, 0.07 percent (“%”) of the subject property consists of watercourses and waterbodies, including Salt Creek and small marsh areas along the creek.

The Stage 1 property inspection took place when the ground was not snow covered, and under conditions that allowed for full viewing of archaeological potential.

The remainder of the subject property, totaling 18.04 ha, 96%, was determined to archaeological potential and require Stage 2 archaeological assessment. 9.27 ha, 49.4%, of the subject property consists of scrubland or manicured lawn. As these lands could not be ploughed, Stage 2 archaeological assessment was conducted by test pit survey at 5 m intervals in accordance with Section 2.1.2 of the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*. Each test pit was dug by hand and was 30 centimetres (cm) in diameter and was dug to at least five cm into the subsoil. Test pits were examined for stratigraphy, cultural features, or evidence of fill. Test pits were dug to within one m of all disturbances and other areas of low archaeological potential. All soil was screened through 6-millimetre mesh to maximize the potential for artifact recovery. Appropriate photographic documentation was taken, and all test pits were backfilled upon completion. As no artifacts were observed during the test pit assessment no intensified survey was conducted.

8.77 ha, 46.6%, of the subject property, consisted of agricultural field that was assessed by means of pedestrian survey at 5 m intervals. The fields had been recently ploughed, with direction provided to the contractor undertaking the ploughing that the ploughing should be deep enough to provide total topsoil exposure, but not deeper than previous ploughing. The ploughed lands were weathered by several light rains to improve the visibility of archaeological resources. At least 80% of the ground surface was visible, meeting conditions for field visibility. As no artifacts were observed during the pedestrian survey no intensified survey was conducted.

There were no weather, ground, or lighting conditions detrimental to the recovery of artifacts. As such, it is confirmed that the assessment met Section 1.2 Standard 2 and Section 2.1 Standard 3 of the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* regarding weather and lighting. The ground was not snow covered and soil was not frozen or saturated during the assessment, and there were no adverse conditions created by conducting winter survey, as per requirements listed in MCM's *Winter Archaeology: A Technical Bulletin for Consultant Archaeologists in Ontario* (MCM, 2013:3).

The entirety of the subject property was assessed. The results of the Stage 1 & 2 assessment are shown in Figure 6. Images of the assessment are provided in Section 8.0.



3.0 RECORD OF FINDS

3.1 Soils

The surface soils within the ploughed agricultural fields consisted of medium brown clay loam. Test pits contained approximately 10 to 20 cm of medium brown clay loam topsoil with 50% of rocky inclusions throughout, above grey clay loam subsoil. Some disturbance was encountered as test pits along the gravel laneway consisted of little to no topsoil above gravel filled subsoil.

3.2 Archaeological Resources

No artifacts or other archaeological resources were observed during the Stage 1 & 2 assessment of the subject property.

3.3 Documentary Record

All fieldwork-related activities were documented and kept, including field notes and observations and detailed maps. Appropriate photographic records were kept of the assessment and all image descriptions were recorded in a photo log.

A detailed list of field records is presented in Table 4. All digital items have been duplicated and all paper items have been scanned and stored as digital documents. All items are housed in the corporate offices of ACC.

Under Section 6 of Regulation 881 of the OHA, ACC will keep in safekeeping all objects of archaeological significance that are found under the authority of the license and all field records that are made in the course of the work authorized by the license, except where the objects and records are donated to His Majesty the King in right of Ontario or are directed to be deposited in a public institution under subsection 66 (1) of the Act.

Table 4: Inventory of Documentary and Material Records

PROJECT INFORMATION		
ACC project number	364-12-24	
Licensee	Kristy O’Neal	
MCM PIF numbers	P066-0440-2024	
DOCUMENT/MATERIAL	NUMBER	DESCRIPTION
field notes & photo logs	1	pages (paper, with digital copies)
maps	1	aerial imagery of subject property
photographs	16	digital colour photographs

4.0 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Potential for Archaeological Resources

Archaeological potential is defined as the likelihood of finding archaeological sites within a subject area. For planning purposes, determining archaeological potential provides a preliminary indication that significant sites might be found within the subject area, and consequently, that it may be necessary to allocate time and resources for archaeological survey and mitigation.

The framework for assigning levels of potential archaeological significance is drawn from provincial guidelines found in the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (MCM, 2011: Sections 1.3.1 and 1.3.2). The following are features or characteristics that can indicate archaeological potential:

- previously identified archaeological sites
- water sources (It is important to distinguish types of water and shoreline, and to distinguish natural from artificial water sources, as these features affect site locations and types to varying degrees.)
 - primary water sources (e.g., lakes, rivers, streams, creeks)
 - secondary water sources (e.g., intermittent streams and creeks, springs, marshes, swamps)
 - features indicating past water sources (e.g., glacial lake shorelines indicated by the presence of raised sand or gravel beach ridges, relic river or stream channels indicated by clear dip or swale in the topography, shorelines of drained lakes or marshes, cobble beaches)
 - accessible or inaccessible shoreline (e.g., high bluffs, swamp or marsh fields by the edge of a lake, sandbars stretching into marsh)
- elevated topography (e.g., eskers, drumlins, large knolls, plateaus)
- pockets of well-drained sandy soil, especially near areas of heavy soil or rocky ground
- distinctive land formation that might have been special or spiritual places, such as waterfalls, rock outcrops, caverns, mounds, and promontories and their bases. There may be physical indicators of their use, such as burials, structures, offerings, rock paintings or carvings.
- resource areas, including:
 - food or medicinal plants (e.g., migratory routes, spawning areas, prairie)
 - scarce raw materials (e.g., quartz, copper, ochre or outcrops of chert)
 - early Euro-Canadian industry (e.g., fur trade, logging, prospecting, mining)



- areas of early Euro-Canadian settlement. These include places of early military or pioneer settlement (e.g., pioneer homesteads, isolated cabins, farmstead complexes), early wharf or dock complexes, pioneer churches and cemeteries. There may be commemorative markers of their history, such as local provincial, or federal monuments or heritage parks
- early historical transportation routes (e.g., trails, passes, roads, railways, portages)
- property listed on a municipal register or designated under the OHA or that is in a federal, provincial, or municipal historic landmark site
- property that local histories or informants have identified with possible archaeological sites, historical events, activities, or occupations

Archaeological potential can be determined not to be present for either the entire property or parts of it when the area under consideration has been subject to extensive and deep land alterations that have severely damaged the integrity of any archaeological resources. This is commonly referred to as “disturbed” or “disturbance” and may include:

- quarrying
- major landscaping involving grading below topsoil
- building footprints
- sewage and infrastructure development
- activities such as agricultural cultivation, gardening, minor grading, and landscaping do not necessarily affect archaeological potential.

4.2 Discussion

Section 1.3.1 of the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (MCM, 2011) lists criteria indicative of archaeological potential. Stage 1 background research indicated that the subject property has general archaeological potential due to the following factors:

- The subject property is largely comprised of well-drained land that is suitable for human habitation and agriculture
- One farmstead is shown within the subject property in 1877 historical mapping.
- The subject property is located adjacent to an early historical transportation route, Airport Road, to the west.
- Salt Creek is located south of the subject property.
- There is 1 archaeological site registered within 1 km of the subject property.

Given the above criteria, background archival research indicates that the subject property exhibits general archaeological potential for the discovery of both pre/post-contact Indigenous



and Euro-Canadian archaeological resources therefore, a Stage 2 archaeological assessment was required.

The subject property measures 18.8 ha. A visual property inspection determined that 0.63 ha of the subject property has been previously disturbed by modern construction activities and has low to no archaeological potential. 0.13 ha of the subject property consists of ponds and watercourses.

0.13 ha, less than 1%, of the subject property consists of Salt Creek. If impacts to these watercourses are proposed, marine archaeological potential may be evaluated through a separate process following the MCM's 2016 *Criteria for Evaluating Marine Archaeological Potential* checklist.

18.04 ha of the subject property retained archaeological potential and was recommended for Stage 2 assessment. 9.27 ha of the subject property consisted of scrubland or manicured lawn and was assessed by test pit survey at 5 m intervals. 8.77 ha of the subject property consisted of agricultural field that was assessed by means of pedestrian survey at 5 m intervals.

No artifacts or other archaeological resources were identified during the Stage 2 archaeological assessment.



5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

Subject to acceptance of the results and approval of the recommendations, MCM is requested to deem this report compliant with ministry requirements for archaeological fieldwork and reporting and to issue a letter accepting this report into the *Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports*.

The following recommendation is provided for consideration by the Proponent and by the MCM:

1. No artifacts or other archaeological resources were identified during the Stage 1 & 2 archaeological assessment. The subject property has now been fully assessed according to the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism's 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*. No further archaeological assessment of the property is required.



6.0 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION

The following advice on compliance with current legislation is provided for consideration:

- a. This report is submitted to the Minister of Citizenship and Multiculturalism as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O. 2005, c O.18. The report is reviewed to ensure that it complies with the standards and guidelines that are issued by the Minister, and that the archaeological fieldwork and report recommendations ensure the conservation, protection, and preservation of the cultural heritage of Ontario. When all matters relating to archaeological sites within the project area of a development proposal have been addressed to the satisfaction of the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism, a letter will be issued by the ministry stating that there are no further concerns with regard to alterations to archaeological sites by the proposed development.
- b. It is an offence under Sections 48 and 69 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* for any party other than a licensed archaeologist to make any alteration to a known archaeological site or to remove any artifact or other physical evidence of past human use or activity from the site, until such a time as a licensed archaeologist has completed archaeological fieldwork on the site, submitted a report to the Minister stating that the site has no further cultural heritage value or interest, and the report has been filed in the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports referred to in Section 65.1 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.
- c. Should previously undocumented archaeological resources be discovered, they may be a new archaeological site and therefore subject to Section 48 (1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The proponent or person discovering the archaeological resources must cease alteration of the site immediately and engage a licensed consultant archaeologist to carry out archaeological fieldwork, in compliance with Section 48 (1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.
- d. The *Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act*, 2002, S.O. 2002, c.33 requires that any person discovering human remains must notify the local police or coroner and the Registrar, Burials Unit, at the Ministry of Public and Business Service Delivery.

7.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES

Adams, Nick

1994 *Field Manual for Avocational Archaeologists in Ontario*. Publication No.16,
Ontario Archaeological Society Inc.

Borden, Charles E.

1952 A Uniform Site Designation Scheme for Canada. *Anthropology in British Columbia*, No.
3, 44-48.

Caston, Wayne

1997 Evolution in the Mapping of Southern Ontario and Wellington County. *Wellington
County History*. 10:91-106.

Chapman, L.J. and D.F. Putnam

1984 *The Physiography of Southern Ontario*. 3rd ed. Ministry of Natural Resources

Coyne, James, C. O. Ermatinger, K. W. McKay

1895 *Historical Sketches of the County of Elgin*. Elgin Historical and Scientific Institute, St.
Thomas.

Ellis, Chris & Neal Ferris

1990 *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650*. Occasional Publication No.
5. London Chapter, Ontario Archaeological Society Inc.

Energy Mines and Resources Canada

1999 *Map 30-M/13, Bolton*. 1:50,000 scale National Topographic System map.

Gervais, Gaetan and Kathe Roth

2004 Champlain and Ontario (1603-35). In *Champlain: The Birth of French America*,
edited by R. Litalien and D. Vaugeois, pp. 180-190. Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press.

Hoffman, D.W. & N.R. Richards

1953 *The Soil Survey of Peel County*. Report No. 18 of the Ontario Soil Survey. Experimental
Farms Service, Canada Department of Agriculture, and the Ontario Agricultural College,
Guelph.

Library and Archives Canada

1861 *1861 Census of Canada*.

<https://www.bac-lac.gc.ca/eng/census/1861/Pages/1861.aspx>

[Accessed December 16, 2024].

Mika, Nick and Helma Mika



1983 *Places in Ontario: Their Name Origins and History. Part II, N-Z.* Mika Publishing Company, Belleville.

Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (“MCM”)

2005 *The Heritage Act, R.S.O. 2005.* Queen's Printer, Toronto.

2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists.* Toronto.

2013 *Winter Archaeology. A Technical Bulletin for Consultant Archaeologists in Ontario.*

2016 *Criteria for Evaluating Marine Archaeological Potential.* Toronto.

2024a Sites within a 1 km radius of the subject property. Provided from the *Ontario Archaeological Sites Database.*

2024b Archaeological assessments completed within the subject property or within 50 m of the subject property. Provided from the *Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports.*

Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (“MNR”) (“MNR”)

2024 *Ontario Topographic Map.*

<https://www.lioapplications.lrc.gov.on.ca/MakeATopographicMap/index.html?viewer=MakeATopographicMap.MATM&locale=en-CA>

[Accessed December 16, 2024].

Ministry of Northern Development and Mines (“MNDM”)

2007 *Physiography of Southern Ontario.* Chapman, L.J. and D.F. Putnam, authors. GIS map data layer distributed by the Ontario Geological Survey as Miscellaneous Release – Data (MRD) 228. Queen's Printer for Ontario.

<http://www.mndm.gov.on.ca/en/mines-and-minerals/applications/ogsearch>.

[Accessed December 16, 2024].

Ontario Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (“OMAFRA”)

2012 GIS Layers for Soils and Physiography in the Province of Ontario.

<http://sis.agr.gc.ca/cansis/publications/surveys/on/index.html>

[Accessed December 16, 2024].

Smith, D. B.

1987 *Sacred Feathers: The Reverend Peter Jones (Kahkewaquonaby) and the Mississauga Indians.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Tremaine, George R

1859 *Tremaine's Map of the County of Peel, Canada West.* George R. Tremaine, Publisher.

Walker & Miles

1877 *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Peel, Ontario.* Toronto.

Wright James V.



1968 *Ontario Prehistory: an eleven thousand-year archaeological outline.* Archaeological Survey of Canada, National Museums of Canada, Ottawa.



8.0 IMAGES





Image 1: Subject property, facing southwest.



Image 2: Driveway and building, facing east.



Image 3: Scrubland along edge of laneway.



Image 4: Scrubland near west of subject property.



Image 5: Laneway near southwest of subject property.



Image 6: Manicured lawn and house.





Image 7: Subject property, facing southwest.



Image 8: Subject property, facing southwest from northeast area.



Image 9: Subject property, facing east from southern edge.



Image 10: Subject property with creek, facing east from southwestern edge.



Image 11: Subject property, facing east from the western corner.



Image 12: Agricultural field conditions





Image 13: Agricultural field conditions



Image 14: Typical test pit.



Image 15: Gravel filled test pit.



Image 16: Test pit with foreign material fill throughout.



9.0 FIGURES

See the following pages for detailed assessment mapping and figures.



Figure 1: Location of the Subject Property on a 1:50,000 Scale Topographic Map




Figure 2: Location of the Subject Property on Tremaine's 1859 Historical Map of Peel County, Canada West




Figure 4: Location of the Subject Property on a Map of the Soils of Peel County




Figure 5: Current Land Use of the Subject Property




Figure 6: Aerial Photograph Showing the Results of the Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment of the Subject Property with Image Locations

