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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Irvin Heritage Inc. was contracted by the proponent to conduct a Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment in support of a development application for a Study Area which is approximately 2.35 Ha in size.

The Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment indicated that the Study Area retained archaeological potential. As such, a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment consisting of 5 m Test Pit Survey was conducted. The Stage 2 identified no archaeological resources within the Study Area.

Given the results and conclusions of the completed Stage 1 & 2 assessment, the following recommendations are made:

- It is the professional opinion of the archaeological licensee, Thomas Irvin (P379) that the Study Area has been sufficiently assessed and is free of further archaeological concern.

- Notwithstanding the above recommendations, the provided Advice On Compliance With Legislation shall take precedent over any recommendations of this report should deeply buried archaeological resources or human remains be found during any future earthworks within the Study Area.
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1. **ASSESSMENT CONTEXT**

1.1. **Development Context**

Irvin Heritage Inc. was retained by the proponent to conduct a Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment of their property (the Study Area) located at the municipal addresses of 5 Capri Road, Part of Block D and Part of Capri Road, Registered Plan M-986, City of Toronto, Part of Lot 20, Concession 2 Northern Division Fronting the Lake Concession. Historic Township of Etobicoke, Historic County of York (Map 1).

The requirement for a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment was triggered by the Approval Authority in response to a Development Application under the Planning Act for the construction of residential units. The assessment reported on herein was undertaken after direction by the Approval Authority and before formal application submission.

The archaeological assessment reported on was undertaken for the entirety of the legal 2.35 Ha property. Permission, without limitation, was provided by the proponent to survey, assess, and document the archaeological potential and resources, if present, of the Study Area.

1.2. **Environmental Setting**

The Study Area is an irregular polygon, approximately 2.35 Ha in size. It consists of a residential apartment tower surrounded by manicured landscaped lawn, a children’s playground, and a large paved parking lot with paved road access (Map 2). The Study Area is bordered on the west by Highway 427, on the north and east by residential apartment towers with similarly landscaped grounds, and on the south by the recreational sports pitch of Burnhamthorpe Collegiate Institute.

Mimico Creek is located approximately 1 km to the east of the Study Area at its closest point and Elmcrest Creek is located approximately 1.5 km to the west of the Study Area.

The Study Area is situated within the South Slope (32) physiographic region of Southern Ontario and the Till Plains (Drumlinized) (6) physiographic landform of Southern Ontario.

2. **HISTORICAL CONTEXT**

2.1. **General History**
The Study Area is situated within lands included within the Toronto Purchase, originally signed in 1787 (MIA 2020). This treaty was reexamined and ratified on August 1\textsuperscript{st}, 1805, as Treaty 13 the Toronto Purchase, signed between the Crown and certain Mississaugu peoples (MIA 2020).

Etobicoke was originally surveyed in 1792 as a township (Rayburn 1997) and its name originates from the Mississauga peoples, who called the area “Adobigok” meaning “where the alders grow” (Harris 2020) (Mika & Mika 1982). In 1967 the Borough of Etobicoke was formed when the towns of Mimico, New Toronto, the Village of Long Branch and the municipal township of Etobicoke were amalgamated; in 1983 the City of Etobicoke was formed (Rayburn 1997). In 1998 the City of Etobicoke was dissolved and it was then amalgamated into the City of Toronto.

2.2. Study Area History

A review of historical resources resulted in the following data relevant to the Study Area:

**Map 3: Historic Atlas of the County of York (Tremaine 1860)**

The Study Area is situated within part of Lot 20, Northern Division Fronting the Lake Concession 2. The land containing the Study Area is listed as under the ownership of Andrew Ward. There are no structures noted within or adjacent to the Study Area.

**Map 4: 1878 Historic Atlas of the County of York (Miles & Co. 1878)**

The Study Area is situated within part of Lot 20, Northern Division Fronting the Lake Concession 2; the northern most part of the Study Area appears to fall within land holdings of Jacob Anderson who owns the adjacent lot and a small portion of Lot 20. The land containing the Study Area is listed as under the ownership of William J. Montgomery. There are no structures noted within the Study Area. A structure is noted at the southern border of the Lot.

The following should be noted in regard to the review of historic maps:

- Study Area placement within historic maps is only approximate
- Many historic maps were subscriber based, meaning only individuals who paid a fee would have their property details mapped
3. **ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT**

The Study Area is situated within an overall historic landscape that would have been appropriate for both resource procurement and habitation by both Indigenous and Euro-Canadian peoples.

3.1. **Registered Archaeological Sites**

A search of the Ontario Sites Database conducted on August 28, 2020, using a Study Area centroid of 17T E 615766 N 4834148 indicated that there are no registered archaeological sites within a 1 km radius of the Study Area.

3.2. **Related and/or Adjacent Archaeological Assessments**

No readily identifiable archaeological assessments have been conducted within or directly adjacent to the Study Area.

3.3. **Cemeteries & Burials**

As per a cursory search conducted on August 28, 2020, there are no known or registered cemeteries or burials within or adjacent to the Study Area.

3.4. **Archaeological Management Plan**

The Study Area is situated within the limits of the City of Toronto Archaeological Potential Map, which indicates that the western limit of the property has elevated archaeological potential (Map 5).

3.5. **Heritage Conservation District**

The Study Area is not situated within an existing or proposed Heritage Conservation District.

3.6. **Heritage Properties**

The Study Area contains no registered or listed heritage properties.

3.7. **Historic Plaques**

There are no historic plaques within a 100 m radius of the Study Area (Ontario Heritage Trust 2020).
4. **STAGE 1 ANALYSIS & CONCLUSIONS**

As lands within the Study Area are indicated as having archaeological potential, a Stage 2 archaeological survey is required. As there is no indicator as to what the trigger for this potential is, as there are no registered sites within a 1 km, the entirety of the Study Area should therefore be regarded as having potential.

As such, the Study Area retains archaeological potential and should be subject to a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment (Maps 5 and 6).

5. **STAGE 1 RECOMMENDATIONS**

Given the analysis and conclusion of the completed Stage 1 assessment, the following recommendations are made:

- Lands which can be subject to agricultural ploughing must be prepared via ploughing to ensure a minimum 80% of soil visibility. Prepared lands must be allowed to weather under a significant rainfall event, or several lighter rains. A visual survey must be undertaken along 5 m survey intervals.

- Lands which are not viable to plough must be subject to a test pit survey with the following conditions:
  - All test pits are to be excavated by hand at 5 m intervals along 5 m transects
  - Test pits must be excavated to within 1 m of all extant and/or ruined structures when present
  - All test pits must be 30 cm in diameter and be excavated into the first 5 cm of subsoil
  - All excavated soils must be screened through 6 mm wire mesh to facilitate artifact recovery
  - All artifacts recovered must be retained via their associated test pit
  - All test pits are to be backfilled unless instructed otherwise by the landowner

6. **STAGE 2 FIELD METHODOLOGY**

Prior to the initiation of fieldwork, the Field Director reviewed the existing Stage 1 archaeological analysis and recommendations; all field staff were then briefed on the archaeological potential of the Study Area. Fieldwork was conducted in August 2020 (see Table 2). The weather consisted of light cloud cover conditions, but at all times the assessment was conducted under appropriate weather conditions.
Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment

The assessment began with a visual review of the Study Area conditions.

The Study Area was found to consist of clearly disturbed and graded soils related to the construction of the residential apartment complex and associated underground parking within the Study Area (Images 1-5). Clear evidence of grading, banking and drainage ditching was present, along with associated infrastructure (Image 4). As such, a 10 m transect Judgemental Test Pit Survey was conducted with no examples of undisturbed soils being present (Images 5-8). The area indicated on the City of Toronto Archaeological Potential mapping was found to consist of highly graded and disturbed soils lacking any archaeological potential (Image 5).

The archaeological methodology employed during the Stage 2 Test Pit survey consisted of:

- All test pits were excavated by shovel at 5 m intervals on 5 m transects (unless noted above)
- Test pits were excavated to within 1 m of all structures, both extant and in ruin, when present
- All test pits were 30 cm in diameter and were excavated into the first 5 cm of subsoil
- All excavated soils which were of an undisturbed context were screened through 6 mm wire mesh
- All test pits were backfilled

The archaeological survey of the property resulted in the discovery of no archaeological resources.

7. STAGE 2 RECORD OF FINDS

The completed archaeological assessment resulted in the creation of various documentary records (Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Record Type or Item</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th># of Boxes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field Notes: P379-0321-2020</td>
<td>Digital Files</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photos: P379-0321-2020</td>
<td>Digital Files</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. **STAGE 2 ANALYSIS & CONCLUSIONS**

The Study Area, measuring approximately 2.35 Ha in size was subject to a complete archaeological assessment. The Study Area was found to consist of low archaeological potential lands related to the existing residential apartment complex and associated site servicing. No archaeological resources were noted during the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Method</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Ha</th>
<th>% of Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological Potential: 10 m Judgmental Test Pit Survey</td>
<td>No Resources</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Potential: Extant structures, driveways etc.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. **STAGE 2 RECOMMENDATIONS**

Given the results and conclusions of the completed Stage 1 & 2 assessment, the following recommendations are made:

- It is the professional opinion of the archaeological licensee, Thomas Irvin (P379) that the Study Area has been sufficiently assessed and is free of further archaeological concern.

- Notwithstanding the above recommendations, the provided Advice On Compliance With Legislation shall take precedent over any recommendations of this report should deeply buried archaeological resources or human remains be found during any future earthworks within the Study Area.
10. ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION

The Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists requires that the following standard statements be provided within all archaeological reports for the benefit of the proponent and approval authority in the land use planning and development process (MTC 2011:126):

This report is submitted to the Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport 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 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 MTCS, 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 Archaeology 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.

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.

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 Service.
11. IMAGES

Image 1: Manicured lawn setting, note underground garage exist in the background.

Image 2: Grading and soil disturbance.

Image 3: Graded and banked lands.

Image 4: Wastewater infrastructure present.
Image 5: Graded soil conditions.

Image 6: Example of disturbed soil conditions.

Image 7: Example of disturbed soil conditions.

Image 8: Example of disturbed soil conditions.
12. MAPS
Map 2: Study Area Environmental Detail

Source: ESRI, ARCGIS PRO
Map 3: Study Area atop 1860 Historic Atlas Map

Source: Tremaine 1860
Map 4: Study Area atop 1878 Historic Atlas Map

Source: Miles & Co. 1878
Map 5: Study Area with City of Toronto Archaeological Potential Layer

Source: City of Toronto GIS
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Map 7: Stage 2 Results of Assessment
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Map 7: Stage 2 Results of Assessment
Map 8: Stage 2 Results of Assessment with Site Survey
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