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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report details the rationale, methods and results of a Stage 1 archaeological background study of the Regional Mental Health Centre, London. The study forms part of a larger cultural heritage assessment of fifteen mental health facilities in Ontario.

The overall study is being carried out on behalf of the Ontario Realty Corporation (ORC). It includes an assessment of the history, architecture, cultural landscape and archaeology of the properties. The study is being headed by Julian Smith & Associates, Architects. The purpose of the study is to provide a baseline level of data on known and potential cultural heritage resources within the subject properties. That information, in turn, is intended to inform future planning decisions with respect to the properties.

The property currently has a total surface area of 65.2 hectares (161 acres). It includes 25 buildings. The property is bounded to the west by Highbury Avenue, to the south by Dundas Street East, to the north by Oxford Street East, and to the east by developed lands. The main building complex of the mental health facility is located in the central portion of the property. The original access to the facility was originally provided by a tree-lined avenue that extended north from Dundas Street East to the Main Building. Modern access to the facility is eastward from Highbury Avenue.

The Stage 1 background study determined that no archaeological sites had been registered within the property but that archaeological discoveries had been recorded within the property in the first three decades of the 20th century, when it still included extensive farmlands. The study also determined that previous archaeological investigations within the property were limited to two assessments carried out in 2003. They were conducted on behalf of Ecoplans Limited and the Ontario Realty Corporation by Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI) and focussed on a parcel that was to be severed and on four buildings that were to be demolished. No significant archaeological remains were discovered by the 2003 assessments but the background study of the proposed severance did recommend that the parcel in question be ploughed in order that an archaeological survey by surface examination could be conducted, in accordance with Ministry guidelines. That survey has not as yet been implemented.

The background study determined that extensive areas within the property have at least a moderate potential for as-yet undiscovered archaeological remains. In order to address that potential, it is recommended that a detailed archaeological assessment be carried out on any portions of the property that should be subject to future severance, or to landscape alteration that could represent an impact to any archaeological remains that might be present.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

On March 1, 2004 the Ontario Realty Corporation (ORC) commissioned a cultural heritage study of fifteen mental health facilities in Ontario. In addition, the study included two properties that had already been assessed.

The study team for this assessment is being headed by Julian Smith & Associates, Architects. Other members of the study team include Contentworks Inc., which is providing expertise in the field of history; and Wendy Shearer Landscape Architect Limited, which is providing expertise in the field of landscape architecture. Finally, D.R. Poulton & Associates Inc (DPA) is providing expertise in the field of archaeology.

The purpose of the study is to provide a baseline level of data on known and potential cultural heritage resources within the subject properties. That information, in turn, is intended to inform future planning decisions with respect to the properties.

The primary document generated by the overall study is the report prepared by Julian Smith & Associates et al. (2004). That report presents an assessment of the cultural heritage of the fifteen mental health facilities. In addition, D.R. Poulton & Associates Inc (DPA) has prepared separate stand-alone reports. They document the archaeological assessment of each of the properties. The present report details the rationale, methods and results of the archaeological assessment of one of the facilities: the Regional Mental Health Centre, London.

This study follows a recent study by Unterman McPhail Associates (2004), which focussed on four structures and an evaluation of the cultural landscape of a portion of the property.

Four sequential stages have been defined in the technical guidelines for archaeological assessment formulated by the Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Recreation (now Ministry of Culture) (MCTR 1993). They are as follows: Stage 1, background study; Stage 2, field survey; Stage 3, test excavation; and Stage 4, salvage excavation. The archaeological component of the cultural resource assessment of the Regional Mental Health Centre, London property and the other mental health facilities involved a Stage 1 level of assessment.

The archaeological study was carried out under Archaeological Consulting Licence # P116, issued to Dana Poulton of DPA by the Ontario Ministry of Culture. DPA submitted a Contract Information Form for the assessment to the Ministry of Culture on May 19, 2004. Confirmation of receipt of the form was received from the Ministry the next day. It designated the project as CIF # P116-008.

Permission to enter the property for the purposes of a visual examination was granted by the Ontario Realty Corporation. The assessment was conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Ontario Heritage Act (Government of Ontario 1980), and with the technical guidelines for archaeological assessments formulated by the Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Recreation (now Ministry of Culture) (MCTR 1993).
2.0 LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION

The Regional Mental Health Centre, London is situated in the eastern part of the City of London (Figure 1). The property includes most of Lot 8, Concession 1, London Geographic Township, Middlesex County. The description of the property that follows is based on various documentary sources, and on site visits conducted on May 17 and September 17, 2004.

As of 2004, the property has a total surface area of 65.2 hectares (161 acres). It includes 25 buildings. The property is bounded to the west by Highbury Avenue, to the south by Dundas Street East, to the north by Oxford Street East, and to the east by developed lands.

The main building complex of the mental health facility is located in the central portion of the property. A more detailed description of the historic evolution of the property is presented in Section 3.2 of this report. For the present, it may be stated that the institution was established in 1870 as the London Asylum for the Insane. The Main Building, which was the heart of the institution, was opened in 1870. It was accessed from by the Avenue, a tree-line road that led north from Dundas Street West. The Avenue still exists; it contains two one-way roads, one northbound and one southbound, although a 1905 postcard of the Avenue shows that it contained three parallel roads.

As with all such institutions, the London Asylum for the Insane included extensive farmlands. The original farm buildings were located in a group north of the Main Building. In the mid 1890s they were moved to the north to make way for the Infirmary Building (now known as the Examination Building), which was built in 1902. The sections of the property that were in orchard were located north and northeast of the Main Building. The sections that were open agricultural fields were located in the northern part of the property, and in the southeastern and southwestern parts of the property, flanking the Avenue.

The property underwent significant changes in the 1960s. They involved a major site redevelopment with the construction of a massive new hospital and administration complex. This redevelopment was followed in the 1970s by the demolition of the original Main Building.

Current conditions within the property are illustrated in Plates 1-6. Plate 1 shows part of the new Administration Building, which was constructed in the 1960s. Plate 2 shows a view looking north up the Avenue from Dundas Street West. Plate 3 shows a view of the Examination Building looking north across the former site of the Main Building. Plate 4 shows a close-up of the Examination Building. Plate 5 shows a view of the soccer fields in the northern part of the property looking north toward Oxford Street West. Finally, Plate 6 shows a view of one of the former agricultural fields of London Insane Asylum farm in the southeast part of the property, looking southwest toward the Avenue.

The subject property is located within the Caradoc Sand Plain physiographic region. The topography is described as level to gently undulating terrain with soils characteristic of silt and fine sand (Chapman and Putnam 1984). Pottersburg Creek is located less than half a kilometre to the southeast of the subject property.
3.0 STAGE 1: BACKGROUND RESEARCH

3.1 Methods

The first stage of the assessment consisted of background research. This was conducted in order to:

- amass all of the readily available information on any previous archaeological surveys in the area;
- determine the locations of any registered and unregistered sites within and adjacent to the property;
- identify areas of archaeological potential which represented concerns for Stage 2 field survey; and
- develop an historical framework for assigning levels of potential significance to any new sites discovered during fieldwork.

The framework for assigning levels of potential archaeological significance is drawn from provincial environmental assessment guidelines (Weiler 1980). The information includes the identification and evaluation of any feature that has one or more of the following attributes:

it has the potential through archaeological exploration, survey, or fieldwork to provide answers to substantive questions (i.e. relate to particular times and places) about events and processes that occurred in the past and therefore add to our knowledge and appreciation of history;

it has the potential through archaeological exploration, survey and fieldwork to contribute to testing the validity of general anthropological principles, cultural change and ecological adaptation, and therefore to the understanding and appreciation of our man-made heritage; or

it is probable that various technical, methodological, and theoretical advances are likely to occur during archaeological investigation of a feature, alone or in association with other features, and therefore contribute to the development of better scientific means of understanding and appreciating our man-made heritage (Weiler 1980:8).

A succinct definition of archaeological resources is provided in the document entitled Conserving a Future for Our Past: Archaeology, Land Use Planning and Development in Ontario, an Educational Primer and Comprehensive Guide for Non-Specialists (Ontario Ministry of Culture 1997). That document was prepared by the Ministry for use by municipal planners and other non-specialists involved in heritage planning. It includes the following definitions:
Archaeological resources (more commonly referred to as archaeological sites) include the physical remains and contextual setting of any structure, event, activity, place, feature or object which, because of the passage of time, is on or below the surface of the land or water and is important to understanding the history of a people or place…Archaeological resources consist of both individual objects (artifacts), and cultural features (settlement patterns) created as a result of past habitation and activities carried out by the people who occupied a specific place. (Ontario Ministry of Culture 1997:1)

In one sense, all archaeological sites are considered to have some significance as cultural resources. From a practical standpoint, however, the significance of archaeological sites as cultural resources and planning concerns depends on what is sometimes termed their information potential. That term refers to the extent to which any given site may provide meaningful insights into the past of the particular culture to which it relates.

There is no set formula for evaluating the relative significance of archaeological resources. However, the significance of archaeological sites varies according to various criteria. They include the age, size, richness and rarity of the site. Yet another factor is the integrity or condition of the site: the extent to which it is completely undisturbed or has been disturbed or destroyed by past impacts such as sand or gravel extraction, landscaping or construction, cultivation, amateur artifact collecting and other agencies.

Still other factors in evaluating archaeological site significance relate to the nature of the site. For example, sites that include or consist of human burials are inevitably identified as significant cultural resources and planning concerns (Ontario Ministry of Culture 1997:1-2). One reason is that they hold special importance to the cultural groups to which they relate. Another is that they are subject to the provisions of the Ontario Cemeteries Act.

For purposes of context, the background study examined data for a two-kilometre study area surrounding the property. Two collective sources were examined in Stage 1. One was the Archaeological Sites Database of the Ministry of Culture. It houses site record forms for registered sites as well as published and unpublished reports on past surveys, assessments and excavations.

The second collective source for the Stage 1 research was the library/archives of D.R. Poulton & Associates Inc. It includes an extensive inventory of published and unpublished reports, as well as inventories of both registered and unregistered archaeological sites in the area.

Another source consulted was the Archaeological Master Plan of the City of London (Wilson 1995). In accessing that document, information was also solicited from Don Menard, the acting Heritage Planner for the City of London.

The above sources included some documentation on potential Euro-Canadian archaeological planning concerns. These were supplemented by reference to the Illustrated Historic Atlas of Middlesex County, Ontario (H.R. Page & Co. 1878).
For reference purposes, a cultural chronology of the region is presented in Table 1. A facsimile of the 1878 Historic Atlas map has been reproduced here as Figure 2.

### Table 1  Cultural Chronology for Southwestern Ontario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERIOD</th>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>TIME RANGE</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PALEO-INIAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fluted Point</td>
<td>9500 - 8500 B.C.</td>
<td>Big game hunters small nomadic groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hi-Lo</td>
<td>8500 - 7500 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ARCHAIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>Nettling</td>
<td>7800 - 7000 B.C.</td>
<td>Nomadic hunters and gatherers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bifurcate Base</td>
<td>6800 - 6000 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Laurentian</td>
<td>6000 - 2000 B.C.</td>
<td>Transition to territorial settlements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>Lamoka</td>
<td>2500 - 1700 B.C.</td>
<td>Polished/ground stone tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broad Point</td>
<td>1800 - 1400 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crawford Knoll</td>
<td>1500 - 500 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glacial Kame</td>
<td><em>ca.</em> 1000 B.C.</td>
<td>Burial ceremonialism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WOODLAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>Meadowood</td>
<td>1000 - 400 B.C.</td>
<td>Introduction of pottery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Red Ochre</td>
<td>1000 - 500 B.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Saugeen</td>
<td>400 B.C. - A.D. 500</td>
<td>Long distance trade networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Princess Point</td>
<td>A.D. 500 - 800</td>
<td>Incipient horticulture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>Glen Meyer</td>
<td>A.D. 800 - 1300</td>
<td>Transition to village life and agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uren</td>
<td>A.D. 1300 - 1350</td>
<td>Large village sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middleport</td>
<td>A.D. 1300 - 1400</td>
<td>Widespread stylistic horizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>A.D. 1400 - 1650</td>
<td>Tribal differentiation and warfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HISTORIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early</td>
<td>Mississauga</td>
<td>A.D. 1700 - 1875</td>
<td>Social displacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late</td>
<td>Euro-Canadian</td>
<td>A.D. 1800 - present</td>
<td>European settlement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Results

The results of the Stage 1 study may be divided into two separate but related categories: information on past archaeological investigations and known sites in the two-kilometre study area containing the property; and data on the history of land use in the area. These will be considered in turn.

**Past Archaeological Investigations and Known Sites in the Study Area**

The Stage 1 background study determined that no archaeological sites had been registered within the property. The study determined that only one archaeological site has been registered to date within the two-kilometre study area surrounding the subject property. It is Kiwanis’s Park site; this site has been designated AfHh-251 under the Borden Block system, the Provincial system of archaeological site registry.

The Kiwanis’ Park site was discovered by an archaeological assessment of the park of the same name, which is situated a few hundred metres south of the subject property (Archaeologix 1999). This site represents a small ceramic and lithic scatter approximately 120 m by 60 m. The site is situated at the north end of Kiwanis’ Park, adjacent to Pottersburg Creek. It has been dated to sometime within the broad temporal span of the Woodland period ca. 1000 B.C. to 1650 A.D.

The only information obtained by the present study on past archaeological investigations and discoveries within the study area pertains to the property of the Regional Mental Health Centre, London itself. That information is detailed in Section 4.0 of this report.

**History of Land Use in the Subject Area**

The Crown granted all 200 acres of Lot 8, Concession 1 to William Hale in 1839. That original land grant encompasses all that now remains of the property containing the Regional Mental Health Centre, London. In 1854 the Grand Trunk Railway was constructed; the railway alignment cut through the southeast corner of the Hale property.

In 1869, three decades after the original land grant, the Hale family sold the property to the Provincial Government as the proposed site of the London Asylum for the Insane. The Provincial Government also acquired an additional 100 acres in 1869, on the west side of Highbury Avenue, in Lot 9. They brought the total surface area of the property to 300 acres. The asylum was constructed in 1870.

The 1878 Historic Atlas map reproduced here as Figure 2 illustrates the expanded limits of the London Asylum property. It also shows the state of surrounding development as of that date. As illustrated, the asylum constructed in 1870 was situated two miles east of the limits of the City of London. East of Highbury Avenue, in the Lot 8 portion of the property, the 1878 map depicts one large structure near the centre of the lot and three smaller structures fronting on Highbury to the west. The large structure represents the Main Building, which opened in 1870. An orchard is depicted to the northeast of the Main Building.
The earliest of the roads in the area of the London Asylum property is Dundas Street. It forms the southern boundary of the property. Originally known as Governors Road, later Highway 2, Dundas Street was established in the 1790s as the major east-west communication route linking the London area with Burlington, Dundas and the west end of Lake Ontario. The other roads, Oxford Street West which bounds the property to the north, and Highbury Avenue which forms the western limit of the current property, were established in the 1820s as part of the initial survey of London Township. As such, they are roughly contemporary with early London, which was founded in 1826.

As stated above, at the time it was founded the London Asylum was located two miles east of the City of London, and it was not until 1912 that the City annexed this area. The closest community to the London Asylum property as of 1878 was Pottersburg. It is illustrated in Figure 2 as an unnamed settlement on Dundas Street in the area of Pottersburg Creek, just east of the property.

The first Superintendent of the London Asylum, and a moving force in its early decades, was Dr. Richard Maurice Bucke (1837-1902). The family farm where he grew up, Creek Farm was situated on Pottersburg Creek in this area, directly east of the asylum property (Seaborn 1944:291, 302).

The landowners in the immediate area of the London Asylum included two prominent Londoners. One was William Saunders who was the first director of the Central Experimental Farm in Ottawa. The other was Sir John Carling who appointed Saunders to that post in 1886. As illustrated in Figure 2, Carling owned land on the west edge of the London Asylum property while Saunders owned land on Pottersburg Creek, immediately to the southeast of the asylum property. The Saunders property, which fronted on Dundas Street, was purchased in 1868 as a site for his experiments on the hybridization of apple trees. It was reportedly 75 acres in size (Seaborn 1944:313), but part of it had evidently been severed by 1878, as the Historic Atlas depicts it as an orchard covering an area of roughly 30 acres.

Plans and photographs from the late 19th and early 20th century provide more detail on the layout and the evolution of the London Asylum. The primary access to the Main Building was via the tree-lined Avenue, which still exists. It has a width of 100 feet (31 metres) and extends north from Dundas Street to the site of the Main Building. A gatehouse stood at the south end of the Avenue on Dundas Street. In the southern part of the property this avenue was flanked to the east and west by agricultural fields. The Main Building and small buildings to the north were contained within a circular drive; they had associated pleasure gardens and a garden, and were connected by an access road that led west to Highbury Avenue.

A complex of farm buildings was originally located directly north of the Main Building complex. The lands immediately north of the farm complex were planted in orchard. The northern third of the property extending north from the orchard to Oxford Street West evidently consisted of open agricultural fields, as did most of the Lot 9 portion of the asylum property west of Highbury Avenue.

In the mid 1890s, in preparation for the construction of a new infirmary to the north of the Main Building, Bucke had the farm buildings removed and a new farm centre constructed to the north. The new infirmary (now the Examination Building) was constructed in 1902.
Over time, the portion of the London Insane Asylum in Lot 9 (west of Highbury Avenue) was severed, as was part of the southern portion of Lot 8 fronting on Highbury Avenue. The Department of National Defence now owns the latter property. It is formally designated the CFB London Supply Depot.

In the 1960s, after a century of existence, a major site redevelopment was undertaken on what was by then named the London Psychiatric Hospital, and a massive new hospital and administration complex was constructed. That was followed in the 1970s by the demolition of the original Main Building.

Over time, farm operations ceased altogether. Several of the farm buildings are still standing but the former agricultural fields in the southern and northern portions of the property are now in grass. The northern fields that front on Oxford Street West are in use as soccer fields by the London United Soccer Club and by local schools.
4.0 KNOWN AND POTENTIAL ARCHAEOLOGICAL CONCERNS

The preceding section of this report summarized the data on past archaeological investigations and known sites in the two-kilometre study area containing the subject property. That section provided context for the documentation on known and potential archaeological resources in the vicinity of the property. This section of the report presents more detailed information on past archaeological investigations and known and potential archaeological sites within the property itself.

4.1 Past Archaeological Investigations

Past archaeological investigations of within the property are limited to two assessments conducted in 2003 on behalf of Ecoplans Limited and the Ontario Realty Corporation. They were carried out by Archaeological Services Inc. (ASI). Figure 3 illustrates the locations of the areas included in these two assessments.

No significant archaeological remains were discovered by the 2003 assessments. However, the results have some implications for ongoing concerns with respect to archaeological planning concerns in this property. Further details on those two assessments are presented below.

One of the two assessments conducted in 2003 focussed on four buildings that were slated to be demolished (ASI 2003a). They were as follows: the 1902 Examination Building; the 1894 Storage Barn; the 1912 Potting Shed; and the 1956 Granary. This assessment focussed on a 10-metre buffer surrounding each of the buildings. The strategy was to conduct a five-metre interval test pit survey of any areas within the buffer that had not previously been disturbed. The survey determined that the only structures where the buffers included partly undisturbed lands were the Storage Barn and the Potting Shed. No artifacts were recovered in the source of this survey.

The other assessment conducted in 2003 focussed on a parcel of the property that was to be severed. As detailed in the report on that assessment, this parcel had a surface area of 18.26-acres (ASI 2003b). It was located in the southern portion of the property (Figure 3). As it evolved, this assessment was limited to a Stage 1 study of the parcel in question.

Background research carried out as part of the assessment of the proposed severance determined that the land in question had a potential for extant archaeological remains and that it warranted Stage 2 archaeological survey. However, no survey was conducted at the time, as the parcel in question was in grass. Accordingly, the 2003 assessment included a recommendation that this parcel be ploughed in order that an archaeological survey by surface examination could be conducted, in accordance with Ministry guidelines (ASI 2003a:4). That recommendation had not been implemented as of September 2004 when the present Stage 1 archaeological assessment was completed.
4.2 Known Archaeological Sites

The earliest record of archaeological discoveries documented for the property dates to the beginning of the 20th century. It consists of the mention of two “celts” found on the “Asylum Property”; they are documented in the catalogue of the Provincial Museum (now the Royal Ontario Museum in Toronto) (Accession # 25271 and 25273), and were donated in 1903. The term celt is a catchall archaeologists use to refer to ground stone axes and adzes.

By the 1930s the London Insane Asylum, London was known as the Ontario Hospital, London. An employee of the institution during that decade was a Dr. McCallum. In 1930 he donated some artifacts to Wilfrid Jury, founder of the Museum of Indian Archaeology (now London Museum of Archaeology). As noted by Pearce (1995:30), this material has no provenience but it may be that the artifacts were found on the hospital farm.

The only other record of archaeological remains documented for the subject property is the discovery a single prehistoric artifact found within the property in the early 20th century. This find is documented in the artifact catalogue maintained by an avocational archaeologist active in the area during the 1930s: John Bycraft. He was a resident of the hamlet of Coldstream in Lobo Township, northwest of London. The Bycraft collection was accessioned to the Museum of Indian Archaeology (now London Museum of Archaeology) by Dana Poulton in 1979.

Only one of the more than 1000 prehistoric artifacts included in the Bycraft collection is attributed to the subject property. It is a prehistoric projectile point of indeterminate age and cultural affiliation. This artifact is No. 1059 in the Bycraft artifact catalogue. It is described in the Bycraft catalogue as a brown chalcedony spear point. The artifact was designated Accession No. 979-8-325 of the Bycraft collection (data on file, London Museum of Archaeology and D.R. Poulton & Associates).

The provenience data included in the Bycraft catalogue simply attribute this artifact to “London East hospital grounds”. Given the provenience data, the artifact could potentially have been found anywhere within the 300-acre surface area of the original asylum property. That includes lands that have been severed from the property since the third quarter of the 19th century. As such, this artifact has no significant to the present study. It merely indicates the obvious: that Native peoples were present in this area in ancient times.

4.3 Archaeological Potential

Archaeological planning concerns for any given property include known archaeological sites and the potential for as-yet undiscovered archaeological remains. This section of the report concerns the potential for as-yet undiscovered archaeological remains.

This section of the report will be prefaced by a general description of the criteria involved in evaluating the archaeological potential of a property. That will be followed by a consideration of the archaeological potential of the Regional Mental Health Centre, London property itself.
Site Potential Criteria

Various criteria have been used in evaluating archaeological potential. Those criteria are described at some length in the document entitled *Conserving a Future for Our Past: Archaeology, Land Use Planning and Development in Ontario, an Educational Primer and Comprehensive Guide for Non-Specialists* (Ontario Ministry of Culture 1997:12-15). A précis of those criteria is presented below.

One factor in the site potential criteria defined by the Ministry is whether the proposed development contains a property or site that has been designated under the Ontario Heritage Act. Another related factor is whether one or more known archaeological sites have been recorded on or within 250 metres of the property.

The most common criteria in evaluating the archaeological potential of a property relate to its topography and drainage. They include the presence within the property of knolls, ridges and other well-drained elevated landforms to which early settlement was often oriented, and the presence of well-drained soils suitable for prehistoric and historic cultivation. They also include other factors, as follow:

- the presence of unusual landforms that may have had spiritual significance to past peoples, such as waterfalls, caverns or rock outcrops;
- the presence of one or more resource-specific features, such as a primary source of chert that served as the raw material for the manufacture of stone tools, or a concentration of plants or animals such as wild rice or spring-spawning fish that represented important food sources or economic resources; and
- the presence of early transportation routes or related features such as trails, portages, landing places, roads, railways and canals.

Of all the physiographic features, the one used most consistently in defining archaeological potential is the presence and nature of natural water sources. That is because a reliable source of potable water is a basic requirement of human existence, regardless of the age or culture of the site involved. In addressing this issue, the Ministry’s Primer defines the following as having a potential for archaeological remains:

- lands within 300 metres of a primary water source (lake, river or large creek);
- lands within 200 metres of a secondary water source (smaller creeks, intermittent stream courses, springs, marshes and swamps); and
- lands within 300 metres of a relic or ancient primary water source such as a glacial lake shore or ancient river channel.

All of the various criteria listed above apply in addressing the potential for both prehistoric and historic First Nations sites and for historic Euro-Canadian sites of the 18th and 19th century. Supplementary criteria also apply in evaluating the specific potential for Euro-Canadian
archaeological remains (Ontario Ministry of Culture 1997:14). They include the following:

- The relationship of the property to places of early military or pioneer settlement in the region, to the older core of a community, the presence of early wharf and dock complexes (a factor which also indicates a potential for related shipwreck sites), and the presence of pioneer churches and/or early cemeteries (a factor which also indicates a potential for unmarked graves).

The final archaeological potential criteria included in the Ministry’s Primer relate to positive or negative features that are specific to the particular development application or study area (Ontario Ministry of Culture 1997:14-15). They are as follows:

- that there is evidence from documentary sources, local knowledge and Aboriginal oral histories concerning associations of the property with historical events, activities, etc.; and

- that the property has been subjected to intensive disturbances to the extent that it may have degraded or eradicated the potential for extant archaeological remains.

To the latter may be added one other negative criterion. It is the extent to which any past archaeological surveys have effectively cleared all or part of the property by confirming that the property or portions thereof have do not contain extant archaeological remains, regardless of their inherent potential for such remains.

**The Regional Mental Health Centre, London Property**

The archaeological master plan formulated by the City of London (1995) includes mapping of areas of known sites and of positive and negative potential for archaeological remains. For reference purposes, a facsimile of the segment of the site potential mapping that includes the Regional Mental Health Centre, London property is illustrated here as Figure 4.

The Master Plan mapping indicates that there were no known sites within the property as of 1995. As for site potential, the areas within the property that were identified as having archaeological potential were limited to a narrow strip at the southern extremity of the property in the lands fronting on Dundas Street, and in the extreme southeast corner of the property adjacent to the railway. Of the various historically documented buildings of the London Asylum for the Insane, this defined area of potential would only capture one that is no longer standing. It is the gatehouse that stood on the north side of Dundas Street just west of the Avenue.

The evaluation of archaeological site potential undertaken by the present study adopted a more liberal approach than the Master Plan study. With reference to the criteria described above, this study determined that the property generally has at least a moderate inherent potential for as-yet undiscovered archaeological remains. That evaluation is indicated by the presence of known archaeological sites within the area and by the proximity to the historic road network which bounds the property on three sides.
The main question for the archaeological potential of this property is the extent to which past landscaping and construction associated with the evolution of the mental health facility have degraded the inherent potential for archaeological remains within the property. The main building complex of this facility is quite massive, and the landscaping and construction of the complex in the 1960s undoubtedly had a significant impact on the archaeological potential of the central portion of the property where it is situated. However, other areas of the property which are quite extensive have probably suffered little or no significant impact as their use evolved from farming under the ownership of the Hale family in the mid 19th century to agriculture as part of the Asylum Farm in the late 19th to early 20th century to lawn and soccer fields in recent decades.

The limits of any landscaping associated with past construction episodes cannot be determined solely on the basis of a visual examination of the topography, as the area in which this facility is situated is naturally flat. Accordingly, a field-based archaeological assessment would be needed to more confidently determine the actual extent of past impacts, and the extent to which various areas within this property retain a potential for surviving archaeological remains. One practical example of that kind of assessment is offered by the 2003 archaeological survey carried out within this property to assess the area around the four buildings that were slated to be demolished (ASI 2003a). Another practical example is the recommendation for archaeological survey that followed the 2003 background of the proposed 18-acre severance in the southern portion of the property (ASI 2003b).

As a footnote to the evaluation of archaeological potential, it should be noted that although the various historically documented buildings of the London Asylum for the Insane represent agencies of disturbance and destruction for any earlier archaeological remains, they too will be represented by below-ground cultural remains. Those remains will include below-ground utilities. They will also include below-ground foundations of buildings that are no longer standing, such as the Main Building which was demolished in the 1970s.

Additional information on most if not all of these former structures is available in the form of blue prints, photographs, annual reports and other documents. The below-ground remains of the former buildings that have occupied this property are not considered to represent significant cultural remains at present. However, that assessment may change as time passes, these remains age and become more rare, and our conventional wisdom on the history of the treatment of mental health continues to evolve.
5.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary, the Stage 1 archaeological background study of the Regional Mental Health Centre, London property determined that only a tiny fraction of the property has been covered by archaeological survey. The study indicates that extensive areas within the property have a moderate to high potential for as-yet undiscovered archaeological remains. The only exception consists of any lands within the central portion of the property that have been severely impacted by past landscaping and construction.

Based on this study, several recommendations have been formulated. The recommendations are as follows:

1. In the event that any areas of the property should be subject to future impact or severance, it is recommended that a field-based assessment be carried out to confirm the presence or absence of sensitive archaeological resources. Any areas confirmed to have a potential for extant archaeological remains will be subjected to a systematic Stage 2 survey. Any areas determined to have no archaeological potential by virtue of past disturbance poor drainage or excessive slope will be eliminated from further concern.

2. Further to the above, it is recommended that if any future archaeological assessments are required within the property they shall be carried out as early as possible in the planning process. That would enable the results to better inform any decisions with respect to the future disposition of the lands in question. If significant archaeological sites are discovered, the timely implementation of the survey would also help ensure that mitigation by preservation rather than salvage excavation was a viable option.

3. It is further recommended that a licenced archaeological consultant conduct any future archaeological investigations that may be carried out within the property, and that they be conducted in accordance with current archaeological guidelines of the Ontario Ministry of Culture.

4. To date, no detailed archival research has been carried out on the history of land ownership for the Regional Mental Health Centre, London property. In the event that any future severance or development should be considered for the property, it is recommended that supplementary archival research be carried out. That would provide useful information on the history of settlement and ownership in those lands.

5. Finally, in the event that any portion of the property should be subject to future severance, it is recommended that the Ontario Realty Corporation follow whatever current protocols that may apply to the proposed land transfer at the time.
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