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Executive Summary

Detritus Consulting Ltd. (‘Detritus’) was retained by Bousfields Inc. (‘the Proponent’) to conduct a Stage 1-2 archaeological assessment on part of Lot 11, Concession 3, Geographical Township of Trafalgar, Halton County, Ontario (Figure 1). This assessment was undertaken in advance of a proposed subdivision development at 485, 501 and 511 Ontario Street, Town of Milton (‘Study Area’). The Study Area measures approximately 1.6 hectares and occupies three entire subject properties (Figure 4). At the time of the assessment, the Study Area comprised manicured lawn, overgrown lawn, treed areas, three houses, three driveways with parking areas, three sheds, and various sidewalks. The remainder of the Study Area comprises Halton Region Conservation Authority (‘HRCA’) lands along the northern boundary of the Study Area; this area is restricted from development and therefore was not assessed. The Study Area was surveyed with stakes by the Proponent prior to the assessment.

The assessment was triggered by the Provincial Policy Statement (‘PPS’) that is informed by the Planning Act (Government of Ontario 1990a), which states that decisions affecting planning matters must be consistent with the policies outlined in the larger Ontario Heritage Act (1990b). According to Section 2.6.2 of the PPS, “development and site alteration shall not be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential unless significant archaeological resources have been conserved.” To meet this condition, a Stage 1-2 assessment of the Study Area was conducted during the pre-approval phase of the proposed development under archaeological consulting license P389 issued to Dr. Walter McCall by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (‘MTCS’) and adheres to the archaeological license report requirements under subsection 65 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act (Government of Ontario 1990b) and the MTCS’ 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (‘Standards and Guidelines’; Government of Ontario 2011).

The Stage 1 background research indicated that the manicured lawn, overgrown lawn, and treed areas within the Study Area exhibited moderate to high potential for the identification and recovery of archaeological resources. A Stage 2 assessment was recommended for these areas.

The subsequent Stage 2 assessment of the Study Area was conducted on August 2 and September 7, 2018. This investigation consisted of a standard test pit survey at five metre intervals across the manicured lawn, overgrown lawn, and treed areas; the assessment resulted in the identification and documentation of no archaeological resources. The remainder of the Study Area was determined to be previously disturbed comprising three houses, three driveways with parking areas, three sheds, and various sidewalks. These areas were mapped and photo documented in accordance with Section 2.1 Standard 6 and Section 7.8.1, Standards 1a and 1b of the Standards and Guidelines (Government of Ontario 2011).

Given the results of the Stage 2 assessment, wherein no archaeological material was encountered, no further archaeological assessment of the Study Area is recommended.

The Executive Summary highlights key points from the report only; for complete information and findings, the reader should examine the complete report.
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1.0 Project Context

1.1 Development Context

Detritus Consulting Ltd. (‘Detritus’) was retained by Bousfields Inc. (‘the Proponent’) to conduct a Stage 1-2 archaeological assessment on part of Lot 11, Concession 3, Geographical Township of Trafalgar, Halton County, Ontario (Figure 1). This assessment was undertaken in advance of a proposed subdivision development at 485, 501 and 511 Ontario Street, Town of Milton (‘Study Area’). The Study Area measures approximately 1.6 hectares (ha) and occupies three entire subject properties (Figure 4). At the time of the assessment, the Study Area comprised manicured lawn, overgrown lawn, treed areas, three houses, three driveways with parking areas, three sheds, and various sidewalks. The remainder of the Study Area comprises Halton Region Conservation Authority (‘HRCA’) lands along the northern boundary of the Study Area; this area is restricted from development and therefore was not assessed. The Study Area was surveyed with stakes by the Proponent prior to the assessment.

The assessment was triggered by the Provincial Policy Statement (‘PPS’) that is informed by the Planning Act (Government of Ontario 1990a), which states that decisions affecting planning matters must be consistent with the policies outlined in the larger Ontario Heritage Act (1990b). According to Section 2.6.2 of the PPS, “development and site alteration shall not be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential unless significant archaeological resources have been conserved.” To meet this condition, a Stage 1-2 assessment of the Study Area was conducted during the pre-approval phase of the proposed development under archaeological consulting license P389 issued to Dr. Walter McCall by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (‘MTCS’) and adheres to the archaeological license report requirements under subsection 65 (1) of the Ontario Heritage Act (Government of Ontario 1990b) and the MTCS’ 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (‘Standards and Guidelines’; Government of Ontario 2011).

Furthermore, the portion of the property located along the northern boundary of the Study Area is currently regulated by the Conservation Authorities Act (Government of Ontario 1990c) and falls under the jurisdiction of the Halton Region Conservation Authority (‘HRCA’). According to Regulation 169/06 of the Conservation Authorities Act (Government of Ontario 1990c), “permission from the conservation authority is required before any person may: undertake development, straighten, change, divert or interfere in any way with a watercourse, or change or interfere in any way a wetland.”

The purpose of the Stage 1 assessment was to compile all available information about the known and potential archaeological heritage resources within the Study Area and to provide specific direction for the protection, management and/or recovery of these resources. More specifically, the objectives of the Stage 1 assessment were as follows:

- To provide information about the Study Area’s geography, history, previous archaeological fieldwork and current land conditions;
- to evaluate in detail, the Study Area’s archaeological potential which will support recommendations for Stage 2 survey for all or parts of the property; and
- to recommend appropriate strategies for Stage 2 survey.

To meet these objectives Detritus archaeologists employed the following research strategies:

- A review of relevant archaeological, historic and environmental literature pertaining to the Study Area;
- a review of the land use history, including pertinent historic maps; and
- an examination of the Ontario Archaeological Sites Database (‘ASDB’) to determine the presence of known archaeological sites in and around the Study Area.

The purpose of the Stage 2 assessment was to provide an overview of any archaeological resources within the Study Area, and to determine whether any of the resources might be archaeological sites with cultural heritage value or interest (‘CHVT’), and to provide specific direction for the
protection, management and/or recovery of these resources. More specifically, the objectives of the Stage 2 Property Assessment were as follows:

- To document all archaeological resources within the Study Area;
- to determine whether the Study Area contains archaeological resources requiring further assessment; and
- to recommend appropriate Stage 3 assessment strategies for archaeological sites identified.

The licensee received permission from the Proponent to enter the land and conduct all required archaeological fieldwork activities, including the recovery of artifacts.

### 1.2 Historical Context

#### 1.2.1 Post-Contact Aboriginal Resources

The post-contact Aboriginal occupation of southern Ontario was heavily influenced by the dispersal of various Iroquoian-speaking communities by the New York State Iroquois and the subsequent arrival of Algonkian speaking groups from northern Ontario at the end of the 17th century and the beginning of the 18th century (Konrad 1981; Schmalz 1991). More specifically, this period marks the arrival of the Mississaugas into Southern Ontario and, in particular, the watersheds of the lower Great Lakes. The oral traditions of the Mississaugas, as recounted by Chief Robert Paudash and recorded in 1904, suggest that the Mississaugas defeated the Mohawk Nation, who retreated to their homeland south of Lake Ontario. Following this conflict, a peace treaty was negotiated between the two groups and, at the end of the 17th century, the Mississaugas’ settled permanently in Southern Ontario (Praxis Research Associates n.d.). Around this same time, members of the Three Fires Confederacy (Chippewa, Ottawa, and Potawatomi) began immigrating from Ohio and Michigan into Southwestern Ontario (Feest and Feest 1978:778-779).

The Study Area first enters the Euro-Canadian historic record as part of Treaty No. 13A. This agreement was conveyed by the Principal Chiefs of the Mississauga Nation to William Claus, Esquire, Deputy Superintendent General and Deputy Inspector General of Indians and their Affairs. This treaty is described as

Commencing at the eastern bank of the mouth of the River Etobicoke, being in the limit of the western boundary line of the Toronto Purchase, in the year 1787; then north twenty-two degrees west, six miles; thence south 38 degrees west, twenty-six miles more or less, until it intersects a line on the course north 45 degrees west, produced from the outlet of Burlington Bay; then along the said produced line, one mile more or less to the lands granted to Captain Brant; then north 45 degrees east, one mile and a half; then south 45 degrees east, three miles and a half more or less to Lake Ontario then north easterly along the waters edge of Lake Ontario. To the eastern bank of the River Etobicoke being the place of beginning... This Treaty Comprises the fronts of the Townships of Toronto, Trafalgar and Nelson, except the 3,450 acres granted to Chief Brant in 1797.

Morris 1943: 22

The size and nature of the pre-contact settlements and the subsequent spread and distribution of Aboriginal material culture in southern Ontario began to shift with the establishment of European settlers. Despite the inevitable encroachment of European settlers on previously established Aboriginal territories, “written accounts of material life and livelihood, the correlation of historically recorded villages to their archaeological manifestations, and the similarities of those sites to more ancient sites have revealed an antiquity to documented cultural expressions that confirms a deep historical continuity to Iroquoian systems of ideology and thought” (Ferris 2009:114). As Ferris observes, despite the arrival of a competing culture, First Nations communities throughout Southern Ontario have left behind archaeologically significant resources...
that demonstrate continuity with their pre-contact predecessors, even if they have not been recorded extensively in historical Euro-Canadian documentation.

1.2.2 Euro-Canadian Resources

The Study Area is located on Lot 11, Concession 3, Geographical Township of Trafalgar, Halton County, Ontario.

On July 24, 1788, Sir Guy Carleton, the Governor-General of British North America, divided the Province of Québec into the administrative districts of Hesse, Nassau, Mecklenburg and Lunenburg (Archives of Ontario 2009). Further change came in December 1791 when the former Province of Québec was rearranged into Upper Canada and Lower Canada under the Constitutional Act. Colonel John Graves Simcoe was appointed as Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada and he initiated several initiatives to populate the province including the establishment of shoreline communities with effective transportation links between them (Coyne 1895:33).

In July 1792, Simcoe divided Upper Canada into 19 counties, including Halton County, stretching from Essex in the west to Glengarry in the east. Later that year, the four districts originally established in 1788 were renamed as the Western, Home, Midland and Eastern Districts.

As population levels in Upper Canada increased, smaller and more manageable administrative bodies were needed resulting in the establishment of many new counties and townships. As part of this realignment Halton County became part of the West Riding, which was later renamed the Gore District in 1816 (Archives of Ontario 2009).

Halton County was first settled in the early 1780s by United Empire Loyalists and immigrants of the British Isles. Halton County originally consisted of the townships of Trafalgar, Nelson, Flamborough and Beverly. In 1821, the county was expanded with the addition of the townships of Esquesing, Erin, Nassagaweya, Eramosa, and Garafraxa (Archives of Ontario 2009).

The Township of Trafalgar is typical of many others in southern Ontario, with lands being surveyed for settlement, the assignment of township names, concessions and lots, and the granting of Crown patents to individuals who then took up settlement on 100-acre or 200-acre lots in the very late 18th century and early 19th century. The Township of Trafalgar was surveyed according to the Double Front survey system utilized throughout the northern half of the County of Halton. This system produced a rectangular pattern of ten 100-acre lots (two deep and five wide) bounded on all four sides by road allowances. The resulting survey created the modern farm landscape and road system. In the vicinity of the Study Area, the lots were divided into five 200-acre lots instead of ten. This resulted in the distinction between east and west halves, or 100-acre lots, when the Crown Patents were issued. The distinct rectangular pattern has prevailed, although with substantial infill in the immediate vicinity of the Study Area.

The Township developed from subsistence farming to an area known for growing wheat by the mid-19th century. The settlement of Trafalgar Township was made possible through the construction of a military road linking York to Niagara. Construction of this road commenced in 1796. Settlement in the County of Halton began in 1783, but it did not commence in Trafalgar Township until 1807. By 1817, the township had 548 inhabitants three schools, one grist mill and four saw mills. The first post office, named Trafalgar, was established at Post’s Corners in 1820 (Pope 1877).

By 1862, Trafalgar Township had seven towns and villages (Milton, Oakville, Bronte, Palermo, Postville, Lower Hornby and Omagh), 14 water saw mills, 4 grist mills, 3 foundries, 2 steam saw mills, 1 woolen factory, 1 brewery, 1 tannery, 1 machine works, 1 shingle factory, as well as 18 common schools and 2 grammar schools (Warnock 1862). There were also several churches and cemeteries in the township, including two churches and a cemetery (now St. Luke’s Anglican Cemetery) in Palermo. By 1871, the population in Trafalgar Township had grown to 5,027 inhabitants (Carter 1984); by 1877, three additional hamlets (Drumquin, Auburn, and Boyne) had
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been established. The growth of the township was facilitated by major roads (including what is now Dundas Street) and railroads; the Toronto and Hamilton Railroad passing through Trafalgar Township prior to 1862 (Warnock 1862). Furthermore, several later railroads were built through the 1870s and 1880s.

According to the 1877 Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Halton (‘Historical Atlas’; Pope 1877) C. Freeman is listed as the landowner of the western half of Lot 11, Concession 3 (Figure 2). A single structure and a single orchard are illustrated on Mr. Freeman’s property northeast of the Study Area. Furthermore, the Town of Milton is illustrated to the west of the Study Area; the Credit Valley Railroad and Hamilton and North Western Railroad are illustrated to the north and west of the Study Area.

Although significant and detailed landowner information is available on the current Historical Atlas, it should be recognized that historical county atlases were funded by subscriptions fees and were produced primarily to identify factories, offices, residences and landholdings of subscribers. Landowners who did not subscribe were not always listed on the maps (Caston 1997:100). Moreover, associated structures were not necessarily depicted or placed accurately (Gentilcore and Head 1984).

1.3 Archaeological Context

1.3.1 Property Description and Physical Setting

The Study Area measures approximately 1.6ha and occupies three entire subject properties (Figure 4). At the time of the assessment, the Study Area comprised manicured lawn, overgrown lawn, treed areas, three houses, three driveways with parking areas, three sheds, and various sidewalks. The remainder of the Study Area comprises Halton Region Conservation Authority Lands (‘HRCA’) along the northern boundary of the Study Area; this area is restricted from development and therefore was not assessed. The majority of the region surrounding the Study Area has been subject to European-style agricultural practices for over 100 years, having been settled by Euro-Canadian farmers by the mid-19th century. Much of the region today continues to be used for agricultural purposes.

The Study Area is located within the Peel Plain physiographic region (Chapman and Putnam 1984). Peel Plain is a tract of clay soils covering approximately 777 square kilometres across the central portions of the Regional Municipalities of York, Peel and Halton in southern Ontario (Chapman and Putnam 1984). The Peel Plain extends across the contact of the red shales of the Queenston Formation. Within the regional area, the terrain ranges in elevation from a high of 200 metres above sea level (masl) to a low of 194 masl and slopes in a southeasterly direction towards Lake Ontario. The underlying geological material of the plain is a till containing large amounts of shale and limestone.

The closest source of potable water is a tributary of Sixteen Mile Creek, which runs along the northeastern boundary of the Study Area.

1.3.2 Pre-Contact Aboriginal Land Use

This portion of southern Ontario has been demonstrated to have been occupied by people as far back as 11,000 years ago as the glaciers retreated. For the majority of this time, people were practicing hunter gatherer lifestyles with a gradual move towards more extensive farming practices. Table 1 provides a general outline of the cultural chronology of Trafalgar Township, based on Ellis and Ferris (1990).
**Table 1: Cultural Chronology for Trafalgar Township**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Cultural Period</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9500 – 7000 BC</td>
<td>Paleo Indian</td>
<td>first human occupation&lt;br&gt;hunters of caribou and other extinct Pleistocene game&lt;br&gt;nomadic, small band society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7500 - 1000 BC</td>
<td>Archaic</td>
<td>ceremonial burials&lt;br&gt;increasing trade network&lt;br&gt;hunter gatherers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 - 400 BC</td>
<td>Early Woodland</td>
<td>large and small camps&lt;br&gt;spring congregation/fall dispersal&lt;br&gt;introduction of pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 BC – AD 800</td>
<td>Middle Woodland</td>
<td>kinship based political system&lt;br&gt;incipient horticulture&lt;br&gt;long distance trade network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD 800 - 1300</td>
<td>Early Iroquoian (Late Woodland)</td>
<td>limited agriculture&lt;br&gt;developing hamlets and villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD 1300 - 1400</td>
<td>Middle Iroquoian (Late Woodland)</td>
<td>shift to agriculture complete&lt;br&gt;increasing political complexity&lt;br&gt;large palisaded villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD 1400 - 1650</td>
<td>Late Iroquoian</td>
<td>regional warfare and&lt;br&gt;political/tribal alliances&lt;br&gt;destruction of Huron and Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1.3.3 Previous Identified Archaeological Work**

In order to compile an inventory of known archaeological resources in the vicinity of the Study Area, Detritus consulted the ASDB. The ASDB, which is maintained by the MTCS (Government of Ontario n.d.), contains information concerning archaeological sites that have been registered according to the Borden system. Under the Borden system, Canada is divided into grid blocks based on latitude and longitude. A Borden Block is approximately 13 kilometres (km) east to west and approximately 18.5km north to south. Each Borden Block is referenced by a four-letter designator and sites within a block are numbered sequentially as they are found. The Study Area lies within block AjGx.

Information concerning specific site locations is protected by provincial policy and is not fully subject to the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act* (Government of Ontario 1990c). 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. The MTCS 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.

An examination of the ASDB has shown that there are 16 registered archaeological sites within 1km of the Study Area. These include seven post-contact Euro-Canadian sites, five pre-contact Aboriginal sites and two multi-component sites. No information is available for the two remaining sites. For further information see Table 2 below.
To the best of Detritus’ knowledge, no other assessments have been conducted on adjacent properties, nor have sites been registered within 50m of the Study Area.

### 1.3.4 Archaeological Potential

Archaeological potential is established by determining the likelihood that archaeological resources may be present on a subject property. Detritus applied archaeological potential criteria commonly used by the MTCS (Government of Ontario 2011) to determine areas of archaeological potential within Study Area. These variables include proximity to previously identified archaeological sites, distance to various types of water sources, soil texture and drainage, glacial geomorphology, elevated topography, and the general topographic variability of the area.

Distance to modern or ancient water sources is generally accepted as the most important determinant of past human settlement patterns and, considered alone, may result in a determination of archaeological potential. However, any combination of two or more other criteria, such as well-drained soils or topographic variability, may also indicate archaeological potential. When evaluating distance to water it is important to distinguish between water and shoreline, as well as natural and artificial water sources, as these features affect sites locations and types to varying degrees. The MTCS (Government of Ontario 2011) categorizes water sources in the following manner:

- **Primary water sources:** lakes, rivers, streams, creeks;
- **secondary water sources:** intermittent streams and creeks, springs, marshes and swamps;
- **past water sources:** glacial lake shorelines, relic river or stream channels, cobble beaches, shorelines of drained lakes or marshes; and
- **accessible or inaccessible shorelines:** high bluffs, swamp or marshy lake edges, sandbars stretching into marsh.

As was discussed above, the closest source of potable water is a tributary of Sixteen Mile Creek, which runs along the northeastern boundary of the Study Area.

Soil texture is also an important determinant of past settlement, usually in combination with other factors such as topography. The Study Area is situated within the Peel Plain physiographic region. As was discussed earlier, the primary soils within the Study Area, meanwhile, have been documented as being suitable for pre-contact Aboriginal practices. Add to this discussion the presence of five pre-contact Aboriginal site and two multi-component sites within 1km of the Study Area and the Aboriginal archaeological potential is judged to be moderate to high.

For Euro-Canadian sites, archaeological potential can be extended to areas of early Euro-Canadian settlement, including places of military or pioneer settlements; early transportation

### Table 2: Registered Archaeological Sites within 1km

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borden Number</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Affinity</th>
<th>Site Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AjGx-6</td>
<td>Wilmott</td>
<td>Pre-Contact</td>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td>findspot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AjGx-55</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Contact, Pre-Contact</td>
<td>Aboriginal, Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AjGx-57</td>
<td>Thomas Robson</td>
<td>Pre-Contact</td>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td>scatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AjGx-126</td>
<td>Derry Road site</td>
<td>Post-Contact</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AjGx-130</td>
<td>Klein</td>
<td>Post-Contact</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AjGx-136</td>
<td>Paira</td>
<td>Archaic, Post-Contact</td>
<td>Aboriginal, Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>Other, homestead, scatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AjGx-142</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Contact</td>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AjGx-144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AjGx-152</td>
<td>Fitzsimmons Site</td>
<td>Post-Contact</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>scatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AjGx-153</td>
<td>Flying Snake</td>
<td>Pre-Contact</td>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AjGx-163</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Contact</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>midden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AjGx-178</td>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Contact</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AjGx-208</td>
<td>Rose Hill Farm</td>
<td>Post-Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td>homestead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AjGx-209</td>
<td></td>
<td>Archaic, Middle</td>
<td>Aboriginal</td>
<td>hunting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
routes; and properties listed on the municipal register or designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act* (Government of Ontario 1990b) or property that local histories or informants have identified with possible historical events.

The *Historical Atlas* map of Trafalgar Township (Figure 2; Pope 1877), demonstrates that Trafalgar Township was densely occupied by Euro-Canadian farmers by the late 19th century. Much of the established road system and agricultural settlement from that time is still visible today. Considering the proximity of the Study Area to the early Town of Milton as well as the Credit Valley Railroad and Hamilton and North Western Railroad. Add to that the seven post-contact sites, and two multi-component sites and the Euro-Canadian archaeological potential of the Study Area is judged to be moderate to high.

Finally, despite the factors mentioned above, extensive land disturbance can eradicate archaeological potential within a Study Area (Wilson and Horne 1995). Within the current Study Area visible areas of disturbance include, three houses, three driveways with parking areas, three sheds, and various sidewalks. The remainder of the Study Area comprised manicured lawn, overgrown lawn, and treed areas.

Given that no additional disturbance areas could be identified, Detritus determined that the manicured lawn, overgrown lawn, and treed areas within the Study Area demonstrated the potential for the recovery of pre-contact Aboriginal, post-contact Aboriginal, and Euro-Canadian archaeological resources, and was recommended for additional assessment.
### 2.0 Field Methods

The Stage 2 archaeological assessment of the Study Area was conducted on August 2 and September 7, 2018 under archaeological consulting license P017, issued to Mr. Garth Grimes by the MTCS (P017-0666-2018). Assessment conditions were excellent and at no time were the field, weather, or lighting conditions detrimental to the recovery of archaeological material. Photos 1 to 20 demonstrate the land conditions at the time of the survey throughout the Study Area. Figure 3 provides an illustration of the Stage 2 survey methods, as well as all photograph locations and directions. Table 3 provides a summary of the weather and field conditions during the Stage 3 archaeological assessments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Weather</th>
<th>Field Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 2, 2018</td>
<td>sunny, 24°C</td>
<td>soil dry and screens easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 7, 2018</td>
<td>mix of sun and clouds, 20°C</td>
<td>soil dry and screens easily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately 70% of the Study Area comprised manicured lawn, overgrown lawn, and treed areas that were inaccessible for ploughing (Figure 3). These areas were subject to a standard test pit survey at five metre (m) intervals in accordance with Section 2.1.2 of the Standards and Guidelines (Government of Ontario 2011; Photos 1 to 5 and 7 to 19). Test pits were excavated to within 1m of all standing structures as per Section 2.1.2, Standard 4 of the Standards and Guidelines (Government of Ontario 2011). All test pits were approximately 30 centimetres (cm) in diameter and were excavated 5cm into sterile subsoil. The soils were then examined for stratigraphy, cultural features, or evidence of fill. All soil from the test pits was screened through six-millimetre (mm) hardware cloth to facilitate the recovery of small artifacts and then used to backfill the pit. Test pits ranged in depth from 20 to 30cm and contained a single stratigraphic layer; considering that each test was excavated 5cm into sterile subsoil, this observed soil layer ranged in depth from 15 to 25cm. No further archaeological methods were employed since no artifacts were identified during the test pit survey.

Approximately 20% of the Study Area was evaluated as having no or low potential and the identification of extensive land alteration that has severely damaged the integrity of archaeological resources as per Section 2.1, Standards 2b of the Standards and Guidelines (Government of Ontario 2011). These areas of disturbance include three houses, three driveways with parking areas, three sheds, and various sidewalks. These areas were mapped and photo documented (Photos 1 to 6, 12 to 14, 16 and 17) in accordance with Section 2.1, Standard 6 and Section 7.8.1, Standards 1a and 1b of the Standards and Guidelines (Government of Ontario 2011).

The remaining 10% of the Study Area comprised HRCA, which includes a tributary of Sixteen Mile Creek; this land is currently regulated by the Conservation Authorities Act (Government of Ontario 1990c) and falls under the jurisdiction of the HRCA. According to Regulation 169/06 of the Conservation Authorities Act (Government of Ontario 1990c), “permission from the conservation authority is required before any person may: undertake development, straighten, change, divert or interfere in any way with a watercourse, or change or interfere in any way a wetland.” Given that this area is restricted from development, it was not assessed. During the Stage 2 assessment, Detritus engaged in no activities that violated Regulation 169/06 of the Conservation Authorities Act (Government of Ontario 1990c).
3.0 Record of Finds

The Stage 2 archaeological assessment was conducted employing the methods described in Section 2.0. An inventory of the documentary record generated by fieldwork is provided in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Inventory of Document Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document Type</th>
<th>Current Location of Document Type</th>
<th>Additional Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Page of Field Notes</td>
<td>Detritus office</td>
<td>Stored digitally in project file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Map provided by the Proponent</td>
<td>Detritus office</td>
<td>Stored digitally in project file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Field Map</td>
<td>Detritus office</td>
<td>Stored digitally in project file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 Digital Photographs</td>
<td>Detritus office</td>
<td>Stored digitally in project file</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No archaeological resources were identified within the Study Area during the Stage 2 assessment; therefore, no artifacts were collected. As a result, no storage arrangements were required.
4.0 Analysis and Conclusions

Detritus Consulting Ltd. (‘Detritus’) was retained by Bousfields Inc. (‘the Proponent’) to conduct a Stage 1-2 archaeological assessment on part of Lot 11, Concession 3, Geographical Township of Trafalgar, Halton County, Ontario (Figure 1). This assessment was undertaken in advance of a proposed subdivision development at 485, 501 and 511 Ontario Street, Town of Milton (‘Study Area’). The Study Area measures approximately 1.6ha and occupies three entire subject properties (Figure 4). At the time of the assessment, the Study Area comprised manicured lawn, overgrown lawn, treed areas, three houses, three driveways with parking areas, three sheds, and various sidewalks. The remainder of the Study Area comprises Halton Region Conservation Authority (‘HRCA’) lands along the northern boundary of the Study Area; this area is restricted from development and therefore was not assessed. The Study Area was surveyed with stakes by the Proponent prior to the assessment.

The Stage 1 background research indicated that the manicured lawn, overgrown lawn, and treed areas within the Study Area exhibited moderate to high potential for the identification and recovery of archaeological resources. A Stage 2 assessment was recommended for these areas.

The subsequent Stage 2 assessment of the Study Area was conducted on August 2 and September 7, 2018. This investigation consisted of a standard test pit survey at five metre intervals across the manicured lawn, overgrown lawn, and treed areas; the assessment resulted in the identification and documentation of no archaeological resources. The remainder of the Study Area was determined to be previously disturbed comprising three houses, three driveways with parking areas, three sheds, and various sidewalks. These areas were mapped and photo documented in accordance with Section 2.1 Standard 6 and Section 7.8.1, Standards 1a and 1b of the Standards and Guidelines (Government of Ontario 2011).
5.0 Recommendations

Given the results of the Stage 2 assessment, wherein no archaeological material was encountered, **no further archaeological assessment of the Study Area is recommended.**
6.0 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 \textit{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 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 \textit{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 \textit{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 \textit{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 \textit{Ontario Heritage Act}.
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8.0 Maps

Figure 1: Study Area

Scale 1:30 000

Base Map Reference
Last accessed: October 10, 2018
Stage 1-2, 485, 501, and 511 Ontario Street, Town of Milton

Figure 2: Portion of the 1877 Historical Atlas Map of Trafalgar Township

Base Map/Reference
Plate 6 in 1877, The Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Halton, Ont., Walker & Miles, Toronto.
Figure 3: Stage 2 Survey Methods
Stage 1-2, 485, 501, and 511 Ontario Street, Town of Milton

Figure 4: Development Map

Detritus Consulting Ltd.
9.0 Images

Photo 1: Manicured Lawn Test Pit Surveyed at 5m intervals; Previously Disturbed, House and Driveway Not Assessed facing northeast

Photo 2: Manicured Lawn Test Pit Surveyed at 5m intervals; Previously Disturbed, House and Driveway Not Assessed facing northwest

Photo 3: Overgrown Lawn Test Pit Surveyed at 5m intervals; Previously Disturbed House Not Assessed, facing northeast

Photo 4: Overgrown Lawn Test Pit Surveyed at 5m intervals; Previously Disturbed Driveway and Shed Not Assessed, facing northeast

Photo 5: Overgrown Lawn Test Pit Surveyed at 5m intervals; Previously Disturbed House, Driveway and Parking Area Not Assessed, facing northwest

Photo 6: Previously Disturbed House and Parking Area Not Assessed, facing southwest
Stage 1-2, 485, 501, and 511 Ontario Street, Town of Milton

Photo 7: Treed Area Test Pit Surveyed at 5m intervals, facing northwest

Photo 8: Treed Area Test Pit Surveyed at 5m intervals, facing west

Photo 9: Treed Area Test Pit Surveyed at 5m intervals, facing northwest

Photo 10: Manicured Lawn Test Pit Surveyed at 5m intervals, facing southwest

Photo 11: Manicured Lawn Test Pit Surveyed at 5m intervals, facing northwest

Photo 12: Treed Area Test Pit Surveyed at 5m intervals; Previously Disturbed Shed Not Assessed, facing northeast
Stage 1-2, 485, 501, and 511 Ontario Street, Town of Milton

Photo 13: Manicured Lawn Test Pit Surveyed at 5m intervals; Previously Disturbed House Not Assessed, facing southeast

Photo 14: Treed Area Test Pit Surveyed at 5m intervals; Previously Disturbed Shed Not Assessed, facing southwest

Photo 15: Manicured Lawn Test Pit Surveyed at 5m intervals, facing northeast

Photo 16: Manicured Lawn Test Pit Surveyed at 5m intervals, facing northeast

Photo 17: Manicured Lawn Test Pit Surveyed at 5m intervals, facing southwest

Photo 18: Manicured Lawn Test Pit Surveyed at 5m intervals, facing southeast
Photo 19: Manicured Lawn Test Pit
Surveyed at 5m intervals, facing northeast

Photo 20: HRCA Lands Including a Tributary of Sixteen Mile Creek, facing northwest