

**Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 5188 Cedar
Point Line, in part of Lot 75 and 76, Concession West
of Lake Road Bosanquet, Lambton Shores, Ontario**

Submitted to

Sifton

Properties

Limited

and

The Ontario Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism, and Culture

Prepared by

HarutaArchaeology.

Report Type: Revised Report

Archaeological License Number P1131, Matthew Haruta,

MSC

PIF P1131-0102-2024

November

27, 2025

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	3
1.0 PROJECT CONTEXT	4
1.1 DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT	4
1.1.1 Objectives	4
1.2 HISTORICAL CONTEXT	5
1.2.1 Pre and Early Post-contact Aboriginal Resources	5
1.2.2 Historic Euro-Canadian Resources	7
1.3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT	7
1.3.1 The Natural Environment	8
1.3.2 Previously Known Archaeological Sites and Surveys	8
1.3.3 Summary of Past Archaeological Investigations within 50m	8
1.3.4 Archaeological Potential	9
2.0 FIELD METHODS	11
3.0 RECORD OF FINDS.....	12
4.0 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS	13
5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS.....	14
6.0 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION	15
7.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES	16
8.0 IMAGES	19
8.1 PHOTOGRAPHS	19
9.0 MAPS	23

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Topographic Map of Study Area.....	24
Figure 2: Study Area.....	25
Figure 3: Portion of the Illustrated Historical Atlas of the county of Middlesex, Ont. 1878	26
Figure 4: Assessment Strategies and Results.....	27

Executive Summary

Haruta Archaeology was retained by Sifton Properties Limited to complete a Stage 1-2 archaeological assessment of 5188 Cedar Point Line to meet the requirements of the *Planning Act* (Government of Ontario 2014) in advance of a planning permit. The study area measures approximately 70.18 hectares in size and is located in part of Lot 75 and 76, Concession West of Lake Road Bosanquet, Lambton Shores, Ontario.

This assessment was triggered by the Provincial Policy Statement that is informed by the *Planning Act* (Government of Ontario 1990a), which states that decisions affecting planning matters must be consistent with the policies outlined in the larger *Ontario Heritage Act* (1990b). According to Section 2.6.2 of the PPS, “*development and site alteration shall not be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential unless significant archaeological resources have been conserved.*”

In accordance with Section 1.3.1 of the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM) 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011), the Stage 1 archaeological assessment 5188 Cedar Point Line has determined that the study area exhibits high potential for the identification and recovery of archaeological resources and a Stage 2 archaeological assessment is recommended.

The Stage 2 assessment was conducted between October 18, 2024 – October 20, 2024, May31-June1, 2025 under archaeological consulting license P1131 issued to Matthew Haruta, MSc, of Haruta Archaeology by the MCM. Archaeological resources were identified during the Stage 2 archaeological assessment of the study area, however not enough to fulfill section 2.2 Standard 1a of the 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011), however all field data and recovered artifacts from previous and current assessments must be considered.

Location 6 (AgHm-6) is a other / campsite found by Paul O'neal in 2003. 32 pieces of artefacts were identified in a 20x25 meter area. Pedestrian survey at 5-meter intervals was intensified to 1-meter intervals, Paul O'neal recommends a stage 3 archaeological assessment (MCM database 2025). Haruta Archaeology when assessing the lands around the GPS coordinates provided by the MCM database at 1-meter intervals identified 3 artefacts. **As such, AgHm-6 (Location 6) is deemed to retain further cultural heritage value and interest and are recommended for a Stage 3 Site specific assessment.**

Location 9 (AgHm-7) is a findspot, is a late archaic. The Findspot was documented by Paul O'neal. The findspot consisted of a single Hind-type Projectile point and a scraper found 2m apart, during the stage 2 pedestrian survey was intensified to 1m intervals, no other artifacts recovered or identified, stage 3 was recommended. (MCM Database 2024). This site was located on the subject property. During the assessment done by Haruta Archaeology between October 18-October 20 2024, no artefacts were identified, Haruta Archaeology revisited the area on June 1st 2025 after re-ploughing and attempted to locate the findspot by assessing the area by pedestrian survey at 1m intervals, one flake was identified. **As such, AgHm-7 (Location 9) is deemed to retain further cultural heritage value and interest and are recommended for a Stage 3 Site specific assessment.**

Executive Summary

The MCM is asked to review the results presented and accept this report into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports.



Project Personnel

Licensed Archaeologist:	Matthew Haruta, MSc (P1131)
Project Manager:	Matthew Haruta, MSc (P1131)
Licensed Field Director:	Matthew Haruta, MSc (P1131)
Field Technicians:	Matthew Haruta, MSc (P1131), Molly Barron MSc, Xander Drinnan, Tandis Javaherian, Mathew Smith, Corrine Genier PHD
GIS Specialist:	Matthew Haruta, MSc (P1131)
Report Writer:	Matthew Haruta, MSc (P1131)
Senior Review:	Molly Barron, MSc

Acknowledgements

Proponent Contact:	Sifton Properties Limited , Property Owner
--------------------	--

STAGE 1-2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT: 5188 Cedar Point Line

Project Context
November

1.0 PROJECT CONTEXT

1.1 DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT

Haruta Archaeology was retained by Karen Duffett to complete a Stage 1-2 archaeological assessment of 5188 Cedar Point Line to meet the requirements of the *Planning Act* (Government of Ontario 2014) in advance of a planning permit. The study area measures approximately 70.18 hectares in size and is located in part of Lot 75 and 76, Concession West of Lake Road Bosanquet, Lambton Shores, Ontario.

This assessment was triggered by the PPS that is informed by the *Planning Act* (Government of Ontario 1990a), which states that decisions affecting planning matters must be consistent with the policies outlined in the larger *Ontario Heritage Act* (1990b). According to Section 2.6.2 of the PPS, “*development and site alteration shall not be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential unless significant archaeological resources have been conserved.*”

Permission to enter the study area and document archaeological resources was provided by Chai Lavie, the property owner.

The purpose of this assessment is to develop the land from agricultural use to residential use.

1.1.1 Objectives

In compliance with the provincial standards and guidelines set out in the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism’ (MCM) 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011), the objectives of the Stage 1 Archaeological Overview/Background Study are as follows:

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

To meet these objectives Haruta Archaeology archaeologists employed the following research strategies:

- A review of relevant archaeological, historic and environmental literature pertaining to the study area;
- A review of the land use history, including pertinent historic maps;
- An examination of the Ontario Archaeological Sites Database (ASDB) to determine the presence of known archaeological sites in and around the project area.



STAGE 1-2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT: 5188 Cedar Point Line

Project Context
November

The objective of the Stage 2 assessment was to provide an overview of archaeological resources on the property and to determine whether any of the resources might be archaeological sites with cultural heritage value or interest and to provide specific direction for the protection, management and/or recovery of these resources. In compliance with the provincial standards and guidelines set out in the MCM' 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011), the objectives of the Stage 2 Property Assessment are as follows:

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

1.2 HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The study area consists of 70.18 hectares of residential land, with manicured lawn and forested area surrounding residential structures and paved driveways. The study area is located in part of Lot 75 and 76 Concession West of Lake Road Bosanquet, Lambton Shores, Ontario.

1.2.1 Pre and Early Post-contact Aboriginal Resources


Our knowledge of past First Peoples settlement and land use in Middlesex County is incomplete. Nonetheless, using province-wide (MCCR 1997) and region-specific archaeological data, a generalized cultural chronology for native settlement in the area can be proposed. The following paragraphs provide a basic textual summary of the known general cultural trends and a tabular summary appears in Table 1.

The Paleoindian Period

The first human populations to inhabit Ontario came to the region between 12,000 and 10,000 years ago, coincident with the end of the last period of glaciation. Climate and environmental conditions were significantly different than they are today; local environs would not have been welcoming to anything but short-term settlement. Termed Paleoindians by archaeologists, Ontario first peoples would have crossed the landscape in small groups (i.e., bands or family units) searching for food, particularly migratory game species. In the area, caribou may have provided the staple of the Paleoindian diet, supplemented by wild plants, small game, birds and fish. Given the low density of populations on the landscape at this time and their mobile nature, Paleoindian sites are small and ephemeral. They are usually identified by the presence of fluted projectile points and other finely made stone tools.

Table 1: Cultural Chronology for Native Settlement within Middlesex County

Period			Time Range (circa)	Diagnostic Features	Complexes
Paleoindian	Early		9000 – 8400 B.C.	fluted projectile points	Gainey, Barnes, Crowfield



STAGE 1-2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT: 5188 Cedar Point Line


Project Context

November

	Late		8400 – 8000 B.C.	non-fluted and lanceolate points	Holcombe, Hi-Lo, Lanceolate
Archaic	Early		8000 – 6000 B.C.	serrated, notched, bifurcate base points	Nettling, Bifurcate Base Horizon
	Middle		6000 – 2500 B.C.	stemmed, side & corner notched points	Brewerton, Otter Creek, Stanly/Neville
	Late		2000 – 1800 B.C.	narrow points	Lamoka
			1800 – 1500 B.C.	broad points	Genesee, Adder Orchard, Perkiomen
			1500 – 1100 B.C.	small points	Crawford Knoll
	Terminal		1100 – 850 B.C.	first true cemeteries	Hind
Woodland	Early		800 – 400 B.C.	expanding stemmed points, Vinette pottery	Meadowood
	Middle		400 B.C. – A.D. 600	thick coiled pottery, notched rims; cord marked	Couture
	Late	Western Basin	A.D. 600 – 900	Wayne ware, vertical cord marked ceramics	Riviere au Vase-Algonquin
			A.D. 900 – 1200	first corn; ceramics with multiple band impressions	Young- Algonquin
			A.D. 1200 – 1400	longhouses; bag shaped pots, ribbed paddle	Springwells-Algonquin
			A.D. 1400-1600	villages with earthworks; Parker Festoon pots	Wolf- Algonquin
Contact		Aboriginal	A.D. 1600 – 1700	early historic native settlements	Neutral Huron, Odawa, Wenro
		Euro-Canadian	A.D. 1700-1760	fur trade, missionization, early military establishments	French
			A.D. 1760-1900	Military establishments, pioneer settlement	British colonials, UELs

Archaic

The archaeological record of early native life in Southern Ontario indicates a change in lifeways beginning circa 10,000 years ago at the start of what archaeologists call the Archaic Period. The Archaic populations are better known than their Paleoindian predecessors, with numerous sites found throughout the area. The characteristic projectile points of early Archaic populations appear similar in some respects to early varieties and are likely a continuation of early trends. Archaic populations continued to rely heavily on game, particularly caribou, but diversified their diet and exploitation patterns with changing environmental conditions. A seasonal pattern of warm season riverine or lakeshore settlements and interior cold weather occupations has been documented in the archaeological record. Since the large cold weather mammal species that formed the basis of the Paleoindian subsistence pattern became extinct or moved northward with the onset of warmer climates, Archaic populations had a more varied diet, exploiting a range of plant, bird, mammal and fish species. Reliance on specific food resources like fish, deer and nuts becomes more pronounced through time and the presence of more hospitable environs and resource abundance led to the expansion of band and family sizes. In the archaeological record, this is evident in the presence of larger sites and aggregation camps, where several families or bands would come together in times of resource abundance. The change to more preferable environmental circumstances led to a rise in population density. As a result, Archaic sites are more abundant than those from the earlier period. Artifacts typical of these occupations include a variety of stemmed and notched projectile points, chipped stone scrapers, ground stone tools (e.g. celts, adzes) and ornaments (e.g. bannerstones, gorgets), bifaces or tool blanks, animal bone and waste flakes, a by-product of the tool making process.



Haruta Archaeology

STAGE 1-2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT: 5188 Cedar Point Line

Project Context
November

Woodland Period

Significant changes in cultural and environmental patterns are witnessed in the Woodland Period (circa 950 B.C to historic times). The coniferous forests of earlier times were replaced by stands of mixed and deciduous species. Occupations became increasingly more permanent in this period, culminating in major semi-permanent villages by 1,000 years ago. Archaeologically, the most significant changes by Woodland times are the appearance of artifacts manufactured from modeled clay and the construction of house structures. The Woodland Period is often defined by the occurrence of pottery, storage facilities and residential areas similar to those that define the incipient agricultural or Neolithic period in Europe. The earliest pottery was rather crudely made by the coiling method and house structures were simple enclosures.

Iroquoian Period

The primary Late Woodland occupants of the area were the Neutral Nation, an Iroquoian speaking population described by European missionaries. Like other known Iroquoian groups including the Huron (Wendat) and Petun, the Neutral practiced a system of intensive horticulture based on three primary subsistence crops (corn, beans and squash). Neutral villages incorporated a number of longhouses, multi-family dwellings that contained several families related through the female line. The Jesuit Relations describe several Neutral centers in existence in the 17th century, including a number of sites where missions were later established. While precontact Neutral sites may be identified by a predominance of well-made pottery decorated with various simple and geometric motifs, triangular stone projectile points, clay pipes and ground stone implements, sites post-dating European contact are recognized through the appearance of various items of European manufacture. The latter include materials acquired by trade (e.g., glass beads, copper/brass kettles, iron axes, knives and other metal implements) in addition to the personal items of European visitors and Jesuit priests (e.g., finger rings, stoneware, rosaries, glassware). The Neutral were dispersed, and their population decimated by the arrival of epidemic European diseases and inter-tribal warfare.

1.2.2 Historic Euro-Canadian Resources

The 1878 *Illustrated Historical Atlas of Bosanquet Township*'s map of the Township of Bosanquet depicts a rural landscape with several landowners, structures, early transportation routes, and early town sites. A portion of the 1878 historic map of the Township of Bosanquet is depicted in Figure 3, and this part of the Lot is located in an agricultural area, the listed owner of lot 76 is Heber Rawlings, the area appears to be a rural agricultural area with no buildings marked within the subject area.

1.3 ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONTEXT

The study area consists of 70.18 hectares of agricultural land, and wooded area. The study area is located in part of Lot 75 and 76 Concession West of Lake Road Bosanquet, Lambton Shores, Ontario.



STAGE 1-2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT: 5188 Cedar Point Line

Field Methods July
2025

1.3.1 The Natural Environment

The project area is located in the Clay plain physiographic region as identified by Chapman and Putnam (1984:146).

West and East of Lambton Shores there are small plains which differ from the adjacent moraines and clay plains in that they are covered with sand or other light textured, water laid deposits. Together they compromise about 300 square miles or 192.000 acres in which the soils are conducive to specialized agriculture

(Chapman and Putnam 1984:146-147)

The soils here are comprised of sandy loam, ideal for agricultural practices and aboriginal settlement.

Potable water is the single most important resource for any extended human occupation or settlement and since water sources in southwestern Ontario have remained relatively stable over time, proximity to drinkable water is regarded as a useful index for the evaluation of archaeological site potential. In fact, distance to water is one of the most commonly used variables for predictive modeling of archaeological site location in Ontario. The closest extant source of potable water is Lake Huron, which is directly West of the study area.


1.3.2 Previously Known Archaeological Sites and Surveys

In order to compile an inventory of archaeological resources, the registered archaeological site records kept by the MCM were consulted. In Ontario, information concerning archaeological sites stored in the ASDB is maintained by the MCM. This database contains archaeological sites registered according to the Borden system. Under the Borden system, Canada is divided into grid blocks based on latitude and longitude. A Borden Block is approximately 13 kilometers east to west and approximately 18.5 kilometers 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.

Information concerning specific site locations is protected by provincial policy and is not fully subject to the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*. The release of such information in the past has led to looting or various forms of illegally conducted site destruction. Confidentiality extends to all media capable of conveying location, including maps, drawings, or textual descriptions of a site location. The MCM will provide information concerning site location to the party or an agent of the party holding title to a property, or to a licensed archaeologist with relevant cultural resource management interests.

An examination of the ASDB has shown that there are 7 archaeological sites registered within a one-kilometer radius of the study area, displayed in the table below. (Sites Data Search, Government of Ontario, October 17, 2024).

Borden Number	Site Name	Time Period	Affinity	Site Type
AgHm-7		Archaic, Late, Pre-Contact	Aboriginal	Findspot
AgHm-6		Pre-Contact	Aboriginal	Other/Campsite



Haruta Archaeology

STAGE 1-2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT: 5188 Cedar Point Line

Field Methods July
2025

AgHm-5	Asfaloth	Archaic, Late	Aboriginal	Findspot
AgHm-4	Arkenstone	Pre-Contact	Aboriginal	Other/Campsite
AgHm-2	Robert Brown			
AgHm-3	Lambton Shores Condominium	Woodland, Woodland, Early, Woodland, Late	Aboriginal	Campsite, Quarry.
AgHm-20				


1.3.3 Summary of Past Archaeological Investigations within 50m

There are no documented archaeological investigation within 50 meters of the subject property. Several sites however have been identified by Paul O'neal in a 2003 stage 1 and 2 archaeological assessments under PIF # P040-012. The sites identified on the subject property are AgHm-4, AgHm-5, AgHm-6, AgHm-7 and AgHm-20, more details about each can be found below. However, it should be noted that the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism currently does not provide an inventory of archaeological assessments carried out within 50 meters of a property, so a complete inventory of assessments on lands adjacent to the subject property cannot be provided.

The Arkenstone site, Borden Number AgHm-4 (Location 2) is a campsite found and excavated by Paul O'neal in 2003. Under PIF #P040-017 a stage three archaeology assessment was conducted in 2003, which identified 190 artefacts in 22 1x1 meter units and the Controlled Surface Pickup, spanning the entire site. (O'Neal, 2003) During the stage 4 assessment conducted in 2010 under P-40-318-2010 a total of 1107 artefacts were recovered in a 20 x 30 meter area, 1x1 meter units were excavated until there were artifact counts less than 10. The artefacts recovered included chipping detritus, scrappers, cores, bifaces, fire-cracked rock, hammerstones and faunal bone. (MCM Database 2024). This site was located on the subject property. (O'Neal, 2010). It should be noted that the stage 3 and stage 4 report could not be located through the MCM. More detail in the supplementary documentation.

The Asfaloth site (Location 8), Borden Number AgHm-5 is a findspot found by Paul O'neal in 2003. 1 projectile point was identified, a Crawford knoll point. A pedestrian survey at 5-meter intervals was intensified to 1-meter intervals and no further artefacts were identified, the research comments state that the site is fully documented, no further work is recommended (MCM Database 2025). Haruta Archaeology when assessing the lands around the GPS coordinates provided by the MCM database at 1-meter intervals did not identify any artefacts. (O'Neal, 2003).

AgHm-6 (Location 6) is a other / campsite found by Paul O'neal in 2003. 32 pieces of artefacts were identified in a 20x25 meter area. Pedestrian survey at 5-meter intervals was intensified to 1-meter intervals, Paul O'neal recommends a stage 3 archaeological assessment (MCM database 2025). Haruta Archaeology when assessing the lands around the GPS coordinates provided by the MCM database at 1-meter intervals identified 3 artefacts. (O'Neal, 2003).



STAGE 1-2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT: 5188 Cedar Point Line

Field Methods July
2025

The AgHm-7 (Location 9) findspot, is a late archaic. The Findspot was documented by Paul O'neal. The findspot consisted of a single Hind-type Projectile point and a scraper found 2m apart, during the stage 2 pedestrian survey was intensified to 1m intervals, no other artifacts recovered or identified, stage 3 was recommended. (MCM Database 2024). This site was located on the subject property. During the assessment done by Haruta Archaeology between October 18-October 20 2024, no artefacts were identified, Haruta Archaeology revisited the area on June 1st 2025 after re-ploughing and attempted to locate the findspot by assessing the area by pedestrian survey at 1m intervals. 1 artefact was identified (O'Neal, 2003).

AgHm-20 has no information available (MCM database 2025). When Haruta Archaeology conducted their assessment around the GPS coordinates provided by the MCM database at 1-meter intervals no artefacts were identified. (O'Neal, 2003).


1.3.4 Archaeological Potential

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

Distance to modern or ancient water sources is generally accepted as the most important determinant of past human settlement patterns and, considered alone, may result in a determination of archaeological potential. However, any combination of two or more other criteria, such as well-drained soils or topographic variability, may also indicate archaeological potential. Finally, extensive land disturbance can eradicate archaeological potential (Wilson and Horne 1995).

As discussed above, distance to water is an essential factor in archaeological potential modeling. When evaluating distance to water it is important to distinguish between water and shoreline, as well as natural and artificial water sources, as these features affect sites' locations and types to varying degrees. The MCM categorizes water sources in the following manner:

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



STAGE 1-2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT: 5188 Cedar Point Line

Field Methods July
2025

The closest extant source of potable water is Lake Huron which passes directly West of the study area. The water resources that exist and existed close to the study area indicate archaeological potential.

Soil texture can be an important determinant of past settlement, usually in combination with other factors such as topography. As indicated previously, the soils within the study area are variable, but include pockets of well-drained and sandy soils that would be suitable for pre-contact Aboriginal agriculture.

An examination of the ASDB has shown that there are 4 archaeological sites registered within a one-kilometer radius of the study area.

For Euro-Canadian sites, archaeological potential can be extended to areas of early Euro-Canadian settlement, including places of military or pioneer settlements; early transportation routes; and properties listed on the municipal register or designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act* or property that local histories or informants have identified with possible historical events. The *Illustrated Historical Atlas of Bosanquet Township* demonstrates that the study area and its environs were densely occupied by Euro-Canadian settlers by the later 19th century. Much of the established road system and agricultural settlement from that time is still visible today.

When the above listed criteria are applied to the study area, the archaeological potential for pre-contact Aboriginal, post-contact Aboriginal, and Euro-Canadian sites is deemed to be moderate to high. Thus, in accordance with Section 1.3.1 of the MCM' 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011), the Stage 1 archaeological assessment of 6202 Lakeshore Road has determined that the study area exhibits moderate to high potential for the identification and recovery of archaeological resources and a Stage 2 archaeological assessment is recommended.


2.0 FIELD METHODS

The Stage 2 assessment of 5188 Cedar Point was conducted between October 18, 2024 – October 20, 2024 and May 31-June 1, 2025 under PIF # P1131-0102-2024 issued to Matthew Haruta, MSC, of Haruta Archaeology by the MCM. The study area consists of 70.18 hectares of agricultural land, wooded area surrounding a shed and gravel driveways. The study area is located in part of Lot 75 and 76 Concession West of Lake Road Bosanquet, Lambton Shores, Ontario.

During the Stage 2 survey, assessment conditions were excellent and at no time were the field, weather, or lighting conditions detrimental to the recovery of archaeological material (Table 4). Photos 1 to 10 confirm that field conditions met the requirements for a Stage 2 archaeological assessment, as per the MCM 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Section 7.8.6 Standard 1a; Government of Ontario 2011). Figure 4 provides an illustration of the Stage 2 assessment methods, as well as photograph locations and directions.

Table 2: Field and Weather Conditions

Date	Activity	Weather	Field Conditions
October 18, 2024	test pit survey,	Overcast, Cool	soils dry and friable screen well, visibility



STAGE 1-2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT: 5188 Cedar Point Line

Field Methods July
2025

	Pedestrian Survey		of soil excellent
October, 19, 2024	test pit survey, Pedestrian Survey	Overcast, Warm	soils dry and friable screen well, visibility of soil excellent
October, 20, 2024	test pit survey, Pedestrian Survey	Sunny, Warm	soils dry and friable screen well, visibility of soil excellent
May 31, 2025	Test pit survey, Pedestrian Survey	Overcast, cool	soils dry and friable screen well, visibility of soil excellent
June 1, 2025	Pedestrian Survey	Sunny, Warm	visibility of soil excellent

Roughly 20% of the study area consisted of Wooded area. These areas were subject to test pit survey at 5-metre intervals in accordance with Section 2.1.2 of the MCM' 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011). Test pitting was also conducted within one meter of built structures in accordance with Section 2.1.2 Standard 4 of the MCM' 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011). Each test pit was at least 30 centimeters in diameter and excavated five centimeters into sterile subsoil. The soils and test pits were then examined for stratigraphy, cultural features, or evidence of fill. All soil was screened through six millimeter (mm) mesh hardware cloth to facilitate the recovery of small artifacts and then used to backfill the pit. No further archaeological methods were employed since no artifacts were recovered during the test pit survey.

Approximately 80% of the study area consisted of agricultural fields. These areas were subject to pedestrian survey at 5-m intervals in accordance with Section 2.1.1 of the MCM' 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011). The agricultural field was ploughed and disked so that at least 80% of the ground surface was visible and was weathered. Due to previous archaeological investigations conducted by Paul O'Neal in 2003, areas around the GPS co-ordinates provided by the MCM database and areas identified in the original 2003 report were subject to pedestrian survey at 1 meter intervals.

STAGE 1-2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT: 5188 Cedar Point Line

Record of Finds
July 2025

3.0 RECORD OF FINDS

The Stage 2 archaeological assessment was conducted employing the methods described in Section 2.0. An inventory of the documentary record generated by fieldwork is provided in Table 5 below. No archaeological resources were identified during the Stage 2 archaeological assessment of the study area.

Table 3: Inventory of Documentary Record

Document Type	Current Location of Document Type	Additional Comments
1 Pages of field notes	Haruta Archaeology office, London	In original field book and photocopied in project file
1 Hand drawn map	Haruta Archaeology office, London	In original field book and photocopied in project file
1 map provided by Client	Haruta Archaeology office, London	Hard and digital copies in project file
75 Digital photographs	Haruta Archaeology office, London	Stored digitally in project file

4.0 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

Roughly 20% of the study area consisted of wooded areas. These areas were subject to test pit survey at 5-metre intervals in accordance with Section 2.1.2 of the MCM' 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011). Approximately 80% of the study area consisted of agricultural fields. These areas were subject to pedestrian survey at 5-meter intervals in accordance with Section 2.1.1 of the MCM' 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011). No further archaeological methods were employed since no artifacts were recovered during the test pit survey or the pedestrian survey.

The Arkenstone site, Borden Number AgHm-4 (Location 2) is a campsite found and excavated by Paul O'neal in 2003. A total of 1107 artefacts were recovered in a 20 x 30 meter area, 1x1 meter units were excavated until there were artifact counts less than 10. The artefacts recovered included chipping detritus, scrappers, cores, bifaces, fire-cracked rock, hammerstones and faunal bone. (MCM Database 2024). This site was located on the subject property.

The Asfaloth site (Location 8), Borden Number AgHm-5 is a findspot found by Paul O'neal in 2003. 1 projectile point was identified, a Crawford knoll point. A pedestrian survey at 5-meter intervals was intensified to 1-meter intervals and no further artefacts were identified, the research comments state that the site is fully documented, no further work is recommended (MCM Database 2025). Haruta Archaeology when assessing the lands around the GPS coordinates provided by the MCM database at 1-meter intervals did not identify any artefacts.

AgHm-6 (Location 6) is a other / campsite found by Paul O'neal in 2003. 32 pieces of artefacts were identified in a 20x25 meter area. Pedestrian survey at 5-meter intervals was intensified to 1-meter intervals, Paul O'neal recommends a stage 3 archaeological assessment (MCM database 2025). Haruta Archaeology when assessing the lands around the GPS coordinates provided by the MCM database at 1-meter intervals identified 3 artefacts.

The AgHm-7 (Location 9) findspot, is a late archaic. The Findspot was documented by Paul O'neal. The findspot consisted of a single Hind-type Projectile point and a scraper found 2m apart, during the stage 2 pedestrian survey was intensified to 1m intervals, no other artifacts recovered or identified, stage 3 was recommended. (MCM Database 2024). This site was located on the subject property. During the assessment done by Haruta Archaeology between October 18-October 20 2024, no artefacts were identified, Haruta Archaeology revisited the area on June 1st 2025 after re-ploughing and attempted to locate the findspot by assessing the area by pedestrian survey at 1m intervals, one flake was identified.

AgHm-20 has no information available (MCM database 2025). When Haruta Archaeology conducted their assessment around the GPS coordinates provided by the MCM database at 1-meter intervals artefacts were identified but not enough to fulfil section 2.2 Standard 1a of the 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011).

Recommendations
July 2025

5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

The Stage 2 archaeological assessment was carried out in accordance with the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism, and Culture Industries' *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011).

Roughly 20% of the study area consisted of wooded areas. These areas were subject to test pit survey at 5-metre intervals in accordance with Section 2.1.2 of the MCM' 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011). Approximately 80% of the study area consisted of agricultural fields. These areas were subject to pedestrian survey at 5-meter intervals in accordance with Section 2.1.1 of the MCM' 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011). No further archaeological methods were employed since no artifacts were recovered during the test pit survey or the pedestrian survey.

All work met provincial standards and three archaeological sites were re-identified during the Stage 2 assessment.

The Arkenstone site, Borden Number AgHm-4 (Location 2) is a campsite found and excavated by Paul O'neal in 2003. A total of 1107 artefacts were recovered in a 20 x 30-meter area, 1x1 meter units were excavated until there were artifact counts less than 10. The artefacts recovered included chipping detritus, scrappers, cores, bifaces, fire-cracked rock, hammerstones and faunal bone. (MCM Database 2024). This site was located on the subject property. During the stage 2 conducted by Haruta Archaeology 9 artefacts were recovered at AgHm-4, this does not fulfill section 2.2 Standard 1a of the 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011). As such the Arkenstone site, Borden Number AgHm-4 (Location 2) has no further cultural heritage value and interest.

The Asfaloth site (Location 8), Borden Number AgHm-5 is a findspot found by Paul O'neal in 2003. 1 projectile point was identified, a Crawford knoll point. A pedestrian survey at 5-meter intervals was intensified to 1-meter intervals and no further artefacts were identified, the research comments state that the site is fully documented, no further work is recommended (MCM Database 2025). Haruta Archaeology when assessing the lands around the GPS coordinates provided by the MCM database at 1-meter intervals did not identify any artefacts. During the stage 2 conducted by Haruta Archaeology 0 artefacts were recovered at AgHm-5, this does not fulfill section 2.2 Standard 1a of the 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011). As such the Asfaloth site, Borden Number AgHm-5 (Location 8) has no further cultural heritage value and interest.

AgHm-6 (Location 6) is a other / campsite found by Paul O'neal in 2003. 32 pieces of artefacts were identified in a 20x25 meter area. Pedestrian survey at 5-meter intervals was intensified to 1-meter intervals, Paul O'neal recommends a stage 3 archaeological assessment (MCM database 2025). Haruta Archaeology when assessing the lands around the GPS coordinates provided by the MCM database at 1-meter intervals identified 3 artefacts. During the stage 2 conducted by Haruta Archaeology 3 artefacts were recovered at

STAGE 1-2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT: 5188 Cedar Point Line

Recommendations


July 2025

AgHm-6, this does not fulfill section 2.2 Standard 1a of the 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011), however all field data and recovered artifacts from previous and current assessments must be considered. **As such the Arkenstone site, Borden Number AgHm-6 (Location 6) is deemed to retain further cultural heritage value and interest and are recommended for a Stage 3 Site specific assessment.**

The AgHm-7 (Location 9) findspot, is a late archaic. The Findspot was documented by Paul O'neal. The findspot consisted of a single Hind-type Projectile point and a scraper found 2m apart, during the stage 2 pedestrian survey was intensified to 1m intervals, no other artifacts recovered or identified, stage 3 was recommended. (MCM Database 2024). This site was located on the subject property. During the assessment done by Haruta Archaeology between October 18-October 20 2024, no artefacts were identified, Haruta Archaeology revisited the area on June 1st 2025 after re-ploughing and attempted to locate the findspot by assessing the area by pedestrian survey at 1m intervals. One artefact were identified. During the stage 2 conducted by Haruta Archaeology 1 artefacts were recovered at AgHm-7, this does not fulfill section 2.2 Standard 1a of the 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011), however all field data and recovered artifacts from previous and current assessments must be considered. **As such the Arkenstone site, Borden Number AgHm-7 (Location 9) is deemed to retain further cultural heritage value and interest and are recommended for a Stage 3 Site specific assessment.**

If construction plans change to incorporate new areas that were not subject to a Stage 2 field survey, these must be assessed prior to the initiation of construction. In keeping with legislative stipulations, all construction, and demolition-related impacts (including, for example, machine travel, material storage and stockpiling, earth moving) must be restricted to the areas that were archaeologically assessed and cleared by the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism, and Culture Industries through acceptance of the assessment report into the provincial register.

The stage 3 site specific assessment should be carried out in accordance with Section 3.2.2 of the 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011) and follow Table 3.1 of the 2011 *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Government of Ontario 2011). It is unknown whether the sites will proceed to stage 4 mitigation. The stage 3 site specific assessment should consist of the excavation of one meter by one meter test units across the extent of the site at 5m intervals, plus additional test units equal to 20% of the total excavated on the 5m grid.



6.0 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION

This report is submitted to the Minister of Tourism, Culture and Sport as a condition of licensing in accordance with Part VI of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c 0.18. The report is reviewed to ensure that it complies with the standards and guidelines that are issued by the Minister, and that the archaeological fieldwork and report recommendations ensure the conservation, protection and preservation of the cultural heritage of Ontario. When all matters relating to archaeological sites within the project area of a development proposal have been addressed to the satisfaction of the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, a letter will be issued by the ministry stating that there are no further concerns with regard to alterations to archaeological sites by the proposed development.

It is an offence under Sections 48 and 69 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* for any party other than a licensed archaeologist to make any alteration to a known archaeological site or to remove any artifact or other physical evidence of past human use or activity from the site, until such time as a licensed archaeologist has completed fieldwork on the site, submitted a report to the Minister stating that the site has no further cultural heritage value or interest, and the report has been filed in the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports referred to in Section 65.1 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

Should previously undocumented archaeological resources be discovered, they may be a new archaeological site and therefore subject to Section 48(1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The proponent or person discovering the archaeological resources must cease alteration of the site immediately and engage a licensed consultant archaeologist to carry out archaeological fieldwork, in compliance with Section 48(1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

The *Cemeteries Act*, R.S.O. 1990 c. C.4 and the *Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act*, 2002, S.O. 2002, c.33 (when proclaimed in force) require that any person discovering human remains must notify the police or coroner and the Registrar of Cemeteries at the Ministry of Consumer Services.

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

Bibliography and Sources
July 2025

7.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES

- Adams, Nick. 1994. *Field Manual for Avocational Archaeologists in Ontario*. Ontario Archaeological Society Inc., Archaeological Stewardship Project.
- Brock, Daniel. 1972. *History of the County of Middlesex, Canada*. Belleville: Mika Studio.
- Caston, Wayne A. 1997. Evolution in the Mapping of Southern Ontario and Wellington County. *Wellington County History* 10:91-106.
- Chapman, Lyman John and Donald F. Putnam. 1984. *The Physiography of Southern Ontario*. 3rd ed. Ontario Geological Survey Special Volume 2. Toronto: Ministry of Natural Resources.
- Eley, Betty E. and Peter H. von Bitter 1989. *Cherts of Southern Ontario*. Toronto: Royal Ontario Museum.
- Ellis, Chris J. and Neal Ferris (editors). 1990. *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650*. Occasional Publication of the London Chapter, Ontario Archaeological Society, Number 5.
- Feest, Johanna E. and Christian F. Feest 1978. The Ottawa. In *Handbook of North American Indians*. Vol. 15 Northeast, pp. 772-786. B.G. Trigger, ed. Washington: Smithsonian Institute.
- Ferris, Neal. 2009. *The Archaeology of Native-Lived Colonialism: Challenging History in the Great Lakes*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Fisher, Jacqueline A. 1997. *The Adder Orchard Site: Lithic Technology and Spatial Organization in the Broadpoint Late Archaic*. Occasional Publications of the London Chapter, OAS, Number 3, 1997.
- Gentilcore, Louis R. and C. Grant Head. 1984. *Ontario's History in Maps*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Government of Ontario. 1990a. *Ontario Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, CHAPTER P.13. Last amendment: 2011, c. 6, Sched. 2.
- Government of Ontario. 1990b. *Ontario Heritage Act*, R.S.O. 1990, CHAPTER O.18. Last amendment: 2009, c. 33, Sched. 11, s. 6.

STAGE 1-2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT: 5188 Cedar Point Line

Bibliography and Sources
July 2025

Government of Ontario. 2011. *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*. Toronto: Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport.

Government of Ontario. n.d. *Archaeological Sites Database Files*. Toronto: Archaeology Programs Unit, Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport.

Konrad, Victor. 1981. An Iroquois Frontier: The North Shore of Lake Ontario during the Late Seventeenth Century. *Journal of Historical Geography* 7(2).

Mayer Heritage Consultants Inc. 2003 *Archaeological Assessment (stages 1 and 2), Reflection Cove Property, Lot 76, Lake Range West, Town of Cedar Point, Bosanquet Township, Lampton County, Ontario*.

Mayer Heritage Consultants Inc. 2003 *Archaeological Assessment (stage 3), Reflection Cove Property, Lot 76, Lake Range West, Town of Cedar Point, Bosanquet Township, Lampton County, Ontario*.

Middleton, Jess Edgar and Fred Landon. 1927. *Province of Ontario – A History 1615 to 1927*. Toronto: Dominion Publishing Company.

Morris, J.L. 1943. *Indians of Ontario*. 1964 reprint. Toronto: Department of Lands and Forests.

Page & Co. H.R. 1878. *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Brant, Ont.* Toronto: H.R. Page & Co.

Rogers, Edward S. 1978. Southeastern Ojibwa. In *Handbook of North American Indians*, Vol. 15 Northeast, pp. 760-771. B.G. Trigger, ed. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press.

Schmalz, Peter S. 1991. *The Ojibwa of Southern Ontario*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Smith, W.H. 1946. *Smith's Canadian Gazetteer: Comprising Statistical and General Information Respecting all Parts of the Upper Province, or Canada West*. Toronto: H. & W. Rowsell.

Williamson et. al. 2017 *City of London Archaeological Management Plan*. London: City of London.

Images July
2025

8.0 IMAGES

8.1 PHOTOGRAPHS

STAGE 1-2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT: 5188 Cedar Point Line

Images July
2025



Photo 1: Assessed by 5m Test Pit Survey Facing West



Photo 2: Assessed by 5m Test Pit Survey Facing South-West



STAGE 1-2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT: 5188 Cedar Point Line

Images July
2025



Photo 3: Typical Testpit Facing East



Photo 4: Close up of Field Conditions Facing East

STAGE 1-2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT: 5188 Cedar Point Line

Images July
2025



Photo 5: Assessed by 5m Pedestrian Survey Facing North- West



Photo 6: Assessed by 5m Test Pit Survey Facing West

STAGE 1-2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT: 5188 Cedar Point Line

Images July
2025



Photo 7: Assessed by 5m Pedestrian Survey Facing North-East



Photo 8: Typical Testpit Facing North-West

STAGE 1-2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT: 5188 Cedar Point Line

Images July
2025



Photo 9: Assessed by 5m Pedestrian Survey Facing North-East



Photo 10: Low Laying and Wet Facing North-East

STAGE 1-2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT: 5188 Cedar Point Line

Images July
2025

8.2 Artefacts



Artefacts (Chipping Detritus) Collected from Location 2 (AgHm-4)



Artefacts (Chipping Detritus) Collected from Location 6 (AgHm-6)

STAGE 1-2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT: 5188 Cedar Point Line

Images July
2025



Artefacts (Chipping Detritus) Collected from Location 9 (AgHm-7)

Maps

July 2025

9.0 MAPS




Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 5188 Cedar Point Line, Lambton Shores Ontario



Figure 1: Study Area

This drawing has been prepared for the use of Haruta Archaeology's client and may not be used or reproduced by a third party, except as agreed upon by the Haruta Archaeology and the client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. Haruta Archaeology does not accept responsibility for any party that modifies this drawing without Haruta Archaeology's expressed consent.

Date: November, 2025

Source: Google Maps





**Stage 1-2 Archaeological
Assessment of 5188
Cedar Point Line, Ontario**

**Figure 2: Topographic
Map of Study Area**

This drawing has been prepared for the use of Haruta Archaeology's client and may not be used or reproduced by a third party, except as agreed upon by the Haruta Archaeology and the client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies Haruta Archaeology does not accept responsibility for any party that modifies this drawing without Haruta Archeology's expressed consent.

Date: November, 2025

Source: OBM
https://www.liaapplications.lrc.gov.on.ca/MakeATopographicMap/index.html?viewer=Make_A_Topographic_Map.MATM&locale=en-CA



Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 5188 Cedar Point Line, Lambton Shores Ontario



Figure 3: Supplemental Map to the Illustrated Historical Atlas of Bosanquet Township, 1878

This drawing has been prepared for the use of Haruta Archaeology's client and may not be used or reproduced by a third party, except as agreed upon by the Haruta Archaeology and the client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. Haruta Archaeology does not accept responsibility for any party that modifies this drawing without Haruta Archaeology's expressed consent.

Date: July, 2025

Source: Illustrated Historical Atlas
of the County of Brant, Ont.
Toronto: H.R. Page & Co., 1878.

NOT TO SCALE




Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 5188 Cedar Point Line Lambton Shores, Ontario

Figure 4: Assessment Strategies and Results

This drawing has been prepared for the use of Haruta Archaeology's client and may not be used or reproduced by a third party, except as agreed upon by Haruta Archaeology and the client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. Haruta Archaeology does not accept responsibility for any party that modifies this drawing without Haruta Archaeology's expressed consent.

Date: July, 2025

Source: Google Maps



Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment of 5188 Cedar Point Line Lambton Shores, Ontario

Figure 5: Assessment Strategies and Results

This drawing has been prepared for the use of Haruta Archaeology's client and may not be used or reproduced by a third party, except as agreed upon by Haruta Archaeology and the client, as required by law or for use by governmental reviewing agencies. Haruta Archaeology does not accept responsibility for any party that modifies this drawing without Haruta Archaeology's expressed consent.

Date: June, 2025

Source: Sifton