\\SP

PIF P1078-0021-2019 LARA WOOD (P1078)

Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment 1583 CORMACK CRESCENT [P-2838 CONCEPT 6B]

ELM CORMACK (2017) INC.

PART OF LOT 5, CONCESSION 2 SOUTH OF DUNDAS STREET, TOWNSHIP OF TORONTO, CITY OF MISSISSAUGA, REGIONAL MUNICIPALITY OF PEEL, PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

ORIGINAL REPORT

PROJECT NO.: 191-00387-00 DATE: JANUARY 2019

WSP 582 LANCASTER STREET WEST KITCHENER, ON, CANADA N2K 1M3

FAX: +1 519 743-8778 WSP.COM



January-24-2019

Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment

1583 Cormack Crescent

Part of Lot 5, Concession 2 South of Dundas Street, Township of Toronto, City of Mississauga, Regional Municipality of Peel

Prepared for:

Elm Cormack (2017) Inc. 1931 Highway 7 Concord, ON L4K 1V5

582 Lancaster Street West Kitchener, ON, Canada N2K 1M3

Tel.: +1 519 743-8777 Fax: +1 519 743-8778 wsp.com

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

WSP Canada was retained by Elm Cormack (2017) Inc. (the Client) to conduct a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (without property inspection) for a proposed residential development project. The subject property covers an area of 0.9 ha and is located on Part of Lot 5, Concession 2 South of Dundas Street, Township of Toronto, City of Mississauga, Regional Municipality of Peel, Ontario (Figure 1 and 2).

This archaeological assessment is required as part of the *Planning Act* in advance of the proposed development. The City of Mississauga is the approval authority under the *Planning Act* to ensure the Client meets their legal obligations under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

Archaeological activities were carried out in accordance with the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport 2011). This study involved a review of documents pertaining to the property, including historic maps, aerial photographs and local histories. A property inspection was not performed for this assessment.

Archaeological recommendations have been made based on the background historic research, locations of known or registered archaeological sites, previous archaeological assessments, and listed heritage resources as outlined in the 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*. These recommendations include the following:

- 1 Some of the study area requires Stage 2 test pit survey at 5 m interval (Figure 7) following Section 2.1.2 in the S&G's (2011).
- 2 Areas assumed to be disturbed by interpretation of aerial imagery will require further documentation and confirmation (with property inspection) in accordance with Section 2.1.8 in the S&G's (2011).

Should previously undocumented deeply buried archaeological materials be discovered, they may constitute a new site and are therefore subject to Section 48 (1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The proponent or person discovering the material must cease work immediately and a provincially licensed consultant archaeologist must assess the material's cultural heritage value or interest in accordance with Section 48 (1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

wsp

PROJECT PERSONNEL

WSP

Project Manager	Lara Wood, MA (P1078) Professional Archaeologist
Field Director	Andrew Turner, HBA (R1042) Archaeologist
Report Preparation	Andrew Turner
Mapping/GIS	Andrew Turner
Report Review	Lara Wood
Admin/Document Control	Lyn Pedersen

NSD TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive summaryii						
Project Personneliii						
1	PROJECT CONTEXT	1				
1.1	Objectives	1				
1.2	Development Context	1				
1.3	Historical Context	1				
1.3.1	Historical Documentation	.1				
1.3.2	Pre-Contact Period	.1				
1.3.3	General History in the Post Contact Period	.3				
1.3.4	Review of Nineteenth Century Maps	.3				
1.3.5	Review of Twentieth and Twenty-First Century Aerial Photographs	.3				
1.3.6	Summary	.4				
1.4	Archaeological Context	4				
1.4.1	Current Conditions	.4				
1.4.2	Physiography and Ecology	.4				
1.4.3	Previous Archaeological Assessments	.4				
1.4.4	Registered Archaeological Sites	.5				
1.4.5	Listed and Designated Heritage Properties	.5				
1.4.6	Summary	.5				
2	ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS	6				
2.1	Archaeological Potential	6				
2.2	Conclusions	6				
3	RECOMMENDATIONS	7				
4	ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION	8				
5	REFERENCES	9				
6	FIGURES	11				

wsp

FIGURES

FIGURE 1: TOPOGRAPHIC MAP OF THE STUDY AREA	12
FIGURE 2: STUDY AREA MAP	13
FIGURE 3: HISTORIC MAPPING (1859)	14
FIGURE 4: HISTORIC MAPPING (1877)	15
FIGURE 5: AERIAL IMAGE (1954)	16
FIGURE 6: PREVIOUS ASSESSMENTS	17
FIGURE 7: RESULTS MAP	18

APPENDICES

- A FEATURES INDICATING ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL
- B DEVELOPMENT PLAN

1 PROJECT CONTEXT

1.1 OBJECTIVES

In accordance with the provisions of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (R.S.O. 1990, c.o. 18), and in compliance with the objectives set out in Section 1.0 and 2.0 of the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (MTCS 2011:13-41), this Stage 1 archaeological investigation was carried out in order to: provide information concerning the geography, history and current land condition of the study area, determine the presence of known archaeological sites and past archaeological assessments in the study area, and evaluate in detail the archaeological potential of the study area.

1.2 DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

WSP Canada was retained by Elm Cormack (2017) Inc. (the Client) to conduct a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (without property inspection) for a proposed residential development project. The subject property covers an area of 0.9 ha and is located on Part of Lot 5, Concession 2 South of Dundas Street, Township of Toronto, City of Mississauga, Regional Municipality of Peel, Ontario (Figure 1 and 2).

This archaeological assessment is required as part of the *Planning Act* in advance of the proposed development. The City of Mississauga is the approval authority under the *Planning Act* to ensure the Client meets their legal obligations under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The assessment was conducted as part of the municipal approval process and the current development plan is included as **Appendix B**. This assessment does not include a property inspection, so it was not necessary to access the property.

1.3 HISTORICAL CONTEXT

1.3.1 HISTORICAL DOCUMENTATION

The study area is located on Part of Lot 5, Concession 2 South of Dundas Street, Township of Toronto, Peel County.

The study area falls within the lands of the Toronto Purchase Treaty 13A, 1805 (Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada, 2016).

The following sections provide a brief outline of the study area history during the pre-contact and post-contact periods to provide a generalized chronological framework in which the archaeological assessment was conducted.

1.3.2 PRE-CONTACT PERIOD

Paleoindian period populations were the first to occupy what is now southern Ontario, moving into the region following the retreat of the Laurentide Ice Sheet approximately 11,000 years before present (BP). The first Paleoindian period populations to occupy southern Ontario are referred to as Early Paleoindians (Ellis and Deller, 1990).

Early Paleoindian period groups are identified by their distinctive projectile point morphologies, exhibiting long grooves, or 'flutes', that likely functioned as a hafting mechanism (method of attaching the point to a wooden stick). These Early Paleoindian group projectile morphologies include Gainey (ca. 10,900 BP), Barnes (ca. 10,700 BP), and Crowfield (ca. 10,500 BP) (Ellis and Deller, 1990). By approximately 10,400 BP, Paleoindian projectile points transitioned to various unfluted varieties such as Holcombe (ca. 10,300 BP), Hi Lo (ca. 10,100 BP), and Unstemmed

and Stemmed Lanceolate (ca. 10,400 to 9,500 BP). These morphologies were utilized by Late Paleoindian period groups (Ellis and Deller, 1990).

Both Early and Late Paleoindian period populations were highly mobile, participating in the hunting of large game animals. Paleoindian period sites often functioned as small campsites where stone tool production and maintenance occurred (Ellis and Deller, 1990).

By approximately 8,000 BP the climate of Ontario began to warm. As a result, deciduous flora began to colonize the region. With this shift in flora came new faunal resources, resulting in a transition in the ways populations exploited their environments. This transition resulted in a change of tool kits and subsistence strategies recognizable in the archaeological record, resulting in what is referred to archaeologically as the Archaic period. The Archaic period in southern Ontario is divided into three phases: the Early Archaic (ca. 10,000 to 8,000 BP), the Middle Archaic (ca. 8,000 to 4,500 BP), and the Late Archaic (ca. 4,500 to 2,800 BP) (Ellis et al., 1990).

The Archaic period is differentiated from earlier Paleoindian populations by a number of traits such as: 1) an increase in tool stone variation and reliance on local tool stone sources, 2) the emergence of notched and stemmed projectile point morphologies, 3) a reduction in extensively flaked tools, 4) the use of native copper, 5) the use of bone tools for hooks, gorges, and harpoons, 6) an increase in extensive trade networks, and 7) the production of ground stone tools. Also noted is an increase in the recovery of large woodworking tools such as chisels, adzes (a tool similar to an axe with an arched blade, used for cutting or shaping large pieces of wood), and axes (Ellis et al., 1990).

The Archaic period is also marked by population growth. Archaeological evidence suggests that by the end of the Middle Archaic period (ca. 4,500 BP) populations were steadily increasing in size (Ellis et al., 1990). Over the course of the Archaic period, populations began to rely on more localized hunting and gathering territories. By the end of the Archaic period, populations were utilizing more encampments that are seasonal. From spring to fall, settlements would exploit lakeshore/riverine locations where a broad-based subsistence strategy could be employed, while the late fall and winter months would be spent at interior sites where deer hunting was likely a primary focus with some wild edibles likely being collected (Ellis et al., 1990). This steady increase in population size and adoption of a more localized seasonal subsistence strategy eventually evolved into what is termed the Woodland period.

The Woodland period is characterized by the emergence of ceramic technology for the manufacture of pottery. Similar to the Archaic period, the Woodland period is separated into three primary timeframes: the Early Woodland (approximately 2,800 to 2,000 BP), the Middle Woodland (approximately 2,000 to 1,200 BP), and the Late Woodland (approximately 1,200 to 350 BP) (Spence et al., 1990; Fox, 1990).

The Early Woodland period is represented in southern Ontario by two different cultural complexes: the Meadowood Complex (ca. 2,900 to 2,500 BP), and the Middlesex Complex (ca. 2,500 to 2,000 BP). During this period, the life ways of Early Woodland populations differed little from that of the Late Archaic with hunting and gathering representing the primary subsistence strategies. The pottery of this period is characterized by its relatively crude construction and lack of decorations. These early ceramics exhibit cord impressions, likely resulting from the techniques used during manufacture (Spence et al., 1990).

The Middle Woodland period is differentiated from the Early Woodland period by changes in lithic tool morphologies (projectile points) and the increased elaboration of ceramic vessels (Spence et al., 1990). In southern Ontario, the Middle Woodland is observed in three different cultural complexes: the Point Peninsula Complex to the north and northeast of Lake Ontario, the Couture Complex near Lake St. Claire, and the Saugeen Complex throughout the remainder of southern Ontario. These groups can be identified by their use of either dentate or pseudo scalloped ceramic decorations. It is by the end of the Middle Woodland period that archaeological evidence begins to suggest the rudimentary use of maize (corn) horticulture (Warrick, 2000).

The adoption and expansion of maize horticulture during the Late Woodland period allowed for an increase in population size, density, and complexity among Late Woodland populations. As a result, a shift in subsistence and settlement patterns occurred, with the adoption of a more sedentary village life and reliance on maize horticulture, with beans, squash, and tobacco also being grown. Nearing the end of the Late Woodland period (approximately 600

BP) villages reached their maximum size. During this period, increased warfare resulted in the development of larger villages with extensive palisades.

Early contact with European settlers at the end of the Late Woodland period resulted in extensive change to the traditional lifestyles of most populations inhabiting southern Ontario. Trade with the Europeans lead to dependency on European goods and incited conflict between the First Nations in southern Ontario (Warrick, 2000).

1.3.3 GENERAL HISTORY IN THE POST CONTACT PERIOD

County of Peel Overview

The County of Peel, as part of Upper Canada, was largely settled in 1819 by United Empire Loyalists. The land within the area was sold in parcels to individuals as well as awarded to soldiers in lots under the stipulation that a percentage of the land be cleared and planted. After the Municipal Act of 1849, Upper Canada was sectioned into Townships to reflect land division in Britain, linking the County of Peel with those of York and Ontario. However, in 1867, due to the desire of counties to retain greater control of their affairs, the County of Peel broke away from York and Ontario as an independent county (Loverseed, 1987).

Toronto Township

The Township of Toronto is located in the south-east of the County of Peel, and is divided into the Old and New Survey. The Old Survey was performed in 1806 and covered the part of the township both sides of the credit river near the shores of Lake Ontario. Growth was slow in the Old Survey, with only seven families making up the entire population in 1808. Following the anglo-american war, the rear half of the township was surveyed and this New Survey was initially settled in 1819 by Irish families emigrating from New York. Key to the growth and development of this township is the Credit river which not only functions as a good watering source but provides ample mill opportunities (Walker & Miles 1877:86).

City of Mississauga

The Toronto Township area developed further and the small villages in the area became more established. In 1968, the Town of Mississauga was created. In 1974, the Town of Mississauga amalgamated with the towns of Port Credit and Streetsville, and with parts of the townships of Toronto Gore and Trafalgar, to become the City of Mississauga (Mississauga Heritage, 2012).

1.3.4 REVIEW OF NINETEENTH CENTURY MAPS

The nineteenth century maps reviewed include Tremaine's *Map of the County of Peel, Canada West* (1859) (Figure 3) and Walker and Miles' *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Peel, Ont.* (1877) (Figure 4). The 1859 map indicates the lot was owned by the Bank of Upper Canada, no structures have been indicated on the lot (Tremaine, 1859). The 1877 map indicates the part of the lot the study area is located on as owned by John Watson, no structures are indicated in close vicinity to the study area (Walker and Miles, 1877).

1.3.5 REVIEW OF TWENTIETH AND TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHS

A review of a 1954 aerial photograph demonstrates that the study was a large residential lot with an orchard on the back half of the property (Figure 5). Currently, the study area has undergone minor developments with the addition of a learning centre and associated parking area (Figure 2).

1.3.6 SUMMARY

First Nations people have been known to inhabit the region from the Paleo-Indian period (11,000 BP) to the present. Historic Euro-Canadian settlement of the area began at the turn of the 19th century. In the second half of the 20th century the study area has seen minor development, with the installation of a learning centre and associated parking area.

1.4 ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

1.4.1 CURRENT CONDITIONS

The study area consists of a 0.9 ha rectangular parcel of land, fronting on Cormack Crescent. A very recent residential development has occurred immediately east of the study area, while west of the study area is a largely vacant lot, and a more established residential area is located north of the study area.

1.4.2 PHYSIOGRAPHY AND ECOLOGY

The study areas are located within the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence forest region of southern Ontario, which is dominated by hardwood forests including maple, oak, yellow birch, and white and red pine. The study area is located within the Iroquois Plain physiographic region that borders the western portion of Lake Ontario from the Niagara River to the Trent River (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 190-196). The Iroquois Plain was formed as a result of glacial recession and the emptying of Lake Iroquois towards New York State and is comprised of myriad soil variations within the general area (Chapman and Putnam 1984: 190).

The study area is contained within the Etobicoke watershed, and the Lower Etobicoke sub watershed (Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, 2019).

The property lies in the Mixedwood Plains Ecozone, within the Lake Erie – Lake Ontario Ecoregion (Ecoregion 7E) (Crins et al. 2009). Climatic and geological characteristics for this ecoregion are provided below, along with a brief description of dominant vegetation and wildlife species.

The climate is hot and moist in the summer and cool in the winter, with a mean annual temperature range of 6.3 to 9.4 degrees Celsius. Limestone bedrock of primarily Devonian and Silurian ages underlays the Ecoregion. Surface topography is generally flat and overlain with deep undulating ground moraine deposits. Historic lakes that once occupied the Ecoregion have left substantial glaciolacustrine deposits in many areas.

The soil of the study area is Fox Sandy Loam, which is described as a stonefree, grey-brown podzolic soil (Hoffman & Richards, 1953).

1.4.3 PREVIOUS ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENTS

The Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport's (MTCS) Ontario Archaeological Sites Database (OASD) and the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports was consulted to determine whether any archaeological assessments had been previously conducted within the limits of, or immediately adjacent to the study area. It was determined that there is at least one report documenting work within 50 m of the study area. The following provides brief summary of the report.

Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of the QEW from Evans Avenue to Cawthra Road (New Directions Archaeology Ltd., 2014).

New Directions Archaeology Ltd. completed a Stage 1-2 archaeological assessment for improvements to the QEW between Evans Avenue to Cawthra Road, as well as the realignment of the Dixie Road that crosses the QEW. Evidence of intensive and extensive disturbance was found over the majority of the study corridor, and no archaeological material was recovered.

1.4.4 REGISTERED ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

A search of the Ontario Archaeological Sites Database revealed that one archaeological site, AjGv-7, is registered within a 1 km radius of the study area. AjGv-7, the Robinson site, was a 3-6 hectare site of unknown affiliation that has been destroyed by development. No sites are located within the study area or within 50m of the study area.

1.4.5 LISTED AND DESIGNATED HERITAGE PROPERTIES

A review of the Mississauga Heritage Register indicates that there is one heritage property listed in close vicinity to the study area at 1559 Cormack Crescent, the Watson/McGillion House and associated Stable/Coach House.

1.4.6 SUMMARY

The study area consists of 0.9 ha located in the City of Mississauga, Regional Municipality of Peel.

A search of the OASD indicated that 1 archaeological site is registered approximately 1 km away from the study area. One report documents work within 50 m of the study area, during which no archaeological resources were recovered. In addition, one heritage property is found in close proximity to the study area.

2 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

2.1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

A number of factors are employed in determining archaeological potential. Features indicating archaeological potential can be found in **Appendix A**.

Criteria for pre-contact archaeological potential is focused on physiographic variables that include distance from the nearest source of water, the nature of the nearest source/body of water, distinguishing features in the landscape (e.g. ridges, knolls, eskers, wetlands), the types of soils found within the area of assessment and resource availability. Also considered in determining archaeological potential are known archaeological sites within or in the vicinity of the study area. Historic research provides the basis for determining historic archaeological potential. Historical maps, land registry records, aerial photographs, and local historical and archaeological knowledge assist in determining historic archaeological potential. Additionally, the proximity to historic transportation corridors such as roads, rail and water courses also affect the historic archaeological potential.

The entire property contains archaeological potential. It is entirely within 300 m of both a historic transportation corridor (Dixie Road), as well as a property listed on the municipal heritage register.

2.2 CONCLUSIONS

The assessment determined that the entire property exhibits archaeological potential, given it is situated within 300 m of both a historic transportation corridor and municipally listed heritage property. As such it will require test pit survey at a 5m interval (Figure 7) following Section 2.1.2 in the S&G's (2011).

Review of recent aerial imagery indicates that portions of the property have undergone extensive and deep land alterations associated with the building footprints and parking lot area (Figure 7). This has likely removed archaeological potential from these disturbed areas, however this will require confirmation and documentation in the Stage 2 assessment (with property inspection) in accordance with Section 2.1.8 in the S&G's (2011).

3 RECOMMENDATIONS

Archaeological recommendations have been made based on the background historic research, locations of known or registered archaeological sites, previous archaeological assessments, and results of property inspection as outlined in the 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*. These recommendations include the following:

- 1 Some of the study area requires Stage 2 test pit survey at 5 m interval (Figure 7) following Section 2.1.2 in the S&G's (2011).
- 2 Areas assumed to be disturbed by interpretation of aerial imagery will require further documentation and confirmation (with property inspection) in accordance with Section 2.1.8 in the S&G's (2011).

Should previously undocumented deeply buried archaeological materials be discovered, they may constitute a new site and are therefore subject to Section 48 (1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The proponent or person discovering the material must cease work immediately and a provincially licensed consultant archaeologist must assess the material's cultural heritage value or interest in accordance with Section 48 (1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

4 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION

This report is submitted to the Minister of Tourism and Culture as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c 0.18. The report is reviewed to ensure that it complies with the Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (2011a) 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 Tourism, Culture and Sport, 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.

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 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*.

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*.

The Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2002, S.O. 2002, c.33 requires that any person discovering human remains must notify the police or coroner and the Registrar of Cemeteries at the Ministry of Consumer Services.

Archaeological sites recommended for further archaeological fieldwork or protection remain subject to Section 48 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act and may not be altered, or have artifacts removed from them, except by a person holding an archaeological licence.

5 REFERENCES

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

1984 The Physiography of Southern Ontario (3rd edition). Government of Ontario, Toronto.

Crins, W.J., P.A. Gray, P.W.C. Uhlig and M.C. Wester

2009. The Ecosystems of Ontario, Part 1: Ecozones and Ecoregions. Technical Report SIB TER IMA TR-01. Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Science & Information Branch (Inventory, Monitoring and Assessment Section), Peterborough, Ontario.

Ellis, C.J. and D.B. Deller

1990 Paleo-Indians. In The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650, Ed C.J. Ellis and N. Ferris, pp. 37-74. Occasional Publication of the London Chapter, OAS No. 5. London: Ontario Archaeology Society.

Ellis, C.J., I.T. Kenyon, and M.W. Spence

1990 The Archaic. In The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650, Ed C.J. Ellis and N. Ferris, pp. 65-124. Occasional Publication of the London Chapter, OAS No. 5. London: Ontario Archaeology Society.

Fox, W.

1990 The Middle Woodland to Late Woodland Transition. In The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650, Ed C.J. Ellis and N. Ferris, pp. 171-188. Occasional Publication of the London Chapter, OAS No. 5. London: Ontario Archaeology Society.

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

1953 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, Ontario.

Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada.

2016 *Treaty Texts – Upper Canada Land Surrenders*. Retrieved from https://www.rcaanccirnac.gc.ca/eng/1360941656761/1544619778887#uc

Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS)

2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists. Toronto: MTCS.

2018 Ontario Archaeological Sites Database (OASD). Toronto: MTCS.

New Directions Archaeology Ltd.

2014 Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of the QEW from Evans Avenue to Cawthra Road, Lots 3-10, Concessions 1 and 2 South of Dundas Street, Geographic Township of Toronto, County of Halton [sic Peel], and Lots 12, 13 and G, Concessions 2 and 3, Geographic Township of Etobicoke, County of York (New Directions Archaeology Ltd., 2014).

Spence, M.W., R.H. Pihl, and C. Murphy

1990 Cultural Complexes of the Early and Middle Woodland Periods. In The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650, Ed C.J. Ellis and N. Ferris, pp. 125-170. Occasional Publication of the London Chapter, OAS No. 5. London: Ontario Archaeology Society.

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority

2018 *Resources – Etobicoke and Mimico*. Available online at: https://trca.ca/conservation/watershed-management/etobicoke-mimico-creek/resources/

Tremaine, G.R. & G.M.

1859 Map of the County of Peel, Canada West. Toronto, Ontario

University of Toronto

2009 *Digital Aerial Photographs, Southern Ontario 1954 – West Index.* Available online at: http://maps.library.utoronto.ca/data/on/AP_1954/ indexwest.html.

Walker & Miles

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

Warrick, G.

2000 The Precontact Iroquoian Occupation of Southern Ontario. Journal of World Prehistory 14(4):415-456.

6 FIGURES



PROJECT:	PROJECT NO.:	DRAWN BY:	
STAGE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT 1583 CORMACK CRESCENT	191-00387-00	AST	
CLIENT:	DATE:	CHECKED BY:	Service Layer Credits: Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO,
ELM DEVELOPMENTS	01/21/2019	LEW	FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Es (Hong Kong), swisstopo, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community



1:5,000



CLIENT:

CHECKED BY:

Service Layer Credits: Tremaine's Map of the County of Peel, Canada West (1859)

ELM DEVELOPMENTS

01/21/2019

DATE:

LEW

480

0







ELM DEVELOPMENTS

01/11/2019

LEW



PROJECT:

STAGE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT 1583 CORMACK CRESCENT CLIENT: PROJECT NO.: 191-00387-00

DATE:

DRAWN BY: AST

01/21/2019

CHECKED BY: LEW Service Layer Credits: Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

ELM DEVELOPMENTS





PROJECT:

STAGE 1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT 1583 CORMACK CRESCENT CLIENT: PROJECT NO.: 191-00387-00

01/24/2019

DATE:

DRAWN BY:

CHECKED BY: LEW Service Layer Credits: Sources: Esri, HERE, Garmin, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community

ELM DEVELOPMENTS







FEATURES INDICATING ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

FEATURES INDICATING ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL

The following are features or characteristics that indicate archaeological potential:

- Previously identified archaeological sites.
- Water sources:
 - Primary water sources (lakes, rivers, streams, creeks).
 - Secondary water sources (intermittent streams and creeks, springs, marshes, swamps).
 - Features indicating past water sources (e.g. glacial lake shorelines, relic river or stream channels, 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, plateaux).
- Pockets of well-drained sandy soil, especially near areas of heavy soil or rocky ground.
- Distinctive land formations that might have been special or spiritual places, such as waterfalls, rock outcrops, caverns, mounds, and promontories and their bases.
- 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 early cemeteries.
- Early historical transportation routes (e.g. trails, passes, roads, railways, portage routes).
- Property listed on a municipal register or designated under the Ontario Heritage Act or that is federal, provincial or municipal historic landmark or site.
- Property that local histories or informants have identified with possible archaeological sites, historic events, activities, or occupations

SOURCE

Ontario Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists Section 1.3.1



B DEVELOPMENT PLAN

