

Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Eglinton East Light Rail Transit TPAP and Design Update – 10% Design (Various Lots and Concessions, Geographical Scarborough Township, County of York) City of Toronto

Original Report

Prepared for:

HDR

100 York Boulevard Suite 300
Richmond Hill ON L4B 1J8

Archaeological Licence: P094 (Merritt)
PIF P094-0367-2023
Archaeological Services Inc. File: 21EA-120

11 April 2024



Executive Summary

Archaeological Services Inc. was contracted by HDR, on behalf of the City of Toronto, to conduct a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (Background Research and Property Inspection) as part of the Eglinton East Light Rail Transit Project Assessment Process and Design Update. The Eglinton East Light Rail Transit is a distinct service built to purpose, extending from Kennedy Station to Sheppard-McCowan and Malvern Town Centre and includes 27 stops, three connections to GO Transit (Kennedy, Eglinton and Guildwood) and a connection to the proposed Durham-Scarborough Bus Rapid Transit. We understand that the Scarborough Malvern LRT Environmental Assessment is the predecessor for the Eglinton East LRT project, for which ASI conducted a Cultural Heritage Assessment Report and a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment.

The Study Area includes the proposed 10% Design footprint, as well as a proposed maintenance storage facility property footprint, proposed stops, and traction power substations.

The Stage 1 background research for the proposed 10% Design footprint Study Area determined 18 previously registered archaeological sites are located within one kilometre of the Study Area, two of which are within approximately 50 metres and do not exhibit further cultural heritage value or interest.

The following is a summary of the recommendations:

- 1) Parts of the Study Area exhibit archaeological potential at 3739 Kingston Road, 3741 Kingston Road, 38 Warnsworth Street, 3295 Ellesmere Road, 3295 Ellesmere Road, 7600 Sheppard Avenue East, 1085 Neilson Road, 10 Tapscott Road and TPSS 375177. If impacted by project designs, these properties require Stage 2 archaeological assessment, prior to any proposed construction activities on these lands.
- 2) The remainder of the Study Area does not retain archaeological potential on account of deep and extensive land disturbance, slopes in excess of 20 degrees, or being previously assessed (P131-0121-2019, P392-0096-2014,



P057-507-2008, P007-0700-2015, P362-0313-2021, P123-007-2010). These lands do not require further archaeological assessment; and,

- 3) Should the proposed work extend beyond the current Study Area, further archaeological assessment should be conducted to determine the archaeological potential of the surrounding lands.



Project Personnel

- **Senior Project Manager:** Lisa Merritt, MSc. (P094) Partner, Director, Environmental Assessment Division
- **Project Manager:** Eliza Brandy, MA (R1109), Associate Archaeologist, Project Manager, Environmental Assessment Division
- **Project Director:** Lisa Merritt
- **Division Coordinator:** Katrina Thach, BA Hons. (R1225), Associate Archaeologist, Assistant Manager, Environmental Assessment Division
- **Project Administrator:** Catherine Kitchen, BA, Archaeologist, Project Administrator, Environmental Assessment Division
- **Field Director:** Eliza Brandy; Kirstyn Allam, BA Hons. (R1258), Cultural Heritage Assistant, Cultural Heritage Division
- **Report Preparation:** Eliza Brandy, Laura Burke, BA Hons. (R1113), Associate Archaeologist, Technical Writer and Researcher, Environmental Assessment Division
- **Graphics:** Jonas Fernandez, MSc (R281), Lead Archaeologist, Manager - Geomatics, Operations Division
- **Report Review:** Eliza Brandy, Lisa Merritt



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	2
Project Personnel	4
Table of Contents	5
1.0 Project Context	10
1.1 Development Context	11
1.1.1 Treaties	12
1.2 Historical Context	14
1.2.1 Indigenous Land Use and Settlement	14
1.2.2 Post-Contact Settlement	16
1.2.3 Map Review	21
1.2.4 Aerial and Orthoimagery Review	23
1.3 Archaeological Context	25
1.3.1 Geography	25
1.3.2 Previously Registered Archaeological Sites	27
1.3.3 Previous Archaeological Assessments	31
2.0 Property Inspection	36
2.1 Field Methods	36
2.2 Current Land Use and Field Conditions	37
3.0 Analysis of Archaeological Potential	41
3.1 Conclusions	44
4.0 Recommendations	45
5.0 Legislation Compliance Advice	46
6.0 Bibliography and Sources	47
7.0 Images	56
7.1 Field Photography	56
7.2 Historical Imagery	69
8.0 Maps	79



Appendix A: Select Previous LRT Assessment Results Mapping 102

List of Images

Image 1: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	57
Image 2: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	57
Image 3: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	57
Image 4: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	57
Image 5: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	58
Image 6: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	58
Image 7: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	58
Image 8: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	58
Image 9: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	59
Image 10: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	59
Image 11: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	59
Image 12: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	59
Image 13: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	60
Image 14: Stage 2 Survey required south of ROW	60
Image 15: Stage 2 Survey required in eastern parking lot	60
Image 16: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	60
Image 17: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	61
Image 18: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	61
Image 19: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	61
Image 20: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	61
Image 21: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	62
Image 22: Disturbed within TPSS 82050 and 116402	62
Image 23: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	62
Image 24: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	62
Image 25: Stage 2 Survey required on private lawn	63
Image 26: Disturbed within TPSS 479208	63
Image 27: Disturbed within the Study Area	63
Image 28: Stage 2 Survey required south of ROW	63
Image 29: Disturbed within TPSS U – 338	64
Image 30: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	64
Image 31: Disturbed within TPSS 371747	64



Image 32: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	64
Image 33: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	65
Image 34: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	65
Image 35: Disturbed within TPSS 116363	65
Image 36: Disturbed	65
Image 37: Disturbed	66
Image 38: Stage 2 Survey required north of ROW	66
Image 39: Disturbed within TPSS 44148	66
Image 40: Disturbed	66
Image 41: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	67
Image 42: Sloped towards East Highland Creek south of ROW	67
Image 43: Disturbed within TPSS 224746	67
Image 44: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	67
Image 45: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	68
Image 46: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	68
Image 47: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	68
Image 48: Disturbed beyond previously assessed areas	68
Image 49: 1961 Aerial Kingston Road at Eglinton Avenue and Scarborough Golf Club Road	69
Image 50: 1971 Aerial Kingston Road from Galloway Road to Poplar Road	70
Image 51: 1973 Aerial Kingston Road from Galloway Road to Poplar Road	71
Image 52: 1963 Aerial Morningside Bridge construction	72
Image 53: 1965 Aerial Morningside Bridge construction	73
Image 54: 1991 Aerial Morningside Avenue and Highway 401	74
Image 55: 2009 Google StreetView of 891 Morningside Avenue and Hydro corridor, location of TPSS U – 338.	75
Image 56: 2011 Google StreetView of 891 Morningside Avenue and Hydro corridor, location of TPSS U – 338.	75
Image 57: 1970 Aerial Sheppard Avenue from Morningside Avenue to Conlins Road	76
Image 58: 1975 Aerial Neilson Road and surrounding subdivisions at Sheppard Avenue	77
Image 59: 1975 Aerial Neilson Road and surrounding subdivisions at Sheppard Avenue	77



Image 60: 1981 Aerial of TPSS Site 44148 east of Neilson Road and north of Sewells Road	78
---	----

List of Figures

Figure 1: Eglinton East LRT Existing Conditions Study Area	79
Figure 2: Study Area overlaid on the 1860 York County map	80
Figure 3: Study Area overlaid on the 1878 Scarborough Township map	81
Figure 4: Study Area Overlaid on the 1914/1915 Toronto and Markham topographic maps	82
Figure 5: Study Area on 1954 Aerial Photography	83
Figure 6: Study Area on 1992 Aerial Photography	84
Figure 7: Study Area – Surficial Geology	85
Figure 8: Study Area – Soil Drainage	86
Figure 9: Stage 1 Results - Kennedy Station to Brimley Road	87
Figure 10: Stage 1 Results - Brimley Road to Torrance Road	88
Figure 11: Stage 1 Results - Eglinton Avenue East from Torrance Road to Markham Road	89
Figure 12: Stage 1 Results - Eglinton Avenue East at Markham Road to Kingston Road at Guildwood Parkway	90
Figure 13: Stage 1 Results - Kingston Road from Guildwood Parkway to Guildwood GO Station	91
Figure 14: Stage 1 Results - Kingston Road from Guildwood GO Station to Lawrence Avenue East	92
Figure 15: Stage 1 Results - Kingston Road from Lawrence Avenue East to Morningside Avenue at Highland Creek	93
Figure 16: Stage 1 Results - Morningside Avenue from the bridge over Highland Creek to the Pan Am Sports Centre	94
Figure 17: Stage 1 Results - Pan Am Sports Centre to Morningside Avenue and Sheppard Avenue East	95
Figure 18: Stage 1 Results - Sheppard Avenue East to the Maintenance Storage Facility	96
Figure 19: Stage 1 Results - Sheppard Avenue East Brenyon Way to west of Neilson Road	97



Figure 20: Stage 1 Results - Neilson Road from Sheppard Avenue East to McLevin Avenue	98
Figure 21: Stage 1 Results - Sheppard Avenue East from west of Neilson Road to Progress Avenue	99
Figure 22: Stage 1 Results - Sheppard Avenue from Progress Avenue to Havenview Road	100
Figure 23: Stage 1 Results - Sheppard Avenue from Havenview Road to west of McCowan Road	101



1.0 Project Context

Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) was contracted by HDR, on behalf of the City of Toronto, to conduct a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (Background Research and Property Inspection) as part of the Eglinton East Light Rail Transit (EELRT) Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP) and Design Update.

The EELRT is a distinct service built to purpose, extending from Kennedy Station to Sheppard-McCowan and Malvern Town Centre and includes 27 stops, three connections to GO Transit (Kennedy, Eglinton and Guildwood) and connection to the proposed Durham-Scarborough Bus Rapid Transit. We understand that the Scarborough Malvern LRT Environmental Assessment is the predecessor for the EELRT project, for which ASI conducted a Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (ASI 2009a) and a Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (ASI 2009d P057-569-2009).

The Study Area includes the proposed 10% Design footprint beginning from Kennedy GO and TTC Station, running along Eglinton Avenue, Kingston Road, Morningside Avenue, Ellesmere Avenue, Military Trail, around University of Toronto Scarborough, and along Sheppard Avenue East to Sheppard Station. The Study Area also includes a section west of Morningside Avenue north of Warnsworth Street, and along Neilson Road to Malvern Town Centre, as well as a proposed maintenance storage facility (MSF) property footprint north of Sheppard Avenue East. Proposed stops are included on the report mapping but represent approximate locations only and not project footprints.

In the current project design there are 16 traction power substations (TPSS) which are standalone at-grade structures whose guideway feed points are collected within a radius of approximately 150 metres of a Station/Stop. Each TPSS footprint is estimated to be 45 metres by 15 metres (675 square metres), inclusive of the 26 metre by 10 metre TPSS structure, vehicle parking, and access road. The TPSS locations are subject to future design changes based on the results of a future load flow study which helps determine energy requirements.

The 16 TPSS locations assessed in this report are as follows:



- TPSS 8122 at 2730 Eglinton Avenue East
- TPSS U-108 at 119 Bellamy Road North
- TPSS U-144 and TPSS U-145 are adjacent to each other within Eglinton Avenue East and a nearby greenspace northwest of Kingston Road.
- TPSS at 4071 Kingston Road
- TPSS 116402 at 4165 Lawrence Avenue East and TPSS 82050 at 4411 Kingston Road.
- TPSS 479208 at 344 Morningside Avenue
- TPSS 375177 at 3295 Ellesmere Road
- TPSS 371747 at 7601 Sheppard Avenue East
- TPSS U – 338 at 891 Morningside Avenue
- TPSS 116363 at 6705 Sheppard Avenue East
- TPSS 44148 at 1301 Neilson Road
- TPSS 224746 at 10 Washburn Way
- TPSS 188879 at 5085 Sheppard Avenue East
- TPSS 302035 at 1715 McCowan Road

All activities carried out during this assessment were completed in accordance with the *Ontario Heritage Act* (1990, as amended in 2023) and the 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists (S & G)*, administered by the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM 2011).

1.1 Development Context

This Project was conducted following recommendations made under now approved TPAP undertaken for this project, under *Ontario Regulation 231/08 - Transit Projects and Metrolinx Undertakings*.

The *Master Plan of Archaeological Resources of the City of Toronto (Interim Report)* (ASI et al., 2004) was also consulted.

Authorization to carry out the activities necessary for the completion of the Stage 1 archaeological assessment and property inspection was granted by HDR on April 11, 2023.



1.1.1 Treaties

The Study Area is within the Johnson-Butler Purchases and in the traditional and treaty territory of the Michi Saagiig and Chippewa Nations, collectively known as the Williams Treaties First Nations, including the Mississaugas of Alderville First Nation, Curve Lake First Nation, Hiawatha First Nation, Scugog Island First Nation and the Chippewas of Beausoleil First Nation, Georgina Island First Nation and the Rama First Nation (Williams Treaties First Nations, 2017).

The Study Area is also within the active Rouge River Valley Tract Claim, filed in 2015 by the Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation. The Mississaugas of the Credit were not signatories to the Williams Treaty and claim unextinguished title to their traditional territories within the southern part of the Rouge River Valley (Fullerton & Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation, 2015; Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation, 2018).

The purpose of the Johnson-Butler Purchases of 1787/1788 was to acquire from the Mississaugas the Carrying Place Trail and lands along the north shore of Lake Ontario from the Trent River to Etobicoke Creek.

As part of the Johnson-Butler Purchases, the British signed a treaty, sometimes referred to as the “Gunshot Treaty” with the Mississaugas in 1787 covering the north shore of Lake Ontario, beginning at the eastern boundary of the Toronto Purchase and continuing east to the Bay of Quinte, where it meets the Crawford Purchase. It was referred to as the “Gunshot Treaty” because it covered the land as far back from the lake as a person could hear a gunshot. Compensation for the land apparently included “approximately £2,000 and goods such as muskets, ammunition, tobacco, laced hats and enough red cloth for 12 coats” (Surtees, 1984, pp. 37–45). First discussions about acquiring this land are said to have come about while the land ceded in the Toronto Purchase of 1787 was being surveyed and paid for (Surtees, 1984, pp. 37–45). During this meeting with the Mississaugas, Sir John Johnson and Colonel John Butler proposed the purchase of lands east of the Toronto Purchase (Fullerton & Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation, 2015). However, descriptions of the treaty differ between the British and Mississaugas, including the depth of the boundaries: “Rice Lake and Lake Simcoe, located about 13 miles and 48 miles north of Lake Ontario,



respectively, were not mentioned as landmarks in the First Nations' description of the lands to be ceded. Additionally, original descriptions provided by the Chiefs of Rice Lake indicate a maximum depth of ten miles, versus an average of 15-16 miles in Colonel Butler's description" (Fullerton & Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation, 2015).

However, records of the acquisition were not clear regarding the extent of lands agreed upon (Surtees, 1984, pp. 37–45). To clarify this, in October and November of 1923, the governments of Canada and Ontario, chaired by A.S. Williams, signed treaties with the Chippewa and Michi Saagiig for three large tracts of land in central Ontario and the northern shore of Lake Ontario, the last substantial portion of land in southern Ontario that had not yet been ceded to the government (Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs, 2013).

The Williams Treaties were signed on October 31 and November 15, 1923 by representatives of the Mississaugas of Alderville First Nation, Curve Lake First Nation, Hiawatha First Nation, Scugog Island First Nation and the Chippewas of Beausoleil First Nation, Georgina Island First Nation and the Rama First Nation. The purpose of the treaties was to address lands that had not been surrendered through previous treaties and no negotiations preceded the signing of the Williams Treaties in 1923, with a commission established by the Federal and Provincial governments led by Treaty Commissioner A. S. Williams.

Through the Williams Treaties, the Crown received three tracts of land occupying approximately 52,000 square kilometres of land. The territory covered by the Williams Treaties stretched from the northern shore of Lake Ontario between Trent River and the Don River to Lake Simcoe and the eastern shore of Georgian Bay to the French River and Lake Nipissing and was bounded to the north and east by the Ottawa River. Specifically, the Williams Treaties include lands originally covered by the John Collins Purchase (1785), the Johnson-Butler Purchase (1787), the Rice Lake Purchase (Treaty #20 – 1818), and the Robinson-Huron Treaty (Treaty #61 – 1850). In exchange, the signing nations received a one-time payment of \$25 for each band member as well as \$233,425.00 to be divided amongst the four Mississauga nations and \$233,375.00 to be divided amongst the three Chippewa nations. However,



records of the acquisition were not clear on the extent of lands agreed upon (Surtees, 1984, pp. 37–45).

However, the seven signatory nations claimed that the original terms of the treaty were not honoured when it was written by the Crown, which included the right to fish and hunt within the treaty lands and did not include the islands along the Trent River (Surtees, 1986; Williams Treaties First Nations, 2017). In 1992, the seven Williams Treaties First Nations filed a lawsuit against the federal government — Alderville Indian Band et al v. Her Majesty the Queen et al — seeking compensation for the 1923 land surrenders and harvesting rights. This case went to trial in 2012 and in September 2018 the Federal and Provincial governments announced that they had successfully reached a settlement with the seven member nations. The settlement includes financial compensation of \$1.11 billion to be divided amongst the nations as well as an entitlement for each First Nation to add up to 11,000 acres to their reserve lands and the recognition by the Crown of the First Nation’s Treaty rights to harvest on Crown lands within the treaty territories (Government of Canada, 2018).

1.2 Historical Context

1.2.1 Indigenous Land Use and Settlement

Current archaeological evidence indicates that southern Ontario has been occupied by human populations since the retreat of the Laurentide glacier approximately 13,000 years before present (B.P.) (Ferris, 2013). Populations at this time would have been highly mobile, inhabiting a boreal-parkland similar to the modern sub-arctic. By approximately 10,000 B.P., the environment had progressively warmed (Edwards & Fritz, 1988) and populations now occupied less extensive territories (Ellis & Deller, 1990).

Between approximately 10,000-5,500 B.P., the Great Lakes basins experienced low-water levels, and many sites which would have been located on those former shorelines are now submerged. This period produces the earliest evidence of heavy wood working tools, an indication of greater investment of labour in felling trees for fuel, to build shelter, and watercraft production. These activities suggest prolonged seasonal residency at occupation sites. Polished



stone and native copper implements were being produced by approximately 8,000 B.P.; the latter was acquired from the north shore of Lake Superior, evidence of extensive exchange networks throughout the Great Lakes region. The earliest archaeological evidence for cemeteries dates to approximately 4,500-3,000 B.P. and is interpreted by archaeologists to be indicative of increased social organization, investment of labour into social infrastructure, and the establishment of socially prescribed territories (J. Brown, 1995, p. 13; Ellis et al., 1990, 2009).

Between 3,000-2,500 B.P., populations continued to practice residential mobility and to harvest seasonally available resources, including spawning fish. The Woodland period begins around 2,500 B.P. and exchange and interaction networks broaden at this time (Spence et al., 1990, pp. 136, 138) and by approximately 2,000 B.P., evidence exists for small community camps, focusing on the seasonal harvesting of resources (Spence et al., 1990, pp. 155, 164). By 1,500 B.P. there is macro botanical evidence for maize in southern Ontario, and it is thought that maize only supplemented people's diet. There is earlier phytolith evidence for maize in central New York State by 2,300 B.P. – it is likely that once similar analyses are conducted on Ontario ceramic vessels of the same period, the same evidence will be found (Birch & Williamson, 2013, pp. 13–15). As is evident in detailed Anishinaabek ethnographies, winter was a period during which some families would depart from the larger group as it was easier to sustain smaller populations (Rogers, 1962). It is generally understood that these populations were Algonquian-speakers during these millennia of settlement and land use.

From the beginning of the Late Woodland period at approximately 1,000 B.P., lifeways became more similar to that described in early historical documents. Between approximately 1000-1300 Common Era (C.E.), larger settlement sites focused on horticulture begin to dominate the archaeological record. Seasonal disintegration of the community for the exploitation of a wider territory and more varied resource base was still practised (Williamson, 1990, p. 317). By 1300-1450 C.E., archaeological research focusing on these horticultural societies note that this episodic community disintegration was no longer practised and these populations now communally occupied sites throughout the year (Dodd et



al., 1990, p. 343). By the mid-sixteenth century these small villages had coalesced into larger communities (Birch et al., 2021). Through this process, the socio-political organization of these First Nations, as described historically by the French and English explorers who first visited southern Ontario, was developed. Other First Nation communities continued to practice residential mobility and to harvest available resources across landscapes they returned to seasonally/annually.

By 1600 C.E., the Confederation of Nations were encountered by the first European explorers and missionaries in Simcoe County. In the 1640s, devastating epidemics and the traditional enmity between the Haudenosaunee and the Huron-Wendat (and their Algonquian allies such as the Nipissing and Odawa) led to their dispersal from southern Ontario. Shortly afterwards, the Haudenosaunee established a series of settlements at strategic locations along the trade routes inland from the north shore of Lake Ontario. By the 1690s however, the Anishinaabeg were the only communities with a permanent presence in southern Ontario. From the beginning of the eighteenth century to the assertion of British sovereignty in 1763, there was no interruption to Anishinaabeg control and use of southern Ontario.

1.2.2 Post-Contact Settlement

Historically, the Study Area is located in part of Lots 28 – 17, Concession C; Lots 27 – 11, Concession D; Lots 11 – 9, Concession 1; Lots 23 – 9, Concession 2; and Lots 23 – 9, Concession 3 in the former Township of Scarborough, County of York.

The S & G stipulates that areas of early Euro-Canadian settlement (pioneer homesteads, isolated cabins, farmstead complexes), early wharf or dock complexes, pioneer churches, and early cemeteries are considered to have archaeological potential. Early historical transportation routes (trails, passes, roads, railways, portage routes), properties listed on a municipal register or designated under the Ontario Heritage Act or a federal, provincial, or municipal historic landmark or site are also considered to have archaeological potential.



For the Euro-Canadian period, the majority of early nineteenth century farmsteads (i.e., those that are arguably the most potentially significant resources and whose locations are rarely recorded on nineteenth century maps) are likely to be located in proximity to water. The development of the network of concession roads and railroads through the course of the nineteenth century frequently influenced the siting of farmsteads and businesses. Accordingly, undisturbed lands within 100 metres of an early settlement road are also considered to have potential for the presence of Euro-Canadian archaeological sites.

The first Europeans to arrive in the area were transient merchants and traders from France and England, who followed Indigenous pathways and set up trading posts at strategic locations along the well-traveled river routes. All of these occupations occurred at sites that afforded both natural landfalls and convenient access, by means of the various waterways and overland trails, into the hinterlands. Early transportation routes followed existing Indigenous trails, both along the lakeshore and adjacent to various creeks and rivers (ASI 2006). Early European settlements occupied similar locations as Indigenous settlements as they were generally accessible by trail or water routes and would have been in locations with good soil and suitable topography to ensure adequate drainage.

Throughout the period of initial European settlement, Indigenous groups continued to fish, gather, and hunt within their traditional and treaty territories, albeit often with legal and informal restrictions imposed by colonial authorities and settlers. In many cases, Indigenous peoples acted as guides and teachers, passing on their traditional knowledge to settlers, allowing them to sustain themselves in their new homes. Indigenous peoples entered into economic arrangements and partnerships, and often inter-married with settlers. However, pervasive and systemic oppression and marginalization of Indigenous peoples also characterized Euro-Canadian colonization, with thousands being displaced from their lands, denied access to traditional and treaty hunting, fishing, and collecting grounds, and forced to assimilate with Euro-Canadian culture through mandatory attendance at Day and Residential Schools (Ray, 2005; Rogers & Smith, 1994).



Sites on the Rouge River and Duffins Creek were critical locations for the Michi Saagiig. Duffin's Creek and Frenchman's Bay were integral to seasonal harvesting rounds and would have involved considerable interaction with settlers in the eighteenth century as they were situated on critical transportation routes to the north. Alexander Henry, a Northwest Company fur trader and merchant, for example, visited with the Michi Saagiig in 1764 and in his published account describes villages along the Humber and Rouge Rivers (Henry & Gough, 1992). There is also a 1779 account by Walter Butler, son of Loyalist commander John Butler, of an expedition to Pine Wood Creek where the trader Duffin had resided, and where Frenchmen had wintered (Duffins Creek, just East of Frenchman's Bay). Bulter noted the creek was "famous with the Indians for great quantities of fish" (Kenney, 1920).

1.2.2.1 Scarborough Township

The township of Scarborough, originally called Glasgow Township, was partially laid out to the east of the township of York. Beginning in 1791, Augustus Jones surveyed the new township, and a baseline was laid out. The early survey of the township was found to be faulty and carelessly done, resulting in numerous lawsuits among property owners. To remedy this situation, a new survey of the township was undertaken under F.F. Passmore in 1864 to correct and confirm the township concession lines. In August 1793, Mrs. Simcoe noted in her diary that she and her party "came within sight of what is named in the Map the high lands of Toronto—the shore is extremely bold and has the appearance of Chalk Cliffs... they appeared so well that we talked of building a Summer Residence there and calling it Scarborough" (Bonis 1968:38). The first land grants were patented in Scarborough in 1796, and were issued to Loyalists, high ranking Upper Canadian government officials, and some absentee Loyalist grantees. Among the first landowners were: Captain William Mayne (1796); David Thomson (1801); Captain John McGill (1797); Captain William Demont (1798); John McDougall (1802); Sheriff Alexander McDonell (1806); and Donald McLean, clerk of the House of Assembly (1805).

The Euro-Canadian settlement of Scarborough remained slow, and in 1802 there were just 89 settlers in the Township. In 1803, the township contained just one



assessable house and no grist or sawmills. The livestock was limited to five horses, eight oxen, 27 milch cows, seven “horned cattle” and 15 swine. In 1809 the population had increased to 140 men, women and children. The settlement and improvement of the township was aided when the Danforth Road was constructed across the township but was checked in 1812 with the outbreak of the war. By 1819, new settlement was augmented by settlers from Britain, Scotland and Ireland, but the population remained low at just 349 inhabitants (Bonis 1968:52).

1.2.2.2 Washington United (Methodist) Church

A frame church was first built in 1838, although one account dates its construction to 1842 (ASI 2007a, p. 18) on part of Lot 16, Concession C at Scarborough Golf Club Road on the south side of Kingston Road. The land for the church and associated burial ground was donated to the congregation by the Annis family. The church was named in honour of Stephen Washington, a local farmer who settled on Lot 22, Concession C in 1824, who was a ‘generous donor’ of money to the building subscription. A polychrome brick church was later erected to replace it in 1885. An associated cemetery was formerly part of the Annis family burial ground and was used as early as 1824, located approximately 200 metres south on Scarborough Golf Club Road (Bonis, 1968, pp. 39, 84–85; Boyle, 1896, p. 57; R. Brown, 1997, p. 103). The extant Scarborough Bluffs United Church was constructed in 1960.

1.2.2.3 Highland Creek

One of the first settlers at Highland Creek was William Knowles, who is said to have established a smithy here in 1802. His son, Daniel Knowles, opened the first general store in the village. The first mill in the village was built by William Cornell in 1804. This structure was razed by fire but was replaced with a gristmill on the same site by William Helliwell in 1847. This structure also burned in 1880 (Brown 1997; MPLS #147).

Highland Creek was established as a post office on July 6, 1852, with William Chamberlain as the first postmaster. The office was rocked by scandal in 1856, when the second postmaster, John Page, absconded. The post office is still in



operation although its name has been changed to the West Hill sub postal outlet #2. The community once contained four stores, two hotels and two gristmills, with a total population of approximately 500 inhabitants (Crossby 1873:144). By 1885, it was described as a “considerable village” with a population of about 600 (Mulvany et al. 1885:112). By the late 1890s, it contained three churches representing Catholics, Methodists and Presbyterians (Boyle, 1896).

The village was primarily centred around the intersection of Kingston Road and the Military Trail on either side of Highland Creek. The main concentration of settlement here was focused on part of Lots 6, 7 and 8 in Concession 1 on land owned by William Helliwell. The central portion of the village, located on Lot 7, was formally subdivided into 15 large building lots by a plan prepared in January 1855 (R. Brown, 1997). At that time, a cooper’s shop stood in the apex of land on the west side of the intersection of Kingston Road and the Military Trail, and a dwelling house was located south of Kingston Road on the east side of Morrish.

Local tradition relates that during the 1860s, approximately 150 local businessmen and speculators formed an oil drilling company along Highland Creek. The only oil discovered here was a small amount that a prankster poured into the rig one night, although a salt deposit was discovered during the drilling operation.

1.2.2.4 Malvern Village

The former village of Malvern is located within the Study Area and was centred on the intersection of Sheppard Avenue East and Markham Road. Prior to 1850, the intersection of Lansing Road (now Sheppard Avenue) and Markham Road was known as Malcolm’s Corners. John and Robert Malcolm operated the Speed the Plough Inn and a harness shop adjacent to their home on the southwest corner of the intersection. Later known as Malvern, the community also included the neighbouring farming community north of what is now Highway 401 (Scarborough Historical Society, n.d.).

In 1857, Senator David Reesor laid out a plan for Malvern village. A local legend states that Reesor needed an attractive name and “having heard from locals of a



nearby spring which had waters with curative powers, Reesor gave it the name of Malvern, after a place in England which also reputedly had ‘magic waters’” (R. Brown, 1997, p. 129).

Malvern Village was laid out in a slightly larger scale and employed a more formal grid system for streets compared to other contemporaneous village developments in Scarborough. The village contained 195 building lots and eight streets. The streets which ran east-west through the village were named Adelaide, Queen, King, Victoria and Scarborough. The north-south streets were Markham, Wallace, and Malvern. Of these historic streets Malvern Street remains.

A post office was established in Malvern on October 1, 1856 with David Brown as the first postmaster. The settlement grew slowly and contained a hotel and store with a total population of approximately 125 residents (Crossby, 1873, p. 184). It is also said to have contained a church, two stores, two blacksmiths, a wagon shop, Badgerow’s woolen factory, and two hotels (R. Brown, 1997, p. 129). Malvern contained “the largest public hall” in the township with seating for 1,000 people. As a result it was frequently used for meetings, lectures, concerts and dances. The basement was home of the ice rink for the Scarborough Curling Club (Boyle, 1896, p. 226). It survived as a community landmark into the 1970s when it was destroyed in a blaze (R. Brown, 1997). In 1911, the Canadian Northern Railway built a new line of track through Scarborough, and a new two-story wooden station was built at Malvern. This railway failed. The assets were absorbed by the Canadian National Railway and the line was closed (R. Brown, 1997). In the 1950s, a new Malvern began to take shape. Vast amounts of farmland north east of the old historic village were expropriated and transformed into a densely populated modern community (Scarborough Historical Society, n.d.).

1.2.3 Map Review

The 1860 *Map of the County of York* (Tremaine, 1860), and the 1878 *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of York* (Miles & Co., 1878) were examined to determine the presence of historical features within the Study Area during the nineteenth century (Figure 2 and Figure 3). Early twentieth-century topographic



mapping (Department of Militia and Defence, 1914, 1915)¹ was also examined (Figure 4).

Nineteenth-century mapping depicts the Study Area within mostly a rural agricultural context. Both the 1859 and 1878 maps show the Study Area traveling through the villages of Scarboro and Malvern, with the villages of Highland Creek and Agincourt outside of the Study Area limits. Much of the land has been subdivided into large lots, with many of them containing a residence by the 1878 map. The maps demonstrate that Eglinton Avenue East, Kingston Road, Morningside Avenue, Ellesmere Road, and Sheppard Avenue East were historically surveyed roads, as were Danforth Road, Lawrence Avenue East, and Military Trail, along with other present-day major north-south roads which intersect with the Study Area. Many of the roads following a similar alignment to their present orientation, with the exception that Morningside Avenue diverts to the west around Highland Creek. The Grand Trunk Railway transect the Study Area at Eglinton Avenue East and Kingston Road, around the village of Scarboro on the 1859 map. By 1878, the Toronto & Nipissing Railway has been constructed and intersects with the western terminus of the Study Area at the southern end. The Highland Creek watercourse is depicted with a general east-west orientation as it intersects the Study Area at Morningside Avenue to the north of Kingston Road. TPSS 224746 is adjacent to an arm of East Highland Creek, north of Sheppard Avenue East, on all mapping. A tributary of the Rouge River transects the northeastern portion of the Study Area along Sheppard Avenue East and at Morningside Avenue.

The 1914-1915 topographic maps show that Eglinton Avenue East is a metalled roadway and is in a similar alignment to earlier mapping. Many of the residences which were on the earlier mapping are now identified as either wooden structures (black squares) or stone/brick (red squares). There are six bridges carrying Eglinton Avenue East over tributaries of Highland Creek. The Toronto & Nipissing Railway is now labelled as the Grand Trunk Railway (Midland Division). TPSS 8122 is located just north of the Grand Trunk Railway line. Kingston Road is also a metalled roadway, following in a similar alignment to earlier mapping.

¹ The georeferencing of these topographic maps resulted in a slight offset of the Study Area. It should be presumed to continue following the roadways in the northern Markham sheet.



There is one bridge along Kingston Road over a tributary of Highland Creek. Now depicted on the mapping, the Toronto and York Radial Railway is illustrated parallel to the alignment of Kingston Road. TPSS U-144, TPSS U-145, TPSS 464247, TPSS 82050 and TPSS 116402 are parallel to this railway line.

Morningside Avenue is an unmetalled roadway that is no longer depicted as crossing the Highland Creek valley. To the south of Sheppard Avenue East, a bridge carries Morningside Avenue over a tributary of Highland Creek. Sheppard Avenue East is an unmetalled road and follows a similar alignment to earlier mapping. There are six bridges carrying Sheppard Avenue East over tributaries of Highland Creek. The villages of Scarborough (formerly Scarboro) and Malvern have remained relatively small. The village of Highland Creek is now labelled on the east side of the Highland Creek valley with the village of West Hill on the western side and closer to the Study Area.

1.2.4 Aerial and Orthoimagery Review

Historical aerial imagery from 1954 (Hunting Survey Corporation Limited, 1954) shows the beginnings of the transition of the Study Area from rural and agricultural to a more urban context. In particular, along Eglinton Avenue East and Kingston Road residential subdivisions had been constructed (Figure 5). Photography from 1992 (City of Toronto Archives, no date) shows the Study Area within an urban context within the enlarged City of Toronto (Figure 6). There were some commercial plazas and large commercial buildings along the Study Area and the University of Toronto Scarborough campus had grown. Highway 401 had expanded to a six-lane highway.

Selections of aerial imagery of Scarborough between 1947 and 1992 (City of Toronto Archives, no date) demonstrate previous disturbance and the history of development within areas identified as exhibiting archaeological potential according to the *Master Plan of Archaeological Resources of the City of Toronto (Interim Report)* (ASI et al., 2004) and it's most recently updated potential mapping (see Section 7.2 Image 49 through Image 60):

- Image 49 at Kingston Road and Eglinton Avenue shows that by 1961 the intersection had been realigned (see also Image 12). The extant



Scarborough Bluffs United Church is shown to have been constructed at the back of the former nineteenth-century church by this time, and the heritage property at 3750 Kingston Road and adjacent parking lots are shown to have remained relatively undisturbed since the nineteenth century.

- Image 50 and Image 51 demonstrates the land use changes from 1971 to 1973 along Kingston Road from Galloway Road to Poplar Road, including construction of the extant large-scale apartment and housing complexes (see also Image 20).
- Image 52 shows the historical alignment of Morningside Avenue and former bridge across Highland Creek in 1963, as well as the property with a large frontage at 38 Warnsworth Street. Image 53 demonstrates extensive construction works, involving creek channelization, for the extant Morningside bridge and new road right-of-way (ROW) in 1965.
- Image 54 demonstrates the Morningside and Highway 401 interchange area in 1991, and undeveloped property south of the hydro corridor east of the road, as well as the municipal yard at 891 Morningside Avenue. Google StreetView looking east to this area in Image 55 and Image 56 demonstrate that these lands have undergone installation and removal of asphalt paving and stockpiling of earth since 2009. 891 Morningside Avenue is also the location of TPSS U-338.
- Image 57 illustrates a former quarry operation south of Sheppard Avenue at Conlins Road in 1970, and associated channelization of a tributary of the Rouge River.
- Image 58 and Image 59 demonstrate extensive topsoil stripping and grading associated with the construction of Neilson Road and its adjacent subdivisions (see also Image 36 and Image 37) in 1975. Note in Image 58 one treed section remained undeveloped west of the road.
- Image 22 show the location of TPSS 82050 and TPSS 11640 within a commercial parking lot.
- Image 26 shows the location of the west side of the TPSS 47920 footprint within a paved lane and a residential fenced backyard.
- Image 31, Image 35 and Image 43 show the location of, TPSS 224746, TPSS 11636 and TPSS 371747 within parking lots.



- Image 60 shows the Neilson Road and Sewells Road intersection which shows ground disturbance in 1981 within the TPSS 44148 footprint (see also Image 39).

1.3 Archaeological Context

This section provides background research pertaining to previous archaeological fieldwork conducted within and in the vicinity of the Study Area and current land use and field conditions. Three sources of information were consulted to provide information about previous archaeological research: the site record forms for registered sites available online from the MCM through “Ontario’s Past Portal”; published and unpublished documentary sources; and the files of ASI.

1.3.1 Geography

In addition to the known archaeological sites, the state of the natural environment is a helpful indicator of archaeological potential. Accordingly, a description of the physiography and soils are briefly discussed for the Study Area.

Part of the Study Area is located on drumlinized till plains and beaches of the South Slope physiographic region of southern Ontario. The South Slope physiographic region (Chapman & Putnam, 1984, pp. 172–174) is the southern slope of the Oak Ridges Moraine. The South Slope meets the Moraine at heights of approximately 300 metres above sea level, and descends southward toward Lake Ontario, ending, in some areas, at elevations below 150 metres above sea level. Numerous streams descend the South Slope, having cut deep valleys in the till.

Part of the Study Area is within the sand plains of the Iroquois Plain physiographic region of southern Ontario. The Iroquois Plain is a lowland region bordering Lake Ontario. This region is characteristically flat and formed by lacustrine deposits laid down by the inundation of Lake Iroquois, a body of water that existed during the late Pleistocene. This region extends from the Trent River, around the western part of Lake Ontario, to the Niagara River,



spanning a distance of 300 kilometres (Chapman & Putnam, 1984). The old shorelines of Lake Iroquois include cliffs, bars, beaches and boulder pavements. The old sandbars in this region are good aquifers that supply water to farms and villages. The gravel bars are quarried for road and building material, while the clays of the old lake bed have been used for the manufacture of bricks (Chapman & Putnam, 1984).

A shorecliff intersects the Study Area on Eglinton Avenue near Kingston Road, and a raised beach feature intersects the Study Area at Sheppard Avenue East at Morningside Avenue.

Surficial geology includes the following (see Figure 7):

- Stone-poor, sandy silt to silty sand-textured till on Paleozoic terrain;
- Coarse-textured foreshore and basinal glaciolacustrine deposits of sand, gravel, minor silt and clay;
- Coarse-textured littoral glaciolacustrine deposits of sand, gravel, minor silt and clay;
- Modern and older alluvial deposits of clay, silt, sand, gravel, and may contain organic remains;
- Fine-textured massive to well laminated glaciolacustrine deposits of silt and clay, minor sand and gravel; and,
- Organic deposits of peat, muck, or marl

Drainage is illustrated in Figure 8. Soil types within the Study Area consist of:

- Fox sandy loam, a grey-brown podzolic with good drainage
- Woburn loam and sandy loam, both being a grey-brown podzolic with good drainage;
- Brighton sandy loam over gravel; a grey-brown podzolic with good drainage;
- Milliken loam, a grey-brown podzolic with imperfect drainage;
- Tecumseth sandy loam, a dark grey gleysolic with imperfect drainage
- Lyons loam, a dark grey gleysolic with poor drainage;
- Malton clay, a dark grey gleysolic with poor drainage; and,



- Bottom Land alluvial deposits with variable drainage

The Study Area crosses the main branch of Highland Creek as well as East Highland Creek and associated tributaries. In total, the Highland Creek watershed drains an area of over 103 square kilometres. As a major landmark along the north shore of Lake Ontario, the Scarborough Highlands lent their name to the creek below (Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, 1999). Urbanization in the 1960s and 1970s resulted in channelization of the creek to facilitate residential and industrial development, and to carry stormwater efficiently away. City infrastructure created a system of sanitary sewers, storm sewers, and watermains (Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, 1999).

1.3.2 Previously Registered Archaeological Sites

In Ontario, information concerning archaeological sites is stored in the Ontario Archaeological Sites Database (OASD) maintained by the MCM. This database contains archaeological sites registered within the Borden system. Under the Borden system, Canada has been divided into grid blocks based on latitude and longitude. A Borden block is approximately 13 kilometres east to west, and approximately 18.5 kilometres 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 under review is located in Borden block *AkGt*.

According to the OASD, 18 previously registered archaeological sites are located within one kilometre of the Study Area, one of which (*AkGt-81*) is located within 50 metres and one site (*AkGt-56*) is approximately 55 metres from the Study Area (MCM 2023). These sites do not exhibit further cultural heritage value or interest (CHVI) as described below (see also P383-0109-2013/P383-0124-2013; and P125-0284-2018). A summary of all sites is provided below in Table 1, with sites in 50 metres shown in italics.



Table 1: Registered Sites within One Kilometre of the Study Area

Borden number	Site Name	Temporal/ Cultural Affiliation	Site type	Researcher
AkGs-38	-	Early Woodland	Scatter	Power 2006
AkGt-2	Elliot	Late Woodland, Uren	Camp	No data
AkGt-3	Sterling	No data	No data	No data
AkGt-13	Brimley	Archaic, Laurentian	Camp	No data
AkGt-14	Brookes	No data	Camp	No data
AkGt-15	Heinze	No data	No data	No data
AkGt-18	Little's Road	No data	No data	No data
AkGt-19	Malvern	No data	No data	No data
AkGt-56	Morningside	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Scatter	D.R. Poulton & Associates Inc. 2001
AkGt-68	UofT Barn	Post-Contact Euro- Canadian	Manufacturing	Archeoworks Inc 2008



Borden number	Site Name	Temporal/ Cultural Affiliation	Site type	Researcher
AkGt-69	Stephenson	Pre-Contact Indigenous	Camp	Archeoworks Inc 2008
AkGt-71	Cornell- Campbell	Post-Contact Euro- Canadian		ASI 2009
AkGt-72	-	Late Woodland	Scatter	ASI 2009
AkGt-73	UofT Barn	Post-Contact Euro- Canadian	Manufacturing	Archeoworks Inc 2008
<i>AkGt-81</i>	<i>Jacques</i>	<i>Post-Contact Euro- Canadian</i>	<i>Landscape fill</i>	<i>ASI 2013, 2018</i>
AkGt-213	-	Post-Contact Euro- Canadian	Homestead	Powers 2015
AkGt-215	Secor Site	Pre-Contact Indigenous; Post-Contact Euro- Canadian	Findspot; Farmstead	ASI 2016, 2019, 2020



Borden number	Site Name	Temporal/ Cultural Affiliation	Site type	Researcher
AkGt-218	Location 1	Post-Contact Euro- Canadian	Farmstead	Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants Inc 2018

See *Supplementary Documentation* for detailed site locations.

The Jacques Site (AkGt-81) was identified by ASI (2013), immediately adjacent to the current Study Area, as part of the Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment of Sheppard Avenue East and Markham Road Condominium Development. The Stage 2 assessment included a field survey conducted by means of a test pit survey employed at five metre intervals and increased to 10 metre intervals when disturbance was encountered. The Jacques (AkGt-81) site was evaluated in a land use context, along with an analysis of the artifacts, and was determined to represent a mid-nineteenth to early-twentieth-century domestic site. Stage 3 site-specific assessment was completed in 2018 including the stratigraphic hand-excavation of 23 one-metre-square test units excavated systematically at a five-metre interval across an area measuring approximately 40 metres northwest-southeast and 16 metres northeast-southwest (ASI 2019b). The assessment demonstrated that the artifacts documented during the Stage 2 were introduced to the area artificially as a result of twentieth-century landscaping activities. Therefore, it is concluded that the Jacques site does not possess CHVI and should be clear of further archaeological concern.

The Morningside Site (AkGt-56) is approximately 55 metres beyond the Study Area. It was identified by D.R. Poulton & Associates Inc. (2001) during a survey for the proposed north-west ramp of the Morningside Avenue / Highway 401 interchange. A scatter of 12 lithic artifacts (including one biface fragment, 9 chipping detritus, one non-chert debitage, one fire cracked rock) were recovered in 25 metre by 12 metre area in a small woodlot between the



highway and Morningside Drive and the west-bound on-ramp, and 17 test units were excavated. The site was recommended for further assessment. The report was not available for review at the time of writing. The OASD notes the site has CHVI and personal communication with Dana Poulton April 21, 2023 indicates that no diagnostic artifacts were recovered, and the surrounding area has been thoroughly disturbed, so it should be considered clear of archaeological concern.

1.3.3 Previous Archaeological Assessments

ASI reviewed previous archaeological assessments that detail fieldwork within 50 metres of the Study Area. Only those specific archaeological assessments of direct relevance to the present undertaking will be included here.

The following reports are associated with previous work related to proposed LRT projects:

- *(URS Canada Inc., 2008) P290-005-2008 Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Sheppard Avenue East Light Rail Transit Class Environmental Assessment Study*
 - The proposed LRT ROW had a 30 metre study corridor (15 metres from the road centreline) between Don Mills Road and Meadowvale Avenue. The overlapping parts with the current Study Area were found to be heavily disturbed by industrial, commercial, and residential development and typical road construction. The northeast corner of Markham Road and Sheppard Avenue East was recommended for Stage 2 survey (later completed by ASI with the identification of the Jacques Site (AkGt-81)). The south side of Sheppard Avenue East between Markham Road and Progress Avenue was also recommended for Stage 2. This area was also later assessed (ASI 2008) and is presently developed. The banks of the tributary of Highland Creek crossing Sheppard Avenue East was noted as being channelized but still recommended for Stage 2, as well as the southeast corner at Washburn Way, the north side of the road between Breyon Way and Morningside Avenue, and the



southwest area at Conlins Road (see Figure 17 to Figure 23: areas highlighted in green; and Appendix A).

- *(ASI 2009d) P057-569-2009 Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Transit Project Assessment Study Scarborough – Malvern Corridor 08EA-103*
 - This EA is the predecessor for the current EELRT project. The report found that the Eglinton Avenue, Kingston Road, and Morningside Avenue ROWs do not retain archaeological site potential due to previous road, commercial, and residential disturbances, and that portion of the study corridor can be cleared of further archaeological concern (see Appendix A).
- *(ASI 2010a) P057-598-2010 Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Scarborough Rapid Transit Extension, Sheppard East Station 10EA-032*
 - This EA was for the proposed rapid transit station on Sheppard Avenue East at Markham Road east of Progress Avenue. The Stage 1 determined there was no archaeological potential and the area can be cleared of further archaeological concern (see Appendix A).
- *(ASI 2010d) P057-604-2010 Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment TTC Kennedy Station Re-Development 10EA-017*
 - The Scarborough Rapid Transit Extension Study expanded its scope to include improved facilities at Kennedy Station. The overlapping parts of the current Study Area were cleared of further archaeological concern (see Appendix A).
- *(ASI 2010g) P057-548-2009 Stage 1 Archaeological Resource Assessment Sheppard East Light Rail Vehicle Maintenance and Storage Facility 09EA-068*
 - This EA is associated with the proposed Sheppard East LRT within the current Study Area. This report assessed the proposed MSF and found parts of it retained archaeological potential and should be subject to Stage 2 survey prior to project impacts (see Appendix A).
- *(ASI 2010h) P264-100-2009 Stage 2 Property Assessment Sheppard East Light Rail Vehicle Maintenance and Storage Facility Environmental Assessment, City of Toronto, Ontario*



- Stage 2 survey of the areas identified in Stage 1 found on archaeological resources and cleared the project area of archaeological concern.

The following projects detail other relevant reports with fieldwork within the Study Area:

- *(AECOM Canada Ltd., 2021) P131-0121-2019 Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Report, Multiple Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township of Scarborough, County of York, Now City of Toronto, Ontario, Scarborough Subway Extension Environmental, Project Report –2020 Addendum*
 - TPSS 8122 (Figure 10) is within this archaeological assessment. It was determined that the complete TPSS 8122 footprint has been previously disturbed and it was cleared of archaeological concern (Appendix A).
- *(ARA, 2015) P007-0700-2015 Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment, Guildwood GO Station, 4105 Kingston Road, City of Toronto, Part of Lots 13–14, Concession D, Geographic Township of Scarborough, Former York County, Ontario*
 - TPSS 464247 (Figure 13) is within this archaeological assessment. It was determined that the complete TPSS 464247 footprint has been previously disturbed and it was cleared of archaeological concern (Appendix A).
- *(Archaeological Assessments Limited, 2010) P123-007-2010 Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of 5085 Sheppard Avenue East*
 - TPSS 188879 (Figure 22) is within this archaeological assessment. It was determined that the complete TPSS 188879 footprint has been previously disturbed and it was cleared of archaeological concern.
- *(ASI 2006a) P046-033-2006 Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment 4770 Sheppard Avenue East 06TS-021*
 - Area cleared of archaeological concern during visual and test pit survey.
- *(ASI 2006b) P046-31-2006 Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment 1265 Military Trail Part of the University of Toronto Scarborough Campus 06TS-033*



- Area cleared of archaeological concern during visual and test pit survey.
- *(ASI 2007b) P047-275-2007 Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment of the Proposed Development of the Northeast corner of Kingston Road and Galloway Road 07TS-017*
 - Area cleared of archaeological concern during visual and test pit survey.
- *(ASI 2008) P049-242-2007/P049-286-2008 Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment Of Property Bounded by Progress Avenue, Sheppard Avenue, And Orchid Place Drive 07TS-243/ 08TS-039*
 - Area cleared of archaeological concern during visual and test pit survey.
- *(ASI 2009b) P049-411-2009 Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment of 1049 to 1050 Military Trail and 3290 Ellesmere Road 09TS-055*
 - Area cleared of archaeological concern during visual and test pit survey.
- *(ASI 2009c) P049-434-2009 Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment of the East Side of Military Trail, North of Ellesmere Road 09TS-070*
 - Area cleared of archaeological concern during visual and test pit survey.
- *(ASI 2010c) P049-528-2010 Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment of the Proposed PAN AM Games Site Servicing Area 10TS-075*
 - Area cleared of archaeological concern during visual and test pit survey.
- *(ASI 2010e) P264-078-2009 Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Kingston Road/Danforth Avenue Transit Project Assessment Study 07EA-173*
 - Area cleared of archaeological concern.
- *(ASI 2010f) P049-545-2010 Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of 3132 Eglinton Avenue East 10TS-079*
 - Area cleared of archaeological concern.
- *(ASI 2010b) P049-535-2010/P049-544-2010 Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment of the Proposed Cindy Nicholas Walkway 10TS-092*
 - Area cleared of archaeological concern during visual and test pit survey.



- (ASI, 2011) *P057-462-2008 Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Transit City Light Rail Plan Jane Street Corridor, City of Toronto, Ontario*
 - TPSS U-144 and TPSS U-145 are within this archaeological assessment. It was determined that both footprints have been previously disturbed and they were cleared of archaeological concern (Appendix A).
- (ASI 2013) *P383-0109-2013/P383-0124-2013 Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment of Sheppard Avenue East and Markham Road Condominium Development 13TS-114*
 - Stage 2 survey identified the Jacques Site (AkGt-81) a mid-nineteenth-century Euro-Canadian occupation recommended for Stage 3 assessment.
- (ASI 2014a) *P392-0096-2014 Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Eglinton GO Station 14EA-203*
 - Partly recommended for Stage 2, the remainder was identified as low and wet, or previously disturbed with no potential. TPSS U – 108 (Figure 11) was analyzed within this assessment and was identified as disturbed (Appendix A).
- (ASI 2014b) *P392-0119-2014 Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Eglinton GO Station 14EA-283*
 - Area cleared of archaeological concern by test pit survey.
- (ASI 2018) *P449-0196-2018 Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment of 3060 Eglinton Avenue East 18PL-066*
 - Area cleared of archaeological concern by test pit survey.
- (ASI 2019a) *P398-0024-2018 Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment 3170 Eglinton Avenue East 17PL-096*
 - Area cleared of archaeological concern.
- (ASI 2019b) *P125-0284-2018 Stage 3 Site Specific Assessment of the Jacques Site (AkGt-81), Part of Lot 18, Concession 3, Geographic Township of Scarborough, County of York, City of Toronto, Ontario*
 - Stage 3 assessment determined The concentration of artifacts in landscape fill is an artificial creation and the site was cleared of further archaeological concern.



- (ASI 2021) *P372-0125-2021 Stage 1 Archaeological Resource Assessment of 3718-3730 Kingston Road 21PL-113*
 - Area cleared of archaeological concern.
- (ASI 2022) *Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Durham-Scarborough Bus Rapid Transit 18EA-153*
 - Area cleared of archaeological concern except where Stage 2 survey was recommended at 3295 Ellesmere Road, which has been carried forward in the current report recommendations.
- (OneT+, 2023) *Revised Report: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment, Scarborough Subway Extension, (SSE) Part of Lots 24, 26-28 Concession C, Lots 22-24 and 26 to 28, Concession D, Lots 22-23 Concession I, Lots 22-24 Concession II and Lot 23 Concession III in the Township of Scarborough, York County, now in the City of Toronto*
 - TPSS 302035 (Figure 23) is within this archaeological assessment. It was determined that the complete TPSS 302035 footprint has been previously disturbed and it was cleared of archaeological concern.
- (TRCA, 2015) *P303-171-2013 Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment Highland Creek Erosion Control Project, Lots 10 and 11, Concession 1 Historic Scarborough Township, York County*
 - Area cleared of further archaeological concern by test pit survey.

2.0 Property Inspection

2.1 Field Methods

A Stage 1 property inspection must adhere to the S & G, Section 1.2, Standards 1-6, which are discussed below. The entire property and its periphery must be inspected. The inspection may be either systematic or random. Coverage must be sufficient to identify the presence or absence of any features of archaeological potential. The inspection must be conducted when weather conditions permit good visibility of land features. Natural landforms and watercourses are to be confirmed if previously identified. Additional features such as elevated topography, relic water channels, glacial shorelines, well-drained soils within heavy soils and slightly elevated areas within low and wet areas should be identified and documented, if present. Features affecting



assessment strategies should be identified and documented such as woodlots, bogs or other permanently wet areas, areas of steeper grade than indicated on topographic mapping, areas of overgrown vegetation, areas of heavy soil, and recent land disturbance such as grading, fill deposits and vegetation clearing. The inspection should also identify and document structures and built features that will affect assessment strategies, such as heritage structures or landscapes, cairns, monuments or plaques, and cemeteries.

The Stage 1 archaeological assessment property inspection was conducted under the field direction of Eliza Brandy (R1109) of ASI, on April 20, 2023, and Kirstyn Allam (R1258) on April 20 and 26, 2023, in order to gain first-hand knowledge of the geography, topography, and current conditions and to evaluate and map archaeological potential of the Study Area. It was a systematic visual inspection from publicly accessible lands/public ROWs only and did not include excavation or collection of archaeological resources. Fieldwork was conducted when weather conditions were deemed clear with good visibility (partly cloudy/sunny with seasonal temperatures), per S & G Section 1.2., Standard 2. Field photography is presented in Section 7.1 (Image 1 through Image 48), and field observations are overlaid onto the existing conditions of the Study Area in Section 8.0 (Figure 9 to Figure 23).

2.2 Current Land Use and Field Conditions

The Study Area along Eglinton Avenue East is approximately 4.6 kilometres in length beginning at the Kennedy Toronto Transit Commission (TTC) Station to the east of Kennedy Road in the west and continues along Eglinton Avenue to its terminus north of the Eglinton Avenue East and Kingston Road intersection. Eglinton Avenue East has a general east-west alignment and features three-lanes of eastbound vehicular traffic, three-lanes of westbound vehicular traffic, and for much of the Study Area the roadway has curbs, sidewalks, and boulevards. For portions of Eglinton Avenue East, one lane for each direction of traffic has been designated for use by buses only. Generally, the Study Area is bounded by a mixture of residential and commercial properties, with the Kennedy TTC Station property at the western end. The Stouffville rail corridor intersects with the western end of the Study Area along Eglinton Avenue East as



well as Line 3 (Scarborough) of the TTC. There are two bridges, both constructed in 1979 within the Kennedy Station property, one is over the Kiss-and-Ride with the other being a ramp bridge at the east of the station. Just to the north of the Study Area is a bridge carrying Eglinton Avenue East over the Stouffville rail corridor that was constructed in 1974 (City of Toronto, 2022). The Lakeshore East rail corridor transects the Study Area just east of Bellamy Road North and is carried over Eglinton Avenue East by a bridge that was constructed in 1962 (City of Toronto, 2022).

The Study Area continues along Kingston Road approximately 3.4 kilometres in length from north of the intersection of Eglinton Avenue East and Kingston Road in the west and extends to the intersection of Kingston Road and Morningside Avenue in the east. Kingston Road has a general northeast—southwest alignment and features three-lanes of northeast-bound, three-lanes of southwest-bound vehicular traffic, and has curbs, sidewalks, and boulevards. For sections of Kingston Road, one lane for each direction of traffic has been designated for use by buses only. Kingston Road is generally bounded by a mixture of residential and commercial properties, and the Guildwood GO Station at the intersection of Kingston Road and Celeste Drive. The Lakeshore East rail corridor intersects with the Study Area along Kingston Road south of Celeste Drive. A bridge that was constructed in 1979 carries Kingston Road over the rail corridor (City of Toronto, 2022).

The Study Area extends along Morningside Avenue for approximately 1.7 kilometres where it turns eastwards on Ellesmere Road for approximately 0.5 kilometres to Military Trail. The Study Area then travels northwards through a university residence building and fields for 0.4 kilometres and then to the west through sports' fields and the Toronto Pan Am Sports Centre property for 0.4 kilometres back to Morningside Avenue at Military Trail. The Study Area then continues along Morningside Avenue for 1.4 kilometres to Sheppard Avenue East. Morningside Avenue is generally oriented in a north-south alignment and features two-lanes of northbound vehicular traffic, two-lanes of southbound vehicular traffic, and has curbs, sidewalks, and boulevards along its length. One lane for each direction of traffic has been designated for use by buses only. Ellesmere Road is oriented in an east-west alignment, with two-lanes of



eastbound vehicular traffic, two lanes of westbound vehicular traffic, and features curbs on both sides, and sidewalks along the southern side. There are sidewalks along both sides of Ellesmere to the east of Military Trail. Morningside Avenue is generally bounded by residential properties from Kingston Road to Fairwood Crescent. A secondary school is located on the west side of Morningside Avenue and Beath Street. Morningside Avenue traverses the Highland Creek and valley with Morningside Park on the west side and the University of Toronto Scarborough campus on the east. The university campus is bounded Ellesmere Road and Military Trail. North of Morningside Avenue and Military Trail, the Study Area is generally bounded by a mixture of residential and commercial properties. Morningside Avenue is carried over Highland Creek by a bridge constructed in 2017 (Niagara Rigging & Erecting Company Ltd., 2023). Morningside Avenue is carried over Highway 401 by a bridge constructed in 1989 (City of Toronto, 2022).

The Study Area extends along Sheppard Avenue East for approximately 5.9 kilometres from the intersection of Sheppard Avenue East and Conlins Road in the east to approximately 0.2 kilometres west of the intersection of Sheppard Avenue East and McCowan Road. The Study Area also includes the proposed Maintenance and Storage Facility site at 8304 Sheppard Avenue East. Sheppard Avenue East is generally oriented in an east-west alignment and features two-lanes of eastbound vehicular traffic, two-lanes of westbound vehicular traffic, and features sidewalks and boulevards. Some portions of the road feature curbs while others have paved shoulders. The Study Area along Sheppard Avenue East is bounded by commercial properties to the east of Morningside Avenue and by a mixture of residential and commercial properties to the west. Two bridges carry Sheppard Avenue East over two branches of the East Highland Creek, the bridge to the east of Gateforth Drive was constructed in 1974 and the bridge to the east of McCowan Road was constructed in 1979 (City of Toronto, 2022).

The Study Area also travels along Neilson Road from Sheppard Avenue East for approximately 1.2 kilometres to south of McLevin Avenue. Neilson Road has a winding orientation but generally travels from north to south. It has two-lanes of northbound vehicular traffic, two-lanes of southbound vehicular traffic, and features curbs, sidewalks, and boulevards along both sides. The Study Area is



generally bounded by residential properties from Sheppard Avenue East to Tapscott Road/Sewells Road. North of Tapscott Road/Sewells Road the Study Area is bounded by residential, institutional, and commercial properties including the Malvern Town Centre.

Highland Creek has been extensively impacted from channelization, including realignment and hardening of the creek banks, as evidenced by historical imagery and the property inspection along the main branch during the original construction of the Morningside bridge and the East Highland Creek tributaries under Sheppard Avenue.

Below is the current condition of each TPSS site:

- TPSS 8122 is located within a paved commercial parking lot (Figure 10).
- TPSS U-108 is located within a paved commercial parking lot (Figure 11).
- TPSS U-144 and TPSS U-145 are situated within the most eastern portion of Eglinton Avenue East within a round-a-bout. The TPSS U-144 and TPSS U-145 footprints partially cover grassed areas which contain a sidewalk (Figure 12).
- The TPSS 464247 footprint is within the Guildwood Go Station paved parking lot (Figure 13).
- TPSS 116402 and TPSS 82050 are adjacent to each other and are aligned in an east to west direction (Figure 14). They are both situated south of Lawrence Avenue East and east of Kingston Road within a paved commercial parking lot (Image 22).
- The TPSS 479208 footprint partially covers the back end of a residential house fronting Morningside Ave (Figure 15). This address is associated with a Post-War Streetscape Cultural Heritage Landscape. The west half of TPSS 479208 contains a paved area, within the fenced backyard. There is an additional, separate multi-level built structure within the backyard (Image 26).
- TPSS 375177 is within a grassed area between Ellesmere Road and Military Trail (Figure 16). It is west of a residential neighbourhood and contains a footpath that leads to the nearby university.



- TPSS 371747 (Figure 17) is located within a paved church parking lot (Image 31).
- TPSS U-338 (Figure 17) is south of a hydroelectric corridor within a paved commercial/industrial parking lot (Image 29)
- TPSS 116363 (Figure 19) is within a paved church parking lot (Image 35).
- The majority of the TPSS 44148 footprint (Figure 20) is within a large paved parking lot associated with a church (Image 39).
- TPSS 224746 (Figure 21) is within a paved church parking lot (Image 43).
- TPSS 188879 (Figure 22) is within a paved commercial parking lot.
- TPSS 302035 (Figure 23) is west of several commercial businesses and within a partially paved lot.

3.0 Analysis of Archaeological Potential

The S & G, Section 1.3.1, lists criteria that are indicative of archaeological potential. The Study Area meets the following criteria indicative of archaeological potential:

- Previously identified archaeological sites (See Table 1);
- Water sources: primary, secondary, or past water source (Highland Creek; Rouge River tributaries);
- Elevated topography;
- Well-drained soils;
- Proximity to early settlements (e.g., village centres, Washington United (Methodist) Church, historical homesteads); and,
- Early historic transportation routes (e.g., Eglinton Avenue, Kingston Road, Morningside Avenue, Ellesmere Avenue, Sheppard Avenue)

The *Master Plan of Archaeological Resources of the City of Toronto (Interim Report)* (ASI et al., 2004) and its most recently updated potential mapping, was reviewed for background information and to help inform any indicators of archaeological potential not captured in other research. Generally speaking, archaeological management plans are high-level analyses of archaeological potential for non-specialists but cannot be considered a replacement for Stage 1 archaeological assessments. ASI's review of the above archaeological



management plan indicates the parts of the Study Area have been modeled as exhibiting archaeological potential. These areas have been reviewed in more detail during the property inspection and historical aerial imagery review (Image 8, Image 10, Image 12-Image 16, Image 19, Image 20, Image 22, Image 24-Image 26, Image 28, Image 30, Image 31, Image 33-Image 41, Image 43-Image 48; Image 49-Image 59). TPSS 44148, TPSS 188879, TPSS 224746, TPSS 116363, TPSS U- 388, TPSS 375177, TPSS 116402 and TPSS 82050 were indicated as exhibiting archaeological potential on this mapping.

According to the S & G, Section 1.4 Standard 1e, no areas within a property containing locations listed or designated by a municipality can be recommended for exemption from further assessment unless the area can be documented as disturbed. The Toronto Heritage Register (City of Toronto, 2023a) was consulted and three properties within the Study Area are Listed or Designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act*:

- 3750 Kingston Road, house, Designated. The extant Jeremiah Annis House stone farmhouse was built in 1867 at the northeast corner of Kingston Road and Scarborough Golf Club Road (R. Brown, 1997, p. 103), now “Old Stone Cottage”.
 - This area retains potential surrounding the existing structure underneath the paved parking lot (Image 15; Figure 12: areas highlighted in light green). According to the S & G Section 2.1.7, Standard 3, this area will require Stage 2 mechanical trenching at a maximum of 10 metre intervals prior to any development, catered to the project impacts.
 - Testing should be carried out using a backhoe equipped with a smooth bucket to sample any deeply buried soil horizons and sample any subsurface features that may be present. Additional hand exposure/excavation of significant archaeological features or deposits may be required as part of this process. Should Stage 2 excavation result in the delineation of archaeological resources, appropriate mitigative measures must be identified. Mitigative options include protection and avoidance; further test or full-scale



salvage excavation; archaeological monitoring of construction activities; or a combination of such approaches.

A detailed review of historical and recent aerial and orthoimagery was carried out for the Study Area to examine the nature of development adjacent to the previously assessed ROWs and within the TPSS footprints. Areas that showed major development after circa 1950 were deemed to have compromised archaeological integrity, based on the understanding that beginning around the middle of the twentieth century, development and construction usually involved wholesale topsoil removal and grading that would eliminate archaeological resources (i.e., residential subdivisions). The property inspection confirmed the nature of these neighbourhoods as being predominantly redeveloped since the mid- to late-twentieth century. According to the S & G Section 1.3.2 these areas do not retain archaeological potential (Image 1-Image 13, Image 16-Image 48; Figure 9 to Figure 23: areas highlighted in yellow) and do not require further survey. TPSS 82050, TPSS 116402, TPSS 479208, TPSS U – 338, TPSS 224746, TPSS 37147, TPSS 44148 and TPSS 116363 have also been shown to be previously disturbed (Image 22, Image 26, Image 29, Image 31, Image 35, Image 39, Image 43, ; Figure 14, Figure 17, Figure 19, Figure 20, Figure 21) and do not require further survey.

A combination of property inspection and assessment of topographic mapping (ESRI 2022) determined that some lands within the Study Area adjacent to East Highland Creek south of Sheppard Avenue at Lapsley Road are sloped in excess of 20 degrees, and according to the S & G Section 2.1 do not retain potential (Image 42; Figure 21: areas highlighted in pink). These areas do not require further survey.

The background research and property inspection determined that parts of the Study Area (Figure 12, Figure 15, Figure 16, Figure 17 and Figure 20: areas highlighted in green) will require Stage 2 test pit survey, prior to any construction activities or other proposed impacts at the following municipal addresses:

- 3739 Kingston Road (Image 14; Figure 12)



- 3741 Kingston Road (Image 14; Figure 12)
- 38 Warnsworth Street (Image 25; Figure 15)
- 3295 Ellesmere Road (Image 28; Figure 16)
- TPSS 375177 (Figure 16)
- 7600 Sheppard Avenue East (Figure 17)
- 1085 Neilson Road (Figure 20)
- 10 Tapscott Road (Image 38; Figure 20)

According to the S & G Section 2.1.2, test pit survey is required on terrain where ploughing is not viable, such as wooded areas, properties where existing landscaping or infrastructure would be damaged, overgrown farmland with heavy brush or rocky pasture, and narrow linear corridors up to 10 metres wide.

The balance of the Study Area has been previously assessed as part of work related to proposed LRT projects or other modern development projects and does not require further archaeological assessment (TPSS 8122, TPSS U – 108, TPSS U – 144, TPSS U – 145, TPSS 464247, TPSS 302035, TPSS 188879 - Figure 9 to Figure 23: areas highlighted in orange).

3.1 Conclusions

The Stage 1 background research for the proposed 10% Design footprint Study Area determined 18 previously registered archaeological sites are located within one kilometre of the Study Area, one of which (AkGt-81) is located within 50 metres and one site (AkGt-56) is approximately 55 metres from the Study Area.

The property inspection determined that the following properties within the 10% Design footprint, beyond areas that have been previously assessed or are disturbed, exhibit archaeological potential and will require Stage 2 archaeological assessment:

- 3739 Kingston Road (Image 14; Figure 12)
- 3741 Kingston Road (Image 14; Figure 12)
- 38 Warnsworth Street (Image 25; Figure 15)
- 3295 Ellesmere Road (Image 28; Figure 16)
- TPSS 375177 (Figure 16)



- 7600 Sheppard Avenue East (Figure 17)
- 1085 Neilson Road (Figure 20)
- 10 Tapscott Road (Image 38; Figure 20)

The remainder of the Study Area may be considered clear of archaeological concern.

4.0 Recommendations

The following recommendations are made:

- 1) Parts of the Study Area exhibit archaeological potential at 3739 Kingston Road, 3741 Kingston Road, 38 Warnsworth Street, 3295 Ellesmere Road, 3295 Ellesmere Road, 7600 Sheppard Avenue East, 1085 Neilson Road, 10 Tapscott Road and TPSS 375177. If impacted by project designs, these properties require Stage 2 archaeological assessment, prior to any proposed construction activities on these lands.
 - a) Test pit survey at five metre intervals is required (Figure 12, Figure 15, Figure 16, Figure 17 and Figure 20: areas highlighted in green);
 - b) 3750 Kingston Road is a Designated heritage property circa 1867 and retains archaeological potential surrounding the existing structure underneath the paved parking lot (Figure 12: areas highlighted in light green). According to the S & G Section 2.1.7, Standard 3, this area will require Stage 2 mechanical trenching at a maximum of 10 metre intervals prior to any development, catered to the project impacts.
 - i) Testing should be carried out using a backhoe equipped with a smooth bucket to sample any deeply buried soil horizons and sample any subsurface features that may be present. Additional hand exposure/excavation of significant archaeological features or deposits may be required as part of this process.
- 2) The remainder of the Study Area does not retain archaeological potential on account of deep and extensive land disturbance, slopes in excess of 20



degrees, or being previously assessed (P131-0121-2019, P392-0096-2014, P057-507-2008, P007-0700-2015, P362-0313-2021, P123-007-2010). These lands do not require further archaeological assessment; and,

- 3) Should the proposed work extend beyond the current Study Area, further archaeological assessment should be conducted to determine the archaeological potential of the surrounding lands.

NOTWITHSTANDING the results and recommendations presented in this study, ASI notes that no archaeological assessment, no matter how thorough or carefully completed, can necessarily predict, account for, or identify every form of isolated or deeply buried archaeological deposit. In the event that archaeological remains are found during subsequent construction activities, the consultant archaeologist, approval authority, and the Archaeology Programs Unit of the MCM should be immediately notified.

The above recommendations are subject to MCM approval, and it is an offence to alter any archaeological site without MCM concurrence. No grading or other activities that may result in the destruction or disturbance of any archaeological sites are permitted until notice of MCM approval has been received.

5.0 Legislation Compliance Advice

ASI advises compliance with the following legislation:

- This report is submitted to the MCM as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the Ontario Heritage Act, RSO 2005, 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 field work and report recommendations ensure the conservation, preservation and protection 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 MCM, a letter will be issued by the MCM stating that there are no further concerns with regards 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 field work 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 sec. 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 or having knowledge of a burial site shall immediately notify the police or coroner. It is recommended that the Registrar of Cemeteries at the Ministry of Consumer Services is also immediately notified.
- Archaeological sites recommended for further archaeological field work or protection remain subject to Section 48(1) of the Ontario Heritage Act and may not be altered, nor may artifacts be removed from them, except by a person holding an archaeological license.

6.0 Bibliography and Sources

AECOM Canada Ltd. (2021). Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment Report, Multiple Lots and Concessions, Geographic Township of Scarborough, County of York, Now City of Toronto, Ontario, Scarborough Subway Extension Environmental, Project Report –2020 Addendum. Report on File with the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism.



- ARA, (Archaeological Research Associates Ltd.). (2015). Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Guildwood GO Station 4105 Kingston Road City of Toronto Part of Lots 13-14, Concession D, Geographic Township of Scarborough Former York County, Ontario [P007-0700-2015]. Report on file with the Ontario Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries.
- Archaeological Assessments Limited. (2010). The Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of 5085 Sheppard Avenue East, City of Toronto [P123-007-2010].
- Archaeological Services Inc. (2006a). Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment 4770 Sheppard Ave. East Part of Lot 21, Concession 3 Geographic Township of Scarborough, County of York Former City of Scarborough, Now the City of Toronto [P046-033-2006].
- Archaeological Services Inc. (2006b). Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment of 1265 Military Trail Part of University of Toronto Scarborough Campus, Former Township of Scarborough, County of York, Now in the City of Toronto [Revised Report]. Report on file with the Ontario Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries.
- Archaeological Services Inc. (2007a). Historical Overview and Assessment of Archaeological Potential Highland Creek Watershed, City of Toronto. Report on file with the City of Toronto.
- Archaeological Services Inc. (2007b). Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment of the Proposed Development of the Northeast corner of Kingston Road and Galloway Road Formerly in the City of Scarborough, Now in the City of Toronto [P047-275-2007].
- Archaeological Services Inc. (2008). Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment Of Property Bounded by Progress Avenue, Sheppard Avenue, And Orchid Place Drive, Block 2 Plan 66M-2300 Part of Lot 17 Concession 2 Geographic Township of Scarborough, County of York Former City of Scarborough, Now the City of Toronto [P049-242-2007/P049-286-2008].
- Archaeological Services Inc. (2009a). Cultural Heritage Assessment Report: Built Heritage Resources and Cultural Heritage Landscapes: Scarborough— Malvern Light Rail Transit Corridor Transit Project Assessment Study City of Toronto, Ontario. Report on file with the Ontario Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries.



Archaeological Services Inc. (2009b). Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment of 1049 to 1050 Military Trail and 3290 Ellesmere Road Part of Lots 10 and 11, Concession 2 Geographic Township of Scarborough, County of York Former City of Scarborough, Now the City of Toronto. Report on file with the Ontario Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries.

Archaeological Services Inc. (2009c). Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment of the East Side of Military Trail, North of Ellesmere Road Part of Lots 9 and 10, Concession 2 Geographic Township of Scarborough, County of York Former City of Scarborough, Now the City of Toronto. Report on file with the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries.

Archaeological Services Inc. (2009d). Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment for Transit Project Assessment Study Scarborough – Malvern Corridor, City of Toronto [P057-569-2009] [Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment].

Archaeological Services Inc. (2010a). REVISED Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (Background Research and Property Inspection) Scarborough Rapid Transit Extension, Sheppard East Station, City of Toronto, Ontario [P057-598-2010].

Archaeological Services Inc. (2010b). Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment of the Proposed Cindy Nicholas Walkway, Part of Block 99, Registered Plan 66M-2413 Part of Lot 11, and Part of the Road Allowance Between Lots 10 and 11, Concession 2 Geographic Township of Scarborough, County of York Former City of Scarborough, Now the City of Toronto [P049-535-2010/P049-544-2010].

Archaeological Services Inc. (2010c). Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment of the Proposed PAN AM Games Site Servicing Area, East Side of Morningside Avenue, North of Military Trail Part of Lot 10, Concession 2 Geographic Township of Scarborough, County of York, Former City of Scarborough, Now the City of Toronto [P049-528-2010].

Archaeological Services Inc. (2010d). Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (Background Research and Property Inspection) Kennedy Station Re-Development, City of Toronto, Ontario [P057-604-2010]. Report on file with the Ontario Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries.

Archaeological Services Inc. (2010e). Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (Background Research and Property Inspection), Kingston Road/Danforth



Avenue Transit Project Assessment Study, City of Toronto, Ontario [P264-078-2009] [Revised Report].

Archaeological Services Inc. (2010f). Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of 3132 Eglinton Avenue East, Part of Block D, Registered Plan 1094, Part of Lot M, Registered Plan 1098, Part of Lots 19 and 20, Concession D, Geographic Township of Scarborough, County of York, Now the City of Toronto [P049-545-2010]. Report on file with the Ontario Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries.

Archaeological Services Inc. (2010g). Stage 1 Archaeological Resource Assessment, Sheppard East Light Rail Vehicle Maintenance and Storage Facility Environmental Assessment, City of Toronto, Ontario.

Archaeological Services Inc. (2010h). Stage 2 Property Assessment Sheppard East Light Rail Vehicle Maintenance and Storage Facility Environmental Assessment, City of Toronto, Ontario P264-100-2009.

Archaeological Services Inc. (2013). Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment of Sheppard Avenue East and Markham Road Condominium Development, Part of Lot 18, Concession 3, Geographic Township of Scarborough, County of York Now in the City of Toronto [P383-0109-2013/P383-0124-2013].

Archaeological Services Inc. (2014a). Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment (Background Study and Property Inspection) Eglinton GO Station, Part of Lots 21 and 22, Concessions C and D, Former Township of Scarborough, York County, City of Toronto, Ontario [P392-0096-2014]. Report on file with the Ontario Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries.

Archaeological Services Inc. (2014b). Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment (Property Assessment) Eglinton GO Station GO Transit Class Environmental Assessment Part of Lot 21, Concession C, Former Township of Scarborough, County of York, City of Toronto, Ontario [P392-0119-2014]. Report on file with the Ontario Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries.

Archaeological Services Inc. (2018). Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment of 3060 Eglinton Avenue East Part of Lot 20, Concession D, Geographic Township of Scarborough, York County, Now the City of Toronto, Ontario



- [P449-0196-2018]. Report on file with the Ontario Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries.
- Archaeological Services Inc. (2019a). Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment of 3170 Eglinton Avenue East Part of Lots 2 and 3, Registered Plan 142, Part of Lot 19, Concession D, Geographic Township of Scarborough, Former York County, City of Toronto, Ontario [P398-0024-2018].
- Archaeological Services Inc. (2019b). Stage 3 Site Specific Assessment of the Jacques Site (AkGt-81), Part of Lot 18, Concession 3, Geographic Township of Scarborough, County of York, City of Toronto, Ontario [P125-0284-2018].
- Archaeological Services Inc. (2021). Stage 1 Archaeological Resource Assessment of 3718-3730 Kingston Road (Part of Lot 17, Concession D, Scarborough Township, County of York), City of Toronto, Ontario [P372-0125-2021].
- Archaeological Services Inc. (2022). Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Durham-Scarborough Bus Rapid Transit Project Various Lots and Concessions (Former Townships of Scarborough, Pickering and Whitby) City of Toronto; City of Pickering; City of Oshawa; and Town of Ajax; Town of Whitby, Ontario.
- Archaeological Services Inc., Cuesta Systems Inc., Commonwealth Historic Resources Management Limited, Golder Associates, & Historica Research Limited. (2004). A Master Plan of Archaeological Resources for the City of Toronto (Interim Report). <https://www.toronto.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/97cc-city-planning-a-master-plan-of-archaeological-resources.pdf>
- ASI, (Archaeological Services Inc.). (2011). Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Transit City Light Rail Plan Jane Street Corridor, City of Toronto, Ontario [Revised Report]. Report on file, City of Toronto Heritage Preservation Services and Ontario Ministry of Culture.
- Birch, J., Manning, S. W., Sanft, S., & Conger, M. A. (2021). Refined Radiocarbon Chronologies for Northern Iroquoian Site Sequences: Implications for Coalescence, Conflict, and the Reception of European Goods. *American Antiquity*, 86(1), 61–89.
- Birch, J., & Williamson, R. F. (2013). *The Mantle Site: An Archaeological History of an Ancestral Wendat Community*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.



- Bonis, R. R. (Ed.). (1968). *A History of Scarborough*. Scarborough Public Library Board.
- Boyle, D. (1896). *The Township of Scarboro, 1796-1896*. William Briggs.
- Brown, J. (1995). On Mortuary Analysis – with Special Reference to the Saxe-Binford Research Program. In L. A. Beck (Ed.), *Regional Approaches to Mortuary Analysis* (pp. 3–23). Plenum Press.
- Brown, R. (1997). *Toronto’s Lost Villages*. Polar Bear Press.
- Chapman, L. J., & Putnam, F. (1984). *The Physiography of Southern Ontario* (3rd ed., Vol. 2). Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources.
- City of Toronto. (2022). *Bridge Structures*. Open Data Portal.
<https://open.toronto.ca/dataset/bridge-structure/>
- City of Toronto. (2023a). *City of Toronto’s Heritage Register Search*.
<https://www.arcgis.com/apps/PanelsLegend/index.html?appid=a90bf1e72b694db5a4892dc6b170688d>
- City of Toronto. (2023b). *Toronto Archaeological Potential Map*. Toronto Maps Release 3.1.0. <https://map.toronto.ca/torontomaps/>
- City of Toronto Archives. (no date). *Aerial Photographs, 1947-1992*. City of Toronto. <https://www.toronto.ca/city-government/accountability-operations-customer-service/access-city-information-or-records/city-of-toronto-archives/whats-online/maps/aerial-photographs/>
- Crosby, P. A. (1873). *Lovell’s Gazetteer of British North America*. John Lovell.
- Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs. (2013). *Upper Canada Land Surrenders and the Williams Treaties (1781-1862/1923)*.
<https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1360941656761/1360941689121>
- D. R. Poulton & Associates Inc. (2001). *The Stage 2-3 A. A. of the Morningside Site (AkGt-56) & the Proposed New North-West Ramp of the Morningside Avenue—Hwy. 401 Interchange, City of Toronto, Ontario [2001-011-015/2001-011-030]*.
- Department of Militia and Defence. (1914). *Markham Sheet 30M/14 [Map]*.
- Department of Militia and Defence. (1915). *Toronto Sheet [Map]*. Ministry of Defence and Militia.



- Dodd, C. F., Poulton, D. R., Lennox, P. A., Smith, D. G., & Warrick, G. A. (1990). The Middle Ontario Iroquoian Stage. In C. J. Ellis & N. Ferris (Eds.), *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650* (pp. 321–360). Ontario Archaeological Society Inc.
- Edwards, T. W. D., & Fritz, P. (1988). Stable-Isotope Paleoclimate Records from Southern Ontario, Canada: Comparison of Results from Marl and Wood. *Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences*, 25, 1397–1406.
- Ellis, C. J., & Deller, D. B. (1990). Paleo-Indians. In C. J. Ellis & N. Ferris (Eds.), *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650* (pp. 37–64). Ontario Archaeological Society Inc.
- Ellis, C. J., Kenyon, I. T., & Spence, M. W. (1990). The Archaic. In C. J. Ellis & N. Ferris (Eds.), *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650* (pp. 65–124). Ontario Archaeological Society Inc.
- Ellis, C. J., Timmins, P. A., & Martelle, H. (2009). At the Crossroads and Periphery: The Archaic Archaeological Record of Southern Ontario. In T. D. Emerson, D. L. McElrath, & A. C. Fortier (Eds.), *Archaic Societies: Diversity and Complexity across the Midcontinent*. (pp. 787–837). State University of New York Press.
- Esri, HERE, Garmin, FAO, NOAA, USGS, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community. (2022). World Topographic Map [Map]. <https://www.arcgis.com/home/item.html?id=7dc6cea0b1764a1f9af2e679f642f0f5>.
- Ferris, N. (2013). Place, Space, and Dwelling in the Late Woodland. In M. K. Munson & S. M. Jamieson (Eds.), *Before Ontario: The Archaeology of a Province* (pp. 99–111). McGill-Queen’s University Press. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt32b7n5.15>
- Government of Canada. (2018). Statement of Apology for the Impacts of the 1923 Williams Treaties. <https://www.rcaanc-cirnac.gc.ca/eng/1542393580430/1542393607484>
- Hunting Survey Corporation Limited. (1954). 1954 Air Photos of Southern Ontario. <https://mdl.library.utoronto.ca/collections/air-photos/1954-air-photos-southern-ontario/index>
- Miles & Co. (1878). *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of York*. [Map]. Miles & Co.



- Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism. (1990). Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. c. O.18.
- Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism. (2022). Ontario's Past Portal. PastPortal. <https://www.pastport.mtc.gov.on.ca>
- Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism. (2023). Ontario's Past Portal. PastPortal. <https://www.pastport.mtc.gov.on.ca>
- MTC, (Ministry of Tourism and Culture). (2011). Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists. Archaeology Programs Branch, Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Culture.
- Mulvany, C. P., Adam, G. M., & Robinson, C. B. (1885). History of Toronto and the County of York, Ontario. C. Blackett Robinson.
- Niagara Rigging & Erecting Company Ltd. (2023). Morningside Avenue Bridge over Highland Creek. NRE. <https://niagararigging.ca/project/morningside-bridge/>
- OneT+. (2023). Revised Report: Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment, Scarborough Subway Extension, (SSE) Part of Lots 24, 26-28 Concession C, Lots 22-24 and 26 to 28, Concession D, Lots 22-23 Concession I, Lots 22-24 Concession II and Lot 23 Concession III in the Township of Scarborough, York County, now in the City of Toronto. Report on File with the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism.
- Rogers, E. S. (1962). The Round Lake Ojibwa. Royal Ontario Museum.
- Scarborough Historical Society. (n.d.). Malvern. <http://scarboroughhistorical.ca/local-history/communities/malvern/#:~:text=In%201856%20a%20post%20office%20was%20established%20at,store%20in%201930%20and%20remained%20there%20until%201956.>
- Spence, M. W., Pihl, R. H., & Murphy, C. (1990). Cultural Complexes of the Early and Middle Woodland Periods. In C. J. Ellis & N. Ferris (Eds.), The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650. Ontario Archaeological Society Inc.
- Surtees, R. (1984). Indian Land Surrenders in Ontario 1763-1867. Research Branch, Corporate Policy, Department of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada.



Surtees, R. (1986). Treaty Research Report, The Williams Treaties. Treaties and Historical Research Centre Indian and Northern Affairs Canada.

Toronto and Region Conservation Authority. (1999). State of the Watershed Report: Highland Creek Watershed. TRCA.
www.trca.on.ca/dotAsset/91720.pdf

TRCA, (Toronto and Region Conservation Authority). (2015). Archaeological Assessment (Stage 1—2) in the City Toronto Erosion Control – Highland Creek Watershed Lot 6, Concession I Lots 9 and 10, Concession I Lots 13 to 15, Concession I Lots 14 and 15, Concession II Lot 22, Concession I Lot 22, Concession D Historic Scarborough Township, York County.

Tremaine, G. C. (1860). Tremaine's Map of the County of York, Canada West [Map]. George C. Tremaine.

URS Canada Inc. (2008). Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment Sheppard Avenue East Light Rail Transit Class Environmental Assessment Study [P290-005-2008].

Williams Treaties First Nations. (2017). About Williams Treaties First Nations.
<http://www.williamstreatiesfirstnations.ca/about/>

Williamson, R. F. (1990). The Early Iroquoian Period of Southern Ontario. In C. J. Ellis & N. Ferris (Eds.), *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650* (pp. 291–320). Ontario Archaeological Society Inc.

