

**1. PUBLIC MEETING TO CONSIDER DRAFT REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN  
AMENDMENT 6 - ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES POTENTIAL MAPPING STUDY**

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. That Council approve the *Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study* (April 1999), under separate cover, to be used as a tool in implementing policies for the protection of archaeological resources, as required in the Provincial Policy Statement, the 1997 Regional Official Plan and the Memorandum of Understanding transferring plan review responsibilities to the Region;
2. That, having held a public meeting, Council enact a bylaw to adopt draft Regional Official Plan Amendment 6 to the 1997 Regional Official Plan, attached as Annex A to this report, to reflect the recommendations of the *Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study*.

**DOCUMENTATION**

1. Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated 21 May 99 is immediately attached.
2. Addendum report from Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner dated 30 Jun 99 immediately follows.
3. Extract of Minute, 22 Jun 99 and Extract of Draft Minute, 13 Jul 99, follow and include a record of the vote.

REGION OF OTTAWA-CARLETON  
RÉGION D'OTTAWA-CARLETON

REPORT  
RAPPORT

Our File/N/Réf. (23) 11-99-0240  
 Your File/V/Réf.

DATE

21 May 1999

TO/DEST.

Co-ordinator  
 Planning and Environment Committee

FROM/EXP.

Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner

SUBJECT/OBJET

**PUBLIC MEETING TO CONSIDER DRAFT REGIONAL  
 OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT 6 - ARCHAEOLOGICAL  
 RESOURCES POTENTIAL MAPPING STUDY**

**DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. That Planning and Environment Committee and Council approve the *Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study* (April 1999), under separate cover, to be used as a tool in implementing policies for the protection of archaeological resources, as required in the Provincial Policy Statement, the 1997 Regional Official Plan and the Memorandum of Understanding transferring plan review responsibilities to the Region;
2. That, subject to the public meeting, Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council enact a bylaw to adopt draft Regional Official Plan Amendment 6 to the 1997 Regional Official Plan, attached as Annex A to this report, to reflect the recommendations of the *Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study*.

**BACKGROUND**

In June 1998, Council approved the appointment of Archaeological Services Inc. in association with Geomatics International Inc. to undertake the *Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study*. The study was prepared to implement policies for the protection of archaeological resources in the Provincial Policy Statement and the Regional Official Plan. The study was also required to meet a contractual obligation with the Province to assume the review of development applications to ensure the conservation of archaeological resources. As part of the development review process, the Planning and Development Approvals Department is to identify those planning applications in which archaeological resource assessments will be required prior to development occurring on the subject lands. In order to efficiently review development applications, the Department needs a GIS driven planning tool which will assist in determining

when an archaeological resource assessment is required, as well as guidelines and protocols to guide its application.

The Regional Official Plan as approved by Regional Council in July 1997 requires Council to prepare a Cultural Heritage Strategy to contribute to the conservation of Ottawa-Carleton's cultural heritage resources early in the development process. Cultural heritage resources are defined in the Regional Official Plan "as archaeological resources; buildings and structural remains of historical, architectural and contextual value; rural, Village and urban districts or cultural landscapes of historic interest; and monuments and cemeteries." The *Archaeological Resources Potential Mapping Study* will be the first component of the Cultural Heritage Strategy.

The *Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study* will also benefit:

- the local development community when making financial and development decisions;
- Provincial and Federal agencies, by assisting in their asset management and development review processes;
- the area municipalities for use during their development review process and municipal development/infrastructure projects.

## STUDY OBJECTIVES

The purpose of the study was to ensure the identification, evaluation and conservation of archaeological resources through effective planning. The objectives of the study were:

- 1) to inventory prehistoric and historic archaeological resources in Ottawa-Carleton;
- 2) to develop an archaeological potential model based on locally relevant criteria; and
- 3) to prepare implementation guidelines for archaeological resource management.

The archaeological potential mapping model outlined in the *Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study* will allow a staff member from the Regional Planning and Development Approvals Department without archaeological expertise to make a simple yes/no determination of whether a development property requires an archaeological resource assessment prior to development. The potential mapping model provides an Ottawa-Carleton specific planning tool that has been approved by the Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation (see letter, Annex B). Only development applications which require an archaeological resource assessment as a condition of approval will need to be reviewed by the Ministry.

Amendment 6 amends the Regional Official Plan to reflect the fact that the *Archaeological Resource Mapping Study* is now completed and provides the planning guidelines which will be used to protect archaeological resources.

## CONSULTATION

The study was prepared in co-operation with an Advisory Committee. The Committee included representatives of the following agencies: the area municipalities, the National Capital Commission, Parks Canada, the Canadian Museum of Civilization, the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation, the Ontario Archaeological Society (Ottawa Chapter), the Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders Association and the Algonquin Golden Lake First Nation.

Committee members met at key stages in the project and provided advice on the archaeological resources database, the evaluation/development of locally relevant criteria to determine archaeological potential, guidelines for resource management and outreach with affected communities such as first nations and heritage groups.

Two public meetings were held in the Fall 1998 to provide information on the study and to solicit information on unregistered archaeological sites within Ottawa-Carleton that are known only to avocational archaeologists. Separate meetings were held with professional archaeologists working in eastern Ontario, with the members of the Ontario Archaeological Society (Ottawa Chapter) and with members of the Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders Association to present the results of the study and provide another opportunity for input, prior to the preparation of the final report. Many of the comments received were helpful in improving the clarity of the report. The revisions were made in consultation with the Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation in recognition of their special role in dealing with archaeological resources and in approving the *Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study* before it can take effect.

Members of the Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders Association expressed the concern that there would be an increased cost and delay as a result of the implementation of the Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study. The study creates an Ottawa-Carleton specific tool rather than relying on generic Ministry (MCzCR) guidelines. It provides an up front indication as to whether a property has archaeological potential, and it speeds up the review process in determining the need for an archaeological assessment of a site. In fact, the total area in Ottawa-Carleton that will require assessment has been reduced significantly (from 95% of the land mass of Ottawa-Carleton to 45%) as a result of the Ottawa-Carleton specific model. The use of the potential mapping model will ensure that important information about Ottawa-Carleton's heritage is not lost, while permitting development to proceed once basic conservation measures have been taken, as required by Provincial policies.

A presentation and discussion on the study process, results and implementation is planned for the morning of June 22, 1999. The intent is to make all involved with the development approval process familiar with the implementation of the archaeological potential mapping model.

## STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS

The *Archaeological Resource Mapping Study* makes the following recommendations:

### Changes to the Regional Official Plan

Recommendation 1 suggests that the Regional Official Plan be revised to reflect the Region's commitment to adhering to the planning and management guidelines identified in the study and to require local municipalities to amend their Official Plans to contain the same commitment.

Staff has prepared Regional Official Plan Amendment 6 (Annex A) to reflect the fact that the *Archaeological Resource Mapping Study* is now completed and provides the planning guidelines which will be used to protect archaeological resources. The commitment to protect archaeological resources is already contained in the Regional Official Plan. Regional Official Plan Amendment 6 only changes the criteria for deciding when an archaeological resource assessment is required, as well as the guidelines to protect archaeological resources. Area municipalities should also make similar changes to their Official Plans to bring them into conformity with both the Regional Official Plan and the Provincial Policy Statement.

### Development Approval

The *Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study* will be used to implement the Regional Official Plan policies related to the protection of archaeological resources. Recommendation 2 suggests that the policy in the archaeology section of the Regional Official Plan and in each local Official Plan require that, where any portion of a proposed development application exhibits potential for the presence of sites, as determined by the potential mapping study, an archaeological assessment prepared to the satisfaction of the Ministry of Citizenship, Culture, and Recreation, be undertaken to determine if an archaeological resource is present, and if so, to determine an appropriate method to protect and manage the resource.

Such a report would be submitted to the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, the relevant local planning authority, and the Ministry in the case of Plans of Subdivision and Condominium, site specific Regional Official Plan Amendments, Site Plans involving large parcels of undisturbed land, as well as regional and municipal development/infrastructure projects. In the case of consent applications which require an archaeological assessment, the report should also be submitted to the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton, as well as the relevant local planning authority, and the Ministry prior to any land disturbing activity. In all cases, the plan for protection or salvage of any significant archaeological site(s) found during the course of the assessment must also be approved by the Ministry of Citizenship, Culture, and Recreation, and be implemented prior to land disturbance. It is not necessary to undertake such assessments on those lands that fall within zones identified as being of no potential.

### Guidelines for Data Sharing, Public Projects and a Contingency Plan

Recommendation 3 suggests that all planning agencies, co-operatively establish guidelines for sharing archaeological information derived from the application of the potential mapping study.

Recommendation 4 suggests that the Region and area municipalities establish guidelines to ensure that municipal construction projects that may negatively impact archaeological resources on public lands and which are located in areas of potential, are subject to archaeological assessment prior to any land disturbing activity.

Recommendation 5 suggests that all Planning Departments (regional and local) develop and adopt, in consultation with the Ministry of Citizenship, Culture, and Recreation, other appropriate agencies, landowners, and the public, a “Contingency Plan for the Protection of Archaeological Resources in Urgent Situations.” The Contingency Plan would address matters such as the notification process, investigation and reporting requirements, and financial responsibility in circumstances when deeply buried archaeological remains are found on a property during construction activities.

Staff suggests that work on these three guidelines be carried out in 1999 in consultation with area municipalities, the Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation, and other agencies.

### COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM CIRCULATION OF DRAFT ROPA 6

To implement the *Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study* recommendations, staff prepared and widely circulated draft Regional Official Plan Amendment 6. On May 3, a meeting was held with area municipal planners to discuss draft Regional Official Plan Amendment 6. The draft amendment was revised to reflect suggestions made at the meeting.

The City Councils of Kanata and Gloucester supported draft ROPA 6 as well as the South Nation Conservation Authority. The City of Ottawa provided comments related to the fact that the *Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study* shows the City’s historic core as having archaeological potential but does not recommend requiring an archaeological assessment. The City asked for two modifications to clarify the draft amendment: 1) to include that in cases of development in the City’s historic core area, an archaeological assessment will not be required as part of the approval process but that in the event archaeological resources are found, an archaeological assessment will be required; 2) to specify that an archaeological assessment is not required when a consent application is severing existing units. Staff amended the draft ROPA 6 as suggested by the City of Ottawa.

## FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Most Regional infrastructure projects (i.e. roads, water and sewer services) are already subject to Environmental Assessment which includes the requirement to do an archaeological assessment. There will be some additional cost to do an archaeological assessment when Regional infrastructure projects are not subject to Environmental Assessment and are located in an area of archaeological potential.

## CONCLUSION

The *Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study* provides the Region with an excellent planning tool to identify lands within Ottawa-Carleton that have archaeological potential. This tool will be useful in protecting Ottawa-Carleton archaeological resources as required by Provincial policies and the Regional Official Plan. The potential mapping model provides site specific indication of archaeological potential that can be used to guide private development proposals and public projects in terms of the need for assessment and protection of archaeological resources in a timely and effective manner.

Regional Official Plan Amendment 6 implements the *Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study* and reaffirms Council's commitment to protect Ottawa-Carleton's heritage.

*Approved by*  
*Nick Tunnacliffe, MCIP, RPP*

Attach. (2)

**DRAFT**  
**AMENDMENT 6**  
**OFFICIAL PLAN (1997) OF THE REGION OF OTTAWA-CARLETON**

**PURPOSE**

The purpose of Amendment 6 is to implement policies for the protection of archaeological resources, as required in the Provincial Policy Statement and the 1997 Regional Official Plan.

**BASIS**

The Regional Official Plan as adopted by Regional Council in July 1997 requires Council to prepare a Cultural Heritage Strategy to contribute to the conservation of Ottawa-Carleton's cultural heritage resources early in the development process. Cultural heritage resources are defined in the Regional Official Plan "as archaeological resources; buildings and structural remains of historical, architectural and contextual value; rural, Village and urban districts or cultural landscapes of historic interest; and monuments and cemeteries." The Plan states that one of the components of the Cultural Heritage Strategy will be "archaeological resource potential mapping, based on locally relevant criteria." In June 1998, Council approved the appointment of consultants to undertake the *Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study*, now completed.

As part of the transfer of review responsibility agreed to by the Region and the Province, the Planning and Development Approvals Department must identify those planning applications for which archaeological assessments will be required prior to development occurring on the subject lands. If as a result of an assessment an archaeological resource is found, vital information about the archaeological site in advance of its destruction will be collected, or the resource will be protected while development proceeds around it. This ensures that crucial information about Ottawa-Carleton's heritage is not lost, while permitting development to proceed once basic conservation measures have been taken.

The archaeological potential mapping model outlined in the *Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study* provides a tool, specific to Ottawa-Carleton, rather than relying on generic Provincial criteria. It provides an indication as to whether a property has archaeological potential, and it speeds up the review process by predetermining the need for an archaeological assessment of a site. The archaeological potential mapping will be used for most planning applications. However, for consent applications, an archaeological assessment will be required based on the specific criteria outlined in Policy 6.12.5. This will reduce the number of times an archaeological assessment will be required for consent applications.

The *Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study* shows the historic core of the City of Ottawa (as defined by the city limits at the time of its incorporation in 1855) as having archaeological potential. This recognises that some archaeological sites are likely to have survived as deeply buried deposits in areas that have been developed. In cases of development in the City's historic core area, an archaeological assessment will not be required. Rather, development proponents should be advised of the City's interest in the archaeological potential of the area. In the event that archaeological resources are encountered, a contingency plan will apply.

Amendment 6 amends the Regional Official Plan to reflect the fact that the *Archaeological Resource Mapping Study* is now completed and provides the planning guidelines which will be used to protect archaeological resources. The commitment to protect archaeological resources is already contained in the Regional Official Plan. Amendment 6 only changes the criteria for deciding when an archaeological resource assessment is required, as well as the guidelines to protect archaeological resources.

While not a part of Amendment 6, the following definition of “undisturbed lands” for the purpose of archaeology will be added to the Regional Official Plan Glossary: “Undisturbed lands- For the purpose of archaeology, undisturbed lands consist of any setting where archaeological deposits can still exist intact. This includes unlogged woodlots, logged woodlots, pasture land, or actively cultivated farm lands. Lands severely altered, but containing intact archaeological deposits, are also considered undisturbed lands. This mostly refers to deposits sealed or capped under fill, roads, etc. Disturbed lands generally consist of areas where topsoil or overburden, and an additional metre of soil have been physically removed.”

## **THE AMENDMENT**

1. Policy 6.12.3 is hereby amended by replacing the words “using archaeological potential criteria, before the Cultural Heritage Strategy and/or archaeological potential mapping is completed, and in conjunction with area municipalities” by the words “using the archaeological potential mapping updated from time to time outlined in the *Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study (1999)*.”
2. Policy 6.12.4 is hereby deleted and replaced by the following policies:
  - "3. When reviewing development proposals for Plans of Subdivision and Condominium, site specific Regional Official Plan Amendments and Site Plans involving large parcels of undisturbed land, determine whether any portion of a proposed development application or a public work has the potential for the discovery of archaeological resources. Council shall consult, and shall require the local municipality to consult the *Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study* to determine archaeological potential.

5. When reviewing consent applications, consider that archaeological potential exists only when the application would:
  - a) contain or directly affect a registered archaeological site, or directly affect a federal, provincial, or municipal historic landmark, monument or designated property, or
  - b) lead to impacts (any soil disturbance) upon undisturbed lands (woodlot, pasture, ploughed land) that are located within 100 metres of the top bank of the Ottawa, Rideau, Carp, Mississippi, or Jock Rivers when two or more new building lots are created.

When a consent application is severing existing units there is no requirement for an archaeological resource assessment.

6. Encourage the City of Ottawa to advise development proponents in the City's historic core area, that if archaeological resources are discovered during the course of construction, the site should be protected from further disturbance until a licensed archaeologist has completed an archaeological resource assessment and any necessary mitigation has been completed. While the *Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study* shows the historic core of the City of Ottawa (as defined by the city limits at the time of its incorporation in 1855) as having archaeological potential, an archaeological assessment will not be required as part of the development approval process.
7. If archaeological potential exists based on Policies 6.12.4 and 6.12.5 require an archaeological resource assessment conducted by an archaeologist licensed under the *Ontario Heritage Act* as a condition of development approval. Archaeological assessment reports shall:
  - a) be carried out to the satisfaction of the Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation and the approval authority;
  - b) include conservation-related recommendations such as documentation, removal and/or preservation *in situ* for heritage integrity purposes, if significant archaeological resources are discovered on a subject property; the plan for protection or salvage of any significant archaeological site(s) found during the course of the assessment must be implemented prior to land disturbance."
3. Policies 6.12.5, 6.12.6, 6.12.7, 6.12.8, 6.12.9, 6.12.10 and 6.12.11 are hereby renumbered to 6.12.8, 6.12.9, 6.12.10, 6.12.11, 6.12.12, 6.12.13 and 6.12.14.

Ministry of Citizenship,  
Culture and RecreationMinistère des Affaires civiques,  
de la Culture et des Loisirs

Cultural Programs Branch  
Archaeology & Heritage Planning  
55 Centre Street, London, Ontario N6J 1T4  
(519) 675-7742; Fax: 675-7777



Ontario

April 28, 1999

To: Sylvie Grenier  
Planning & Development Approvals Dept.  
Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton  
111 Lisgar Street  
Ottawa, Ontario K2P 2L7

**RE: Archaeological Resource Mapping Study and Regional OPA #6**

I have had a chance to review the archaeological resources undertaken by Archaeological Services Inc. on behalf of the Region of Ottawa-Carleton. The data and findings presented in that report have clearly been well researched and thought out. As such, although the mapping of potential presented in the report varies considerably from the provincial standards, they clearly are relevant to the physical and historical context of Ottawa-Carleton. For this reason, we can have no objections to the region using this mapped data in place of the provincial screening criteria when determining the presence or absence of archaeological concerns for a particular development application.

I have also reviewed the proposed OPA that will implement the archaeological study. Adoption of this OPA will both initialise the regular use of the archaeological study, and complete the Region's earlier Official Plan policy commitment to have regard for this part of the PPS.

On behalf of this Ministry, I wish to commend the Region for undertaking this effort. Obviously, the use of this study in making Planning-Act decisions will both ensure the Region effectively addresses the archaeological heritage conservation concerns arising from development activity, and ensure provincial support for all of those potential determinations. We also remain available to the Region in addressing specific technical issues arising from managing archaeological resources, providing support and assistance in mediating any disputes that arise, and in taking the results of implementation to further refine the model in the years ahead.

I trust that these comments are of assistance. Should you have any questions, please give me a call.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Neal Ferris".

Neal Ferris  
Regional Archaeologist/Heritage Planner

cc. ✓ R. Williamson, Archaeological Services Inc.  
✓ C. Healy, MMA&H

REGION OF OTTAWA-CARLETON  
RÉGION D'OTTAWA-CARLETON

REPORT  
RAPPORT

Our File/N/Réf. (23) 11-99-0240  
Your File/V/Réf.

DATE 30 June 1999

TO/DEST. Co-ordinator  
Planning and Environment Committee

FROM/EXP. Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner

SUBJECT/OBJET **ADDENDUM TO ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES  
POTENTIAL MAPPING STUDY - FINAL REPORT, REGIONAL  
OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT 6**

---

**DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATION**

**That Planning and Environment Committee and Council receive this report for information.**

**BACKGROUND**

At its meeting of June 22, 1999, Planning and Environment Committee deferred its decision on the recommendations regarding the *Archaeological Resources Potential Mapping Study* and Regional Official Plan Amendment 6 so that the Ottawa-Carleton Home Builders Association (OCHBA) would have more time to study the documentation and meet with Planning staff.

Staff met with representatives of the OCHBA on June 30. This report provides further clarification arising from this meeting.

**DISCUSSION**

The following four issues were discussed:

**Map update** - Records of lands where an archaeological assessment has been completed will be maintained on the Region's Geographic Information System. Using this information, the resource potential mapping will be updated from time to time, most likely in conjunction with the review of the Regional Official Plan. It was agreed that any changes to the archaeological potential mapping would be brought to Planning and Environment Committee to provide the opportunity for public comment and then go to Council. It was also agreed that if the potential areas were increased, land owners affected by the change would be notified.

**Site specific Regional Official Plan** - Policy 4 of the draft amendment refers to site specific Regional Official Plan Amendments. The intent is to review a site specific Regional Official Plan amendment application for archaeological potential when the application involves a specific development project, such as a Major Community Facility, as opposed to a secondary plan or an amendment involving a large area. In other words, an archaeological resource assessment will be required at the ROPA stage where a plan of subdivision is not expected to form part of the subsequent planning approvals process.

**Implementation of ROPA 6** - The policies on the protection of archaeological resources have been in effect since September 28, 1998. Since the archaeological resource potential mapping has been available, applicants have been informed that an archaeological resource assessment will be required if an application falls within a potential area.

However, it has been agreed with the representatives of the OCHBA that the policies outlined in ROPA 6 will only be applied to new applications submitted after the adoption of ROPA 6. The policies will also apply to extensions of draft plan approval for subdivisions, if the site has not been altered. It is standard practice for Development Approvals Division to update conditions when granting extensions of draft approval.

**What is an archaeological resource assessment?** - Clarification was requested on what an archaeological resource assessment referred to in Policy 6.12.7 includes. If a development property exhibits potential, an archaeological resource assessment conducted by a licensed archaeologist will be required. The licensed archaeologist must follow the standard steps detailed in the Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation's *Archaeological Assessment Technical Guidelines*. These steps are outlined in the attached excerpt of the Ministry's *An Educational Primer and Comprehensive Guide for Non-specialists, 1997* (Annex A). The archaeologist will conduct background research (Stage 1) and a field survey (Stage 2). The requirements for the subsequent stages depend on whether an archaeological site is identified.

## PUBLIC CONSULTATION

This report provides information on a further step of consultation with the OCHBA.

## FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no financial implications to this report.

## CONCLUSION

Staff continue to recommend the approval of the *Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study* and the adoption of draft Regional Official Plan Amendment 6. The archaeological potential mapping model outlined in the *Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study* provides a tool, specific to Ottawa-Carleton, rather than relying on generic Provincial criteria. It provides an indication as to whether a property has archaeological potential, and it speeds up the review process by predetermining the need for an archaeological assessment of a site.

Nick Tunnacliffe, MCIP, RPP

SG/jg

## SECTION 4

# IDENTIFICATION AND EVALUATION OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES ON A DEVELOPMENT PROPERTY

### 4.1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT

Structures and cultural landscapes of heritage significance are often easily identifiable on development property and can be brought to the attention of the approval authority, development agency or proponent by the municipal LACAC or even members of the public. However, as archaeological resources are below ground, they are not obvious features of the landscape and are difficult to recognize by untrained individuals. Consequently, if a development property exhibits the potential for the discovery of archaeological remains, an archaeological field assessment will be necessary. This usually entails hiring a consultant archaeologist - who must be licensed under the Ontario Heritage Act - to examine the full extent of the development property in a systematic matter, in order to identify all archaeological remains present. Assessment is a relatively straight-forward process, which will usually take a short period of time to complete (depending on field conditions, size of the field crew, number of archaeological sites present on the property, whether the land consists of ploughed fields or not, etc.). However, this work must be completed, and resulting report reviewed, well in advance of any servicing, grading, topsoil stripping, landscaping, or other land disturbance activities. It is also important to note that this work can only be completed in warm weather; frozen ground and snow cover necessarily prohibiting the ability of an archaeologist to survey a property in winter.

The aim of an assessment is for the consultant to compile an inventory and evaluate the significance of all archaeological resources present on the development property. There are four basic components to this process which the consultant must follow to obtain the end result, as detailed in MCzCR's *Archaeological Assessment Technical Guidelines* (copies of this guideline are available on request from Archaeology & Heritage Planning offices of MCzCR):

- Stage 1 - Background

The consultant will review the available archaeological and historical data for the region around the development property.

- Stage 2 - Field Assessment

The consultant will conduct a surface survey of the development property to identify all sites present. The survey must include all lands that are part of the development proposal, with the exception of areas disturbed by previous, fully destructive activities or lands which are permanently wet (eg. swamps, marshes, etc.), exposed bedrock, or are steeply sloped (greater than 20°). Survey consists either of walking a ploughed field, looking for artifacts lying on the surface of the ground, or shovel-

test pitting unploughed areas (woodlots, old pasture, etc.), and screening fill to identify artifacts. Wherever possible, lands that can be ploughed should be, to minimize cost, and improve site visibility.

- Stage 3 - Site assessment

When an archaeological site is identified, the consultant will need to collect sufficient information about the age, size and artifact frequency of the site to evaluate its significance. This normally includes mapping the extent of the artifact scatter or extent of artifact yielding test pits, and possibly excavating a limited number of test units (1 metre in size).

- Documentation - The Assessment Report

At the conclusion of these activities the consultant will generate a report detailing the fieldwork conducted, sites found, and whether or not any of those sites are significant enough to require the mitigation of development impacts. At that point *MCzCR* will review the report (which may also include a follow up inspection of the development property), in order to confirm that the consultant has adhered to provincial standards and licensing requirements, and to advise the proponent what further work will be required, if any, to satisfy the provincial interest in archaeological resource conservation. If inadequate field activities were employed, or if insufficient information was provided to determine whether or not development impacts to the site need to be mitigated, the consultant will be required to conduct additional investigations or revise the report.

Extract of Minute

Planning and Environment Committee  
22 June 1999

PUBLIC MEETING TO CONSIDER DRAFT REGIONAL OFFICIAL  
PLAN AMENDMENT 6 - ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES  
POTENTIAL MAPPING STUDY

- 
- Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated 21 May 1999
  - The Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study of the Region of Ottawa-Carleton issued separately.

At the outset, Committee Chair Hunter read a statement required under the Planning Act, wherein he advised that anyone, whose intention it was to appeal Regional Official Plan Amendment 6 to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB), must either voice their objections at the public meeting or submit their comments in writing. Failure to do so could result in refusal/dismissal of the appeal by the OMB.

Sylvie Grenier, Planner, Policy Planning Branch provided Committee with an overview of the staff report and introduced Neal Ferris, Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation, and Ron Williamson and Rob MacDonald, Archaeological Services Inc.

Mr. Ferris provided comments on Provincial involvement in this project. He noted when the responsibility for the protection of archaeologically significant sites was transferred to municipalities, some generic screening criteria for applications was provided to municipalities. The Region proposed to do this potential mapping study, as the provincial criteria did not reflect the unique physical and cultural characteristics of this region. Mr. Ferris indicated he had worked closely with Regional staff and the consultant in the development of this tool and, although the screening criteria is much tighter than the Province's, it is well substantiated by the results of this study. He indicated The Ministry of Citizenship Culture and Recreation fully supports the study and the decisions that will arise out of its application.

Dr. Williamson, then provided Committee with an overview of the planning study prepared by Archaeological Services Inc. A copy of the slides used by Dr. Williamson in his presentation, is held on file with the Regional Clerk.

In his presentation, Dr. Williamson noted the study resulted in approximately 45% of the total land mass in the Region exhibiting archaeological potential. He said if the Province's criteria were applied against the land mass, approximately 95% would exhibit archaeological potential. Using this mapping model, planners will be able to easily conclude whether or not a particular piece of land falls within an area of potential significance. The review process could occur at the pre-consultation period or when the application is submitted and, if any portion of a planning application falls within the potential zone, an assessment of all the land is required (the Ministry will continue to review archaeological reports). He pointed out both the assessment and site mitigation

Extract of Minute

Planning and Environment Committee  
22 June 1999

could be undertaken prior to the application or as a condition of draft approval. Most assessments would take one day, the report could then be produced within a week or two and the Ministry review would likely be completed within the month. Dr. Williamson advised the mapping will be used in plans of sub-divisions and condominiums, site specific Official Plan amendments, site plans involving large parcels of undisturbed land, public agency developments and certain consent applications.

Responding to questions posed by Councillor van den Ham, Mr. Ferris indicated the Provincial general screening criteria would be used province-wide, unless a municipality develops its own specific screening criteria. The Province feels archaeological resources are a very significant part of our heritage (representing over 10,000 years of history, most of which has no written records), however, if critical information is removed from those sites, development could proceed. In the alternative, a developer could choose to protect a significant site by allowing it to remain as greenspace. He said the aim is to manage the requirements within the development process, rather than serve as development constraint.

Councillor van den Ham then asked Mr. Ferris if his Ministry would still play a funding or a subsidy role in terms of preserving this heritage. Mr. Ferris replied funding had been provided by the Province for built heritage for designated properties, however, there are very few of these types of programs left in the Ministry. The Ministry does provide resources (in terms of staff), but no financial resources.

Councillor Munter had queries concerning the fact that, if the provincial criteria were used, 95% of the land mass in the Region would be covered. Dr. Williamson indicated the main reason for this was that poorly drained land in the buffer zone was not included in the regional tool, thus reducing the land mass covered by this tool (i.e. 45% of the total land mass). Councillor Munter concluded that by developing a specific tool, the Region would not be more restrictive but rather fewer land owners in Ottawa-Carleton would be affected than if the provincial criteria were used. Dr. Williamson concurred and went on to say the Region has demonstrated far sightedness by having this study done, specifically tailored to its reality.

In response to further questions from Councillor Munter, Mr. Ferris confirmed an assessment would only be triggered when a development application under the Planning Act (e.g. subdivision, condominium, etc.) came forward. He said the Province is not interested in imposing studies on citizens who happen to have land that falls within a potential area. Rather, the intent is to capture this when the land use change is going to occur, as this would be when the destruction to the resource would occur.

Councillor Legendre asked what would be involved in an archaeological resource assessment. Dr. Williamson replied a Ministry licensed consultant, retained by the

Extract of Minute

Planning and Environment Committee  
22 June 1999

proponent, would send a team out to the property to examine it. For example, a 50 acre parcel of land that is cultivated would take one day to assess by systematically walking the property. These trained archeologists would look for particular small artifacts that reflect previous occupation of the property. If a site is found, then an assessment is made as to whether further work is required on that site. In the case of land that is not plowed (e.g. a wood lot) but which is level and not wet, a different survey methodology would be utilized, that being test-pitting. This involves digging a hole in the ground and screening and examining the contents of the pit for artifacts.

Councillor Legendre found it odd that a representative from the Ottawa-Carleton Homebuilder's Association (OCHBA) sat on the Advisory Committee and questioned on what basis they were invited to participate. Ms. Grenier replied the OCHBA representative participated as a stakeholder. She said all members of the Advisory Committee made a positive contribution and staff took into consideration all comments made. The one comment made by the OCHBA representative related to the process and that was, if an assessment was required, they wanted the flexibility to do it at either the pre-consultation stage or at the draft approval stage.

Councillor Stewart pointed out the Mapping Study, although dated April 99, was only received by Councillors the previous Friday. She went on to say it was quite a lengthy study and she had not had a chance to read it thoroughly. She asked if there was any reason why this item would have to proceed quickly through Committee and Council. Nick Tunnacliffe, Commissioner, Planning and Development Approvals, indicated the item had been advertised as a public meeting for the Official Plan Amendment, however, after hearing from any member of the public that wished to speak on this matter, the Committee could choose to defer it.

Responding to further questions from Councillor Stewart, Ms. Grenier explained the proposed amendment is not changing the policy in the Official Plan; Council has committed to protect archaeological resources. Rather, staff are saying if the provincial criteria were used in the Region it would encompass so much more land mass (because there are so many rivers in Ottawa-Carleton). The proposed mapping model is much more reasonable and less restrictive than the provincial criteria.

Councillor Stewart asked if the area municipalities were in support of the staff proposal. Ms. Grenier indicated all written comments received from the area municipalities were positive and noted staff had worked very closely with them in developing it .

Councillor Legendre expressed astonishment that, although the report recognizes the City of Ottawa core as having historical potential, it does not recommend requiring an archaeological assessment. He asked for comment on this. Dr. Williamson stated in his

Extract of Minute

Planning and Environment Committee  
22 June 1999

experience, there is usually enough public attention to redevelopment projects in downtown cores that if something archaeologically significant is found, it is reported to someone and the media usually picks up on it. He said in the study, they recommended a contingency plan be developed to identify who would "go to the table" to devise a plan for dealing with such a resource. Councillor Legendre then asked, if a redevelopment project took place in an area of potential archaeological significance, would the municipality be required to issue some sort of advisory. Dr. Williamson confirmed they were recommending a cautionary letter be issued.

Councillor van den Ham had questions concerning the actual assessment process. Dr. Williamson clarified trained archaeologists would conduct a systematic pedestrian survey of the property (five metres apart) on a piece of cultivated land. He said using this technique, the team would be able to identify anything from 8,000 years ago to more recent evidence of European activity (e.g. a mid-19th century farmstead).

The Councillor then asked how a survey would be conducted on un-cultivated land. Dr. Williamson advised, pursuant to the Provincial guidelines, if the land has been previously plowed, it must be plowed again for the survey. He pointed out this would be in the best interest of the proponent because a walking survey would be much more cost effective than test-pitting. He noted there are exceptions to this rule, for example, if there is live stock on the property and they will be there for some time, then the property would be test pitted. As well, previously plowed areas where scrub brush has grown up on it and wooded areas, would have to be test pitted.

Councillor van den Ham noted the map provided showed 45% of Ottawa-Carleton with potential for archaeological resources; he asked if there would be something in place to protect the remaining 55% of the Region. Dr. Williamson replied much care was taken in the preparation of the map to ensure that most of the resources would fall within the 45% zone. However, there will be some resources that fall outside of the zone and for this reason they recommended a contingency plan (i.e. the same contingency plan recommended for the historic core). Dr. Williamson doubted that resources would be found in a rural situation, where development occurs outside of a zone of potential. Many of these sites would be relatively tiny and may only consist of 10 or 15 artifacts on the surface, which a non-archaeologist would not be able to recognize.

The Committee then heard from the following public delegations.

Jean-Luc Pilon, Curator of Ontario Archaeology, Canadian Museum of Civilization (CMC), commended the Region on the proposal, noting it was very forward thinking, whose real value would last well beyond our life time.

Extract of Minute

Planning and Environment Committee  
22 June 1999

Mr. Pilon went on to quote a passage written by Dr. Norman Emerson, an Archaeology Professor at the University of Toronto: "Historical understanding makes a very real contribution to the personal and national pride of Canadians. A profound faith in the future can only be built upon a deep sense and understanding of the past. Human beings thrive upon the secure feeling that their roots are set deep in the soil." He then expanded upon the high value people place on their past and the past of the land in which they live, noting the popularity of the Canadian Museum of Civilization and other historical institutions across the country and around the world.

Mr. Pilon advised there have been people living in the Region of Ottawa-Carleton for 9000 years or more. The Museum of Civilization has most of the objects found within the Region, most collected over a century ago and, with the exception of one or two excavated sites in the Constance Bay area, most of the materials would fit in a shoe box. He said there has been much destruction of information about previous uses of the Region and gave the example of the land where the Supreme Court and the National Archives are today. In the middle of the last century, while some sand was being excavated to build a bridge, they found a large common grave with over 20 individuals buried there centuries ago. Little bits and pieces have been found on the streets of downtown Ottawa, enough to tell us that people were using the area in ways that are difficult to imagine.

In concluding his remarks, Mr. Pilon compared the significance of each archaeological artifact and site, to a book. The book represents a story of an area or of a people and time, through natural agencies, tears out all sorts of pages leaving perhaps every third or fourth page. By the time an archaeologist appears on the scene to try to reconstruct the essential thread of that story, there is very little left to deal with. This makes each and every page that much more valuable than it had been in the original book. At the same time it means that the destruction of each additional page for the wrong reasons makes the task so much more difficult. The story of this land's past belongs to all of us and he stressed that it must be respected and the needless destruction of additional pages of the story avoided.

Gordon Watson, Ottawa Chapter of the Ontario Archaeological Society appeared before the Committee on behalf of the Society President, Marian Clark. Mr. Watson noted he was one of the founding members of the chapter and had worked as an archaeologist in the Region and just beyond for some thirty years. He said just last year he had presented the findings from his work to the Canadian Museum of Civilization. Mr. Watson noted the Society participated in the Advisory Committee and many members, including himself, had input to the study by informing the consultant, Archaeological Services, about what they knew of the Region's archaeology from their own work.

Extract of Minute

Planning and Environment Committee  
22 June 1999

Mr. Watson concluded his remarks by conveying the Ontario Archaeological Society's support for the initiative demonstrated by the Region in undertaking this study and he noted the Society assesses its importance as very high for the future of the control of archaeology in the Region.

Ian Dyck, Ontario Archaeological Society advised he too was an archaeologist. He said he had lived much of his life in the Prairies and was therefore quite familiar with the history of various sites and landmarks there. He said this was not easy to do in Ottawa because the archaeology is not well developed in this immediate region. Mr. Dyck related the few things he did know about the Region, for example the Portage site across the River from the Parliament buildings was excavated in the last century and the sand was used as a base for the Parliament Buildings. The Portage material would likely contain some very interesting artifacts from many thousands of years back. He said this type of site indicated to him that there should be more of them around the Region. He said with the proposed plan, he was able to begin to see where these sites likely would be. Mr. Dyck applauded the efforts of the Region in this area and commended the consultants for their work. He urged the Committee to support it.

Nicholas Patterson stated it would appear from the report that OCHBA expressed strong concerns that this procedure would increase costs and delays. He surmised they were against the staff proposal of an Ottawa-Carleton specific tool and would prefer to rely on the generic Ministry guidelines. Mr. Patterson also noted the staff report did not indicate if any formal detailed analysis or survey was carried out, as to what other major municipalities in Ontario and Canada are doing and how this proposal compares. He said he would like to see something from staff in this regard.

Ted Phillips, Ottawa Carleton Homebuilders' Association. Mr. Phillips advised he had received calls that day from five builders who, despite having been circulated a great deal of material on this matter, felt somewhat unaware of the process and unaware of the implications of the Planning and Environment Committee endorsing the subject report. In this regard, Mr. Phillips requested that the Committee defer the item for two weeks so that a meeting could be arranged with staff and the builders.

Chair Hunter stated he had spoken with a developer who indicated they were already having to do some type of archaeological assessment on projects, as a Ministry requirement. Mr. Phillips replied this would depend on when the subdivision was draft approved and what the conditions of approval were. He said older conditions of draft approval do not require archaeological review. Mr. Phillips advised he had been involved in one project more than three years earlier, where an archaeological review was done. He said, in speaking with the development community, he was the only one that he knew of that had done one.

Extract of Minute

Planning and Environment Committee  
22 June 1999

Responding to a further question from Chair Hunter, Mr. Phillips stated that most large suburban developers would be hard pressed to find a hundred acres of land within the Region that did not have a potential zone in the middle of it. He advised that everything Richcraft owns in the Region (approximately 4000 acres) is affected by this and he suspected this would be the case with most large developers.

Councillor Legendre stated he could understand members of OCHBA would be impacted by this amendment, however, he said if the Committee did agree to a deferral, he would hope Mr. Phillips would ask OCHBA members if they saw any value in this policy. The Councillor said he would be very disappointed if the members of OCHBA did not. Mr. Phillips indicated anyone that he had spoken to in the industry recognizes the importance of what staff is trying to do. He said developers want to determine what is quantifiable in terms of the expectations of what will be preserved and what will be done with what is found. He stated he did not believe any of OCHBA members were philosophically opposed to this policy.

Councillor Munter opined that OCHBA is one of the groups that is better practiced at coming before Committee. He noted OCHBA had not submitted a letter and he surmised, had it not been for an article in the newspaper that day, Mr. Phillips would not likely have attended the meeting. He asked if it would be reasonable to extrapolate from this, that generally speaking OCHBA does not have a problem with the staff report. Mr. Phillips stated he would not assume that. He said that most of the large builders have read the report, have met to discuss the requirements of the study, are aware of the implications and philosophically believe they have an obligation to do things the right way. He said they are not trying to avoid the inevitable, but rather are trying to get a better understanding of some parts of what will be required. Mr. Phillips stated the development industry had been extremely preoccupied over the last several months on the issue of Development Charges.

In response to questions from Councillor Stewart, Mr. Phillips advised the industry has questions about the intent of what will be determined as archaeologically significant. As well, some OCHBA members had no idea this was going on and have concerns about the implications it will have. He said if the opportunity were provided for Regional staff to provide a bit more description of certain terms within the report, then he felt the report could be supported by the industry.

Chair Hunter advised Councillor Beamish had put forward a motion that this item be deferred to the Planning and Environment Committee meeting of 13 July 1999.

Extract of Minute

Planning and Environment Committee  
22 June 1999

Councillor van den Ham indicated he would be supporting deferral. Referencing the staff report, the Councillor noted the archaeological potential mapping study was the first component in the cultural heritage study and he asked if all of the components could be addressed at the same time. Carol Christensen, Senior Project Manager, Land Use, Policy Planning Branch advised there are three components to the Cultural Heritage Strategy. The first is a Comprehensive Built And Landscape Heritage Features Data Base compiled from existing sources; the second is the Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study; and the third one is Guidelines For Resource Management And Site Development In The Vicinity Of Heritage Resources. She said each was relatively free standing and it was not necessary to have the complete strategy to deal with one part or another of it.

Ms. Grenier speaking to the OCHBA request for deferral, pointed out they had been involved for more than a year and in fact were involved in developing the terms of reference, even before the consulting firm was hired. She also noted a special meeting was held to inform the Home Builders about the process. Ms. Grenier stated an information meeting (such as the one held that morning and attended by several builders) could be held, however, it would not have any effect on the amendment itself.

Councillor Legendre indicated he would not be supporting deferral as OCHBA had participated in the whole process and he felt inappropriately so. He opined they should not have been part of the Advisory Committee, as they offered no expertise in this area. The Councillor noted it would have been “normal and healthy” for OCHBA to be involved after the study was finalized, when it could have been circulated to them for their comment/involvement.

Chair Hunter disagreed with Councillor Legendre’s view, and felt the Home Builders gave some balance to the process. He pointed out the report was written by archaeologists and recommends work for archaeologists. The involvement of the Home Builders (or others who do not have an interest in creating business for archaeologists) gives some balance and credibility to the report and suggests that they are, to a certain extent, buying into the process.

Councillor Stewart stated from an archaeological perspective, it was very important to have a comprehensive policy to address preservation of the past in the Region. She indicated she would be supporting deferral so that she would be able to read the report in-depth and to allow OCHBA members to do their homework and have their say before a decision is made.

Councillor Beamish noted the Committee normally tries to accommodate the public as much as possible and he felt, as some members of OCHBA feel they would like another

Extract of Minute

Planning and Environment Committee

22 June 1999

opportunity to look at this policy, three weeks would be a very small amount of time in the overall scheme of things. He urged the Committee to support his motion for deferral.

Councillor Munter also expressed his agreement with granting deferral as he felt the matter did not require urgent Council approval. The Councillor expressed his support for the report and thanked staff for the amount of work that went into this policy.

The Committee considered Councillor Beamish's motion.

Moved by D. Beamish

**That Item No. 1 be deferred to the 13 July 1999 Planning and Environment Committee meeting.**

CARRIED

(J. Legendre dissented)

Extract of Draft Minute  
Planning and Environment Committee  
13 July 1999

PUBLIC MEETING TO CONSIDER DRAFT REGIONAL OFFICIAL PLAN  
AMENDMENT 6 - ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES POTENTIAL  
MAPPING STUDY

- 
- *Deferred from Planning and Environment Committee Meeting of 22 June 1999*
  - Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner's report dated 21 May 1999
  - The Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study of the Region of Ottawa-Carleton issued previously
  - Addendum report from Planning and Development Approvals Commissioner dated 30 June 1999

Committee Chair Hunter advised this was a continuation of the public meeting for Regional Official Plan Amendment 6 and, noting there were no speakers' forms submitted for this item, he inquired if there was anyone present who wished to speak. There being no speakers, the Committee approved the staff recommendations.

- 1. That Planning and Environment Committee and Council approve the *Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study* (April 1999), under separate cover, to be used as a tool in implementing policies for the protection of archaeological resources, as required in the Provincial Policy Statement, the 1997 Regional Official Plan and the Memorandum of Understanding transferring plan review responsibilities to the Region;**
- 2. That, subject to the public meeting, Planning and Environment Committee recommend that Council enact a bylaw to adopt draft Regional Official Plan Amendment 6 to the 1997 Regional Official Plan, attached as Annex A to this report, to reflect the recommendations of the *Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study*.**

CARRIED