

**Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment for  
Part of Lots 40 to 44 (Inclusive), 46, and 47  
Southwest side of Arthur Street, And all of Lots 40 to 44 (Inclusive),  
Part of Lots 46 to 49 (Inclusive), Northeast side of Louisa Street, And all  
of Park Lots 11 to 14 ( Inclusive), Southwest side of Louisa Street, And  
Part of Park Lots 11 and 12 and All of Park Lots 13, 14 and 15,  
Northeast Side of Alice Street, and Part of Louisa Street, Minto Street  
and Albert Street, Townplot of Thornbury, Geographic Town of  
Thornbury, Town of The Blue Mountains, County of Grey**



Prepared by

Licensee: Keith Powers  
Archaeological Consulting Licence P052  
Project Information Number P052-1096-2021

**THE ARCHAEOLOGISTS INC.**

Original Report  
Report Filed: August 11<sup>th</sup>, 2021

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Archaeologists Inc. was contracted to conduct a Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment for Part of Lots 40 to 44 (Inclusive), 46, and 47 Southwest side of Arthur Street, And all of Lots 40 to 44 (Inclusive), Part of Lots 46 to 49 (Inclusive), Northeast side of Louisa Street, And all of Park Lots 11 to 14 ( Inclusive), Southwest side of Louisa Street, And Part of Park Lots 11 and 12 and All of Park Lots 13, 14 and 15, Northeast Side of Alice Street, and Part of Louisa Street, Minto Street and Albert Street, Townplot of Thornbury, Geographic Town of Thornbury, Town of The Blue Mountains, County of Grey. The development project was triggered by the Planning Act and the archaeological assessment report is being submitted as part of a Zoning By-Law amendment and Site Plan Approval application for development approval by the Town of the Blue Mountains' Planning Department.

A Stage 1 background study of the subject property was conducted to provide information about the property's geography, history, previous archaeological fieldwork and current land condition in order to evaluate and document in detail the property's archaeological potential and to recommend appropriate strategies for Stage 2 survey. A Stage 2 property assessment was conducted to document all archaeological resources on the property, to determine whether the property contains archaeological resources requiring further assessment, and to recommend next steps. The characteristics of the property dictated that the Stage 2 survey be conducted by test pit survey.

The Stage 1 background study found that the subject property exhibits potential for the recovery of archaeological resources of cultural heritage value and concluded that the property requires a Stage 2 assessment. The Stage 2 property assessment, which consisted of a systematic test pit survey, did not result in the identification of archaeological resources. The report recommends that no further archaeological assessment of the property is required.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	i
Table of Contents	ii
Project Personnel	iii
1.0 Project Context	1
1.1 Development Context	1
1.2 Historical Context	1
1.3 Archaeological Context	3
2.0 Field Methods	5
3.0 Record of Finds	7
4.0 Analysis and Conclusions	7
5.0 Recommendations	7
6.0 Advice on Compliance with Legislation	8
7.0 Bibliography and Sources	9
8.0 Images	10
9.0 Maps	21



## PROJECT PERSONNEL

Project/Field Director:	Mr. T. Keith Powers (P052)
Field Archaeologists	Mr. T. Keith Powers Ms. Karen Powers Mr. John Ellis
Report Preparation:	Mrs. Karen Powers Mr. Keith Powers Mrs. Susan Dyer
Historical Researcher	Mrs. Karen Powers
Graphics	Mrs. Karen Powers



## **1.0 PROJECT CONTEXT (Section 7.5.5)**

This section of the report will provide the context for the archaeological fieldwork, including the development context, the historical context, and the archaeological context.

### **1.1 Development Context (Section 7.5.6, Standards 1-3)**

#### ***Section 7.5.6, Standard 1***

The Archaeologists Inc. was contracted to conduct a Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment for Part of Lots 40 to 44 (Inclusive), 46, and 47 Southwest side of Arthur Street, And all of Lots 40 to 44 (Inclusive), Part of Lots 46 to 49 (Inclusive), Northeast side of Louisa Street, And all of Park Lots 11 to 14 ( Inclusive), Southwest side of Louisa Street, And Part of Park Lots 11 and 12 and All of Park Lots 13, 14 and 15, Northeast Side of Alice Street, and Part of Louisa Street, Minto Street and Albert Street, Townplot of Thornbury, Geographic Town of Thornbury, Town of The Blue Mountains, County of Grey (Figure 1). The archaeological assessment was triggered by the Planning Act. This assessment report is required in order to obtain final approval/registration of the draft plan of subdivision.

#### ***Section 7.5.6, Standard 2***

There is no additional development-related information relevant to understanding the choice of fieldwork strategy or recommendations made in the report.

#### ***Section 7.5.6, Standard 3***

Permission to access the study area to conduct all required archaeological fieldwork activities, including the recovery of artifacts was given by the landowner and their representative.

### **1.2 Historical Context (Section 7.5.7, Standards 1-2)**

#### ***Section 7.5.7, Standard 1***

In advance of the Stage 2 assessment, a Stage 1 background study of the subject property was conducted in order to document the property archaeological and land use history and present condition. Several sources were referenced to determine if features or characteristics indicating archaeological potential for pre-contact and post-contact resources exist.

Characteristics indicating archaeological potential include the near-by presence of previously identified archaeological sites, primary and secondary water sources, features indicating past water sources, accessible or inaccessible shoreline, pockets of well-drained sandy soil, distinctive land formations that might have been special or spiritual places, such as waterfalls, rock outcrops, caverns, mounds, and promontories and their bases, resource areas, (including food or medicinal plants, scarce raw materials, early Euro-Canadian industry), areas of early Euro-Canadian settlement, early historical

transportation routes, property listed on a municipal register or designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act* or that is a federal, provincial or municipal historic landmark or site, and property that local histories or informants have identified with possible archaeological sites, historical events, activities, or occupations.

Archaeological potential can be determined not to be present for either the entire property or a part of it when the area under consideration has been subject to extensive and deep land alterations that have severely damaged the integrity of any archaeological resources. This is commonly referred to as 'disturbed' or 'disturbance', and may include: quarrying, major landscaping involving grading below topsoil, building footprints, and sewage and infrastructure development. Archaeological potential is not removed where there is documented potential for deeply buried intact archaeological resources beneath land alterations, or where it cannot be clearly demonstrated through background research and property inspection that there has been complete and intensive disturbance of an area. Where complete disturbance cannot be demonstrated in Stage 1, it will be necessary to undertake Stage 2 assessment.

The background study determined that the following features or characteristics indicate archaeological potential for the subject property:

- The near-by presence of previously identified archaeological sites; 2 site is registered within a 1-kilometre radius of the subject property.
- The 1880 Atlas depicts that the subject property is located within the Townplot of Thornbury.
- The subject property is located off an historic transportation route (i.e. modern day Arthur street west).
- Little Beaver Creek runs just north of the subject property within 50 metres.

The 1880 Illustrated Atlas of the County of Grey, was reviewed to determine the potential for finding historical archaeological remains within the study area.

The *Atlas* indicates that the study area, which encompasses Part of Lots 40 to 44 (Inclusive), 46, and 47 Southwest side of Arthur Street, And all of Lots 40 to 44 (Inclusive), Part of Lots 46 to 49 (Inclusive), Northeast side of Louisa Street, And all of Park Lots 11 to 14 ( Inclusive), Southwest side of Louisa Street, And Part of Park Lots 11 and 12 and All of Park Lots 13, 14 and 15, Northeast Side of Alice Street, and Part of Louisa Street, Minto Street and Albert Street, Townplot of Thornbury, Geographic Town of Thornbury, Town of The Blue Mountains, County of Grey. As the study area is within the Townplot of Thornbury there is no specific ownership attached to any of the lots within the Townplot.

It must also be noted that not all features of interest today would have been considered within the scope of the *Atlas* at the time of publication. Nevertheless, the *Atlas* is considered one source for the assessment of archaeological potential. It can therefore be

concluded that the study area has potential for the identification of historic archaeological remains.

The Subject lands are situated in the Beaver Valley physiographic region of Southern Ontario, (Chapman & Putnam, 1984: pp. 122-124).

Little Beaver Creek runs just north of the subject property. Aquatic features such as these were an important foci for humans participating in seasonal resource procurement.

The Stage 1 background study indicates, that there is potential for the recovery of pre-contact and post-contact Euro-Canadian archaeological resources within the subject property. As it cannot be clearly demonstrated through the background study that there has been complete and intensive disturbance of the area, archaeological potential is not removed. There are areas within the subject property that have the potential for the recovery of archaeological resources.

#### ***Section 7.5.7, Standard 2***

The Stage 2 property assessment of the subject property will employ the strategy for test pit survey, following the standards listed in Section 2.1.2 of the *2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*. This is the appropriate strategies based on Stage 1 background study. To our knowledge there are no other reports containing relevant background information related to this development project.

### **1.3 Archaeological Context (Section 7.5.8, Standards 1-7)**

#### ***Section 7.5.8, Standard 1***

In order that an inventory of archaeological resources could be compiled for the study area, three sources of information were consulted: the site forms for registered sites housed at the Ministry of Tourism and Culture; published and unpublished documentary sources; and the files of *The Archaeologists Inc.*

In Ontario, information concerning archaeological sites is stored in the Ontario Archaeological Sites Database (O.A.S.D.), an inventory of the documented archaeological record in Ontario.

Information on the known archaeological sites in the vicinity of the study area was obtained from the Ministry of Tourism and Culture site database. There are two known archaeological sites located within a one-kilometre radius of the subject property is provided in table 1 of this report.

**TABLE 1: Registered Archaeological Sites Within 1 kilometre of the Study Area**

<b>Borden Number</b>	<b>Site Name</b>	<b>Time Period</b>	<b>Affinity</b>	<b>Site Type</b>
----------------------	------------------	--------------------	-----------------	------------------



*Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment for Part of Lots 40 to 44 (Inclusive), 46, and 47 Southwest side of Arthur Street, And all of Lots 40 to 44 (Inclusive), Part of Lots 46 to 49 (Inclusive), Northeast side of Louisa Street, And all of Park Lots 11 to 14 (Inclusive), Southwest side of Louisa Street, And Part of Park Lots 11 and 12 and All of Park Lots 13, 14 and 15, Northeast Side of Alice Street, and Part of Louisa Street, Minto Street and Albert Street, Townplot of Thornbury, Geographic Town of Thornbury, Town of The Blue Mountains, County of Grey*

BdHc-28	Thornbury	Post-Contact	Euro-Canadian	scatter
BdHc-6	Ferguson			

### ***Section 7.5.8, Standard 2***

The Subject lands are located within the Beaver Valley physiographic region of Southern Ontario. This region is a small but well-defined region occupying a sharply cut indentation in the Niagara cuesta, opening upon Georgian Bay. At its widest point, the Beaver Valley is six and a half miles (or 10.5 kilometres) across. The upper rim of the valley is the edge of the Amabel Formation which appears as an almost vertical cliff, and below is the Manitoulin Formation which appears as a flat shelf. The wider, northern part of the Beaver Valley contains several tributary streams and one fair-sized stream, the Indian Brook, which has cut juvenile valleys into the shale below. The Beaver Valley exhibits considerable complexity of landforms including lake plains, beaches, moraines, steep valley sides, and vertical cliffs. The soils of the lake plains around Thornbury and Clarksburg resembles those in the broader area of the Algonquin plain in the southern part of Simcoe County. The boulders on the old wave-cut terraces have prevented cultivation of those soils and they are pastured or are covered with cedar thickets while rose briars and dogwood are present on stony pastures. The driest sand west of Thornbury produces heavy crops of apples when well fertilized. Mixed farming occurs on the slopes with emphasis on beef cattle (Chapman & Putnam, 1984: pp. 122-124).

A soil type found within the subject property is Brighton sand. Brighton sand is a from the grey brown podzolic group. It is made up of well sorted sandy outwash and has good drainage. It is essentially stone free. This soil type supports the mixed nature of past subsistence practices and changing industries of early settlers in these areas. Soils more conducive to agriculture, such as good drainage and stonefree, has the potential for past settlement, support greater population density and subsequently elevated archaeological potential.

### ***Section 7.5.8, Standard 3***

The Stage 2 archaeological fieldwork of the subject property was undertaken on July 7<sup>th</sup>-9<sup>th</sup>, 2021.

### ***Section 7.5.8, Standard 4***

No previous archaeological fieldwork has taken place within the limits of the project area. The Archaeologists Inc. is not aware of any other archaeological fieldwork being conducted within or adjacent to the subject property.

### ***Section 7.5.8, Standard 5***

We are unaware of previous findings and recommendations relevant to the current stage.

### ***Section 7.5.8, Standard 6***



*Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment for Part of Lots 40 to 44 (Inclusive), 46, and 47 Southwest side of Arthur Street, And all of Lots 40 to 44 (Inclusive), Part of Lots 46 to 49 (Inclusive), Northeast side of Louisa Street, And all of Park Lots 11 to 14 (Inclusive), Southwest side of Louisa Street, And Part of Park Lots 11 and 12 and All of Park Lots 13, 14 and 15, Northeast Side of Alice Street, and Part of Louisa Street, Minto Street and Albert Street, Townplot of Thornbury, Geographic Town of Thornbury, Town of The Blue Mountains, County of Grey*

---

There are no unusual physical features that may have affected fieldwork strategy decisions or the identification of artifacts or cultural features.

***Section 7.5.8, Standard 7***

There is no additional archaeological information that may be relevant to understanding the choice of fieldwork techniques or the recommendations of this report.



## **2.0 FIELD METHODS (Section 7.8.1, Standards 1-3)**

This section of the report addresses Section 7.8.1 of the 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists. It does not address Section 7.7.2 because no property inspection was done as a separate Stage 1.

### ***Section 7.8.1, Standard 1***

The entire project area was systematically tested at a 5-metre interval except those areas noted within section 7.8.1, Standard 2.

### ***Section 7.8.1, Standard 2***

As relevant, we provide detailed and explicit descriptions addressing Standards 2a, b and c. Standard 2d is not relevant.

*Section 7.8.1, Standard 2a* - The general standards for property survey under Section 2.1 of the 2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists were addressed as follows:

- Section 2.1, S1 – All portions of the subject property were surveyed.
- Section 2.1, S2a (land of no or low potential due to physical features such as permanently wet areas, exposed bedrock, and steep slopes) –An area of steep sloping land was not tested due to its lack of potential.
- Section 2.1, S2b (no or low potential due to extensive and deep land alterations) – Two areas that contained residential structures and associated garages/ sheds were not tested as they were considered disturbed. Their associated drives and walks were also not tested as they were considered disturbed.
- Section 2.1, S2c (lands recommended not to require Stage 2 assessment by a previous Stage 1 report where the ministry has accepted that Stage 1 into the register) - n/a
- Section 2.1, S2d (lands designated for forest management activity w/o potential for impacts to archaeological sites, as determined through Stage 1 forest management plans process) - n/a
- Section 2.1, S2e (lands formally prohibited from alterations) - n/a
- Section 2.1, S2f (lands confirmed to be transferred to a public land holding body, etc) - n/a
- Section 2.1, S3 - The Stage 2 survey was conducted when weather and lighting conditions permitted excellent visibility of features.
- Section 2.1, S4 - No GPS recordings were taken as no artifacts were found during the Stage 2 assessment.
- Section 2.1, S5 - All field activities were mapped in reference to either fixed landmarks, survey stakes and development markers as appropriate. See report section 9.0 Maps.
- Section 2.1, S6 - See report section 8.0 Images for photo documentation of examples of field conditions encountered.



- Section 2.1, S7 - n/a

*Section 7.8.1, Standard 2b* -The subject property was subject to a systematic test pit survey appropriate to the characteristics of the property with the exception of disturbed areas noted above.

The test pit survey of the property followed the standards within Section 2.1.2 of the *2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists*. Test pit survey was only conducted where ploughing was not possible or viable, as per Standard 1. Test pits were spaced at maximum intervals of five metres and to within one metre of built structures, when present, or until test pits show evidence of recent ground disturbance. All test pits were at least 30 cm in diameter. Each test pit was excavated by hand, into the first five cm of subsoil and examined for stratigraphy, cultural features, or evidence of fill. No stratigraphy or cultural features were noted. Soils were screened through 6mm mesh. All test pits were backfilled.

*Section 7.8.1, Standard 2c* – All areas of the subject property were surveyed at five metre intervals with the exception of disturbed areas noted above.

***Section 7.8.1, Standard 3***

The entire subject property was test pit surveyed at five metre intervals with the exception of disturbed areas noted above.



### **3.0 RECORD OF FINDS (Section 7.8.2, Standards 1-3)**

This section documents all finds discovered as a result of the Stage 1 and 2 archaeological assessment of the subject property.

#### ***Section 7.8.2, Standard 1***

No archaeological resources or sites were identified in the Stage 2.

#### ***Section 7.8.2, Standard 2***

An inventory of the documentary record generated in the field is provided in Table 2.

<b>Table 2: Inventory of Documentary Record</b>	
<b>Document Type</b>	<b>Description</b>
Field Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This report constitutes the field notes for this project</li></ul>
Photographs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 12 digital photographs</li></ul>
Maps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• mapping provided in the report represent all of the maps generated in the field.</li></ul>

#### ***Section 7.8.2, Standard 3***

Information detailing exact site locations on the property is not submitted because no sites or archaeological resources were identified in the Stage 2 assessment.

### **4.0 ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS (Section 7.8.3, Standards 1-2)**

#### ***Section 7.8.3, Standard 1***

No archaeological sites were identified. Standard 2 is not addressed because no sites were identified.

### **5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS (Section 7.8.4, Standards 1-3)**

#### ***Section 7.8.4, Standard 1***

This standard is not applicable as no sites were identified.

#### ***Section 7.8.4, Standard 2***

The report makes recommendations only regarding archaeological matters.

#### ***Section 7.8.4, Standard 3***

The Stage 2 survey did not identify any archaeological sites requiring further assessment or mitigation of impacts and it is recommended that no further archaeological assessment of the property be required.

## **6.0 ADVICE ON COMPLIANCE WITH LEGISLATION (Section 7.5.9, Standards 1-2)**

### ***Section 7.5.9, Standard 1a***

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

### ***Section 7.5.9, Standard 1b***

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

### ***Section 7.5.9, Standard 1c***

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*.

### ***Section 7.5.9, Standard 1d***

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.

### ***Section 7.5.9, Standard 2***

Not applicable

*Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment for Part of Lots 40 to 44 (Inclusive), 46, and 47 Southwest side of Arthur Street, And all of Lots 40 to 44 (Inclusive), Part of Lots 46 to 49 (Inclusive), Northeast side of Louisa Street, And all of Park Lots 11 to 14 (Inclusive), Southwest side of Louisa Street, And Part of Park Lots 11 and 12 and All of Park Lots 13, 14 and 15, Northeast Side of Alice Street, and Part of Louisa Street, Minto Street and Albert Street, Townplot of Thornbury, Geographic Town of Thornbury, Town of The Blue Mountains, County of Grey*

---

## **7.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES (Section 7.5.10, Standards 1)**

H. Belden & Co.

1880 Illustrated Atlas of the County of Grey. Offset Edition Port Elgin 1971,  
Toronto, Ontario.

Chapman, L.J. and F. Putnam

1984 *The Physiography of Southern Ontario, Ontario Geological Survey  
Special Volume 2*. Toronto: Government of Ontario, Ministry of Natural  
Resources.

Ministry of Tourism and Culture

2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists.



## **8.0 IMAGES (Sections 7.5.11, 7.7.5, 7.8.6)**



Plate 1: Looking at conditions of the property for test pit survey at a 5 metre interval.



Plate 2: Looking at conditions of the property for test pit survey at a 5 metre interval.





Plate 3: Looking at conditions of the property for test pit survey at a 5 metre interval.



Plate 4: Looking at conditions of the property for test pit survey at a 5 metre interval.



Plate 5: Looking at conditions of the property for test pit survey at a 5 metre interval.



Plate 6: Looking at conditions of the property for test pit survey at a 5 metre interval.



Plate 7: Looking at conditions of the property for test pit survey at a 5 metre interval.



Plate 8: Looking at conditions of the property for test pit survey at a 5 metre interval.



Plate 9: Looking at conditions of the property for test pit survey at a 5 metre interval.



Plate 10: Looking at conditions of the property for test pit survey at a 5 metre interval—note the residential structure and associated drives.



Plate 11: Looking at conditions of the property for test pit survey at a 5 metre interval—note the residential structure.



Plate 12: Looking at conditions of the property for test pit survey at a 5 metre interval.

*Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment for Part of Lots 40 to 44 (Inclusive), 46, and 47 Southwest side of Arthur Street, And all of Lots 40 to 44 (Inclusive), Part of Lots 46 to 49 (Inclusive), Northeast side of Louisa Street, And all of Park Lots 11 to 14 (Inclusive), Southwest side of Louisa Street, And Part of Park Lots 11 and 12 and All of Park Lots 13, 14 and 15, Northeast Side of Alice Street, and Part of Louisa Street, Minto Street and Albert Street, Townplot of Thornbury, Geographic Town of Thornbury, Town of The Blue Mountains, County of Grey*

---


## 9.0 MAPS (Section 7.5.12, 7.7.6, 7.8.7)



Map 1: The General Location of the subject property on mapping.


*Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment for Part of Lots 40 to 44 (Inclusive), 46, and 47 Southwest side of Arthur Street, And all of Lots 40 to 44 (Inclusive), Part of Lots 46 to 49 (Inclusive), Northeast side of Louisa Street, And all of Park Lots 11 to 14 (Inclusive), Southwest side of Louisa Street, And Part of Park Lots 11 and 12 and All of Park Lots 13, 14 and 15, Northeast Side of Alice Street, and Part of Louisa Street, Minto Street and Albert Street, Townplot of Thornbury, Geographic Town of Thornbury, Town of The Blue Mountains, County of Grey*

---



Map 2: The approximate location of the subject property depicted in red, within the 1880 Historic Atlas.

Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment for Part of Lots 40 to 44 (Inclusive), 46, and 47 Southwest side of Arthur Street, And all of Lots 40 to 44 (Inclusive), Part of Lots 46 to 49 (Inclusive), Northeast side of Louisa Street, And all of Park Lots 11 to 14 (Inclusive), Southwest side of Louisa Street, And Part of Park Lots 11 and 12 and All of Park Lots 13, 14 and 15, Northeast Side of Alice Street, and Part of Louisa Street, Minto Street and Albert Street, Townplot of Thornbury, Geographic Town of Thornbury, Town of The Blue Mountains, County of Grey



Map 3: The stage 2 field assessment of the subject property.

Map 4: A clear copy of the development plan.



Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment for Part of Lots 40 to 44 (Inclusive), 46, and 47 Southwest side of Arthur Street, And all of Lots 40 to 44 (Inclusive), Part of Lots 46 to 49 (Inclusive), Northeast side of Louisa Street, And all of Park Lots 11 to 14 (Inclusive), Southwest side of Louisa Street, And Part of Park Lots 11 and 12 and All of Park Lots 13, 14 and 15, Northeast Side of Alice Street, and Part of Louisa Street, Minto Street and Albert Street, Townplot of Thornbury, Geographic Town of Thornbury, Town of The Blue Mountains, County of Grey




Figure 5; Close-up of the stage 2 field assessment of the subject property.