



**Matrix  
Heritage**

## **ORIGINAL REPORT**

### **Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment:**

5971 Flewellyn Road  
Part Lot 25, Concession 9,  
Geographic Township of Goulbourn,  
Former County of Carleton,  
City of Ottawa, Ontario

### **Prepared For**

Jada Goodman  
Project Manager, Land Development  
Caivan  
3713 Borrisokane Road  
Nepean ON, K2J 4J4  
Jada.Goodman@caivan.com

**June 2, 2026**

PIF: P378-0169-2026

Nadine Kopp (License Number P378)

Report: MH1511-REP.01

**Matrix Heritage Inc.**  
6131 Perth Street  
Richmond  
Ontario K0A 2Z0  
Tel: (613) 807-2071  
[www.MatrixHeritage.ca](http://www.MatrixHeritage.ca)

## **1.0 Executive Summary**

Matrix Heritage, on behalf of Caivan, conducted a combined Stage 1 and 2 archaeological assessment of the study area at 5971 Flewellyn Road, located on Part Lot 25, Concession 9, in the Geographic Township of Goulbourn, formerly within Carleton County, now within the City of Ottawa (Map 1). This archaeological assessment was undertaken in support of a development application proceeding under the Planning Act for proposed development within the study area (Map 2). The study area falls within the larger Stittsville Magnolia development (assessed under PIFs P369-0236-2022 and P369-0188-2021) and was recently acquired., as such, development mapping does not currently extend into this parcel. Study area boundaries were determined by the previous development plan and parcel mapping. This assessment is in accordance with the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* by the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM 2011).

The City of Ottawa has an archaeological management plan which was developed in 1999, *The Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study of the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton*. The management plan covers the Geographic Township of Goulbourn (Archaeological Services Inc. and Geomatics International Inc 1999). According to the management plan, the study area falls within an area of archaeological potential due to the location along the historic Flewellyn Road (Map 3).

The Stage 1 assessment included a review of the MCM archaeological site databases, a review of relevant environmental, historical, and archaeological literature, as well as primary historical research including: historical maps, land registry, and census records. The Stage 1 background assessment concluded that, based on criteria outlined in the MCM's *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (Section 1.3, (2011)), the study area has both pre-contact Indigenous as well as historical Euro-Canadian archaeological potential.

The Stage 2 archaeological assessment involved subsurface testing consisting of hand excavated test pits at 5 m intervals in areas of archaeological potential. Fieldwork was undertaken on May 21, 2026. Weather conditions were sunny with a temperature of 20°C. Permission to access the property was provided by the owner. Nothing of archaeological significance was encountered during the field assessment.

Based on the results of this investigation it is recommended:

1. No further archaeological study is required for the study area at 5971 Flewellyn Road as delineated in Map 1.

## **2.0 Table of Contents**

|       |                                                                 |    |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 1.0   | Executive Summary .....                                         | i  |
| 2.0   | Table of Contents.....                                          | ii |
| 3.0   | Project Personnel.....                                          | 2  |
| 4.0   | Project Context .....                                           | 3  |
| 4.1   | Development Context .....                                       | 3  |
| 4.2   | Historical Context.....                                         | 3  |
| 4.2.1 | Historic Documentation .....                                    | 3  |
| 4.2.1 | Pre-Contact Period.....                                         | 3  |
| 4.2.2 | Euro-Canadian Colonial History .....                            | 9  |
| 4.2.3 | Study Area Specific History .....                               | 10 |
| 4.3   | Archaeological Context .....                                    | 11 |
| 4.3.1 | Current Conditions .....                                        | 11 |
| 4.3.2 | Physiography .....                                              | 11 |
| 4.3.3 | Previous Archaeological Assessments .....                       | 12 |
| 4.3.4 | Registered Archaeological Sites and Commemorative Plaques ..... | 13 |
| 4.4   | Archaeological Potential.....                                   | 13 |
| 5.0   | Field Methods .....                                             | 13 |
| 6.0   | Records of Finds.....                                           | 14 |
| 7.0   | Conclusions and Recommendations .....                           | 14 |
| 8.0   | Advice on Compliance with Legislation .....                     | 15 |
| 9.0   | Closure .....                                                   | 16 |
| 10.0  | Bibliography and Sources .....                                  | 17 |
| 11.0  | Images.....                                                     | 20 |
| 12.0  | Maps.....                                                       | 28 |
|       | Appendix A: Photographic Catalogue .....                        | 35 |
|       | Appendix B: Document Catalogue .....                            | 36 |
|       | Appendix C: Map Catalogue .....                                 | 36 |

### **3.0 Project Personnel**

|                    |                                 |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Licensee           | Nadine Kopp, MA (P378)          |
| Field Director     | Cedric Sabourin (R1361)         |
| Field Crew         | Tim Boekema<br>Catherine Brooks |
| Report Preparation | Andrea Jackson, MLitt (P1032)   |
| Archival Research  | Andrea Jackson, MLitt (P1032)   |
| GIS and Mapping    | Danny Kavanagh                  |
| Report Review      | Andrea Jackson, MLitt (P1032)   |

## 4.0 Project Context

### 4.1 Development Context

Matrix Heritage, on behalf of Caivan, conducted a combined Stage 1 and 2 archaeological assessment of the study area at 5971 Flewellyn Road, located on Part Lot 25, Concession 9, in the Geographic Township of Goulbourn, formerly within Carleton County, now within the City of Ottawa (Map 1). This archaeological assessment was undertaken in support of a development application proceeding under the Planning Act for proposed development within the study area (Map 2). The study area falls within the larger Stittsville Magnolia development (assessed under PIFs P369-0236-2022 and P369-0188-2021) and was recently acquired. As such, development mapping does not currently extend into this parcel. Study area boundaries were determined by the previous development plan and parcel mapping. This assessment is in accordance with the *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* by the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism (MCM 2011).

The City of Ottawa has an archaeological management plan which was developed in 1999, *The Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study of the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton*. The management plan covers the Geographic Township of Goulbourn (Archaeological Services Inc. and Geomatics International Inc 1999). According to the management plan, the study area falls within an area of archaeological potential due to the location along the historic Flewellyn Road.

At the time of the archaeological assessment, the study area was owned by Caivan. Permission to access the study area was granted by the owner prior to the commencement of any field work without restrictions.

### 4.2 Historical Context

#### 4.2.1 Historic Documentation

The study area is located within the City of Ottawa in Carleton County. There is a significant amount of literature available concerning the history and development of the City of Ottawa. Some of these sources include; the *Illustrated Historical Atlas of Carleton County* (Belden & Co. 1879a), the *Carleton Saga* (Walker and Walker 1968), *Ottawa, An Illustrated History* (Taylor 1986), *Where Rivers Meet: An Illustrated History of Ottawa* (Bond 1984). The early history of Goulbourn is described in *Goulbourn Memories* (Goulbourn Township Historical Society 1996) and *For King and Canada: The 100<sup>th</sup> Regiment of Foot During the War of 1812* (Roberts 2004).

#### 4.2.1 Pre-Contact Period

##### Early Human Occupation

Indigenous histories speak of the advance and retreat of glaciers and of their presence on the land from time immemorial. Presently, the earliest human occupation of the Americas has been archaeologically documented to predate 14,000 years ago. However, at that time much of eastern Canada was covered by thick and expansive glaciers and the Laurentide Ice Sheet of the Wisconsinian glacier blanketed southwestern Ontario until about 12,500 B.P. At this time the receding glacial terminus was at the southern edge of present-day Georgian Bay and melt water in the region created Early Lake Erie and Lake Iroquois (the basin of today's Lake Ontario).

The earliest archaeologically recovered evidence in northeastern North America dates from circa 11,000 B.P. and relates to groups archaeologically referred to as Paleo people. For Ontario the Paleo period is divided into the Early Paleo period (11,000 - 10,400 B.P.) and the Late Paleo period (10,500-9,400 B.P.), based on changes in tool technology (Ellis and Deller 1990). The Paleo people, who had moved into hospitable areas of southwest Ontario (Ellis and Deller 1990), likely consisted of small groups of exogamous hunter-gatherers relying on a variety of plants and animals who ranged over large territories (Jamieson 1999).

### Archaic Period

As the climate continued to warm, the forests became dominated with white pine and some deciduous trees and the ice sheet receded further northwards, allowing areas to be travelled and occupied in what is known as the Archaic Period (9,500 – 2,900 B.P.). Archaic populations generally remained hunter-gatherers with an increasing emphasis on fishing. People began to organise themselves into small family groups operating in a seasonal migration, congregating annually at resource-rich locations for social, religious, political, and economic activities. Often sites from this time are located on islands, waterways, and at narrows on lakes and rives where caribou and deer would cross, suggesting a common widespread use of the birchbark canoe that was so prominent in later history (McMillan 1995).

In the Boreal forests of the Canadian Shield, the Archaic period is referred to as the “Shield Archaic,” characterized by adaptations to a forested environment with a focus on hunting, fishing, and gathering, using stone tools made from locally available materials. In contrast, the mixed forests to the south are associated with the “Laurentian Archaic,” marked by a broader range of subsistence activities, including fishing with nets and woodworking using ground-stone tools such as axes and gouges.

### Woodland / Pre-European Contact Period

Generally, the introduction of the use of ceramics marks the transition from the Archaic Period into the Woodland Period. Populations continued to participate in extensive trade networks that extended across much of North America. Social structure appears to have become increasingly complex with some status differentiation recognized in burials. Towards the end of this period domesticated plants were gradually introduced to the region. This coincided with other changes including the development of semi-permanent villages. The Woodland period is commonly divided into the Early Woodland (1000 – 300 B.C.), Middle Woodland (400 B.C. to A.D. 1000), and the Late Woodland (A.D. 900 – European Contact) periods.

The Early Woodland is typically noted via lithic point styles (i.e., Meadowood bifaces) and pottery types (i.e., Vinette I). The Middle Woodland period is identified primarily via changes in pottery style (e.g., the addition of decoration). The divides within the Middle Woodland and the shift into the period held as the Late Woodland are not well defined. There are general trends for increasingly sedentary populations, the gradual introduction of agriculture, and changing pottery and lithic styles. However, nearing the time of contact, Ontario was populated with somewhat distinct regional populations that broadly shared many traits. In the southwest, in good cropland areas, groups were practicing corn-bean-squash agriculture in semi-permanent, often palisaded villages which are commonly assigned to Iroquoian-speaking peoples (Wright 2004:1297–1304). Algonquian-speaking peoples, including the Michi Saagiig (Mississauga) and the Chippewa, inhabited the same or neighbouring areas, but their presence in the archaeological record is less visible owing in part to seasonal rounds of hunting, fishing, and gathering, relying on the waterways of the Kawarthas, Rice Lake, and Georgian Bay for subsistence and travel (Kapyrka

and Migizi 2016:4–5). These waterways supported extensive trade networks, connecting Indigenous communities across the region.

### European Contact

Archaeological information suggests that ancestral Anishinabe Algonquin people lived in the region of what is today eastern Ontario and western Quebec for at least 8,000 years before the Europeans arrived in North America. This traditional territory is generally considered to encompass the Ottawa Valley on both sides of the river, in Ontario and Quebec, from the Rideau Lakes to the headwaters of the Ottawa River. The region is dominated by the Canadian Shield which is characterized by low rolling land of Boreal Forest, rock outcrops and muskeg with innumerable lakes, ponds, and rivers. This environment dictated much of the traditional culture and lifestyle of the Anishinabe Algonquin peoples. At the time of European contact, the Anishinabe Algonquin territory was bounded on the east by the Montagnais people, to the west by the Nipissing and Ojibwa, to the north by the Cree, and to the south by the lands of the Iroquois.

The addition of European trade goods to artifacts of native manufacture in archaeological material culture assemblages ushered in a new period of history. When the French arrived, there was already a long-standing and vast trade network extending from the Saguenay to Huronia. This route existed at least from the early beginnings of agricultural societies in Ontario around A.D. 1000 (Moreau et al. 2016). This trade increased rapidly after the arrival of the Europeans with the introduction of European goods and the demand for furs. The Huron held a highly strategic commercial location controlling the trade to the south and the west, and the Algonquin, Michi Saagiig, and Chippewa were their critical connection to goods from the east, including European products.

The so-called St. Lawrence Iroquoians were the first Iroquoian people to be contacted by Europeans, when Jacques Cartier encountered villages around present day Québec City and Montréal in 1535. A few decades later, they had disappeared with various branches likely being subsumed by the more powerful Huron-Petun (Wendat-Tionontate) or Five Nations (Haudenosaunee) Iroquoian confederacies and others incorporated into Algonquian groups in the Ottawa Valley or further east (Wabanaki) (Warrick 2008:203). At this time, late in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, several changes occurred in the distribution of Iroquoian villages in southern Ontario as well. Prior to contact with Europeans, Iroquoian communities along the north shore of Lake Ontario and the Trent River Valley appear to have dispersed, likely relocating to Huronia. By the 17<sup>th</sup> century, missionaries and explorers collectively referred to these groups as the Hurons. This migration is generally attributed to increased participation in the fur trade.

The first recorded meeting between Europeans and Anishinabe Algonquin occurred at the first permanent French settlement on the St. Lawrence at Tadoussac in the summer of 1603. Samuel de Champlain came upon a party of Algonquins, the Kitchissipirini under Chief Tessouat, who were celebrating a recent victory over the Iroquois with their allies the Montagnais and Malecite (Hessel 1993). Champlain made note of the “Algoumequins” and his encounter with them, yet the initial contact between Champlain and the Algonquin people within their own territory in the Ottawa Valley was during his travels of exploration in 1613.

By the time of Champlain’s 1613 journey, the Anishinabe Algonquin people along the Ottawa River Valley were important middlemen in the rapidly expanding fur-trade industry. Champlain knew this and wanted to form and strengthen alliances with the Algonquins to further grow the fur-trade, and to secure guidance and protection for future explorations inland and north towards

a potential northwest passage. Further, involving the Algonquins deeper in the fur trade promised more furs filling French ships and more Indigenous dependence on European goods. For their part, the French offered the promise of safety and support against the Iroquois to the south.

Early historical accounts note many different Algonquian speaking groups in the region at the time. Of note for the lower Ottawa Valley area were the Kichesipirini (focused around Morrison Island); Matouweskariini (upstream from Ottawa, along the Madawaska River); Weskarini (around the Petite Nation, Lièvre, and Rouge rivers west of Montreal), Kinouchepirini (in the Bonnechere River drainage); and the Onontchataronon, (along the South Nation River) (Holmes and Associates 1993a; Morrison 2005; Pilon 2005). However, little archaeological work has been undertaken regarding Anishinabe Algonquin at the time of contact with Europeans (Pilon 2005).

### Fur Trade, Early Contact with the French

Champlain understood that the Anishinabe Algonquin would be vital to his eventual success in making his way inland, exploring, and expanding the fur trade. This was partially due to their language being the key to communication with many other groups, as well as their dominance over trade routes surrounding the Ottawa River and the connection with the Huron in the west.

By the mid-17<sup>th</sup> century, the demands of the fur trade had caused major impacts to the traditional way of life including a change in tools, weapons, and a shift in diet to more European as hunting was more for furs and not for food. This dependence on European food, ammunition, and protection tied people to European settlements (McMillan 1995). The summer gathering sites shifted from prominent fishing areas to trading posts. This further spurred social changes in community structure and traditional land distribution and use.

The well-situated Anishinabe Algonquin, particularly the Kitchesipirini who controlled passage around Allumette Island, were originally reluctant to cede any of their dominance in fear of being cut out of their lucrative middleman role in the trade economy. However, an alliance with the French meant protection and assistance against the Iroquois. The French, as well as other Europeans like the Dutch and English, were able to align their own political and economic rivalries with those of the native populations. The competitive greed and obsession with expanding the fur trade entrenched the rivalries that were already in place, and these were intensified by European weapons and economic ambition. The trading policies of Europeans created an imbalance between these native rivalries as the Haudenosaunee were readily supplied muskets by their Dutch allies, while the French allied with the Huron and their trading partners the Algonquin, Nippissing, Michi Saagiig, and Chippewa only supplied guns to Christian converts (Lackenbauer et al. 2010:21–23).

### Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) Wars

Little information exists about inter-tribal warfare prior to European contact, however, there was existing animosity between the Haudenosaunee and the Anishinabe Algonquin when Champlain first arrived in the Ottawa Valley. Like his fellow Europeans, Champlain was able to use this existing rivalry to make a case for an alliance, thus gaining crucial access to the established trade networks and economic power of the Anishinabe Algonquin. Prior to European contact, the hostilities had been mainly skirmishes and raids, or formal battles that were often ritualized and organized to minimize casualties, but everything changed as European reinforcement provided deadlier weapons and higher economic stakes with the introduction of the fur trade (Lackenbauer et al. 2010:5–8).

Along with the French, the Anishinabe Algonquin were allied against the Haudenosaunee with the Huron, Nipissing, Michi Saagiig, and Chippewa. French records suggest that at the end of the sixteenth century the Algonquins were the dominant force and were proud to have weakened and diminished the Iroquois. The first Algonquin campaign the French took part in was a 1609 attack against the Mohawk. The use of firearms in this fight marked the beginning of the escalation of brutality between these old enemies. The Haudenosaunee corn stalk shields could stop arrows but not bullets or French swords (Hessel 1993).

Eventually the tide changed and as the Haudenosaunee exhausted the beaver population in their own territory they became the aggressors, pushing into the lands of the Anishinabe Algonquin, Michi Saagiig, Chippewa, and Huron, with the added strength of Dutch weaponry. Through the 1630s and 40s constant and increased raiding into Anishinabe Algonquin, Michi Saagiig, and Chippewa territory by the Haudenosaunee Nations had forced many multi-generational residents to leave their lands and seek protection from their French allies in places like Trois Rivières and Sillery while others fled to the north. By 1650 Huronia, the home of the long-time allies of the Anishinabe Algonquin and traditional and treaty territory of the Chippewa, had been destroyed by the Haudenosaunee. The Anishinabe Algonquin of the Ottawa Valley had largely been scattered or displaced, reduced through war and disease to small family groups under the protection of the French missions only fifty years after the first Europeans had travelled the Ottawa River (Morrison 2005:26).

There is some evidence that the Anishinabe Algonquin did not completely abandon the Ottawa Valley but withdrew from the Ottawa River to the headwaters of its tributaries and remained in those interior locations until the end of the century. Taking advantage of the Anishinabe Algonquin absence, the Ottawa people, originally from the area of Manitoulin Island, used the river for trade during this time and their name became historically applied to the river.

### Aftermath of War

As the Haudenosaunee push continued and the Anishinabe Algonquin sought refuge amongst their French allies, other factors came into play that significantly contributed to their displacement and near destruction. The introduction of European diseases, the devastating influence of alcohol, and the increasing pressure to convert to Christianity massively contributed to the weakening of the Anishinabe Algonquin people and their traditional culture.

The Anishinabe Algonquin thought of themselves as part of the natural world with which they must live in harmony. The traditional stories of Anishinabe Algonquin folklore contained lessons and guides to behaviour. The French missionaries regarded them as “heathens” and dismissed their religion as superstition (Day 2005). The missionaries believed it was their duty to convert these people to Christianity to save them from evil. Anishinabe Algonquin chief Tessouat had seen his Huron neighbours become ill and die after interactions with the European missionaries and had thus originally warned his people about abandoning their old beliefs and the dangers of conversion (Hessel 1993). Eventually the French imposed laws allowing only those converted to Christianity to remain within the missions and under French protection. This created divisions amongst the Anishinabe Algonquin themselves which weakened the social structure as some settled into a new religion and new territory.

Starting in the 1630s and continuing into the 1700s, European disease spread among the Anishinabe Algonquin groups along the Ottawa River, bringing widespread death (Trigger 1986:230). As disease spread through the French mission settlements the priests remained

certain that the suffering was punishment for resisting Christianity. An additional threat lurking amongst the French settlements was alcohol which precipitated many issues.

### The Long Way Back

After the Haudenosaunee (Iroquois) Wars, the remaining Anishinabe Algonquin people were generally settled around various French trading posts and missions from the north end of the Ottawa Valley to Montreal. A large settlement at Oka was the first mission established on Anishinabe Algonquin lands in 1720. This settlement included people from many groups who had been collected and moved around from various locations. It became a type of base camp; occupied during the summer while the winters were spent at their traditional hunting territories in the upper Ottawa Valley. This arrangement served the French well, since the Anishinabe Algonquin converts at Oka maintained close ties with the northern bands and could call upon the inland warriors to join them in case of war with the British or Iroquois League.

As the British gained control of Canada from the French in 1758-1760 they included in the Articles of Capitulation a guarantee that the Indian allies of the French would be maintained in the lands they inhabited. Many of the Anishinabe Algonquin and other native groups that had been living on French mission settlements were shuffled around to new reserves while others began to migrate back to their traditional territories. Those who had remained on the land and continued to be active in the fur trade, now did so with the English through companies in Montreal like the North West Company, and in the north with the Hudson Bay Company.

Some Anishinabe Algonquin people began to return to their traditional territory to join those groups who had remained in the lower Ottawa Valley and continued their traditional lifeway through to the influx of European settlement in the late 1700s and early 1800s. This included bands noted to be living along the Gatineau River and other rivers flowing into the Ottawa. These traditional bands maintained a seasonal round focused on harvesting activities into the 1800s when development pressures and assimilation policies implemented by the colonial government saw Indigenous lands taken up, albeit under increasing protest and without consideration for Indigenous claims, for settlement and industry. Anishinabe Algonquin lands began to be encroached upon by white settlers involved in the booming lucrative logging industry or having been granted the land as Loyalist soldiers or through other settler groups.

As some Anishinabe Algonquin had been redistributed to lands in Quebec, their traditional territory within the Ottawa Valley was included in multiple land transfer deals, agreements, and sales with the British Crown beginning in the 1780s and continuing till the 1840s. The Anishinabe Algonquin were not included in these transactions and numerous petitions and inquiries on behalf of their interests were often overruled or ignored (Holmes and Associates 1993a; Holmes and Associates 1993b; Sarazin). The Constitution Act of 1791 divided Quebec into the Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada with Ottawa River as the division line, thus the lands claimed by the Algonquins fell under two separate administrations creating more confusion, exclusion, and oversight.

Two “protectorate” communities were eventually established in the nineteenth century for the Anishinabe Algonquin people at Golden Lake in Ontario and River Desert (Maniwaki) in Quebec. One of the last accounts of the Anishinabe Algonquin living traditionally was from 1865. The White Duck family was living just west of Arnprior when they were forced to leave their wigwams as surveyors arrived to tell them the railway was being expanded through their land (Hessel 1993).

Anishinabe Algonquin people continue to live in the wider Ottawa Valley and there are still many speakers of several Algonquian dialects. Outside of the officially recognized bands there are an unspecified number of people of Anishinabe Algonquin decent throughout the Ottawa Valley unaffiliated with any reserve. Today there are ten Anishinabe Algonquin communities that are collectively represented by the Algonquins of Ontario: The Algonquins of Pikwàkanagàn First Nation, Antoine, Kijicho Manito Madagouskarini, Bonnechere, Greater Golden Lake, Mattawa/North Bay, Ottawa, Shabot Obaadjiwan, Snimikobi, and Whitney and area.

Struggles to officially secure title to their traditional land, as well as fight for hunting and fishing rights have continued into modern times. The Algonquins of Ontario (AOO) and the Governments of both Canada and Ontario are working together to resolve this land claim through a negotiated settlement. The claim includes an area of 9 million acres of unceded territory within the watersheds of the Ottawa and Mattawa Rivers in Ontario including the city of Ottawa and most of Algonquin Park. The signing of the Agreement-in-Principle in 2016 by the AOO and the provincial and federal governments, signifying a mutual intention for a lasting partnership, was a key step towards a final agreement to clarify the rights and nurture new economic and development opportunities in the area.

#### 4.2.2 Euro-Canadian Colonial History

Although the French exerted some influence in the region that would become eastern Ontario and western Quebec through the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries, with permanent settlements established to the east and west on the Island of Montreal and Cataraqui (present day Kingston), permanent European settlement did not occur until the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. Despite having gained control of Canada at the end of the Seven Years' War (1754–1763), the British did not express interest in establishing settlements until the end of the American Revolution, when United Empire Loyalists left the newly established Republic.

The Governor of Quebec, General Frederick Haldimand, sought to make lands available for settlement for the Loyalists in what would become Upper Canada. Early Euro-Canadian land divisions into districts, counties, townships, etc. and the expansion of settlement were facilitated by the Indigenous Nations who agreed to enter formal treaty relationships with the newcomers to share the land and resources. Today, the study area is recognized as lying on the traditional uncaded territory of the Anishinabe Algonquin, within the lands of the Crawford Purchases, and just outside the boundary of the Rideau Purchase.

The uncaded Anishinabe Algonquin territories encompass nine million areas of land across much of Eastern Ontario. Treaty negotiations between the Algonquin Anishinaabeg (collectively represented by the Algonquins of Ontario) and the Crown (Ontario and Canada), reached an Agreement-in-Principle in 2016. The Agreement-in Principle is a key step toward a Final Agreement clarifying the rights of all parties and demonstrates a building of respect between the Crown and the Indigenous communities.

The Crawford Purchase was negotiated between the Crown and the Mississauga Anishinàbeg living east and west of present-day Kingston. It resulted in opening a large area along the north shore of the upper St. Lawrence River and the eastern end of Lake Ontario (the greater Kingston area) for settlement by Loyalists and Indigenous peoples who fought for and supported Britain during the American Revolution. However, much controversy surrounds this agreement. No formal contract has survived, and any contract may have never been signed. The wording of the agreement is only known from a couple of letters between the Crown negotiators. Notably, these lands are the traditional territory of the Anishinabe Algonquin, who were not party to the Crawford

Purchase, never ceded title or rights, and have continuing ownership of the Ontario portions of the Ottawa and Mattawa River watersheds and their natural resources.

The Rideau Purchase was negotiated between the Crown and the Michi Saagiig for a three-million-acre tract of land along the south shore of the Ottawa River between Pembroke and Ottawa, extending south and west. With the Rideau Purchase the Crown sought to alleviate disputes regarding previously unceded lands north of the poorly defined limits of the Crawford Purchase (1783). This was largely to facilitate increasing demands for settlement in the Rideau Corridor and throughout the watersheds of the Ottawa valley and the Madawaska and Mississippi rivers.

The Township of Goulbourn was first surveyed in 1817 by McNaughton, and was named for Sir Henry Goulbourn, the Undersecretary for War and the Colonies and one of the commissioners for negotiating the Treaty of Ghent (War of 1812) (Elliot 1991; Roberts 2004). The township was laid out in the usual 100 acre lots, except for Concession 12, which were 80 acre lots. The Richmond Military Settlement, or Village of Richmond, was created out of Lots 22 to 25 of Concession 3, and the south half of Lots 22 to 25 of Concession 4. The first European settlers to the area were in 1818 and included disbanded members of the 99<sup>th</sup> Regiment, who received military posts in the newly created village of Richmond (Belden 1879; Roberts 2004:185). Lots were awarded to discharged military as follows: Privates 100 acres, Sergeant 200 acres, Lieutenant 500 acres, Sergeant Major 500 acres, Ensign 500 acres, Captain 800 acres, and Navy Captain 1000 acres. Emigrants were awarded 100 acres (Stanzel 2001). The main group of settlers arrived at Richmond in September of 1818 as temporary tents were set up. It was not until October that land tickets were issued (Roberts 2004:185).

The Tipperary group was settled on land on the northeast corner of the township in the area of the village of Hazeldean (Roberts 2004). Emigrants from Ireland and Scotland moved to the Township, and specifically to the Village of Hazeldean in 1819 (Belden & Co. 1879b:253). Goulbourn Township was incorporated into Carleton County in 1821. In 1851, the population of Goulbourn Township was 2,525. There were 15 stone houses, 2 frame houses, 241 log houses, and 100 shanties. The population grew very slowly and by 1861 there were 2,914 residents in the township residing in 19 stone houses, 7 frame houses, and 407 log houses (Bond 1968:24). By the 1870s, the village of Hazeldean, which was located 13 miles from Ottawa, had tri-weekly mail delivery. There was one general store, some trade shops, one school, two churches (Episcopal and Methodist), a Temperance Hall, and an Orange Hall (Belden & Co. 1879b:253). By 1878, the population had grown to 3,007. The 55,060 acres that encompassed the township held 2,914 cattle, 3,409 sheep, 1,007 pigs, and 1,075 horses (Belden & Co. 1879b:105–109).

#### 4.2.3 Study Area Specific History

The study area is located on the north side of Flewellyn Road, to the southwest of the intersection with Shea Road, in the centre of the southern edge of Lot 25, Concession 9, in the Geographic Township of Goulbourn, now part of the City of Ottawa.

##### **Lot 25, Concession 9**

The Crown patents for Lot 25, Concession 9, were granted to John Hall (the eastern 100 acres), and John McGuire (the western 100 acres) in 1824 (LRO (04)). While it is not recorded in the land registry abstract, John McGuire acquired the entire lot at some point as the land was passed through his will following his death in 1860 (LRO (04)). The southern 40 acres of the lot were granted to Thomas McGuire, presumably his son or other close relation, while the remainder was given to John's "wife and sons" (LRO (04)). Historic mapping from 1863 shows no house or

owner within the southern portion of the lot (Map 4). As the study area falls within the southern portion of the lot, that is the property detailed within this report.

Census records from 1871 list Thomas aged 32, living with his wife Susanna, their four young children ranging in age from three months to six years, and a farm labourer, Charles Erskin, aged 34 (Statistics Canada 1871). Historic mapping from 1879 (Map 4), shows a structure attributed to T. McGuire to the north of the current study area. By the time of the 1891 and 1901 censuses two more children had been added to the family, while the two youngest children listed in the 1871 census are no longer there, suggesting their young deaths (Statistics Canada 1891; Statistics Canada 1901). By 1911, the census shows that the youngest son, George Mills McGuire, was no longer living at home, suggesting he had married (Statistics Canada 1911). This coincides with the selling of the subject property to George M. by his father Thomas in 1912 (LRO (04)), over half a century after he had first acquired it. Only a year later, in 1913, George sold the land to neighbour Orrin Spearman (LRO (04)). Thomas McGuire died in 1919 at the age of 80 (Ancestry.com 2012). Decades later, in 1960, Orrin Spearman sold the land to Frederick Eder who held the property until at least the mid 1990s (LRO (04)).

### 4.3 Archaeological Context

#### 4.3.1 Current Conditions

The study area (0.8 ha) is located on the north side of Flewellyn Road, to the southwest of the intersection with Shea Road, in the centre of the southern edge of Lot 25, Concession 9, in the Geographic Township of Goulbourn, now part of the City of Ottawa. The study area consists of a mostly treed lawn around a house. Site conditions at the time of the assessment are shown in Figure 1 to Figure 16 and Map 5.

#### 4.3.2 Physiography

This study area lies within the Ottawa Valley Clay Plains physiographic region (Map 6). This region is characterized by poorly drained topography of clay plains interrupted by ridges of rock or sand that offer moderately better drainage. This topography was influenced by the post glacial sequence Champlain Sea (ca. 10,500 to 8,000 B.C.) that deposited these clay soils and were subsequently covered by sand deposits from the emerging freshwater drainage. Some of these sands were eroded to the underlying clay deposits by later channels of the developing Ottawa River. The sections to the north and south of the Ottawa River are characteristically different. On the Ontario side there is a gradual slope, although there are also some steep scarps (Chapman and Putnam 2007:205–208).

The soil in the study area is of the Bainsville series with the southern end composed of North Gower soils, and a small pocket of Grenville soils in the northeastern portion (Map 6). Bainsville silt and loam textured soils have developed from deltaic silt and fine sand. They tend to occur as transition soil areas between large sand plains and clay flats. These soils have poor natural drainage, the surface is usually dark in colour, and they contain a high content of organic matter. The surface is usually underlain by a grey silt loam over grey clay. Dairying is the main agricultural enterprise for this type of soil and the principal crops grown are hay, grains, and fodder corn.

The surficial geology of the study area consists of massive to well-laminated, fine-textured, glaciomarine deposits of silt, clay, minor sand, and gravel (Map 6). There are no primary water

sources within or immediately adjacent to the study area. The Jock River, a tributary of the Rideau River, flows about 6 km to the southeast.

### 4.3.3 Previous Archaeological Assessments

Archaeological work in the region has primarily consisted of cultural resource management studies related to specific properties or development projects. Due to the extensive development of the past few decades within the Stittsville area, there have been a significant number of archaeological assessments conducted prior to these developments.

A Stage 1 assessment conducted by Matrix Heritage in 2025 included the southeastern portion of the current study area comprising the deep ditch along Flewellyn Road (Matrix Heritage 2026). The Stage 1 assessment concluded that this section of the study area had no archaeological potential due to the deep and pervasive land disturbance of the ditch.

Within the immediate vicinity of the study area specifically, there have been several assessments from Stage 1 through to Stage 4, these are outlined below in Table 1. The identified sites within this area have been post-contact Euro-Canadian sites, mainly associated with the historic occupation of Lot 25, Concession 9, by the McGuire family.

| PIF                            | Date | Project                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | Company         |
|--------------------------------|------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| P1032-0026-2025                | 2025 | Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment, Shea Road at Flewellyn Road, Part Lots 25 and 26, on Concessions 8 and 9, Geographic Township of Goulbourn, Former Carleton County, City of Ottawa, Ontario                                     | Matrix Heritage |
| P369-0250-2022                 | 2022 | Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment: T. McGuire Site (BhFx-70), 5993 Flewellyn, 6070 Fernbank, and 6115 Flewellyn Road Part Lots 24 and 25, Concession 9, Geographic Township of Goulbourn, Carleton County, City of Ottawa, Ontario | Matrix Heritage |
| P369-0236-2022                 | 2022 | Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment: Stittsville Properties 5993 Flewellyn, 6070 Fernbank, and 6115 Flewellyn Road Part Lots 24 and 25, Concession 9, Geographic Township of Goulbourn, Carleton County, City of Ottawa, Ontario     | Matrix Heritage |
| P369-0188-2021                 | 2022 | Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment: Stittsville Properties 5993 Flewellyn, 6070 Fernbank, and 6115 Flewellyn Road Part Lots 24 and 25, Concession 9, Geographic Township of Goulbourn, Carleton County, City of Ottawa, Ontario     | Matrix Heritage |
| P369-0036-2015                 | 2016 | Stage 4 Archaeological Mitigation: McGuire 1 (BhFx-54) Site Davidson Co-Tenancy 5993 Flewellyn Rd, Concession 9, Part lot 25 Geographic Township of Goulbourn City of Ottawa, Ontario                                              | Paterson Group  |
| P369-0035-2015                 | 2015 | Stage 4 Archaeological Mitigation: Mrs. McGuire's School House (BhFx-55) Site Davidson Co-Tenancy 5993 Flewellyn Rd, Concession 9, Part lot 25 Geographic Township of Goulbourn City of Ottawa, Ontario                            | Paterson Group  |
| P369-0032-2015, P369-0033-2015 | 2015 | Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment: McGuire 1 (BhFx-54) and Mrs. McGuire's School House (BhFx-55) Sites Davidson Co-Tenancy 5993 Flewellyn Rd, Concession 9, Part lot 25 Geographic Township of Goulbourn City of Ottawa, Ontario   | Paterson Group  |
| P378-0009-2013                 | 2015 | Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment: Davidson Lands 5993 Flewellyn Rd, Concession 9, Part lot 25 Geographic Township of Goulbourn City of Ottawa, Ontario                                                                            | Paterson Group  |
| P003-373-2013                  | 2014 | Stage 1 & 2 Archaeological Assessment Stittsville South Development Area Part Lots 22, 23, 24 & 25, Concession 9 Geographic Township of Goulbourn City of Ottawa                                                                   | Adams Heritage  |

**Table 1: Previous archaeological assessments undertaken within Lots 24 to 27, Concession 8 and 9.**

#### 4.3.4 Registered Archaeological Sites and Commemorative Plaques

A search of the Ontario Archaeological Sites Database indicated there are three registered archaeological sites within a 1 km radius of the study area. All three sites are post-contact in nature, are related to the McGuire family's occupation of Lot 25, Concession 9, and are all located to the northwest of the current study area. The sites are outlined below in Table 2.

No commemorative plaques or monuments are located within 1 km of the subject property.

| Borden  | Site Name                   | Time Period  | Affinity      | Site Type | Status          |
|---------|-----------------------------|--------------|---------------|-----------|-----------------|
| BhFx-70 | T. McGuire Site             | Post-Contact | Euro-Canadian | farmstead | No Further CHVI |
| BhFx-55 | Mrs. McGuire's School House | Post-Contact | Euro-Canadian | school    | No Further CHVI |
| BhFx-54 | McGuire 1                   | Post-Contact | Euro-Canadian | house     | No Further CHVI |

**Table 2: Registered archaeological sites within 1km of the study area.**

#### 4.4 Archaeological Potential

Potential for pre-contact Indigenous sites is based on physiographic variables that include distance from the nearest source of water, the nature of the nearest source/body of water, distinguishing features in the landscape (e.g., ridges, knolls, eskers, wetlands), the types of soils found within the area of assessment, and resource availability. The study area has low potential for pre-contact Indigenous archaeological resources based on the poorly drained soils and distance to primary water sources.

Potential for historical Euro-Canadian sites is based on proximity to historical transportation routes, historical community buildings such as schools, churches, and businesses, and any known archaeological or culturally significant sites. The study area has potential for post-contact Euro-Canadian archaeological resources based on the historic roads within the study area, the early patent dates, and the historic occupation of the area by generations of the McGuire family.

The City of Ottawa has an archaeological management plan which was developed in 1999, *The Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study of the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton*. The management plan covers the Geographic Township of Goulbourn (Archaeological Services Inc. and Geomatics International Inc 1999). According to the management plan, the portion of the study area along Flewellyn Road has archaeological potential due to the historic road and structures based on historic mapping (Map 3).

#### 5.0 Field Methods

The study area (0.8 ha) is considered to have archaeological potential according to the 2011 standards set out for consultant archaeologists by the MCM and by the City of Ottawa *Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping*. The study area consists of a partially treed residential property with a manicured lawn and a house (Figure 1 to Figure 6) and was therefore not suitable for ploughing as per Standard 1.a. and 1.e., Section 2.1.2 (MCM 2011).

The central portion and southeastern edge of the study area (0.21 ha) were deemed to be deeply disturbed through the existing house, raised septic bed, and a deep ditch under the driveway and were therefore not tested as per Standard 2.b. of Section 2.1 (MCM 2011) (Figure 7 to Figure 10) (Map 5). Much of the southeastern edge of the study area, comprised of a deep ditch, was previously assessed as part of a Stage 1 archaeological assessment and was deemed deeply disturbed (Matrix Heritage 2026).

Much of the northwestern corner of the study area (0.09 ha) was excluded from testing due to permanently wet conditions as per Standard 2.a.i, Section 2.1 (MCM 2011) (Figure 11 to Figure 14) (Map 5).

The remainder of the of the study area (0.5 ha) was shovel tested at 5 metre intervals (Figure 15 and Figure 16) (Map 5). All test pits were a minimum of 30 cm in diameter and were excavated 5 cm into subsoil and extended to within 1 m of structures (Section 2.1.2). All soil was screened using 6 mm mesh. All test-pits were examined for cultural features and stratigraphy then backfilled upon completion. Nothing of cultural significance was encountered during the Stage 2 test pitting survey of the study area.

All field activity and testing areas were mapped using a 9<sup>th</sup> Generation iPad with ArcGIS Field Maps. Average accuracy at the time of survey was approximately 5 m horizontal. Study area boundaries were determined in the field using boundaries digitized from the plan of survey (Map 2) overlaid in ArcGIS Field Maps. All survey data is compiled into ArcGIS and every survey point has a UTM Zone 18T NAD 83 coordinate.

Photographs were taken during fieldwork to document the current land conditions (see Map 5 for photo locations mapped by figure number) as per Standard 1.a., Section 7.8.6 (MCM 2011).

Fieldwork was undertaken on May 21, 2026. Weather conditions were sunny with a temperature of 20°C. Lighting, visibility, and overall conditions were good (Section 2.1, Standard 3 MCM 2011). Nothing of archaeological significance was encountered during the field assessment.

At the time of the archaeological assessment, the study area was owned by Caivan. Permission to access the study area was granted by the owner prior to the commencement of any field work without restrictions.

## **6.0 Records of Finds**

Despite having archaeological potential, no archaeological remains, artifacts, or cultural soil profiles were encountered during the Stage 2 assessment of the study area.

## **7.0 Conclusions and Recommendations**

The Stage 1 assessment indicated that the study areas had both pre-contact Indigenous as well as historic Euro-Canadian archaeological potential. However, the Stage 2 assessment did not identify any archaeological resources within the assessed portion of the study area.

Based on the results of this investigation it is recommended:

2. No further archaeological study is required for the study area at 5971 Flewellyn Road as delineated in Map 1.

## **8.0 Advice on Compliance with Legislation**

- a. This report is submitted to the *Minister of Citizenship and Multiculturalism* as a condition of licencing 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 Citizenship and Multiculturalism, 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.
- b. It is an offence under Sections 48 and 69 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* for any party other than a licenced 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 Archaeology Reports referred to in Section 65.1 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.
- c. 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 licenced consultant archaeologist to carry out archaeological fieldwork, in compliance with Section 48 (1) of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.
- d. 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.

## 9.0 Closure

Matrix Heritage has prepared this report in a manner consistent with the time limits and physical constraints applicable to this report. No other warranty, expressed or implied is made. The sampling strategies incorporated in this study comply with those identified in the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism's *Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists* (2011) however; archaeological assessments may fail to identify all archaeological resources.

The present report applies only to the project described in the document. Use of this report for purposes other than those described herein or by person(s) other than Caivan or their agent(s) is not authorized without review by this firm for the applicability of our recommendations to the altered use of the report.

Unless otherwise indicated, all materials in the report are copyrighted by Matrix Heritage. All rights reserved. Matrix Heritage authorizes the client and approved users to make and distribute copies of this report only for use by those parties. No part of this document either text, map, or image may be used for any purpose other than those described herein. Therefore, reproduction, modification, storage in a retrieval system or retransmission, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical or otherwise, for reasons other than those described herein, is strictly prohibited without prior written permission of Matrix Heritage.


This report is pending Ministry approval.

We trust that this report meets your current needs. If you have any questions or we may be of further assistance, please contact the undersigned.

Matrix Heritage Inc.



Nadine Kopp, M.A., A.P.A.  
Senior Archaeologist



Andrea Jackson, MLitt  
Staff Archaeologist

## **10.0 Bibliography and Sources**

Ancestry.com

2012 Canada Find a Grave Index, 1600s-Current.

Archaeological Services Inc. and Geomatics International Inc

1999 *The Archaeological Resource Potential Mapping Study of the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton: Planning Report*. Archaeological Services Inc. and Geomatics International Inc., Ottawa, Ont.

Belden & Co.

1879a *Illustrated Historical Atlas of the County of Carleton (Including City of Ottawa)*, Ont. Toronto.

1879b *Historical Sketch of the County of Carleton*. Mika Silk Screening Ltd., Belleville.

Bond, Courtney C. J.

1968 *The Ottawa Country*. National Capital Comm., Ottawa.

1984 *Where the Rivers Meet: An Illustrated History of Ottawa*. Windsor Publications.

Chapman, L. J., and D. F. Putnam

2007 *The Physiography of Southern Ontario*. Vol. Miscellaneous Release Data 228. Ontario Geological Survey, Toronto.

Day, Gordon

2005 *The Indians of the Ottawa Valley*. Canadian Museum of Civilization Corporation.

<http://www.lynngehl.com/uploads/5/0/0/4/5004954/23.pdf>.

Elliot, Bruce S.

1991 *The City Beyond: A History of Nepean, Birthplace of Canada's Capital 1792-1990*. Corporation of the City of Nepean, Nepean, Ont.

Ellis, C. J., and B. D. Deller

1990 Paleo-Indians. In *The Archaeology of Southern Ontario to A.D. 1650*, C. J. Ellis and N. Ferris, editors, 5:pp. 37–63. Occasional Publications of the London Chapter, OAS, London.

Goulbourn Township Historical Society

1996 *Goulbourn Memories*. Lowe-Martin Printing, Ottawa.

Hessel, P.D.K

1993 *The Algonkins of the Ottawa Valley: An Historical Outline*. Kichesippi Books, Arnprior.

Holmes, J, and Associates

1993a *Algonquins of Golden Lake Claim*. In . Ontario Native Affairs Secretariat.

1993b *Aboriginal Use and Occupation of the Ottawa River Watershed*. In *Algonquins of Golden Lake Claim*, 2:. Ontario Native Affairs Secretariat.

Jamieson, S.

1999 *A Brief History of Aboriginal Social Interactions in Southern Ontario and Their Taxonomic*

Implications. In *Taming the Taxonomy: Toward a New Understanding of Great Lakes Archaeology*, R. F. Williamson and Christopher M. Watts, editors, pp. 175–192. eastendbooks, Toronto.

Kapyrka, Julie, and Gitiga Migizi

2016 Truth and Reconciliation in Archaeology: Dismantling the Kingdom. *Ontario Archaeological Society Notes* 21(4):3–9.

Lackenbauer, P. Whitney, John Moses, R. Scott Sheffield, and Maxime Gohier

2010 *A Commemorative History of Aboriginal People in the Canadian Military*. National Defence, Ottawa.

LRO (04)

Land Registry Records - Carleton (LRO 04), Goulbourn, Book 6.

Matrix Heritage

2026 *Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment, Shea Road at Flewellyn Road, Part Lots 25 and 26, on Concessions 8 and 9, Geographic Township of Goulbourn, Former Carleton County, City of Ottawa. (P1032-0026-2025)*. Matrix Heritage, Richmond, Ontario.

MCM

2011 Standards and Guidelines for Consultant Archaeologists.

McMillan, Alan, D

1995 *Native Peoples and Cultures of Canada*. Douglas and McIntyre, Vancouver.

Moreau, Jean-Francois, F. Guindon, and E. Langevin

2016 The Northern Route, between the Saguenay and Georgian Bay: Construction of a Hypothesis. In *Contact in the 16th Century*. Mercury Series Archaeology Paper 176. Canadian Museum of History and the University of Ottawa Press, Ottawa.

Morrison, James

2005 Algonquin History in the Ottawa River Watershed. *Ottawa River: A Background Study for Nomination of the Ottawa River Under the Canadian Heritage Rivers System*:17–36.

Pilon, J.-L.

2005 Ancient History of the Lower Ottawa River Valley. *Ottawa River: A Background Study for Nomination of the Ottawa River Under the Canadian Heritage Rivers System*:12–17.

Roberts, A. Barry

2004 *For King and Country: The Story of the 100th Regiment of Foot During the War of 1812*. Goulbourn Township Historical Society and Museum, Ottawa.

Sarazin, G

220 Years of Broken Promises. Algonquins of Greater Golden Lake First Nation.  
<http://www.greatergoldenlake.com/220.html>.

Stanzel, Jim

2001 *Land Patent Holders: Goulbourn Township and Village of Richmond*. The Ontario Geneological Society, Ottawa.

Statistics Canada

1871 Census of Canada.

1891 Census of Canada.

1901 Census of Canada.

1911 Census of Canada.

Taylor, John H.

1986 *Ottawa. An Illustrated History*. Lorimer & Co., Toronto, Ont.

Trigger, B. G.

1986 *Natives and Newcomers: Canada's "Heroic Age" Reconsidered*. McGill-Queen's University Press, Montreal.

Walker, H. J., and O. Walker

1968 *The Carleton Saga*. The Runge Press Ltd., Ottawa, Ont.

Warrick, Gary

2008 *A Population History of the Huron-Petun, A.D. 500-1650*. Cambridge University Press, New York.

Wright, James V.

2004 *A History of the Native People of Canada: Volume III (A.D. 500 - European Contact)*. National Museum of Canada Mercury Series, Archaeological Survey of Canada Paper No. 152. Canadian Museum of Civilization, Hull.

## 11.0 Images



**Figure 1: General view of back of house within study area (MH1511-D015).**




**Figure 2: Example of conditions within study area (MH1511-D010).**



**Figure 3: General view of the backyard of the house (MH1511-D039).**



**Figure 4: General view of the east side of the study area (MH1511-D040).**



**Figure 5: Example of conditions within the study area, structures near the treed portion (MH1511-D038).**



**Figure 6: Example of treed portion of the study area (MH1511-D026).**



**Figure 7: Example of structures and utilities on the property (MH1511-D012).**



**Figure 8: Example of structure with landscape built up around it (MH1511-D037).**



**Figure 9: View of the front of the house showing the raised land of the septic bed (MH1511-D002).**



**Figure 10: Test pitting in progress along the raised land of the septic bed (MH1511-D003).**



**Figure 11: Example of wet conditions (MH1511-D029).**



**Figure 12: Example of wet conditions (MH1511-D030).**



**Figure 13: Example of wet conditions (MH1511-D031).**



**Figure 14: Example of wet conditions (MH1511-D033).**





**Figure 15: Test pitting in progress (MH1511-D021).**



**Figure 16: Test pitting in progress (MH1511-D018).**

## 12.0 Maps




LEGEND  
STUDY AREA




REFERENCES:  
<https://www.ontario.ca/page/open-government-licence-ontario> , CITY OF OTTAWA/VILLE D'OTTAWA, CITY OF OTTAWA, PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ESRI CANADA, ESRI, HERE, GARMIN, INCREMENT P, USGS, METI/NASA, EPA, USDA, AAFC, NRCAN, CITY OF OTTAWA, ONTARIO BASE MAP, PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ESRI CANADA, ESRI, © OPENSTREETMAP CONTRIBUTORS, HERE, GARMIN, USGS, NGA, EPA, USDA, NPS, AAFC, NRCAN, CITY OF OTTAWA, PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ESRI CANADA, ESRI, HERE, GARMIN, INCREMENT P, INTERMAP, USGS, METI/NASA, EPA, USDA, AAFC, NRCAN

|                                         |                 |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------------|
| FILE MH1511                             | DATE 2026-05-22 |
| PROJECTION: NAD 1983 UTM Zone 18N       | CREATED BY: DK  |
| PROJECT                                 | CHECKED BY: AJ  |
| STAGE 1 AND 2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT |                 |
| 5971 FLEWELLYN ROAD, STITTSVILLE, ON    |                 |
| TITLE                                   | MAP             |
| LOCATION                                | 1               |





LEGEND  
STUDY AREA



REFERENCES:  
CITY OF OTTAWA/VILLE D'OTTAWA, VANTOR, CITY OF OTTAWA, PROVINCE OF ONTARIO,  
ESRI CANADA, ESRI, HERE, GARMIN, USGS, NGA, EPA, USDA, NPS, AAFC, NRCAN  
PLAN PROVIDED BY PROPONENT

FILE MH1511 DATE 2026-05-22  
PROJECT STAGE 1 AND 2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT  
5971 FLEWELLYN ROAD, STITTSVILLE, ON  
CREATED BY: DK  
CHECKED BY: AJ

F:\Users\m\Matrix\Heritage\Projects\MH1511 - Canan - 5971 Flewellyn Road\GIS



**LEGEND**

-  STUDY AREA
-  ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL / POTENTIEL  
ARCHÉOLOGIQUE





REFERENCES:  
SOURCES: ESRI, VANTOR, AIRBUS DS, USGS, NGA, NASA, CGIAR, N ROBINSON, NCEAS, NLS, OS, NMA, GEODASTYRELSEN, RIJKSWATERSTAAT, GSA, GEOLAND, FEMA, INTERMAP, AND THE GIS USER COMMUNITY, CITY OF OTTAWA, PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ESRI CANADA, ESRI, HERE, GARMIN, USGS, NGA, EPA, USDA, NPS, AAFC, NRCAN 1999 POTENTIAL MAPPING FROM GEOOTTAWA

FILE **MH1511** DATE **2026-05-22**

PROJECTION: NAD 1983 UTM Zone 18N CREATED BY: DK  
CHECKED BY: AJ

PROJECT  
STAGE 1 AND 2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT  
5971 FLEWELLYN ROAD, STITTSVILLE, ON

TITLE MAP  
**ARCHAEOLOGICAL POTENTIAL** **3**



LEGEND  
STUDY AREA




0 150 300 450 600 Meters 1:10,000

REFERENCES:  
CITY OF OTTAWA, PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ESRI CANADA, ESRI, HERE, GARMIN, INCREMENT P, INTERMAP, USGS, METI/NASA, EPA, USDA, AAFC, NRCAN, CITY OF OTTAWA, PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ESRI CANADA, ESRI, HERE, GARMIN, USGS, NGA, EPA, USDA, NPS, AAFC, NRCAN  
  
SEGMENT OF WALLING 1863 MAP OF THE CARLETON COUNTY: FROM SURVEYS UNDER THE DIRECTION OF H.F. WALLING  
SEGMENT OF THE TOWNSHIP OF GOULBURN FROM THE ILLUSTRATED ATLAS OF THE COUNTY OF CARLETON PUBLISHED IN 1879 BY BELDEN & CO., TORONTO.

FILE MH1511 DATE 2026-05-22  
CREATED BY: DK  
PROJECT CHECKED BY: AJ

STAGE 1 AND 2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT  
5971 FLEWELLYN ROAD, STITTSVILE, ON

TITLE MAP  
HISTORIC 4




**LEGEND**

- PHOTO LOCATION, DIRECTION, AND FIGURE NUMBER
- STUDY AREA
- DISTURBED
- RETAINED LANDS
- SHOVEL TEST (5 M INTERVAL)
- PERMANENTLY WET
- PREVIOUSLY ASSESSED




REFERENCES:  
MICROSOFT, VANTOR, CITY OF OTTAWA, PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ESRI CANADA, ESRI, HERE, GARMIN, INCREMENT P, USGS, METI/NASA, EPA, USDA, AAFC, NRCAN, SOURCES: ESRI, TOMTOM, GARMIN, FAO, NOAA, USGS, © OPENSTREETMAP CONTRIBUTORS, AND THE GIS USER COMMUNITY

|         |                                                                                 |             |            |
|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------|
| FILE    | MH1511                                                                          | DATE        | 2026-05-22 |
|         |                                                                                 | CREATED BY: | DK         |
|         |                                                                                 | CHECKED BY: | NK         |
| PROJECT | STAGE 1 AND 2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT<br>5971 FLEWELLYN ROAD, STITTSVILLE, ON |             |            |
| TITLE   | METHODS, KEY, CONDITIONS                                                        | MAP         | 5          |



SOIL SURVEY COMPLEX



POINTFEATURES

F

FOSSIL LOCALITY

LINERFEATURES

BEACH RIDGES AND NEAR SHORE BARS

SURFICIALGEOLOGY

3: PALEOZOIC BEDROCK

5B: STONE-POOR, CARBONATE-DERIVED SILTY TO SANDY TILL


7: GLACIOFLUVIAL DEPOSITS

10A: MASSIVE-WELL LAMINATED


11C: FORESHORE-BASINAL DEPOSITS

20: ORGANIC DEPOSITS

SURFICIAL GEOLOGY



PHYSIOGRAPHY



LEGEND

STUDY AREA

0 340 680 1,020 1,360 Meters 1:20,000

REFERENCES:  
CITY OF OTTAWA, PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ESRI CANADA, ESRI, HERE, GARMIN, USGS, NGA, EPA, USDA, NPS, AAFC, NRCAN, <https://www.ontario.ca/page/open-government-licence-ontario>, CITY OF OTTAWA, PROVINCE OF ONTARIO, ESRI CANADA, ESRI, HERE, GARMIN, INCREMENT P, USGS, METI/NASA, EPA, USDA, AAFC, NRCAN, ONTARIO GEOLOGICAL SURVEY  
SOIL SURVEY COMPLEX LIO  
SURFICIAL GEOLOGY OF SOUTHERN ONTARIO 2003  
CHAPMAN AND PUTNAM 2007 PHYSIOGRAPHY OF SOUTHERN ONTARIO

|                                         |                 |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------------|
| FILE MH1511                             | DATE 2026-05-22 |
| PROJECTION: NAD 1983 UTM Zone 18N       | CREATED BY: DK  |
| PROJECT                                 | CHECKED BY: AJ  |
| STAGE 1 AND 2 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT |                 |
| 5971 FLEWELLYN ROAD, STITTVILLE, ON     |                 |
| TITLE                                   | MAP             |
| SOILS AND GEOLOGY                       | 6               |

## Appendix A: Photographic Catalogue

| Photo Number | Description                                                               | Direction | Date      | Photographer |
|--------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|--------------|
| MH1511-D001  | Test pitting in progress South of Leaching field, by roadside ditch       | S         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D002  | Household Landscape, septic and leaching field in foreground              | N         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D003  | Test pitting clear of leaching field from septic                          | SE        | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D004  | Septic and leaching field in front of house                               | N         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D005  | Test pit Lot 1 over Lot 2                                                 | N         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D006  | Test pit Lot 1 over Lot 2                                                 | N         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D007  | Test pit Lot 1 over Lot 2                                                 | N         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D008  | Outbuildings from house corner                                            | W         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D009  | Garage and gravel driveway                                                | W         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D010  | Shed west of Garage                                                       | W         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D011  | Western face of House                                                     | E         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D012  | Western side of house; propane, and drilled well between garage and house | N         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D013  | Drilled Well Cap                                                          | S         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D014  | Northern face House, backyard                                             | S         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D015  | Northern face House, backyard                                             | S         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D016  | Back garden on edge of slope down                                         | N         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D017  | Northeast Corner of house                                                 | SW        | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D018  | Test pitting in progress, 1m from structure                               | NW        | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D019  | Example of excavated test pit, with Lot 2 as construction fill            | N         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D020  | Example of excavated test pit, with Lot 2 as construction fill, close up  | N         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D021  | Test pitting in progress in back yard                                     | N         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D022  | Drilled well cap- and line to house- avoided                              | W         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D023  | Example of test pit in the woodlot                                        | N         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D024  | Example of test pit in the woodlot, close up                              | N         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D025  | Slope/ Bermmed 1m up scale shot                                           | W         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D026  | Example of wooded conditions                                              | NE        | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D027  | Example of wooded conditions                                              | NE        | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D028  | Example of low and wet marshy area (NW from garden)                       | NW        | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D029  | Example of low and wet marshy area (NW from garden)                       | NW        | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D030  | Example of low and wet marshy area (NW from garden)                       | NW        | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D031  | Northern Ditch-about level with landscape                                 | E         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D032  | Northern Ditch-Western side                                               | W         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D033  | Western Ditch going towards road                                          | S         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D034  | Western Ditch flowing North                                               | N         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D035  | Slope behind garage                                                       | S         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D036  | Slope behind garage, shovel as scale                                      | SE        | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D037  | Slope behind garage                                                       | W         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D038  | Berm slope behind garage and shed                                         | SW        | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D039  | Rear of the eastern yard                                                  | E         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |
| MH1511-D040  | Southeastern corner of lawn                                               | S         | 21-May-26 | C. Sabourin  |

**Appendix B: Document Catalogue**

| <b>Project</b> | <b>Description</b>                                        | <b>Created By</b> |
|----------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|
| MH1511         | 5972 Flewellyn Road Field Notes - Stage 2 (One Note File) | C. Sabourin       |

**Appendix C: Map Catalogue**

| <b>Map Number</b> | <b>Description</b>                 | <b>Created By</b> |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1                 | Location                           | D. Kavanagh       |
| 2                 | Development Mapping                | D. Kavanagh       |
| 3                 | Archaeological Potential           | D. Kavanagh       |
| 3                 | Historic                           | D. Kavanagh       |
| 4                 | Conditions, Methodology, Photo Key | D. Kavanagh       |
| 5                 | Soils and Geology                  | D. Kavanagh       |