1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

King Township, in the face of urban growth, is presented with opportunities to shape its future, while contributing to further understanding its past. This process of growth, teamed with planned research activities, has the potential to uncover the hidden cultural heritage of the Township; Implementation of a clear and strong municipal policy that speaks to the value of this heritage and recognizes the connections between past people and the natural environment, will maintain these links to the past. A community that values their heritage and encourages community awareness instills a sense of pride and stewardship in their residents.

To achieve this goal, the Township of King Heritage Committee (Heritage King) has been actively documenting built heritage in the Township and promoting awareness within the community and the municipal government. As a result, the Township holds extensive records of built heritage – both rural and urban – an important and crucial first step for their protection from future impact. In contrast, archaeological sites and cultural landscapes have very fragmented and sparse documentation, leaving the cultural canvas in the Township and the region incomplete and vulnerable to the effects of future development.

Archaeological sites in Ontario are most commonly identified as a result of assessments prior to development, or as a result of a specific research project; neither of which have been extensively required in the Township. Heritage King, realizing the importance of filling in the gaps in our understanding of cultural resources, commissioned the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority’s (TRCA) Archaeology Resource Management Services to conduct a study to illustrate the extent of potential to encounter cultural heritage resources in the Township.

1.2 Study Purpose and Goals

The purpose of this document is to identify the cultural heritage potential in the Township and to propose a course of action that will assist in identifying these places of past human activities. The main goal is to enhance our knowledge of cultural heritage in the Township, its regional significance, and ultimately to document and protect these archaeological sites.

1.3 Methodology

Methods that were incorporated in creating this document were:

- Consulted existing probability models,
- Compiled data from the Ontario Archaeological Sites Database,
- Compared existing conditions with surrounding municipalities, identified existing gaps,
- Researched previous projects that were conducted in the Township,
- Consulted historic maps,
- Key points were conveyed through example case studies,
- Researched natural features and their link to cultural heritage,
- Carried out consultations with local residents.

Cultural heritage can be manifested in many ways and future studies should include other heritage expressions such as cultural heritage landscapes and oral histories.

This study is limited in scope and illustrates potential rather than serve as a master plan. No field investigations were carried out to support the proposed potential.
In order to carry out proper and standardized archaeological investigations, the Ministry of Culture has provided a set of standards and guidelines to be used for all archaeological assessments in Ontario (1993). Technical details within the standards and guidelines are currently under review for revisions. The different steps in archaeological assessments are identified as ‘Stages 1-4’:

2.1 Definitions

**Archaeological Resources:**
These include moveable artifacts, land-based archaeological sites and marine archaeological sites. The identification and evaluation of such resources are based upon licenced archaeological fieldwork.

**Artifact:**
Refers to any object, material or substance that is made, modified, used, deposited or affected by human action and is of cultural heritage value or interest.

**Archaeological site:**
Any property that contains an artifact or any other physical evidence of past human use or activity that is of cultural heritage value or interest that is on or below the surface.

**Archaeological Assessment:**
Desktop and fieldwork assessments carried out by licenced archaeologists to determine the potential for, or existence of, archaeological sites (see Stages 1-4).

**Archaeological Significance:**
A measure of an archaeological site’s potential to contribute to the understanding of past technologies and lifestyles. At times, archaeological sites are the only record of the past. Some of these sites may hold additional, local, regional, or national significance.

**Archaeological Potential:**
A process intended to identify lands that are most likely to contain archaeological resources and screen out properties that have low to no potential to contain archaeological resources. Accepted criteria are applied when determining archaeological potential and the following values are taken into account:

- proximity to known archaeological site (within 250 m)
- distance to water - both existing and ancient (within 200 - 300 m)
- topography (steep cliffs, drumlins)
- soils (sandy vs. rocky)
- unusual land formations (mounds, waterfalls, caverns)

**Cultural Heritage Landscapes:**
Any defined geographical area of heritage significance which has been modified by human activities and is valued by a community. A landscape involves a grouping(s) of individual heritage features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites, and natural elements, forming together a significant type of heritage form, including villages, parks, gardens, battlefields, main streets, neighbourhoods, cemeteries, trailways, and industrial complexes.
Stage 1: A comprehensive background study of the project area in order to evaluate its potential to contain archaeological materials. Previous disturbances and known cultural heritage features are noted. Further strategies may then be recommended (Ministry of Culture, Technical Guidelines, 1993).

Plate 1: Historical documents

Stage 2: A field investigation conducted in order to determine the presence of sites on the project area. There are two basic survey methods: pedestrian (visual inspection of ploughed areas) and test pit survey. Field conditions or obstacles to ploughing determine the use of either survey (Ministry of Culture, Technical Guidelines, 1993).

Plate 2: Pedestrian Survey

Plate 3: Test pitting
Stage 3: When archaeological sites are encountered, further investigation is required in order to determine the size, artifact frequency, and cultural affiliation of the site. The data will be used to determine significance and established an appropriate mitigation strategy (Ministry of Culture, Technical Guidelines, 1993).

Stage 4: Consists of appropriate mitigation methods for a site considered to be of archaeological significance. Mitigation may involve complete excavation and documentation of a site, partial mitigation and protection for the remainder of the site, avoidance, and interpretation (Ministry of Culture, Technical Guidelines, 1993).
2.2 Provincial Legislation

Given that development projects have the potential to affect archaeological resources, the Ontario government has passed legislation that provides for the conservation and protection of the cultural heritage of the province. The primary agent is the Ontario Heritage Act. The act was conceived in 1975 in order to preserve both the built and archaeological heritage of Ontario. In 2005, the province passed several amendments to the act in order to strengthen the protection. These amendments provided the municipalities with the power to delay and possibly prevent the destruction of heritage buildings, which allowed for further ease in the designation of heritage properties and improved the protection of marine heritage sites and archaeological resources. Furthermore, under the act, any alteration of an archaeological site conducted without the involvement of a Ministry sanctioned archaeologist by an individual or a corporation is liable to a fine of up to $1,000,000 or imprisonment for up to one year or both.

The Environmental Assessment Act outlines the responsibilities for carrying out environmental assessments for proposed projects that involve provincial government evaluation, such as those initiatives by municipalities, development companies, conservation authorities or others. The assessment determines any possible environmental effects and proposes mitigations to any adverse affects. Given that the act includes in its definition of environment “any building, structure, machine or other device or thing made by humans” (s.1[d]), archaeology is included as part of any environmental assessment. If archaeological resources are encountered within the study area, the proponent must provide for mitigation of the site, whether by avoidance/protection, or excavation.

Other provincial legislation that may involve requirements for identification and protection include the Cemeteries Act, the Planning Act, the Aggregate Resources Act, and other provincial policy, regulatory, and protocol documents, which support the legislation. These legislative measures act as tools that allow us to prevent the loss of information about Ontario’s past and at the same time as part of its provincial interest “the conservation of features of significant architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological or scientific interest” (s.2[d]). Consequently, the act prohibits “any use of land and the erecting, locating or using of any class or classes of buildings or structures on land that is the site of a significant archaeological resource” (s.34 [3.4]). As with the Environmental Assessment Act, if archaeological materials are encountered, the proponent must provide for mitigation of the site through either avoidance/protection or excavation.

Currently, King Township’s Official Plan and associated Community Secondary Plans vary in addressing cultural heritage resource policies, and do not always fully address the need for an archaeological assessment prior to impact. Council and staff identified inconsistencies need to be addressed as follows:
In September 2007, Council recognized that amendments to the Official and Associated Community Plans may be needed and requested that:

“The Planning Department bring forward a report which reviews the Township’s current policies and considers incorporating in King Township’s Official Plan and associated Community Plan, policies that require a Heritage Impact Statement and/or a Conservation Plan (prepared by a qualified individual) before permits are issued for development applications or demolitions of built heritage resources and cultural heritage landscapes.”

In March 2008, the Planning Department submitted a report to Council recommending

“That as part of any new or update of the Township Official Plan and/or Community/Secondary Plans, the Township considers the incorporation of appropriate policies related to the submission of a Heritage Impact Statement and/or a Conservation Plan as part of a Planning Act application.”

The Planning Department recommends these amendments, however, it is not clear if any had been made prior to the conclusion of this study. Regardless, careful consideration should be given to the definition of ‘development’ in this context, to ensure that it encompasses multiple types of development and not simply subdivisions.

**Case in Point 1: Compliance with the Ontario Planning Act**

In the fall of 2003, an archaeological assessment was carried out along the length of a gravel trail in the Town of Ajax. The trail had been constructed without an archaeological investigation and the archaeological assessment was carried out after the fact in order to determine whether any archaeological sites had been impacted during the construction of the trail. The result of this investigation was the discovery of four distinct archaeological sites. Unfortunately, the impact of the trail construction cannot be fully assessed; however, it is clear that cultural heritage resources were impacted due to a lack of archaeological investigation prior to construction. In many cases trails are constructed in high probability areas, however, municipal bylaws may not capture the need for an archaeological assessment for this type of soil disturbance. Likewise, tree-planting activities fill projects, and grading projects, are other examples of potentially destructive activities that require proactive archaeological assessments.

![Plate 8: Stage 2 Investigation Prior to Trail Construction](image-url)
### 3.0 REGIONAL CULTURAL HISTORY

The cultural history of south-central Ontario begins at the end of the last great ice age. This history is characterized by a rich legacy of the many Past Peoples who inhabited the area and, later, the many vibrant immigrant communities that, together, have given Canada its proud multicultural identity. The following is a brief synopsis of the general character of people and their environments through time (Table 1). We rely on archaeology and regional oral history as lines of evidence to interpret the history and cultures of the PreContact periods, since records of deep time such as petroglyphs, pictographs, scrolls or wampum belt treaties for King Township area are not currently known to exist. Different sources of evidence are available for the PostContact Settler period in the many forms of written, illustrated, and photographic documentation, and thus the historical record tends to be more detailed about specific people, places and events during the past two hundred years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date (Years Ago)</th>
<th>Archaeological Period</th>
<th>Major Characteristics and Shifts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ca 12,000-10,000 Y.A.</td>
<td>PalaeoIndian</td>
<td>• Tundra-like climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• First Human Occupation in Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Hunter-Gatherers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Nomadic Family Groups, temporary structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Fluted Points and Chipped Stone Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca 10,000- 2,800 YA</td>
<td>Archaic</td>
<td>• Gradually warming climate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Wider Range of Foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Wider Trade Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sedentism and reliance on fishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Oval Wigwam structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca 2,800- 1,200 Y.A.</td>
<td>Early to Middle Woodland</td>
<td>• Seasonal Migrations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ceramic Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Bow and Arrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Burial Mounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Introduction to domesticates crops and semi-sedentary settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca 1,200- 500 Y.A.</td>
<td>Terminal Woodland</td>
<td>• Political Alliances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Horticulture: Maize, beans, and squash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Longhouse structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Permanent Villages and Iroquoian groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca 500- 300 Y.A.</td>
<td>PostContact</td>
<td>• Arrival of Europeans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Missionaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Establishment of Segregated Reserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Colonial Settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ca 300 Y.A.- Present Day</td>
<td>EuroCanadian Period</td>
<td>• Pioneer Homesteads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Influx of Immigrant Populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Land Acquisition and Clearances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Major Towns and Villages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.1 PalaeoIndian Period – 12,000 to 10,000 Y.A.

Twelve thousand years ago, as the glaciers retreated from southern Ontario, nomadic peoples gradually moved into areas recently vacated by the massive ice-sheets. These people lived in small family groups and it is presumed that they hunted caribou and other fauna associated with the cooler environment of this time period. It should be remembered that as the glaciers melted at the end of the last ice age, the landscape of southern Ontario was very much like the tundra of the present day eastern sub-arctic. Traditionally, the PalaeoIndian occupation of southern Ontario has been associated with glacial lake shorelines, such as the highlands surrounding the Holland Marsh, however recent investigations in the Toronto vicinity indicate that these peoples also exploited locations situated inland from the glacial lakes, such as the kettle lakes west of the Township. As of 2007, five PalaeoIndian sites were registered in the Township and, in 2008, two additional PalaeoIndian sites were registered in other locations in the Township. Considering the rarity of these early sites in southcentral Ontario, the high frequency of PaleoIndian sites in the Township may suggest a higher than usual potential to find sites from this period.

3.2 Archaic Period – 10,000 to 2,800 Y.A.

As the climate in southern Ontario warmed, Past Peoples adapted to these new environments and associated fauna. Thus, many new technologies and subsistence strategies were introduced and developed by the Archaic Peoples of this time period; “Archaic” being an archaeological term for the cultures of this time since we are not aware of the language(s) spoken by the people or the name(s) they would have used for themselves. Woodworking implements such as groundstone axes, adzes and gouges began to appear, as did net-sinkers (for fishing), numerous types of spear points and items made from native copper, which was mined from the Lake Superior region. The presence of native copper on archaeological sites in southern Ontario and adjacent areas suggests that Archaic groups were involved in long range exchange and interaction. The trade networks established at this time were to persist between Past Peoples until European contact. To harvest the new riches of the warming climate, the Archaic bands of southern Ontario followed an annual cycle, which exploited seasonably available resources in differing geographic locales within watersheds, such as the Humber and Holland systems. As the seasons changed, these bands split into smaller groups and moved inland to exploit other resources that were available during the fall and winter such as deer, rabbit, squirrel and bear, which thrived in the forested margins of these areas. As of 2007, two Archaic sites were registered in the Township.

3.3 Early to Middle Woodland Period – 2,800 to 1,200 Y.A.

Early in the Initial Woodland period, band size and subsistence activities were generally consistent with the groups of the preceding Archaic Period. Associated with the earliest components of this cultural period is the introduction of clay pots. Additionally, around two thousand years ago a revolutionary new technology, the bow and arrow, was brought into southern Ontario and radically changed the approach to hunting and warfare. These two technological innovations allowed for major changes in subsistence and settlement patterns. As populations became larger, camps and villages with more permanent structures were occupied longer and more consistently. Generally, these larger sites are associated with the gathering of macrobands. Often these larger groups would reside in favourable locations to cooperatively take advantage of readily exploitable resources. It was also during this period that elaborate burial rituals and the interment of numerous exotic grave goods with the deceased began to take place. Increased trade and interaction between southern Ontario populations and groups as far away as the Atlantic coast and the Ohio Valley was also taking place. One such site was registered in the Township as of 2007.
3.4 Terminal Woodland Period – 1,200 Y.A. to 500 Y.A.

Around 1300 Y.A., maize was introduced into southern Ontario from the south. With the development of horticulture as the predominant subsistence base for the Iroquoian-speaking peoples, the Terminal Woodland Period gave rise to a tremendous population increase and the establishment of permanent villages. These villages consisted of longhouses measuring six metres in both width and height and extending anywhere from three to 15 metres in length. Quite often these villages, some of which were one to four hectares in size, were surrounded by multiple rows of palisades suggesting that defence was a community concern. Aside from villages, these people (known as Nadowe and labelled by the first Europeans as Huron, Petun and Neutral) also inhabited hamlets and special purpose cabins and campsites that are thought to have been associated with larger settlements. Social changes were also taking place, as reflected in the fluorescence of smoking pipes; certain burial rituals; increased settlement size; and distinct clustering of both longhouses within villages (clan development) and villages within a region (tribal development). The shift in emphasis from hunting to horticulture influenced a major socio-cultural reorganization away from the traditional patrilineal and patrilocal societies to a matrilineal orientation; a person’s clan affiliation was the same as their mother, and longhouse families often lived together by the mother’s side. Terminal Woodland Period groups in the Toronto area (Wendat, or known as Huron/Petun) gradually moved their villages northward toward Georgian Bay. It was these and the groups in southwest Ontario (Attiwandaronk, or known as Neutral) who interacted with and were described by French missionaries and explorers during the early seventeenth century.

At this point, the main villages of the Haudenosaunee (the Five Nations, later labelled as Mohawk, Oneida, Onondaga, Cayuga and Seneca) were to the south of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River, later, with the sixth nation (Tuscarora) to live in villages and reserves in Ontario. Meanwhile, according to oral traditions, some Anishinaabe peoples migrated from the East coast areas into the Great Lakes region about 700 years ago. These and other Algonquian-speakers, such as the Ojibway, Mississauga and Cree nations, were relatively less dependent upon cultivated crops and large villages. Living on the Canadian Shield, these groups continued their seasonal rounds well into the Historic or EuroCanadian Period. **In 2007, one such site was registered in the Township and another was registered in 2008.**

3.5 PostContact Period – 500 to 300 Y.A.

Also called the Early Historic Period, these years are characterized by the arrival of small number of Europeans interested in exploration, trade and establishing missions coupled with a gradual adoption of European materials by the local people. In terms of material culture, it is often difficult to distinguish between Wendat, Haudenosaunee, Anishinaabe, Métis and colonial settler campsites during these early years. This is due to the interaction and adoption of each others’ material goods and subsistence strategies which blur cultural boundaries. Such interaction was essential to early explorers and missionaries who relied on local people for survival strategies and knowledge of the local landscape and ancient trade routes such as the Toronto Carrying Place. These permeable boundaries continued until the Crown established segregated reserves in the 18th and early 19th centuries for the Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe communities who remained here while granting properties to European settlers. **No such sites were registered in the Township by 2007, however, there are many accounts of contact by local residents and sites can be expected to be found in lands adjacent to the King Railway Station, the hills surrounding Kettleby and the Holland Marsh, and to the south of Cold Creek. Fifteen of the sites that are registered in the Township are of unknown cultural affiliation; their lack of culturally specific artifacts may place them during any of the previously mentioned periods.**
3.6 EuroCanadian Period – 300 Y.A. to Present

Following the American Revolutionary War, the British government decided to reopen the overland trade route from Lake Ontario to Lake Huron, the Passage de Taronto. Thus, in 1783 the British secured from the Mississauga nation a tract stretching from Cataraqui to the Etobicoke Creek. Due to irregularities in the treaty and in order to establish the actual lands negotiated, on September 23, 1787, the Crown obtained the lands from the Mississauga nation specific to the Toronto Purchase, resulting in relocation of the Mississauga nation. Additional negotiations in 1805 led to clarification of the lands and were finally settled in 1923 by the Williams Commission.

Since 1788, the land north of Lake Ontario formed part of the District of Nassau in the Province of Quebec. Following the creation of the Province of Upper Canada in 1791, Colonel John Graves Simcoe, the first Lieutenant-Governor, renamed it the Home District and formed York County along with 18 other counties. York County was divided into two ridings, East and West York. West York included King Township. The Districts were abolished in May 1849 and the area remained as part of the County of York. Finally, on January 1, 1971, the County of York was dissolved and replaced by the Regional Municipality of York.

Lieutenant-Governor Simcoe established the Town of York as the military headquarters of Upper Canada. Early land patents in the county were rewards to soldiers in the British fight against the American Colonies. Simcoe named King Township after Major John King, the English Under-Secretary of State. King Township was partially surveyed in 1800 by Johann Stegman, an officer in the Hessian Regiment during the American Revolution. The survey was continued by others between 1836 and 1838, 1850 and in 1859. The Township was laid out in twelve concessions one and a quarter miles (two kilometers) apart, running north and south from Yonge Street west to the Albion-King Town Line and was divided by seven sideroads one and a quarter miles (two kilometers) apart running east and west from the King-Vaughan Town Line north to the county boundary. Each concession was divided into 200 acre lots, with five lots between every sideroad. Thus, a lot and concession referred to a 200 acre (81 hectare) parcel of land defined by the concession road on its eastern border. The Eleventh and Twelfth Concessions form a gore, or an incomplete concession in terms of width. With the formation of the County of Simcoe in 1851 the lands north of King Township and east of the Holland River were annexed from the Township of West Gwillimbury. Further boundary changes occurred mainly to the east along Yonge Street with the growth of communities such as Richmond Hill, Aurora and Newmarket. With the formation of the Regional Municipality of York in 1971, the boundaries of the Township shifted one concession west to Bathurst Street and one lot north from the King-Vaughan Town Line.

The Constitutional Act of 1891 provided for a reserve of land in each township for the support of the Crown and the Protestant clergy. These reserves were to equal one seventh of the lands granted in each township. The Surveyor-General, D.W. Smith, evolved the Chequered Plan for the location of the Clergy and Crown Reserves. Simcoe wished to maintain Yonge Street as a military road to the north and therefore decided the reserve plan should not include concessions bordering the street. These Reserves hindered road improvement, as each settler was only responsible for clearing the road fronting his own lot, and additionally they blocked access to streams. Settlers could lease the Reserve lots for a period of 21 years and if the duties of building the house and clearing the road were performed they could then sell the lease and be compensated for their work. In 1828 the Crown Reserves were turned over to King’s College (later to become the University of Toronto) and then sold off. The Clergy Reserves were a contributing factor to the Upper Canada Rebellion of 1837.
French émigré families from the French Revolution formed the first King Township settlers in 1799. Other settlers began to arrive in 1800 and by the time of Stegman’s survey, their population stood at 20 residents. In 1801 Timothy Rogers, a Quaker from Vermont, received a grant of 40 farms of 200 acres each and in 1802 led a settlement of 40 Quaker families to the Yonge Street area of the Township in present day Newmarket. Many of the earliest settlers arrived from the United States as United Empire Loyalists while others were attracted by the offer of 200 acre land grants. These grants were on condition that the settlers clear five acres (two hectares), build a house and open the road fronting the lot. While King Township was quickly settled by Scottish, Irish and English immigrants, many were Quakers from Pennsylvania and New York. Censuses and other records throughout the nineteenth century reveal how extensively the Quaker families intermarried, the frequency of land transactions among themselves and how it was common for them as kin to be adjacent landowners over the generations.

Settlement began along Yonge Street and quickly pushed west and east around waterways, fertile land and timber resources, with the Oak Ridges Moraine influencing the settlement patterns. To the north and south of the Moraine could be found the hamlets and villages. The early development of King Township occurred as small communities began at intersections of main roads or near to a stream or river providing a source of power for a mill. Hardwood forests of maple mixed with beech, cherry, oak basswood, hemlock and pine were in the fertile soils of the highlands while stands of white and red pine were found in the lighter sandy soil. The wet and moist areas supported cedar, yellow birch, black ash, elm and spruce. The earliest settlers needed to clear these trees to cultivate their lands and make their homes. The many tributaries of the Humber and Holland Rivers were home to many small sawmills throughout the Township, supplying lumber for local use, the mast and spar industry for the Royal Navy and planks for the roadways. These were soon followed by larger sawmills, gristmills for flour, woolen mills and distilleries. As many as 24 saw or gristmills existed throughout the Township at one time. The mill operation was followed by facilities to serve the settler including a general store, church, school and later a post office and new communities were thus created.

The Humber River and its many tributaries played an important part in the development of the Township during and prior to EuroCanadian settlement. Passing to the east and northeast of Jonda/Eaton Hall Lake, the Schomberg and Aurora Railway ran from 1902 to 1927. Traces of the railway bed may still be distinguished in some areas.

Agricultural censuses of the mid nineteenth century indicate the small variety of crops grown by the farmers in the area. These included to a large extent oat, some wheat and barley, followed by peas, potatoes and hay. Some families produced maple sugar though a few produced cider or kept bees. Most farms kept livestock that included a few beef and dairy cattle, horses, pigs and sheep. This livestock resulted in butter, beef, and pork produce to sustain the farmer’s family with enough left over to bring to market. The farm lots of the time were mostly 100 acres (40.5 acres) in size thus the censuses show predominately farmers, later joined by servants and labourers in the last part of the 19th century. Their homes were mainly one and a half storey frame or log structures. More expensive stone and brick homes followed later in the century. The origins of the families in this area were a good representation of the earliest settlers; English, Scottish and Irish with many professing to be Quaker, Wesleyan Methodist, Mennonite, Church of England and Presbyterian.  

As of 2007, only two archaeological sites of the historic period were registered in the Township. In 2008, 7 more historic sites were registered, one of which is a mill complex with tail and head races still visible. Given the rich history mentioned above, many more archaeological sites may be identified in the Township.
**4.0 REGIONAL ARCHAEOLOGY**

### 4.1 Adjacent Municipalities - Comparison

Figure 2 demonstrates the number of archaeological sites that were registered to date in seven local municipalities: these numbers are more contingent on the amount of development, which triggers archaeology, rather than a true representation of cultural resources in the municipality. Areas with extensive development, such as Vaughan show that the number of archaeological sites increases exponentially.

![Figure 2: Registered Archaeological Sites and municipalities area – 2007](image)

Figure 3 illustrates the density and local concentrations of sites and it becomes evident that the majority of archaeological sites were discovered in newer subdivision areas, while areas of older subdivision and undeveloped areas do not reflect similar numbers. For example, in Newmarket, a total of 29 sites were registered by 2007. Twenty two of these sites are concentrated in recent subdivision development. Since the rest of the city was developed prior to the legislation enforcement, it is likely that permanent loss of archaeological sites has occurred. King Township, on the other hand had minimal development and by 2007, only 30 sites registered. When applying the same density that we find in new subdivisions in Newmarket, it can be hypothesized that nearly 700 sites could be situated within the Township of King's boundaries. Figure 4 demonstrates possible site density in vicinity to watercourses. Applying these numbers to the Township and its many water features will raise these proposed numbers even more.
As this study was reaching its conclusion, several new sites were registered in the area as the result of an archaeological assessment that was triggered by a subdivision application. These sites, including a PaleoIndian site, a possible village site, a mill site with race remnant, and several isolated artifact finds, illustrate further the high potential to encounter archaeological sites of different functions and different time periods throughout the Township.
Case in Point 2: Archaeological Site Density in the Rouge River Watershed

The data in Figure 2 paints a clear picture of the existing gap in our knowledge of cultural heritage in King Township and some of its neighbours. A systematic survey of agricultural lands can aid in identifying and mapping previously unknown sites. Consequently, this would result in a proactive and open-ended inventory of archaeological sites. An example of such an inventory was conducted within the Rouge Watershed by TRCA. A series of survey projects in Rouge Park resulted in close to 200 previously unknown archaeological sites that are now registered in the Ontario Archaeological Database for an area of about 3 square kilometres: nearly 70 sites per square kilometer. When the same math is applied to the Township of King, the potential to find previously unknown sites is very high. It is highly recommended that targeted research studies such as the Rouge Survey be conducted in the Township; key benefits will be eliminating the gap, enhancing our knowledge, documenting cultural resources, and finally, protecting these resources.

Figure 4: Example of Site Density in Rouge River Watershed

Source: TRCA (specific site locations are randomly offset)
5.0 PREVIOUS LOCAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH

Since 1974, all known archaeological sites in the province have been registered with the Ontario Archaeological Sites Database, maintained by the Cultural Services Unit of the Ministry of Culture. This is the official repository of all archaeological information collected under the Ontario Heritage Act (OHA).

All archaeological sites in Canada are registered using the Borden System. This system was introduced in 1952 and was widely used by 1956. The system is based on the National Topographic Series of maps, which identifies latitude and longitude axis and intervals with a unique series of capital and lower case letters. This identifies hundreds of 16 square kilometre areas across the country, each referred to as a Borden Block. Within a single Borden Block, each individual archaeological site receives a sequential number as it is found. Thus, AkGv-016 is the sixteenth site registered within the AkGv Borden Block. While archaeological sites may share informal titles, their Borden designation is unique. There are five Borden Blocks within King Township: AlGu, AlGv, AlGw, BaGv and BaGw.

There are very few registered archaeological sites in King Township, due more to a lack of study rather than an absence of past human activity. The large amount of archaeological sites that surround King Township in Vaughan, Richmond Hill, Aurora, Newmarket and Caledon is a testament to the extent of regional human activity in the past. Furthermore, while Lizards (1974:112) does not specifically mention King Township, she notes, “many fields, when under the plough, have given up flint arrows, axe-heads and numerous pipes.” This certainly applies to King Township as evidenced by the numerous known and unknown private artifact collections held by farming families.

According to residents in the area, a number of artifacts were recovered during the 1950s and 1960s around Hackett Lake, which seem to indicate a late Ontario Iroquoian presence. The Toronto Carrying Place Trail passed nearby this site (Austin 1995:81). The site is indicated on the King Township Heritage Map provided by the Township of King Heritage Committee and King Heritage Map Partnership. However, the site is not included in the database of registered archaeological sites provided by the Ministry of Culture, suggesting the site has not been investigated further, and it clearly has not been registered with the Ministry of Culture, leaving it unprotected. Similarly, artifacts related to the general northern alignment of the Toronto Carrying Place in the township were dropped off at different museums in Ontario. Aurora Museum, King Museum, the ROM, and the Waterfront Marine Museum are some institutions that held artifact that were collected in the Township of King, however, the location of these artifacts was not registered as an archaeological site. AARO magazine form 1911 reports that artifacts from CON 6 LOT 2 and CON 5 LOT 7, were dropped off at the ROM.

By the end of 2007, there were 30 registered archaeological sites in King Township. Some of these sites include:

- The Peppy site (AlGw-033), the Vink site (AlGw-034) and the Shock site (AlGw-035) are all located along a north-south axis at the southwest corner of King Township and are situated roughly equidistant from each other. They are located on tableland overlooking the Humber River with an intermittent stream nearby and a deep cut tributary. The Peppy site (AlGw-033) is the northernmost site and was identified by the presence of four chert (stone) flakes, one chert core, and a single intrusive EuroCanadian pipe bowl fragment. The Vink site (AlGw-034) is located close to a minor river tributary and was identified by three chert flakes and two stone tools. The Shock site (AlGw-035) is located on a rise of...
tableland between the Humber River and a tributary. Two chert biface fragments and a single flake identified the site. The limited numbers of types of artifacts in all cases prevents a cultural or temporal affiliation for these sites.

- The Nobleton 1 (AlGv-131), Nobleton 2 (AlGv-132) and Nobleton 3 (AlGv-133) sites are all findspots located along an east-west axis and are roughly equidistant from each other. They are all situated on rolling terrain that is drained by tributaries of the Humber River. Prominent knolls and a ridge that overlook watercourses characterize the landscape. The Nobleton 1 (AlGv-131) site was identified by a single chert biface. The Nobleton 2 (AlGv-132) site was identified by a Meadowood biface and the Nobleton 3 (AlGv-133) site was identified by a scraping tool. The Sisler site (BaGv-011) is a PaleoIndian camp located along a strandline near the Holland Marsh north of the intersection of Dufferin Street and Millers Sideroad.

**Case in Point 3: Planting Activities and Impact on Cultural Heritage**

It is not a common practice in most municipalities to conduct archaeological assessments prior to tree planting projects. Extensive reforestation activities may result in capping archaeological sites, rendering them inaccessible and may impact these resources either by the planting activities themselves, or merely by root action. Hand planting as well as caliper planting may damage subsoil features, such as hearths, storage pits, and middens, by digging to a depth of 15 cm (6”). It is increasingly important that the Township has a policy regarding these types of soil disturbances.

As mentioned in Case in Point 2, an archaeological assessment conducted prior to a reforestation project north of Nobleton recorded 22 distinct sites in a 36 hectare area, almost doubling the number of sites in the Township.

Assessments prior to planting activities may result in avoidance of certain areas in a case where significant resources are encountered; it does not, however, result in costly excavation, since the objective is documentation and protection of resources.
6.0 PREDICTIVE MODELLING

6.1 The Archaeological Site Predictive Model

The Archaeological Site Predictive Model (ASPM) was initially developed as a component of the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority’s Archaeological Master Plan (1990). The model was designed for use by TRCA project planners in order to assess the potential for cultural resources within a particular property. While the model does not forecast exact site locations, it does present a generalized prediction based on the known settlement patterns of PreContact peoples. The TRCA model covers the area south of the watershed divide that dissects the Township of King (Figure 5).

Several variables determine archaeological probability: distance to water, stream order, soil type, drainage, physiographic region, degree of slope, and proximity to registered archaeological sites. However, the three most significant factors that determined settlement location for past peoples were close proximity to water, well drained soils, and flat to gently sloping terrain. It should be noted that the most critical factor influencing settlement location is the distance to a source of water.

The model employs High, Medium and Low probability categories. Within King Township, locations that hold high archaeological potential include the physiographic regions of the Oak Ridges Moraine, the South Slope, the North Slope, and the Peel Plain. Properties with sandy and clay loams featuring good to imperfect drainage also have high potential. Settlement also seemed to gravitate toward land that is level to gently undulating and near to first and second order streams and kettle lakes, ponds, and ancient shorelines.

As mentioned, availability of water is one of the most fundamental influences on human settlement and is therefore a major indicator of archaeological potential. In its’ 1993 Standards and Guidelines, The Ministry of Culture notes that primary water sources within 300 metres of a project area, secondary water sources within 200 metres, as well as features that indicate past or ancient water sources within 300 metres of a project area are likely to contain an archaeological site.

Thus, areas with high probability to contain PreContact cultural resources are within approximately 250 metres of a water source with good soil drainage and level to gently undulating topography. Probability decreases as distance to water increases, as drainage gets poorer and hills and knolls get more prominent, although in many cases, archaeological sites are associated with prominent land features.

While EuroCanadian and other PostContact settlement were dictated by the same needs as those of PreContact peoples, environmental constraints were lessened due to land clearances and road building. However, primary and permanent water resources were crucial for establishing mills, which were vital for further settlement. Areas with high probability to contain EuroCanadian sites are typically within 150 metres from historic transportation routes. These routes are in many cases have a similar alignment to modern roads.

Probability models are tools that assist in determining potential and are to be used in conjunction with site visits and field assessments and not as stand-alone tools, especially when determining that there is low potential for finding archaeological sites. The accuracy of such models have not been thoroughly studied and compared with archaeological finds in the last two decades, however, it is quite clear that most sites are located in high probability areas. The only scenario where archaeological potential is nil, occurs when there is reliable, convincing data to determine that a
location has been thoroughly disturbed and that no potential remains for intact archaeological resources to survive. Even in areas of disturbance, there is still the possibility to encounter deeply buried deposits containing cultural resources.

Ontario municipalities are increasingly adopting archaeological master plan predictive models for PreContact and PostContact sites as a useful tool to assist with urban planning and heritage culture management. The Town of Markham (1985), the City of Vaughan (1989), the Town of Richmond Hill (1990), and the City of Toronto (2006), are examples of some of these municipalities.

Figure 5: Probability Map for Pre Contact Sites (Within the Humber Watershed)

Developed by TRCA Archaeology Unit (1990), revised (2003)
6.2 High Probability Areas and Cultural Landscapes in King Township

The probability model developed by TRCA in 1990 includes the southern third of the Township of King. It paints a very clear picture of medium to high probability of encountering cultural resources and very few areas of low or no probability to encounter such resources.

King Township is at a crossroad between two large natural features that are regionally significant: The Oak Ridges Moraine and the Humber River. Both of these natural features played a major role in Past Peoples’ lives and many sites that hold key clues to those who lived here before us have been recorded along these corridors.

Based on this probability model and further research, the following are some of the areas of special consideration that hold very high potential for encountering cultural heritage resources in general, and archaeological sites in particular.

- **Highlighting these areas of high potential should not discount high potential in other areas in the Township, but rather, call attention to areas that hold special characteristics as a model for the rest of the Township.**

- **The following are areas that hold high potential for encountering archaeological sites in King Township; each area’s general location is represented in Figure 7.**

6.2.1 Holland Marsh

The **Holland Marsh** consists of 2,900 hectares of poorly drained organic peat moss and is situated within the Holland River Watershed. The south side of the marsh is located in King Township in York Region, while the northern side is located in the Town of Bradford in Simcoe County. It is roughly 15 kilometres in length and 4 kilometers wide. The marsh lies in the floodplains of the Schomberg River, which meets the Holland River at the northeastern termination of the marsh. This flat, level area was once an arm of Glacial Lake Algonquin and a shallow extension of Lake Simcoe (Chapman and Putnam 1984:181). The marsh is named after its surveyor, Major J. Samuel Holland.

The marsh was a massive wetland and offered a home to a variety of game, fish and fowl, providing these life-sustaining resources sought after by the earliest inhabitants of this region as well as later European settlers. It was crossed by the Toronto Carrying Place Trail, although another route to the east was also in use in order to avoid the marsh.

In 1925, the idea of muck farming the marsh was proposed and a five-year project to drain the area was begun. A canal and dikes were constructed in order to reroute the river. Much of the swamp and marshland no longer exists, and today the marsh is known as Ontario’s vegetable garden, providing produce for an international market. It is considered some of the best farmland in Ontario.

The lands sloping up towards the south contain ancient beaches and strandlines, and hold very high potential for significant archaeological sites; a more detailed discussion about ancient shorelines can be found in the next category of high potential areas. In addition, its documented connection to
the Toronto Carrying Place Trail, used for millennia, suggests further potential for archaeological sites of later dates as well.

The general area surrounding the marsh contains several drumlins and eskers that are considered areas of high potential for finding archaeological sites and local farmers report many finds of arrowheads on the hills surrounding the marsh.

### 6.2.2 Ancient Shorelines and Ancient Beaches

The southern finger of the Holland Marsh was once a long embayment that was part of a series of finger lakes forming the southern margin of **Glacial Lake Algonquin**. This preglacial lake encompassed Lake Huron, Georgian Bay and Lake Simcoe. The water level was about 40 metres higher than the current levels of Lake Simcoe (Storeck 2004:24) and ancient beaches and strandlines can be seen on slopes that led down to the basin of the lake providing evidence of dramatic changes in water levels. The lake was more akin to an inland sea and formed from glacial melt water when glaciers moved north to create an outlet that drained Glacial Lake Algonquin through the Trent River about 11,500 years ago (Chapman and Putnam 1984:24).

These ancient beaches between the high and low water marks seemed to be favoured by PalaeoIndian peoples for setting up camps (Jackson et al 2000:428). These locations have preferred since they may likely have attracted caribou and mastodon due to the cooling lake breeze and edible ground lichen. Furthermore, resources such as fish and waterfowl would have been available (Jackson et al, 2000:433).

Ancient beach ridges of gravel or sand and wave cut bluffs with bouldered terraces are relatively easy to identify (Chapman and Putnam 1984:19). It should be stressed, however that shorelines can rapidly change due to erosion or deposition and the exact location of these ancient beaches cannot always be determined with absolute certainty (Drzyzga et al. 2002:11); an archaeological assessment may be the only way to detect such sites.

- The corridor that extends between the Schomberg area, along Highway 9 and towards the northeast corner of the Township (Figure 7 and Appendix A) represents the potential for these significant sites; several PaeleoIndian sites were discovered prior to the Highway 9 road widening. Current and future industrial activities pose a threat to cultural resources in this area; any future activities that may impact the soil should involve an archaeological assessment prior to disturbance.

### 6.2.3 Oak Ridges Moraine

The **Oak Ridges Moraine** is the dominant physiographic feature of south central Ontario and extends 200 kilometres from the Niagara Escarpment to the Trent Valley. It has an average altitude of approximately 300 metres above sea level and significantly narrows in several areas through which roads and highways may cross, one of which is York Regional Road 27 locally referred to as Highway 27 (Chapman and Putnam 1984:166). It stretches through the middle of King Township and covers over 70% of the area. It is, arguably, the single greatest environmental influence on the settlement of King Township (King Township: History and Heritage 2006).

The moraine is an interlobate moraine and is the result of two opposite lobes of ice pushing and rubbing against each other (Chapman and Putnam 1984:14) and eventually depositing either till or gravel and sand. They are commonly characterized by irregular surfaces (Chapman and Putnam 1984:162).
The depressions between these irregularities, caused by trapped blocks of melting ice, formed basins known as kettles, these features lack surface drainage and soon become small lakes (McQueen 1999:267). Clay till is the dominant soil in King Township, however, towards the east part of The Township of King the moraine is generally sandy (Chapman and Putnam 1984:53).

The Oak Ridges Moraine is the source of all the watersheds in the Greater Toronto Area. The sand and gravel deposits absorb groundwater, which is then filtered and released into the 65 streams and rivers that have their headwaters in the moraine. The ecological diversity of the moraine provides a home for a variety of forests, kettle lakes, bogs and is one of the last surviving green corridors in southern Ontario. Interestingly, the moraine provides its own microclimate. It is several degrees cooler than the temperature in the surrounding areas.

While moraine soils are characteristically droughty and unstable when cultivate, the resources provided by the moraine would have appealed to Past Peoples in particular. Furthermore, the moraine offered a source of timber, which was exploited by early settlers. Following deforestation, the slopes and hillsides were occupied as farmland (Chapman and Putnam 1984:167). Alarmingly, extensive deforestation of the moraine has resulted in a reduction of natural groundwater. In King Township, over 80% of the streams have become intermittent between 1837 and 1937. In the past, however, these would have provided a reliable source of water (Westgate et al. 1999:29).

The territory between Lake Ontario and the Oak Ridges Moraine has been divided into three physiographic regions. The Iroquois Lake Plain occupies the lowest land, the Peel Plain is the central region, the South Slope, (Chapman and Putnam 1984:172). King Township is situated on the latter two regions and extends north on the moraine.

The South Slope extends across the entire southern edge of the Oak Ridges Moraine and contains a variety of soils, some of which are excellent for agricultural purposes (Chapman and Putnam 1984:173). The area was colonized by a second wave of British immigrants following the Napoleonic Wars. These early settlers employed mixed subsistence agriculture and the slope was soon cleared for farming. Consequently, very few woodlands or wetlands remain (Chapman and Putnam 1984:174).

The southern areas of King Township are situated on the Peel Plain, a piece of land that spreads over 780 square kilometers and includes central areas of York, Peel and Halton Regions (Chapman and Putnam 1984:174). The plain gradually slopes toward Lake Ontario and ranges in elevation from 150 to 230 metres above sea level. The Credit, Humber, Don and Rouge Rivers provide drainage and wetlands. However, water supply on the plain can be inconsistent due to shallow overburden, dense till and lack of natural aquifers. The plain also experiences a high degree of evaporation (Chapman and Putnam 1984:175).

Although the Peel Plain is now almost completely deforested, in the past it supported high quality hardwood forests. Fertile soils have resulted in extensive agricultural use of the plain and it was once a noted wheat-growing area. (Chapman and Putnam 1984:176). Century farms can still be found dotting the plain.

- The Oak Ridges Moraine is identified as an area of high probability to encounter cultural heritage resources. Several ‘highlight areas’ have been identified on the map (Figure 7, and Appendix A) and are discussed separately. This does not exclude other areas on the moraine from being included in this category of high probability.
6.2.4 Wetland Complexes and Kettle Lakes

The Township is home to a number of provincially significant wetland complexes, forested areas and swamps and kettle lakes. These include the Eaton Hall, Mary, and Hackett Lakes to name a few, the Nobleton Wetland Complexes, the Pottageville Swamp, Southeast Upland and Happy Valley Forests and other, smaller lakes, swamps and wetlands. Figure 7 (Appendix A is a larger version) illustrates the corridor along the top of the moraine that contains many of these water features; it does not discount other wetlands and kettle lakes in the Township that may also present high potential to encounter cultural resources.

The Eaton Hall-Mary-Hackett Lakes Wetland Complex is a large wetland system that is connected by streams, forested uplands and agricultural fields. Each wetland is within 750 metres from its neighbour. This complex contains the largest and most diverse wetlands within the Oak Ridges Moraine and hosts a number of kettle lakes. The larger Pottageville Wetland Complex is mainly made up of swamp, marsh and fen, as is the Nobleton Wetland Complex, which is made up of 35 wetlands. Finally, the Ansnorveldt Wetland Complex is located in the northern part of the Township and is bounded by the Holland Marsh to the east and northeast. Pottageville Swamp is a deciduous swamp and the source for several tributaries of the Holland River. This was originally connected to the Holland Marsh but has since been isolated due to the drainage realignments projects of the 1920s.

The Pottageville Southeast Upland Forest is a high quality forest situated on the north slope of the Oak Ridges Moraine and contains a number of tributaries of the Holland River. The Happy Valley Forest is the largest deciduous old-growth forest on the moraine. It consists of several wetland areas and a few kettle ponds. The Toronto Carrying Place Trail likely crossed this area, suggesting an area of cultural significance.

There are many smaller lakes, ponds, and wetlands within these systems and all are areas of high potential.

6.2.5 Humber River

King Township includes the northern extremes of the main and east branches of the Humber River and several of its associated tributaries on the southern margin of the Township.

The Humber Valley has been an attractive area for human travel and settlement for thousands of years. The Toronto Carrying Place Trail made use of the valley and the first European settlement in the Greater Toronto Area was in the area of the mouth of the Humber on the shores of Lake Ontario (McAndrews 1999:280). Today, evidence of the early history of the Humber River is reflected, not only in archaeological sites, but also in other heritage sites such as the King Railway Station. Although removed from its original place, it was once part of the Northern Railway and is now the oldest surviving railway station in Canada.

The river is a part of the Northern Lake Ontario Drainage. It has an area of 570 square miles and the main river runs for approximately 100 kilometres and includes several tributaries. It can be up to 30 metres deep in some areas and is the largest watershed in the region (Chapman and Putnam 1984:103). Because of the human heritage and recreational values associated with the river, it was officially designated as a Canadian Heritage River on September 24, 1999. Every year, the TRCA reports on the increases and decreases in the numbers of registered archaeological sites, heritage...
structures, and other cultural heritage indicators. There has been a consistent increase in known archaeological sites in the Humber Watershed every year, primarily in developing areas of the watershed such as Brampton and Vaughan, ever-expanding our knowledge of past peoples and their lives in different times and in different environments relating to the Humber River.

King Township contains many other watercourses and the potential to encounter archaeological resources in their vicinity is very high.

**Case in Point 4: Kettle Lakes and Human Activities**

Kettle Lakes can be viewed as ‘nature’s supermarket’; they provided sustenance for past peoples. As a result of these constant ‘shopping excursions’, kettle lakes tend to have a high density of archaeological sites around them. To the east of the Township, archaeological assessments near kettle lakes in Richmond Hill resulted in the registration of many sites. Limited investigations in King Township suggest that similar results should be expected. The Thompson Lake Canoe site (AlGw-021) **(Appendix A, number 1)** was registered after a dugout canoe was found floating in the small kettle lake in 1981. Not much more is known about this site; however, it is interesting to note that another dugout canoe was reported as recovered from Eaton Hall Lake (Lake Jonda) **(Appendix A, number 2)**, located approximately 14 kilometres to the east, during the time that Eaton Hall was still inhabited by the Eaton family. This find was never registered with the Ministry of Culture and its fate unknown.

Interestingly, an archaeological assessment prior to a wetland enhancement on the Seneca College grounds discovered a large lithic site. The Janus site (AlGv-240), an Archaic Period site, is situated on the southwest shore of Eaton Hall Lake and suggests that human activities in the area spanned over thousands of years.

Hackett Lake **(Appendix A, number 3)** is a locally well-known archaeological site that is situated by a kettle lake; this supposed village site was never registered as an archaeological site although there are many local accounts of artifacts on the property. This site is shown on historic and modern maps as one of the villages along the Toronto Carrying Place and would be a significant addition to the archaeological record.
6.2.6 Happy Valley Forest

Happy Valley Forest is an upland forest with mostly steep rolling terrain that is located on the Oak Ridges Moraine. It consists of extensive forest, some of which is old growth, and contains swamps, wetlands, and small kettle ponds. This area is one of the highest points in the township and interestingly, intersected by two high potential: the Toronto Carrying Place Trail and the distinct east west line of kettle lakes on the Oak Ridges Moraine.

The dramatic terrain, the strategic location, and the presence of locally-known cultural heritage resources, suggests that the Happy Valley Forest as a prime potential area for encountering cultural resources that may be associated with spiritual and ceremonial practices, burials, villages and campsites. Local residents report remnants of old stump fences, artifacts and mounds that were found in the area. Note that the unregistered site near Hackett Lake is just to the south of the forest (Appendix A, Number 6)

6.2.7 King Creek/ King Trails

King Creek and King Trails (Appendix A, Number 5) is a culturally rich area that holds the potential to encounter archaeological sites that range in date from deep time, through ancient trade routes, to 19th and 20th century eras. Its proximity to the Carrying Place and the Humber River identifies King Trails as a high probability area to encounter PreContact sites. In the 19th century, the area was a small milling community and had housing for mill workers. Later, it became a cottage destination, and in 1954, the area was impacted by Hurricane Hazel and abandoned. The high probability to encounter both EuroCanadian and PreContact sites in the area is very high, and combined with the most recent chapter in Ontario history represented by Hurricane Hazel, the area can be considered a candidate for cultural heritage landscape designation and preservation.

Today, King Trails is a beautiful destination for a hike along the Humber River, its past all but hidden.

6.2.8 Cold Creek

Cold Creek is a spring fed creek located at the southwestern edge of King Township. The surrounding forest and wildlife area is provincially designated as an area of natural and scientific interest, due to the ecological diversity provided by the one kilometre long creek. Several springs and streams dot the area and it boasts an excellent example of mature black spruce forest and a variety of Boreal species. Hardwood and conifer forests, meadows and steep escarpments contribute to the landscape. Low-lying high quality swampy areas that include a unique boreal peat bog and upland areas on the South Slope till plain characterize the area (Appendix A, number 6).

An interesting feature about Cold Creek is the microclimate it produces. The shade from the tree cover and the cold ground water provided by the spring fed creek lowers the air temperature by about ten degrees in the summer. During the winter months the creek never freezes and the air is somewhat warmer as a result, a feature that would certainly have appealed to both First Nation Peoples as well as later settlers in the area.
Cedar Glen, located just north of King Road on the Eleventh Concession in the Cold Creek area was the location of a Mississauga encampment from 1845 to 1865. The property was then purchased by Jonathan Kehoe and farmed until 1961. This site was never registered and therefore not incorporated into the Ontario Archaeological Sites Database.

In commemoration of the strong Past Peoples presence in this area, Cold Creek as with the Humber Watershed as a whole, has adopted the turtle as its signature totem. The turtle continues as a sacred animal to First Nations and Métis worldviews and figures prominently in many creation stories (Pearce 2005).

6.2.9 Transportation Routes

Transportation routes, whether of PreContact or EuroCanadian eras, carry with them the possibility to encounter archaeological sites. King Township, similar to other southern Ontario municipalities, contains within its borders a weave of different types of transportation routes. The areas around these transportation routes are considered high probability areas, and may consist of, but are not restricted to, rivers, streams, ancient trails, historic roadways and historic railways. Some of these transportation routes are illustrated below.

It was not practical to identify each one of these transportation routes on the map (Appendix A), however, when consulting Appendix A one should keep in mind that the lands adjacent to roads, streams and railways throughout the municipality represent high potential to encounter archaeological sites.

6.2.10 The Toronto Carrying Place: the Humber Portage

The multi-branched Toronto Carrying Place Trail has also been called the Humber Portage and the Toronto Passage. One of the portage trails generally followed the eastern bank of the Humber River and ran north, bisecting King Township up to the Holland River and northeast to Atherly Narrows that connects Lake Simcoe to Lake Couchiching. The trail travels through King Township for approximately 17 kilometres and runs parallel to Weston Road for much of this distance. The trail, quite likely, extends through the Happy Valley Forest.

As people traveled the Toronto Carrying Place Trail, they certainly passed through what has become the Township. It is believed the portage was employed by Étienne Brûlé in the summer of 1615 (Mays 2002:96) and later by Sieur de La Salle in the 1670s, and accordingly, these explorers were the first Europeans to visit King Township.

Originally, the Wendat, called Lake Simcoe Ouentironk, meaning “Beautiful Water.” It appeared on a 1680 map as Lac de Taronto, after the Iroquoian term for the area. Consequently, the portage was subsequently dubbed the Passage de Taronto. The trail was akin to a modern day highway and was noted on early maps as noted Lizzars (1974:14), “the track there called Portage is distinctly marked and where its terminus is marked by the word Toiouegon.” It was similar to other paths that cut across North Eastern North America. These paths “were worn deep, sometimes a foot, almost always six inches into the earth” (Lizzars 1974:13).
After Governor Simcoe commissioned the construction of a straight road from Lake Simcoe to Lake Ontario (i.e. Yonge Street), the portage was largely abandoned as a primary route. Parks Canada designated it as being nationally and historically significant in 1969 and the King Township Historical Society erected a plaque where the trail meets the Holland River on Highway 9, to the west of Weston Road in 1982. It was in this area that a local resident indicated a well-worn footpath and a causeway of tamarack poles, possible remains of the portage (Austin 1995:75). Curiously, the portage has never been officially mapped, although it is known that it seemed to have passed near several villages, camps and burial sites (Austin 1995:74). An estimated route and its surrounding area is depicted in Appendix A. An example of a recent exercise to overlay the Percy Robinson’s route of the Toronto Carrying Place on a relief map is shown in Figure 6.
Figure 6: The Toronto Carrying Place Map Overlay

Source: Ken Carter, Canadian Heritage Landscapes
6.2.11 Kettleby Creek

Kettleby Creek is situated in a valley nestled within steep hills. This area is identified as a high probability area, and a variety of cultural resources may be discovered in this area. Early settlers passed on accounts of First Nation People activities on the hills surrounding the valley present the high probability of finding remnants of campsites. Accounts of remnants of a corduroy road, as well as 19th century archaeological sites such as mill and homestead foundations and middens, present the possibilities of other types of archaeological sites in this area (Appendix A, number 4).

6.2.12 Thornton Bales Conservation Area

Thornton Bales in an area of natural, scientific, and heritage Interest. Situated on the crest of the Oak Ridges Moraine, it is one of its highest areas. The area is situated on a rare Kame moraine with dramatic landforms, steep slopes, and extreme elevation changes. The forested slopes may still contain old growth forest, while at the bottom of the cliffs, several brooks flow into the Holland River. This conservation area and the fields surrounding it, have a very high probability to contain cultural resources (Appendix A, number 8).

6.2.13 Burial Grounds and Villages

The Late Woodland Period was witness to evolving mortuary practices among Iroquoian peoples. When a village shifted its location every ten to 15 years, individuals were exhumed from their primary burial location and reinterred together in a deep pit lined with beaver robes or bark. This practice was accompanied by rituals and a ceremony known as ‘The Feast of the Dead.’ The resulting common grave is known as an ossuary and it is believed that every major village, or a cluster of several villages, have an associated ossuary. These pits are up to ten metres in width and may be three metres in depth.

However, as of 2003, 49 villages have been recorded across the GTA and several more that are known locally have not been recorded. Yet only ten ossuaries have been discovered. While several neighbouring villages collaborated in the feast bringing their dead to the ossuary, these numbers still suggest that either ossuary burial was a less frequent event than is suggested by contemporaneous accounts, or they are typically deep enough to avoid detection. Most likely, a large number of ossuaries await discovery and protection from deep construction activities. This scenario played out in August of 2005 when road widening uncovered the Teston Ossuary, which is a 450 year old bone pit containing up to 400 individuals. Presumably, the ossuary is related to the nearby Teston village (AkGv-002). The Township of King holds high potential for several villages and numerous campsites along with individual/single or ossuary burials that were associated with these settlements. Local information suggests the existence of burial or ceremonial mounds in the vicinity of the unregistered village of Hackett Lake that should be assessed.

6.2.14 King Railway Station

Although King Railway Station has been moved from its original context (Appendix A, number 9), the area surrounding its former location may contain archaeological sites, particularly, those pertaining to the Contact Period. Several accounts from local residents identify the field adjacent to the station as a gathering place for Anishinaabe people waiting for the train to come so that they could engage in trade. The area around the station may also hold potential for EuroCanadian sites;
future studies ahead of proposed development around the station should take these accounts into consideration.

### 6.2.15 Historic Communities

King Township is home to several early settlements that are still present today. These villages and hamlets contain a large number of built heritage structures; the likelihood of encountering archaeological sites in and around these communities is very high, whether around existing buildings or those long gone. Many communities started around mills. Some of these communities, for example Bell’s Lake, Davis Corners and King Ridge, were abandoned; however, most still exist today. Communities such as Kettleby, Lloydtown, and Laskay, to name a few, are very high potential areas for encountering archaeological sites.

**Case in Point 5: Artifact ID Clinic**

In an attempt to involve the local community and acquire additional information, an artifact identification clinic was offered during the 2008 Doors Open event at The King Township Museum. King Township residents had the opportunity to bring in artifacts for identification. A handful of local residents stepped forward and brought in artifacts for identification; these artifacts were photographed and the approximate location where they were collected was mapped. Although not all of the artifacts were local, several were collected within the Township. Many residents stopped by to share information about their parents, grandparents, or neighbours and their collections of artifacts.

Artifacts were collected from the following locations: Schomberg and Lloydtown, Happy Valley Forest area, and Hackett Lake area.
7.0 SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Summary

Four clear points emerge as the result of this report. First, a demonstrated high potential to encounter cultural heritage resources from all past cultural periods exists throughout the Township. Second, Council and staff have recognized that municipal policies and practices need significant strengthening in order to offer sufficient protection for cultural resources. Third, there is a lack of systematic research, documentation and best management practices identified for archaeological sites in the Township. Fourth, cultural heritage resources of many forms in the Township of King may face imminent impact as a direct result of the three previous points.

Several subdivisions and projects, such as the proposed Holland Marsh Power Plant and the proposed Holland Marsh Peaker Plant, will impact the “Townships’ visible landscape, as well as its invisible cultural landscape. As a result, archaeological sites and cultural landscapes - the cultural footprint of the region and its unique signature - may be lost forever.

Well-planned urban growth, however, can be an opportunity to enhance our knowledge, protect and document these cultural resources, and link the ‘Township of King to become’, with ‘the space that the Township of King once was’, recognizing the tie between the past, present and future of a unique place.

7.2 Recommendations

The following are recommendations for future efforts to strengthen the protection for and perceived value of the Township of King’s historic and archaeological resources:

- **Evaluate current policies in the Township of King** and consider the requirement of an archaeological assessment prior to any land disturbance such as, but not limited to, fill, grading, parking lots, trail construction, reforestation projects and other projects that may not be covered under current Municipal Policies. The Township will be the most appropriate to take the lead to implement these best management practices;

- **Build capacity for in-house expertise** where cultural heritage may be involved and to enable municipal staff to be involved in training initiatives offered by the Ministry of Culture and request additional opportunities to ensure that topics are covered such as: archaeology and legislative requirements; archaeological standards and technical guidelines; evaluation of an archaeological assessment during the municipal permitting process; options for long term protection of archaeological sites; and, relationship building with Anishinaabe, Wendat, Haudenosaunee and Métis communities and early settler period descendant families. To be led by the Township;
Initiate systematic assessments throughout the township. Extensive and systematic Stage 2 pedestrian surveys conducted on ploughed farmers’ fields along high probability areas will boost the archaeological record and enhance local and regional knowledge of past peoples. These projects to be led by a licenced archaeologist with some community assistance;

Register with the Ministry of Culture all of the locally known unregistered archaeological sites. Conduct research and register cultural resources in the Township for future protection; Hackett Lake village site and mill ruins are some examples. A licenced archaeologist can act as lead with some community participation;

Register the locations of demolished historic buildings as archaeological sites. To be led by a licenced archaeologist, Heritage King, and interested community members;

Explore and further research local knowledge of culturally significant resources such as, but not restricted to: Contact Period meeting places, burial mounds, disappearing cultural heritage landscapes such as stump fences, farm laneways and gates, to be led by Heritage King and an archaeological/cultural consultant;

Protect identified resources by listing them on the municipal register of cultural heritage properties and designate as appropriate under the Ontario Heritage Act;

Create a Municipal Archaeological Master Plan that will include open-ended cultural inventory and cultural heritage landscape identification in order to preserve the cultural integrity of the Township while integrating those into future development initiatives. To be led by the Township with archaeological/cultural heritage consultant;

Engage descendant groups in a meaningful way through active consultation. Create opportunities for Anishinaabe, Wendat, and Haudenosaunee people to explore King’s special natural and environmental places, enabling them to share their Traditional Ecological Knowledge. To be led by the Township and archaeological/cultural consultant; and,

Create Education opportunities through Interpretation. With increased knowledge of cultural heritage resources in the Township, Heritage King, in collaboration with descendant groups and cultural heritage consultant, should take a strong lead in interpreting these cultural resources through public education, displays and other heritage related activities.
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