

JANUARY 2021~~NOVEMBER 2016~~

Garden District Heritage Conservation District Plan

City of Toronto, City Planning

with

MHBC Planning Ltd.

Garden District Heritage Conservation District Plan online:

<https://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2017/te/bqrd/backgroundfile-99124.pdf> www.toronto.ca/gardendistrict/

GARDEN DISTRICT HCD

Table of Contents

- i. How to Read This Plan
- ii. Road Map

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 City of Toronto's Vision for HCDs and City Building
- 1.2 Project Background
- 1.3 The Purpose of the Plan
- 1.4 Public Engagement and Community Consultation
- 1.5 Historic Overview

2.0 Legislative and Policy Framework

- 2.1 Ontario Heritage Act
- 2.2 Provincial Policy Statement
- 2.3 Official Plan
- 2.4 Zoning By-laws
- 2.5 Planning Act
- 2.6 Applicable Studies, Plans and Guidelines

3.0 Statement of Objectives

4.0 District Significance

- 4.1 Description of Historic Place
- 4.2 Statement of Cultural Heritage Value
- 4.3 Heritage Attributes

5.0 District Boundary and Resources

- 5.1 District Boundary
- 5.2 Architectural Styles
- 5.3 Contributing and Non-Contributing Properties
- 5.43 Character Sub-Areas
- 5.54 Parks and Open Spaces
- 5.65 Archaeological Resources

6.0 Policies and Guidelines for Contributing Properties

- 6.1 Understanding
- 6.2 Existing Part IV Designations
- 6.3 Combined Properties
- 6.4 Demolition
- 6.5 Removal and Relocation
- 6.6 Maintenance
- 6.7 Code Compliance
- 6.8 Restoration
- 6.9 Alteration
- 6.10 Massing
- 6.11 Roofs
- 6.12 Exterior Walls
- 6.13 Windows and Doors
- 6.14 Entrances, Porches and Balconies
- 6.15 Storefronts
- 6.16 Signage
- 6.17 Front Yard Landscaping
- 6.18 Parking and Circulation

7.0 Policies and Guidelines for Non-Contributing Properties

- 7.1 Understanding
- 7.2 Adjacency to Contributing Properties
- 7.3 Combined Properties
- 7.4 Demolition
- 7.5 New Development and Additions
- 7.6 Massing
- 7.7 Articulation and Proportions
- 7.8 Roofs
- 7.9 Exterior Walls
- 7.10 Signage
- 7.11 Front Yard Landscaping
- 7.12 Parking and Circulation

8.0 Policies and Guidelines for Parks and Public Realm

- 8.1 Allan Gardens
- 8.2 Moss Park
- 8.3 Views
- 8.4 Streetscape and Laneways
- 8.5 Utilities and Public Works

9.0 Archaeological Resources

9.1 Archaeological Resource Requirements

10.0 Procedures

10.1 Heritage Permits Deemed to be Issued

10.2 Heritage Permit Process

10.3 Heritage Impact Assessment

10.4 Archaeological Assessment

11.0 Recommendations

11.1 Periodic Review

11.2 Heritage Awareness and Implementation

11.3 Heritage Interpretation

Appendices

A: Definitions

B: Incentives

C: Character Sub-Area Maps

D: Index of Contributing Properties

E: Statements of Contribution

F: List of Non-Contributing Properties

G: Transition Provision

How to Read This Plan

Italicized terms throughout this document have been defined; definitions can be found in Appendix A.

The Garden District Heritage Conservation District Plan (the Plan) is intended to provide information for those seeking to better understand the Garden District Heritage Conservation District's (the District) *cultural heritage value*, heritage resources and significance, as well as to provide *policies* and *guidelines* to achieve the stated objectives. Sections 1, 3, 4 and 5 should be referred to by those seeking information on the District's *cultural heritage value* and significance; sections 6 through 9 provide *policies* and *guidelines*.

While it is strongly encouraged that all *property* owners within the District familiarize themselves with the Plan to understand its scope and intent, sections 6 through 9 of the Plan apply to properties depending upon the *property's* classification, *character sub-area*, and whether there are any archaeological or *public realm* considerations.

Section 1 – Introduction provides background on the Plan, including the City of Toronto's vision for heritage ~~*conservation*~~ and city building, summary of the study and plan process, including community consultation, historic overview and the Plan's purpose.

Section 2 – Legislative and Policy Framework provides an overview of applicable *policy* and supporting *guidelines* as they relate to heritage ~~*-conservation*~~, as well as an analysis of the planning framework within the District.

Sections 3 and 4 – Statement of Objectives and District Significance provide important, foundational information that applies to all properties within the District. The objectives, statement of *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes* are the basis of the Plan, and are referred to throughout the document.

Section 5 – District Boundary and Resources includes a description of the district boundary, building typologies, *character sub-areas* and other heritage resources within the District, including the methodology for their identification and evaluation.

Sections 6 through 9 – Policies and Guidelines provide the *policies* and *guidelines* for managing change within the District in order to meet the objectives of the Plan.

Section 10 – Procedures describes how the plan will be used, the types of work that do not require review against the plan, and the heritage permit process.

Section 11 – Recommendations provides important information on the financial incentives available to owners of *contributing properties* within the District, and the recommended schedule for periodic review of the Plan.

The chart on the following page shows how a District *property* owner can determine which sections of the Plan apply based on a *property's* classification and *character sub-area*.

Road Map

*With the exception of Allan Gardens (160 Gerrard Street) and Moss Park (150 Sherbourne Street). Refer to Section 8 Policies and Guidelines for Parks and Public Realm.

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1** City of Toronto's Vision for HCDs and City Building
- 1.2** Project Background
- 1.3** The Purpose of the Plan
- 1.4** Public Engagement and Community Consultation
- 1.5** Historic Overview

1.1 CITY OF TORONTO'S VISION FOR HCDS AND CITY BUILDING

Toronto's diverse cultural heritage is reflected in the built form and landscapes of its extensive neighbourhood system, main streets, ravines and parks, as well as the traditions and cultural spaces of its over 2.5 million residents. Cultural heritage is widely understood to be an important component of sustainable development and place-making and Toronto City Council is acting to ensure the ongoing conservation of significant heritage areas.

A range of regulatory tools available to the City are used to ~~conserve~~ ~~conserve~~ the *cultural heritage values* and *attributes* of heritage properties and areas - this includes designation as a heritage conservation district under Part V of the ~~Ontario Heritage Act~~ ~~Ontario Heritage Act~~, as well as individual *property* designation under Part IV of the ~~Ontario Heritage Act~~ ~~Ontario Heritage Act~~, and listing on the City of Toronto's Heritage Register. In addition, coordination between Heritage ~~Planning~~ ~~Preservation Services~~ and other City departments in the development of Secondary Plans, Official Plan amendments, Site and Area Specific Policies and Zoning By-law amendments ensures that the regulatory process is *complementary*, and reflects the common goals that all City departments strive to achieve as mandated by City Council.

Heritage conservation districts are a valuable regulatory tool that enable the City to recognize places that speak to Toronto's rich history and which continue to contribute to the livability and appeal of Toronto as a multicultural, sustainable and equitable place for present and future generations. They are also valued for their ability to strengthen business areas; leverage economic development; positively influence *conservation* and planning outcomes; enhance civic engagement; protect the public interest, have regard to provincial interests, and demonstrate compliance with provincial planning policy and the City's own Official Plan.

The identification, evaluation and designation of heritage conservation districts is a City Planning priority because heritage conservation districts are valued for their ability to provide contextual, place-based *policies* and *guidelines* to ~~conserve~~ ~~conserve~~ and enhance our unique historic neighbourhoods.

The City has created its own suite of *policy* tools for heritage conservation districts to achieve these goals, recognizing that, as Canada's largest city, Toronto faces unique challenges as well as unique opportunities in ~~conserving~~ ~~conserving~~ and benefiting from heritage districts. City Council adopted ~~Heritage Conservation Districts in Toronto: Procedures, Policies and Terms of Reference (HCDs in Toronto)~~ ~~Heritage Conservation Districts in Toronto: Procedures, Policies and Terms of Reference~~ (2012), which is built upon the requirements of the ~~Ontario Heritage Act~~ ~~Ontario Heritage Act~~, and provides a detailed approach to the study and planning of heritage conservation districts within in Toronto. Its goal is to ensure a fair, consistent and transparent process in the development of policy-driven plans within a clear, predictable and responsive heritage planning system.

As Toronto evolves and expands, heritage conservation districts are well-positioned to ensure that growth and change are managed in a way that respects and takes advantage of the features that have come to define Toronto. Our existing Heritage Conservation Districts already promote and support walkability, spaces for small businesses, a healthy tree canopy and diversity in built form. The City of Toronto's vision for heritage conservation districts is that they will continue to ~~conserve~~ ~~conserve~~ those features that express the unique heritage character of historic neighbourhoods, main streets and areas across Toronto, in order to contribute to a healthy, sustainable, prosperous and equitable city.

1.2 PROJECT BACKGROUND

In Toronto, Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs) are designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act through a two phased process: the Study phase and the Plan phase. In the HCD Study phase, the District is analyzed and evaluated to determine if the area should be conserved as a heritage conservation district. The HCD Plan phase is initiated if the HCD Study concludes that the area merits designation as an HCD. *Policies* and *guidelines* are developed in the Plan phase to conserve the *cultural heritage value* of the area identified in the Study phase.

Garden District was authorized and prioritized for study as a potential HCD by City Council on October 2, 2012, after the Downtown East Planning Study, initiated in October 2011, identified heritage conservation as a key component of the revitalization strategy for the area. The City subsequently engaged MHBC Inc. as the lead consultant to conduct the HCD Study in May 2012. The Downtown East Planning Study, which was intended to update the planning policy framework for the area, resulted in the adoption of Official Plan Amendment 82 (OPA 82) by City Council on March 31, 2015. OPA 82 was appealed to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal who approved the document in a modified form in May of 2018 and has now been incorporated into the Official Plan as Site and Area Specific Policy 461. As part of an integrated policy approach for the area, the HCD will ensure that heritage resources are conserved as the area builds up and that *new development* is firmly rooted in the Garden District's heritage character and values.

The Garden District HCD Study was completed in Summer 2014. The Study determined that there was merit in proceeding with developing an HCD Plan for the Garden District. The findings of the HCD Study were endorsed by the Toronto Preservation Board in July 2014. The HCD Plan phase was subsequently initiated in the Fall 2014.

During the Plan phase, the HCD Boundary was refined, a Statement of *Cultural Heritage Value* or Interest and a Statement of Objectives were developed, and properties that represented the identified values were classified as *contributing properties*. A Statement of Contribution was developed for each *contributing property* in accordance with HCDs in Toronto.

Figure 1: Garden District HCD Study Area Boundary with proposed HCD Plan boundary

1.3 THE PURPOSE OF THE PLAN

The purpose of the Garden District HCD Plan is to:

- create a statement explaining the *cultural heritage value* or interest of the District
- describe the *heritage attributes* of the District
- create a Statement of Objectives to be achieved in designating the area
- provide *policies, guidelines* and procedures for managing change in the District and achieving the stated objectives
- describe the *alterations* or classes of *alterations* that the owner of a *property* in the District may carry out without obtaining a permit
- provide access to financial incentives for *contributing properties*

This HCD Plan applies to all privately and municipally-owned properties within the District where changes are being proposed. The HCD Plan does not compel *property* owners to proactively make improvements or *alterations* to their properties beyond routine *maintenance*, which can generally be undertaken without a permit.

1.4 PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

The ~~Ontario Heritage Act~~ Ontario Heritage Act (OHA) Part V, Section 41.1 specifies:

(6) Before a by-law adopting a heritage conservation district plan is made by the council of a municipality under subsection 41 (1) or under subsection (2), the council shall ensure that,

- information relating to the proposed heritage conservation district plan, including a copy of the plan, is made available to the public;
- at least one public meeting is held with respect to the proposed heritage conservation district plan; and
- if the council of the municipality has established a municipal heritage committee under section 28, the committee is consulted with respect to the proposed heritage conservation district plan. 2005, c. 6, s. 31.

To fulfill the requirement to consult and inform the community, the City's procedure of two community consultations during the Plan phase and a series of stakeholder engagement activities have been undertaken. As drafts of the Study, Plan and other material were prepared, the public was invited to access this information on the City's website, and to provide feedback to the study team. A final draft of the proposed HCD Plan was made available for three weeks on October 31st, 2016 in order to solicit written comments and feedback for consideration prior to finalization.

Summary of Community Consultations

Three community consultation meetings were held during the HCD Study Phase. The first meeting was held on June 24, 2013 to introduce the project to the community. A second meeting was held on September 24, 2013 to present and discuss work undertaken to date. A community workshop was held on February 6, 2014 for those who had expressed an interest in the project at previous meetings as well as individuals and groups who were identified as having an interest in the area. The meeting provided an opportunity for the project team to gain feedback from attendees regarding the proposed boundary of the Garden District HCD, and to identify issues to address in the creation of the HCD Plan. In addition to the above community consultation opportunities, the public was able to attend and provide deputation at the Toronto Heritage Preservation Board meeting on July 17, 2014 where the HCD Study was presented by the study team.

During the HCD Plan phase a community consultation meeting was conducted on February 24, 2015 to gain community feedback on the structure and direction of the HCD Plan and its contents. Another community consultation meeting was held on November 16, 2015 in order to obtain community input on the draft Garden District HCD Plan. The *policy* approach and direction was presented and community feedback assisted the team in identifying areas where the *policies* and *guidelines* required greater clarity. Additional stakeholder meetings were conducted in the two week period following the November 16th, 2015 meeting. Individual community stakeholders were consulted throughout the project.

A draft of the Plan was released for public review and comment on October 31, 2016 for a period of 3 weeks ending on November 18, 2016.

These consultations resulted in further refinements to the Garden District HCD Plan for clarity and consistency with provincial legislation.

1.5 HISTORIC OVERVIEW

The following text is adapted from the historic overview of the District as found in the Garden District Heritage Conservation District Study (September 2014) prepared by MHBC Planning Inc. The full text including references is available online at the City's website.

1.5.1 The Physiographic Context

The Garden District, located within the City of Toronto, is part of a broad physiographic region known as the Iroquois Plain. This region is part of the lowland around Lake Ontario, and extends from Niagara to Trenton. The physiographic region is named the Iroquois Plain after the post-glacial Lake Iroquois that covered the area. There are variations in the landscape in different parts of the region, and the section that characterizes Toronto is defined by the lakefront harbour that was created by the shelter of the Toronto Island. Settlement and human activity in the area has changed the physiographic characteristic of Toronto considerably over time. This includes filling in valleys, modifying the natural harbour area, and extending the Lake Ontario shoreline (Chapman and Putnam 192-193, 1984). Historical watercourses, such as Moss Park Creek within the District, have been filled or buried as a result of human settlement and activity.

The presence of lithic flakes from the creation of stone tools during archaeological assessments at Allan Gardens confirm the early Indigenous presence in the District, however 19th-20th century urban development has since removed or limited the potential to encounter additional *archaeological resources*.

1.5.2 Indigenous Heritage

The City of Toronto, and the Garden District within it, has evolved out of a landscape that was originally inhabited by Indigenous groups. The area of Toronto, on the north shore of Lake Ontario, was a carrying place and trade route between Lake Ontario and northern lake systems. Trade routes like Davenport Road (outside the District) followed the natural topography between the Humber and Don Rivers and made useful transportation routes that over time became incorporated into the emerging urban fabric. In the Garden District HCD, Indigenous cultural heritage is not just a remnant of the past. Today, the Miziwe Biik Aboriginal Employment and Training Centre, Anishnawbe Health Toronto and the Native Women's Resource Centre in the District provide ongoing community and cultural services to the City's Indigenous community. In Allan Gardens a large mural, painted on construction fencing during water main construction from 2013-2016 called "All My Relations" represents contemporary First Nations life and culture in Toronto, and is one of the largest outdoor murals in Canada at more than 90 square metres.

1.5.3 Development of Residential Neighbourhoods

Historically, the entire Garden District neighbourhood was part of a section of Park Lots set aside for wealthy citizens in the early surveys of the Town of York. Park Lots 5 and 6 were owned by the Jarvis family (Lot 6) and the Allan family (Lot 5) as early as the 1820s.

William Allan purchased Park Lot 5 in 1819. Allan was a Scottish immigrant and arrived in York in 1795. He was appointed the first postmaster of the town, and collector of customs. With these appointments and other capitalist ventures, Allan amassed a large fortune. Construction of Allan's grand brick estate house began in 1827 and the Allan family established themselves at the estate in 1829, beginning extensive landscaping of the

grounds. Allan named the estate Moss Park, after his northern Scotland birthplace (Caerwent House Stories; Commonwealth Historic Resource Management 2002). A laneway on the eastern edge of the Moss Park Estate called "Allan's Lane" (now known as Sherbourne Street), provided access to the Moss Park estate house.

After inheriting the south portion of Park Lot 5 from his father, G. W. Allan subdivided the *property* between present-day Queen Street and Carlton Street. He registered the plan of subdivision in 1855 for the Moss Park Estate, during his term as mayor (Caerwent House Stories). The Moss Park Estate subdivision included Pembroke Street, an eastward extension of Gerrard Street, Sherbourne Street and Wilton Crescent. The subdivision plan provided for 69 lots between the Moss Park estate house and the area set aside for horticultural gardens later known as Allan Gardens. Laneways were included to provide access to the rear of the lots. North-south laneways ran between the properties fronting on George Street and Pembroke Street, and Pembroke Street and Sherbourne Street. East-west laneways intersected with these behind the lots fronting on Gerrard Street and Wilton Crescent (Dundas Street).

G.W. Allan, honouring his father's passion for horticulture, donated a portion of the Moss Park Estate lands to the Toronto Horticultural Society for a public garden, now known as Allan Gardens, which opened in 1860 (Commonwealth Historic Resource Management, 2002).

A number of structures were constructed on the subdivided Jarvis and Allan lots by 1858 (particularly along Jarvis Street), as seen on the WS Boulton Atlas of the City of Toronto and Vicinity, but the majority of the area had not yet been built on. By 1872, a boys' home had been constructed on the east side of George Street, where Seaton House stands now. Photographs from the Toronto Public Library collection suggest that this existed as early as 1867 (Toronto Reference Library 2014).

By 1880 most of the lots in the District had been built on. There were a number of single detached houses or duplexes along Pembroke Street, Sherbourne Street, George Street and Shuter Street. Buildings were either of frame construction or brick. Undeveloped land was still available on the north side of Wilton Crescent (Dundas Street), and there were still a few vacant lots on Pembroke Street.

Between the 1880s and the turn of the century, there were again few major changes within the District. Residences were constructed on the Moss Park Estate south of present day Dundas Street by 1884 fronting on George and Shuter Street, and a skating rink was located in the centre of the lot.

A few more buildings appeared on vacant or subdivided lots between 1880 and 1903, and some existing buildings were replaced with others of a similar footprint, but the overall density of the area, with a mix of single detached houses, duplexes and rowhouses in a mix of brick and frame remained the same.

1.5.4 20th Century Development

Development in the early decades of the 20th century occurred similarly to the latter decades of the 19th century. New structures were constructed as infill on larger lots, and replaced earlier structures. A number of terraces on vernacular or influenced by the Edwardian Classicism style were constructed during this time, different and more simplified in appearance than the earlier Gothic Revival, Italianate and Second Empire style buildings, but still with similar *setbacks*, massing and building forms.

Key changes in the District continued after the publication of the 1924 Fire Insurance Plan, with the 1929 construction of the Duke of York school (now École Élémentaire Gabrielle-Roy), fronting on Pembroke Street with the rear yard extending to George Street, replacing several 19th century properties, and providing a large area of open space school yard around the building.

Up until the end of the 19th century, Toronto's wealthy lived along Jarvis and Sherbourne Streets, north of Shuter Street. The aftermath of the First World War and the Depression changed the social and economic fabric of Canada's cities. In the Garden District, and many other areas, wealthy single family homes were divided into apartments for working or middle class individuals and families. Beginning in the mid-20th century urban renewal schemes to provide public housing through clearance and redevelopment were adopted in several sectors of the Don District, such as Regent Park North and South and Moss Park. This resulted in the replacement of low-density housing with higher density apartment housing.

This can be seen in a number of developments in the Garden District, and especially in the adjacent Moss Park development. High-rise and mid-rise apartment buildings and complexes are scattered throughout the District. Many of these replaced 19th century structures, while others, like the Sherbourne Lanes project, incorporated the 19th century house-form buildings into a larger apartment mid-rise located to the rear. The Sherbourne Lanes project, led by architects A.J. Diamond and Barton Meyers, was an important initiative in proposing alternatives to the *demolition* of historic buildings that was associated with urban renewal. The project allowed for similar density of housing while still retaining the character of street.

In the 1970s, a City of Toronto Planning Board report noted that despite the urban renewal that had occurred in the areas in and near the Garden District, the replacement housing was not suitable for large families or single lodgers. The report also noted a steady decline in suitable housing for rooming house accommodations and that residents in the Moss Park/Garden District area and others like it were having difficulty staying in the area because of replacement housing costs. As a result, a number of residents were forced to leave the area with no provision for *relocation* assistance under existing programs and institutions, especially those catering towards individuals with special needs, either had to change their services or relocate. Particularly vulnerable individuals were noted as heavily dependent on hostels and other institutions which may not find it feasible to relocate.

Recommendations of the Toronto Planning Board in the 1970s provided that emphasizing the existing housing stock should be encouraged by upholding the existing zoning, and while some higher density developments could be permitted, rezoning applications would be evaluated as to whether they were compatible with rooming house and low income residential requirements. Much of the District, except for blocks along George Street (Seaton House) and the Grand Hotel/RCMP Headquarters and Jarvis Street area were considered to be "soft area where change appeared likely and in the near future" (City of Toronto Planning Board, 1970).

The Toronto Planning Board report illustrates the considerable change that had occurred in this area of Toronto since the turn of the century, transitioning from wealthy single-family housing to an area with increased population density accommodated in the existing building stock and urban renewal developments. It also describes the District's transformation into an area challenged by homelessness, substance abuse and prostitution.

The District now contains a mix of two historic patterns. Parts of the area contain a high concentration of social

services dedicated to helping the area's continued challenges with homelessness, drug and alcohol use, prostitution and social welfare concerns. Much of the area contains social housing, rooming houses and apartments, while other parts contain single residential dwellings or upscale condominium/apartment dwellings in older buildings. The Garden District is planned to grow and accommodate additional development in certain areas identified in the City's Official Plan. Despite the 20th century changes to the District, there remains a high concentration of built heritage fabric and historic landscape and streetscape patterns that are reflective of the 19th century subdivision.

2.0 Legislative and Policy Framework

- 2.1** Ontario Heritage Act
- 2.2** Provincial Policy Statement
- 2.3** Official Plan
- 2.4** Zoning By-Laws
- 2.5** Applicable Studies, Plans and Guidelines

2.1 ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT

The key piece of legislation that governs heritage ~~conservation~~ in Ontario is the *Ontario Heritage Act* (~~OHA~~) (RSO 1990, Amended 2005), which was created to support *conservation*, protection and preservation of heritage resources in the Province. Under Part V of the OHA municipalities are enabled to establish heritage conservation districts where their official plan contains provisions relating to the establishment of such. The City of Toronto's ~~Official Plan~~ supports identification, evaluation and designation of heritage conservation districts.

Part V, Section 41.1(5), of the OHA lists the following as requirements of an HCD Plan:

- a statement of the objectives to be achieved in designating the area as a heritage conservation district;
- a statement explaining the *cultural heritage value* or interest of the heritage conservation district;
- a description of the *heritage attributes* of the heritage conservation district and of properties in the district;
- *policy* statements, *guidelines* and procedures for achieving the stated objectives and managing change in the heritage conservation district; and
- a description of the *alterations* or classes of *alterations* that are minor in nature and that the owner of *property* in the heritage conservation district may carry out or permit to be carried out on any part of the *property*, other than the interior of any structure or building on the *property*, without obtaining a permit under section 42. 2005, c. 6, s. 31.

This Plan meets the requirements of an HCD Plan as provided by the OHA.

2.1.1 Ontario Heritage Toolkit

The *Ontario Heritage Toolkit* is a best practice document produced by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport to assist municipalities in the identification and designation of HCDs in their communities. The *Ontario Heritage Toolkit* provides guidance on how to conduct HCD studies and plans, identify *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes*, determine district boundaries, and prepare a statement of objectives. The toolkit can be accessed at the following link: http://www.mtc.gov.on.ca/en/heritage/heritage_toolkit.shtml

2.2 PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT

The *Provincial Policy Statement, 2020* (PPS) is issued under Section 3 of the *Planning Act*, and it provides *policy* direction on matters of provincial interest related to land use planning and development. The *Planning Act* requires municipal and provincial land use planning decisions to be consistent with the PPS. The PPS is intended to be read in its entirety with relevant *policies* applied to each situation.

It is effective ~~May 1, 2020~~ April 30, 2014 and applies to planning decisions made on or after that date. It replaces the *Provincial Policy Statement, 2014* (PPS 2014).

PPS 2020 requires that cultural heritage and *archaeological resources* (identified as key provincial interests) be ~~conserved~~ alongside the pursuit of other provincial interests, including public health and safety and efficient and resilient development. Ontario's long-term economic prosperity, environmental health, and social well-being are considered to be dependent on the protection of these (together with other) resources.

Like PPS 2014, the current PPS provides specific direction for the protection of built heritage, *cultural heritage landscapes*, *archaeological resources* and areas of archaeological potential, both on a development site

and where development is proposed on an *adjacent property*. The changes in the current PPS strengthen *policies* and definitions relating to cultural heritage and archaeology.

The PPS connects heritage conservation to economic development and prosperity. Policy 1.7.1 ~~(e)~~ ~~(d)~~ states that encouraging a 'sense of place' through the promotion of well-designed built form, cultural planning and ~~conserving~~ ~~conserving~~ features that help define character, including built heritage resources and ~~cultural heritage~~ ~~age cultural heritage~~ ~~landscapes resources~~, can support long term economic prosperity. Policy 1.7.1 ~~(d)~~ ~~(e)~~ similarly relates the *maintenance* and enhancement of downtowns and main streets to economic development. Both policy statements support urban heritage ~~conservation~~ ~~conservation~~ and cultural planning, recognizing the economic value of built heritage resources in defining character and place-making.

PPS policy 2.6.1 states "Significant built heritage resources and significant *cultural heritage landscapes* shall be *conserved*." Policy 2.6.2 states "development and site *alteration* shall not be permitted on lands containing *archaeological resources* or areas of archaeological potential unless significant *archaeological resources* have been ~~conserved~~ ~~conserved~~." Policy 2.6.3 relating to site development *adjacent* to protected heritage properties states "Planning authorities shall not permit development and site *alteration* on *adjacent* lands to protected heritage *property* except where the proposed development and site *alteration* on has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the ~~heritage attributes~~ ~~heritage attributes~~ of the protected heritage *property* will be ~~conserved~~ ~~conserved~~."

2.3 OFFICIAL PLAN

The City of Toronto Official Plan (the OP) addresses the designation of HCDs and the authority of the OHA in Section 3.1.5 (3):

3) Heritage properties of *cultural heritage value* or interest properties, including Heritage Conservation Districts and archaeological sites that are publicly known will be protected by being designated under the ~~Ontario Heritage Act~~ ~~Ontario Heritage Act~~ and/or included on the Heritage Register.

The majority of the District is designated Neighbourhoods or Apartment Neighbourhoods in the OP, with the exception of Dundas Street East, which is designated Mixed-Use Areas.

On February 3, 2016, the City received an application for an Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment to re-designate Seaton House (located at 295-349 George Street) from Neighbourhoods to Institutional as part of the George Street Revitalization Project. At the time of writing, the application was under review.

In the area as a whole, the OP permits development in Neighbourhoods that will reinforce the existing physical character of the neighbourhood, including *conservation* of heritage buildings, structures and landscapes (4.1.5). While the OP *policies* permit additional gross floor area (GFA) for lands designated Mixed-Use Areas, Apartment Neighbourhoods and Institutional Areas for a lot containing a ~~conserved~~ ~~conserved~~ heritage building, the *new development* must conform to any applicable HCD plan (3.1.5.21.e):

21) Additional gross floor area may be permitted in excess of what is permitted in the Zoning By-law for lands designated Mixed Use Areas, Regeneration Areas, Employment Areas, Institutional Areas or Apartment Neighbourhoods for a heritage building or structure on a designated heritage *property* that is part of a *new development* provided that:

e) where the *property* is within a Heritage Conservation District, the proposed development conforms to the Heritage Conservation District plan and/or any *guidelines* for that district.

The revised 2015 OP policies for heritage conservation (OPA 199) require that proposed *alterations*, development and/or public works within or *adjacent* to HCDs ensure the *integrity* of the districts' *cultural heritage values* and *attributes*, and that they are retained in accordance with respective HCD plans. The impacts of these changes may be required to be described and assessed through a Heritage Impact Assessment.

2.3.1 Site and Area Specific Policy ~~82-461~~ (Official Plan Amendment 82)

Site and Specific Policy ~~82461~~ (SASP 461), Official Plan Amendment 82 (OPA 82),-was adopted by Toronto City Council on March 3, 2015, and appealed to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal who approved the document in a modified form in May of 2018. The ~~policy~~ ~~policy~~-area is generally bounded by Jarvis Street, Carlton Street, Sherbourne Street and Queen Street East.

~~SASP OPA~~-82 is a result of the Downtown East Planning Study, which developed as part of an inter-divisional revitalization strategy for the Downtown East area. The purpose of ~~SASP OPA~~-82 is to establish a *policy* framework that directs where growth can be accommodated, while providing protection for stable neighbourhoods and heritage resources; provision of additional affordable housing; and *public realm* enhancements. ~~SASP OPA~~-82 ~~permits~~ ~~limits~~-tall buildings within identified character areas with policies to provide transition to ~~adjacent~~ ~~adjacent~~-Neighbourhood designated areas in the Official Plan.

~~OPASASP~~-82 also recognizes the importance of parks and open spaces in the area, including Allan Gardens, Moss Park and the school playground of École Élémentaire Gabrielle-Roy, as *public realm* anchors in the area, with no net new shadows to be allowed on these open spaces. Recommendations for *public realm* enhancements include establishing a "green link" between Allan Gardens and Moss Park.

~~SASPOPA~~-82 character areas are based on land use functions and provide direction on where tall buildings are permitted. Garden District HCD Plan *character sub-areas* are based on heritage built form character and provide direction on the ~~conservation~~ ~~conservation~~-of ~~cultural heritage value~~ ~~cultural heritage value~~-in the management of change. Character areas identified in ~~SASPOPA~~-82 are distinct from and mutually supportive to *character sub-areas* identified in the Garden District HCD Plan. Both documents will be read together to achieve an appropriate balance between growth and conservation.

[Map to be revised]

Figure 2: "Schedule A" Map, Official Plan Amendment (~~SASP~~) 82, Revisions to Land Use Map 18 to Redesignate Lands from Neighbourhoods to Apartment Neighbourhoods.

2.3.2 Heritage Conservation Districts in Toronto: Procedures, Policies, and Terms of Reference

Heritage Conservation Districts in Toronto: Procedure, Policies and Terms of Reference (HCDs in Toronto) was adopted by Toronto City Council on March 6, 2012. It was developed to reflect changes to the OHA and to provide a consistent approach for the studying and planning of HCDs in the city. ~~*HCDs in Toronto*~~ ~~*HCDs in Toronto*~~ addresses the requirements of the OHA for the creation of an HCD Plan in the following ways: Policies 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and Section 2 – Appendix A of ~~*HCDs in Toronto*~~ ~~*HCDs in Toronto*~~ address OHA requirements set out in Section 41.1 (5). This section requires an HCD Plan to:

- State the objectives of designating the area as an HCD
- Explain the *cultural heritage value* of the district and the properties within it
- Create policy statements, *guidelines* and procedures for achieving the stated objectives of the HCD
- Describe *alterations* or classes of *alterations* that the property owner may carry out without obtaining a permit

The Garden District HCD Plan meets the requirements of *HCDs in Toronto*.

2.3.3 Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada

The Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada (Standards and Guidelines) is the benchmark for recommending *conservation treatments* and approaches. Toronto's Official Plan references the *Standards and Guidelines* as a key guidance document, requiring that properties on the City's Heritage Register be ~~*conserved*~~ ~~*conserved*~~ and ~~*maintained*~~ ~~*maintained*~~ consistent with the- ~~*Standards and Guidelines*~~ ~~*Standards and Guidelines*~~. In addition, Policy 10 of ~~*HCDs in Toronto*~~ ~~*HCDs in Toronto*~~ states, “the HCD Plan and the *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada* will apply to any interventions to the HCD as a whole and will generally apply to individual properties within an HCD...”.

The ~~*Standards and Guidelines*~~ ~~*Standards and Guidelines*~~ were adopted by Toronto City Council in 2008 as the official framework for the planning, stewardship and *conservation* of heritage resources within the City of Toronto.

2.4 ZONING BY-LAWS

The harmonized zoning by-law 569-2013 was enacted by City Council on May 9, 2013. ~~Following appeals to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal, the Tribunal has issued decisions that amend and/or bring the majority of by-law 569-2013 into force and effect as of the date of writing. At the time of writing, this zoning by-law was under appeal at the Ontario Municipal Board.~~ As such, for the purpose of issuing building permits, ~~both~~ the new ~~and previous~~ zoning by-law (zoning by-law ~~569-2013~~ ~~438-86~~) ~~is are~~ considered to be in effect ~~and the standard against which new applications will be passed, with the more stringent of the two being applicable where there is a conflict.~~

Under zoning by-law 569-2013, the District is predominantly zoned as Residential (R), with the exception of: Allan Gardens and Moss Park, which are zoned Open Space – Recreation Zone (OR); Dundas Street East, which is zoned Commercial Residential (CR).

~~Under zoning by-law 438-86, the District is predominantly zoned as Residential District (R3 Z1.0 or R4 Z2.0) with the exception of: Allan Gardens and Moss Park, which are zoned Park District (G); and Dundas Street East, which is zoned Mixed-Use District (MCR T1.5 C1.0 R1.0).~~

~~On February 3, 2016, the City received an application for an Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment to permit a new institutional building to replace the existing Seaton House at 295-349 George Street to provide long-term care beds, assisted living beds, emergency shelter beds, affordable housing units and a community service hub. These uses are permitted in areas zoned as Residential under zoning by-law 569-2013. Under zoning by-law 438-86, site-specific rezoning would require permitting the use of a crisis care facility. At the time of writing, this application was under review.~~

2.5 APPLICABLE STUDIES, PLANS AND GUIDELINES

2.5.1 City of Toronto Archaeological Management Plan

The City of Toronto's ~~Archaeological Management Plan~~ *Archaeological Management Plan* is a more detailed means of identifying general areas of archaeological potential than is possible through application of generic Provincial criteria. The intent of the management plan is to ensure that archaeological sites are adequately considered and studied prior to any form of development or land use change that may affect them. The management plan also identifies specific areas of known archaeological sites referred to as Archaeologically Sensitive Areas (ASAs). These represent concentrations of interrelated features of considerable scale and complexity, some of which are related to significant periods of occupation or a long-term continuity of use, while others are the product of a variety of changes in use, or association, over time and therefore constitute an array of overlapping but potentially discrete deposits.

Typically, when redevelopment is proposed for any lands that incorporate areas of archaeological potential, it triggers an assessment and evaluation process is undertaken (Stage 1 Background Study and Property Inspection). This begins with a detailed land use history of the *property* in order to identify specific features of potential archaeological interest or value and to predict the degree to which *archaeological resources* may still survive.

In cases where the Stage 1 study confirms that significant *archaeological resources* may be present on a *property*, some form of test excavation is required (Stage 2 Property Assessment). If the results of the test is positive, more extensive investigation may be required (Stage 3 Site-Specific Assessment), but often it is possible at the conclusion of the Stage 2 work to evaluate the cultural heritage value of the archaeological remains and to develop any required Stage 4 Mitigation of Development Impacts to minimize or offset the negative effects of the proposed redevelopment and/or soil disturbance.

Mitigation strategies may consist of planning and design measures to avoid the archaeological remains, archaeological monitoring during construction or extensive archaeological excavation, salvage and recording prior to construction, or some combination of these approaches. Archaeological monitoring and excavation work on site is followed by comparative analyses of the archaeological data that have been recovered ("salvaged") and the interpretation of those data. The identification of the most appropriate form of Stage 4 mitigation requires close consultation between the consulting archaeologist, the development proponent and their agents and contractors, and the planning approvals and regulatory authorities and must be carried out in accordance with the City of Toronto's ~~Archaeological Management Plan~~ *Archaeological Management Plan* and applicable provincial regulations. This overall assessment process generally takes place in the context of development applications, but additional application types might be reviewed within an HCD Plan area. For a list of development/*alteration* types and *alterations* requiring assessment see Section 10.1.

3.0 Statement of Objectives

3.0 STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES

The overall objective of the Garden District HCD Plan is the protection, *conservation* and management of its *heritage attributes* and *contributing properties* so that the District's *cultural heritage value* is protected in the long-term. The *cultural heritage value* of the District consists of its historic, contextual, design, social and community values. The *heritage attributes* of the District include its built form, *public realm* and *archaeological resources*.

Specific objectives of this Plan are set out below. Although the following objectives are numbered, the numeric sequence does not establish a priority among the objectives.

OBJECTIVES

1. ~~Conserve~~Conserve, maintain, and enhance the *cultural heritage value* of the District as expressed through its *heritage attributes*, *contributing properties*, *character sub-areas*, *public realm*, and *archaeological resources*.
2. ~~Conserve~~Conserve, ~~maintain~~maintain and enhance the overall soft landscaped, residential streetscape character of ~~the District~~the George, Pembroke, Sherbourne, Gerrard and Shuter Street *character sub-areas* with generous front yard *setbacks* and a collection of 2-3 storey house-form buildings displaying a range of architectural styles.
3. ~~Conserve~~Conserve, ~~maintain~~maintain and enhance ~~Allan Gardens~~Garden District as a *cultural heritage landscape* in the City, ~~as characterized by Allan Gardens~~, a designed-landscape anchor to the residential neighbourhood to the south, which has historic and physical connections to Moss Park as its southern landscaped terminus.
4. ~~Conserve~~Conserve, maintain and enhance Pembroke Street as a green connection and central access between Allan Gardens and Moss Park.
5. ~~Conserve~~Conserve the legibility of the District's period of significance, between 1850 to 1930, as expressed through the District's *heritage attributes*.
6. ~~Conserve~~Conserve the physical form, scale and architectural features of the range of residential architectural styles of *contributing properties* found in the District, including (but not limited to) Second Empire, Bay and Gable, Gothic Revival, Italianate, Queen Anne, Romanesque, Edwardian, Classicism, and vernacular.
7. ~~Conserve~~Conserve and enhance *contributing properties*, Part IV designated properties and listed properties.
8. ~~Conserve~~Conserve the predominant scale and built form pattern in each *character sub-area*, while allowing for growth and changes as permitted in the City's Official Plan.
9. Ensure *complementary alterations* to *contributing properties* and prevent the *removal* of *heritage attributes* from *contributing properties* within the District.
10. Ensure that *new development* and *additions* ~~conserve~~conserve and enhance the *cultural heritage value* of the District in general, as well as the *character sub-area* ~~character sub-area~~ in which it is located, particularly with respect to scale, *public realm* and the general pattern of the built form as set out in the policies and guidelines.
11. Ensure that *archaeological resources* are protected.
12. Encourage high quality architecture in the design of *new development*, *additions* and *alterations* that is

complementary to the District's *cultural heritage value*.

13. ~~Conserve Conserve~~ and enhance views ~~from the public realm identified in this Plan of contributing properties from the public realm, and specific views and vistas~~ that contribute to an understanding of the District's *cultural heritage value*.
14. ~~ConserveConserve~~, support and enhance the social, cultural and community values of the District as a socially inclusive neighbourhood with a history of innovative community and social services.
15. Ensure development and *alterations adjacent* to the District ~~conserve conserve~~ the District's *cultural heritage value*.
16. Honour and commemorate the area's Indigenous heritage.

Figure 3: (opposite page) Excerpt from the 1860s Tremaine's Map of the County of York, Canada West showing the extent of the built up area of the City of Toronto at the time. The Garden District HCD, highlighted in green, is characterized by the Moss Park Estate and is depicted as one of the prominent landscapes in the City, along with the University grounds (now forming a portion of the University of Toronto Campus and Queen's Park), Union Station, and Clarence and Victoria squares. The layout of the Moss Park Estate as a residential neighbourhood bookended by Allan Gardens to the north and Moss Park to the south is parallel to the "dumb bell" design scheme that characterized the relationship of Clarence and Victoria Squares as two parks connected by Wellington Street as a landscaped residential corridor.

4.0 District Significance

4.1 Description of Historic Place

4.2 Statement of Cultural Heritage Value

4.3 Heritage Attributes

4.1 DESCRIPTION OF HISTORIC PLACE

The Garden District Heritage Conservation District (HCD) is located within Toronto's downtown east neighbourhood. The District is bounded by Carlton Street to the north, Queen Street East to the south, George Street to the west and Sherbourne Street to the east. The District is comprised of properties facing onto one or both sides of these streets, as well as onto Pembroke Street and Dundas Street East. The District is characterized as a residential neighbourhood bookended by two public parks: Allan Gardens to the north and Moss Park to the south. The Garden District HCD primarily contains late 19th and early 20th century residential properties. Dundas Street East, initially a residential street, contains many houses adaptively re-used for commercial use with some purpose-built commercial properties. Some institutional uses are also found in adaptively re-used residential properties with some purpose-built institutional buildings. The Garden District HCD displays a mix of buildings in varying architectural styles, as well as contemporary buildings, located within a defined street grid.

The Garden District HCD is a *cultural heritage landscape* that was planned in the mid-19th century as a residential enclave anchored by Allan Gardens to the north with the Moss Park estate lands to the south. The Garden District is an evolved district that has a rich history of social inclusion.

Figure 4: "Villa lots for Sale on the Moss Park Estate of G.W. Allan Esq, Toronto", 1855 (Source: Toronto Public Library)

4.2 STATEMENT OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE

The Garden District HCD has historic and associative value with the foundation of the neighbourhood built on Anishnawbe lands. The neighbourhood was laid out in 1855 when George William Allan subdivided the Moss Park Estate (the southern half of Park Lot 5), to the plans of surveyor John Ownsworth Browne. Informed by G. W. Allan's passion for English landscape traditions, the design intent for the subdivision was an upscale residential enclave situated between two landscapes – Allan Gardens, a formal landscaped garden to the north and a remnant portion of the picturesque Moss Park estate lands to the south. Prior to the 1855 plan of subdivision, the Moss Park Estate was laid out c1829 by Belgium-born, Brooklyn-based landscape designer, André Parmentier, with the Moss Park estate house situated within a 19th century picturesque landscape where Moss Park Creek, a tributary of Taddle Creek, once flowed through. Sherbourne Street had historically served as a laneway and access to the Moss Park estate house as early as 1819 and was once known as

"Allan's Lane". In the 1855 plan, a curved road (Wilton Crescent) framed the remnant portions of the Moss Park estate lands in its picturesque setting, while accommodating the development of a residential neighbourhood to the north. Wilton Crescent evolved into a residential street then to an extension of Dundas Street East as a commercial thoroughfare. Today's Moss Park has evolved from 19th century picturesque estate lands to a neighbourhood community park with active, community and recreational uses. Today, the original design and historic relationship between Allan Gardens, which anchors the residential neighbourhood to the north, and Moss Park, connected by Pembroke Street as the central access, remains legible and intact in the Garden District.

Garden District has contextual value as part of the original Moss Park Estate lands. The 1855 lot pattern of the District represents the growth and development of the City in the 19th century, as a number of estates were subdivided according to the uncoordinated plans of individual landowners within the street grid established through a system of 100-acre park lots. A feature of the Garden District, arising from the 1855 plan of subdivision, includes the generous *setbacks* of residential buildings from the streets with soft-landscaped front yards. This *complements* the landscaped setting of Allan Gardens to the north and Moss Park to the south, with landscaped front yards and street tree canopy along the residential spine of the district, Pembroke Street, serving as the central access and green connection between the two parks. Laneways are also a notable feature within the Garden District, historically providing access to the rear of properties. Despite evidence of constant renewal and change, the District's historic pattern of street and laneway plan, front yard *setbacks*, building orientation, walkways and soft landscaped front yards is still largely intact.

Figure 5: Pembroke Street looking south to Moss Park

The design value of the Garden District is represented in the wide range of architectural styles found in the District. The District is primarily composed of late 19th and early 20th century residential house-form buildings. A number of the residential buildings, particularly along Dundas and Gerrard streets have been adaptively re-used for commercial and institutional use. In addition, a number of purpose-built commercial buildings have been constructed along Dundas Street East. The District includes examples of various architectural styles, such as Gothic Revival, Second Empire, Bay and Gable, Italianate, Romanesque Revival, Queen Anne, Edwardian Classicism and vernacular design. The presence of different styles illustrates periodic waves of growth or redevelopment within the District between 1850 and 1930. After those decades, new construction

slowed through the Great Depression in the 1930s and the World War II era. As a result, many of the original examples of architectural styles have been retained over time, ~~contributing~~ ~~contributing~~ to the historic character of the neighbourhood. Although numerous architectural styles are evident in the District, most of the buildings share built form commonalities with respect to height, massing and plan that contribute to a sense of coherence within the District.

Another ~~contributing~~ ~~contributing~~ factor to the *cultural heritage value* of the District involves its social and community significance. The District has played a historic role in providing community and social services in the city, many of them representing firsts for the city. Allan Gardens, originally part of the Moss Park Estate, is one of the earliest examples of private donorship to the City for public parks. George W. Allan donated the original 5-acre portion of the Gardens to the Toronto Horticultural Society in 1861 from his Moss Park Estate lands. The Toronto Horticultural Society, founded in 1834 and one of the earliest in Canada, transferred these lands to the City in 1888. Allan Gardens has continued to be a significant open space for civic, cultural and recreation pursuits in Toronto since it was first opened to the public.

The Toronto Boys' Home (~~demolished~~ ~~demolished~~ in 1958 and the current site of Seaton House) was the oldest social agency of its type in Ontario, founded in 1859 by a group of benevolent Protestant women for "the training and *maintenance* of destitute boys not convicted of crime" who were between the ages of 5 and 14. The Boys' Home drew other social institutions to the area, including the Salvation Army and the Fegan Boys' Home. The Allan School, opened in 1910 as part of the Boys' Home campus, is one of the surviving reminders of the strong commitment to social services in the Garden District since the 19th century. Sherbourne Lanes, a 1970s adaptive re-use project on the east side of Sherbourne Street, south of Gerrard Street, is a public housing development and known as the first infill housing scheme to be constructed in the city. Constructed the year before the ~~Ontario Heritage Act~~ ~~Ontario Heritage Act~~ was enacted in 1975, Sherbourne Lanes marked a pivotal moment in the City's *preservation* movement and provided an alternative to the wide-spread *demolition* involved in mid-century urban renewal schemes.

The District continues to serve the community by way of a number of institutions focused on social goals. These include the All Saints Church-Community Centre, Seaton House, École Élémentaire Gabrielle-Roy and Miziwe Biik Aboriginal Employment and Training. First Nations community centres and First Nations artwork have prominent places in the District, reflecting the living heritage of people that lived on the land before the establishment of the Town of York, now the City of Toronto.

Figure 6: Dundas Street ~~East~~ and George Street in 1923 (Source: City of Toronto Archives)

4.32 HERITAGE ATTRIBUTES

The *cultural heritage value* of the Garden District HCD is expressed by the following *heritage attributes*:

- The orientation of the residential neighbourhood situated between the open spaces of Allan Gardens to the north and Moss Park to the south;
- The remnant street and landscape patterns representative of the 1855 Moss Park Estate plan of subdivision including the curve in Dundas Street, laneways to the rear of properties, generous building *setbacks*, soft landscaped front-yards, orientation of buildings fronting to the street, and walkway connection between front entrances and the public street;
- The ~~pre-dominant~~ low-rise residential character of the District George, Pembroke, Sherbourne, Gerrard and Shuter Street character sub-areas, including 2-3 storey single detached, row house, semi-detached and duplex house-form buildings in a variety of architectural styles from the 19th- and early 20th-centuries that demonstrate the periods of growth between 1850 and 1930;
- The collection of buildings representing a diversity of architectural styles, including (but not limited to) Second Empire, Bay and Gable, Gothic Revival, Italianate, Queen Anne, Romanesque, Edwardian Classicism, and vernacular, and architectural treatment of roofs, materials, windows, doors, entrances, porches, balconies, and storefronts.
- The soft-landscaped streetscape character of the George, Pembroke, Sherbourne, Gerrard and Shuter Street character sub-areas District created by landscaped front-yards and street tree canopy;
- The Pembroke Street *character sub-area*, which functions as the low-scale, residential spine of the District, lined with landscaped front-yards and tree canopy, providing a central access and green connection between Allan Gardens and Moss Park;
- The Gerrard and Shuter Streets *character sub-areas*, which function as edges to open spaces Allan Gardens and Moss Park respectively, with low-scale residential house-form buildings oriented towards the parks;
- The Dundas Street East *character sub-area*, marked by a curved alignment that runs through the heart of the District, which illustrates the evolution of the street from a residential street to commercial thoroughfare, with a mix of adaptively re-used house-form buildings for commercial use, and some purpose-built commercial buildings;
- The George and Sherbourne Streets *character sub-areas* that function as the east and west edges of the District with a primarily residential character.
- North-south views within the District terminating at Allan Gardens and Moss Park;
- The community support institutions that occupy adaptively-reused house-form buildings or purpose-built

buildings throughout the District;

- The absence of front-yard parking and the absence of garages facing the street; and
- The *archaeological resources* in the District that provide evidence of both pre-contact and historic Euro-Canadian history, reflecting the evolution of Toronto.

5.0 District Boundary and Resources

- 5.1** District Boundary
- 5.2** Architectural Styles
- 5.3** Contributing and Non-Contributing Properties
- 5.4** Character Areas
- 5.5** Parks and Open Spaces
- 5.6** Archaeological Resources

5.1 DISTRICT BOUNDARY

The delineation of the Garden District HCD's boundary has been informed by the findings of the HCD Study, community consultation, and the identification and refinement of *contributing properties* and *character sub-areas*. The boundary contains resources that express the *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes* of the Garden District HCD.

The boundaries of the Garden District HCD are Carlton Street to the north, Sherbourne Street to the east, Queen Street East to the south and George Street on the west (with a jog along Jarvis Street, north of Gerrard Street, accounting for the Allan Gardens *property* boundaries). The boundary limits include the full right-of-ways on George Street and Sherbourne Street, where the boundary does not include properties on both sides of the street (see map on pg. 31).

Revisions from the HCD Study area boundary include:

- Exclusion of properties oriented onto Jarvis Street and on the west side of George Street, due to their location on Park Lot 6, *adjacent* to the historic Moss Park Estate on Park Lot 5. The built form character and historic evolution of these properties reflect the characteristics of the subdivision of Park Lot 6 by early 19th century landowner, Samuel P. Jarvis, to the designs of prominent Toronto architect, John Howard (Howard surveyed Park Lot 6 between 1846-1851);
- Inclusion of Allan Gardens, Moss Park and Seaton House, due to their direct connection to the District's *cultural heritage value* ~~*cultural heritage value*~~ as a *cultural heritage landscape* with Allan Gardens as a designed-landscape anchor to the residential neighbourhood, with Moss Park as its southern landscaped terminus and Seaton House as part of a long-standing history of innovative social and community services in the District.

The District includes:

- Properties with house-form buildings fronting onto Pembroke and Dundas streets; the north side of Shuter Street; the south side of Gerrard Street; the east side of George Street; both sides of Sherbourne Street, north of Dundas Street East; and on the west side of Sherbourne Street, south of Dundas Street East that establish the residential character of the streetscape;
- Mixed-use properties on Dundas Street East, either with adaptively re-used house-form buildings or purpose-built commercial buildings, that represent the street's evolution from residential street to commercial thoroughfare;
- Properties that are associated with the history of social services in the District including the Seaton House *property* on George Street and Sherbourne Lanes on Sherbourne Street;
- Allan Gardens and Moss Park.

(Map)

5.2 ARCHITECTURAL STYLES

The range of residential architectural styles that are predominant within the District is identified as a heritage attribute in the Garden District HCD. There are several architectural styles found throughout the Garden District including Gothic Revival, Queen Anne, Edwardian Classicism, the Toronto 'Bay and Gable' style, Romanesque Revival, and most prominently, Second Empire. These architectural styles are a reflection of the development and evolution of the District over time.

5.2.1 Gothic Revival

The Gothic Revival style, dating from 1830-1900, is often characterized by lancet or pointed windows, steep gables and decorative barge boards. Many examples of this building type feature round arched or segmental arched windows, window hoods, drip moulds or brick voussoirs.

The residences reflective of this architectural style in the Garden District HCD are mostly two-and-a-half storey single-detached houses.

5.2.2 Second Empire

The Second Empire style, dating from 1860-1900, is characterized by a distinctive mansard roof and dormer windows. Most examples of Second Empire buildings feature round arched or segmental arched windows with decorative window hoods or surrounds. Many Second Empire style examples also feature decorative cornices or brackets.

Most of the residences reflective of this architectural style within the Garden District HCD are duplexes and row houses, two-and-a-half to three stories.

5.2.3 Bay and Gable

The Bay and Gable style is a common Toronto building form that arose in the later-19th century. Dwellings of this style are named for their distinctive combination of steep gables and (single or double storey) bay window projections. These structures, typically duplexes or terraces, were constructed quickly to keep up with housing demand for the working and emerging middle class in Toronto. While part of a mass-produced building form, there are several variations of the bay and gable type with different decorative touches. In the District, most of the bay and gable buildings are duplexes or terraces, and two-and-a-half storeys.

5.2.4 Italianate

The Italianate style was popular in Ontario for both residential and commercial buildings. They are often quite sculptural and dramatic combining several materials, often in contrasting colours. Elaborate cornices with paired brackets, tall vertical proportions and round or segmental arched openings for doors and windows are typical features. Domestic buildings often have low-pitched hipped roofs, large bay windows and occasionally a tower, rooftop belvedere or cupola. Many examples employ highly sculptural treatments of doors and windows with surrounds or pediments. Most of the Italianate influenced buildings are single-detached structures. These buildings are typically two-and-a-half to three stories, sometimes with towers or turrets extending the height.

5.2.5 Romanesque Revival

In Canada, the Romanesque Revival style (also called Richardsonian Romanesque) originated from the 19th century Romantic movement. It often featured a monumental scale, and was popular both for institutional for civic buildings, as well as elaborate residences for the wealthy and fashionable. Distinctive for use of sandstone and brick, terra cotta tiles, heavy rounded archways and asymmetrical plans, the style is generally used for single detached buildings, but is also seen on some terraces in the District. These buildings are typically two-and-a-half to three stories, sometimes with towers or turrets extending the height.

5.2.6 Queen Anne

The Queen Anne style, dating from 1880-1910, is typically characterized by an irregular plan, broad gables, towers or turrets and tall, decorated chimneys. Queen Anne style buildings are often described as eclectic in their decorative features, containing elements such as decorative wood shingles, spindle work, brackets, stained glass and multiple types of window shapes.

The residences reflective of this architectural style in the Garden District HCD are generally single-detached houses and duplex houses. These buildings are typically two-and-a-half to three stories, sometimes with towers or turrets extending the height.

5.2.7 Edwardian Classicism

Edwardian Classicism refers to a British architectural style that represented a rejection of High Victorian styles and a return to a more restrained classicism with simpler forms and a selective use of strong classical elements. Stylized and exaggerated classical elements are a typical feature of this style. In North America the “Four-Square” house evolved in response to this new taste for simplicity. These houses are typically built of brick and are two-and-a-half storeys high with a hipped roof and central dormer. A large verandah across the front has classical details. In the District, many examples influenced by this style are duplexes or terraces, two-and-a-half stories in height.

5.2.8 Vernacular

The term “vernacular” is typically used to describe buildings or structures that are locally crafted, using local materials and built by local craftsmen. Usually such structures do not fit into defined stylistic categories as with others identified here, although they may borrow individual architectural elements or decorative features. These buildings are diverse in character, size and age. These buildings vary in form, but are often two to five stories in height.

5.3 CONTRIBUTING & NON-CONTRIBUTING PROPERTIES

HCDs are collections of heritage resources that create a sum that is greater than its parts. While an HCD should be considered a heritage resource in itself, HCDs are composed of resources and features that together create a coherent sense of time and place. Properties that contain resources and features that contribute to the District's *cultural heritage value* and *attributes* are '*contributing properties*'. The classification of *contributing properties* assists in illustrating how the *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes* are expressed within the District and informs decisions on how they will be ~~conserved~~conserved.

An HCD can also include properties that are '*non-contributing*', typically because they have been heavily ~~altered~~altered over time and no longer contribute to the *cultural heritage value* or *heritage attributes* of the District. For example, the *demolition* of a commercial row building within a block of a historic Main Street *streetwall* that has been replaced with a surface parking lot. Nevertheless, *alterations*, *additions* or *new development* on '*non-contributing properties*' can impact the *cultural heritage value* of the District, and are also important opportunities to enhance the heritage character of the District. As such, the HCD Plan provides different sets of *policies* and *guidelines* that apply to these two categories of properties.

METHODOLOGY

A multi-step process was used to determine the classification of properties as '*contributing*' or '*non-contributing*' in the Garden District. First, a review of the construction date of the *property* was undertaken. As noted in the statement of *cultural heritage value*, the significant periods of construction within the District fell between 1855 and 1930. If a building was constructed within this date range, the form and typology were reviewed to determine if the architectural style and *integrity* warranted inclusion as a '*contributing*' building. Buildings that fell outside of the periods of construction or buildings that have been heavily modified to the point where their architectural features/*heritage attributes* are no longer intact were classified as '*non-contributing*'.

Appendices B, C and D contain schedules of *contributing* and *non-contributing properties* within the Garden District HCD, including a statement of contribution for each '*contributing property*'.

(Map)

5.4 CHARACTER SUB-AREAS

The Garden District HCD is a *cultural heritage landscape* that was planned and evolved as a residential enclave anchored by Allan Gardens to the north with the Moss Park estate lands to the south. The Garden District HCD represents a cohesive, unified whole, consisting of *character sub-areas* - component parts with a distinct character and function that contribute to the District's overall *cultural heritage value*. The ~~*character sub-areas*~~ *character sub-areas* are based on the layout and design intent of the 1855 plan of subdivision, influenced by G.W. Allan's passion for English landscape traditions. The *policies* in this Plan considers each *character sub-area* - the massing *policies* in Section 6.10 and Section 7.6 in particular, respond to the characteristics and function of each sub-area. *Policies* for Allan Gardens and Moss Park, which respond to their characteristics and function to the District as a whole are found in Section 8.

The identification of *character sub-areas* reinforces the *integrity* of the District's ~~*cultural heritage value*~~ *cultural heritage value* and establishes a framework for the *conservation* and enhancement of the *heritage attributes* of the District. By identifying the *heritage attributes* of *character sub-areas*, *policies* and *guidelines* for the *complementary* development of *contributing* and *non-contributing properties* can be refined to manage change in a way that reflects the immediate context. *Character sub-areas* recognize that different forms of development may be appropriate throughout the District, and *character sub-area* specific *policies* and *guidelines* are intended to manage and inform *alterations* and *new development* in a way that respects and conserves the District's ~~*cultural heritage value*~~ *cultural heritage value*. The identification of *character sub-areas* is therefore an essential tool in the evaluation of the appropriateness of any proposed ~~*new development*~~ *new development* or ~~*alteration*~~ *alteration* in the District.

GARDEN DISTRICT HCD CHARACTER SUB-AREAS

(Diagram)

5.4.1 1 - Allan Gardens

Allan Gardens is a designed landscape, which anchors the Garden District as a *cultural heritage landscape*. It is historically and physically linked to Moss Park, the southern landscaped terminus to the residential component of the Garden District HCD.

5.4.2 2 - Moss Park

Moss Park is the southern landscaped terminus to the residential component of the Garden District HCD. It is historically and physically linked to Allan Gardens.

5.4.3 3 - Pembroke Street

Pembroke Street is the residential spine of the Garden District HCD. It functions as a green connection between Allan Gardens and Moss Park, with low-scale (2-3 storey) house-form buildings oriented to the street and soft landscaped front-yards. Properties on both sides of Pembroke Street between Gerrard and Shuter streets are included within this *character sub-area*.

5.4.4 4 - Gerrard Street

On Gerrard Street, the low-scale (2-3 storey) house-form buildings oriented towards the parks with soft landscaped front-yards establishes an edge, framing the open space, Allan Gardens, to the north. Several Indigenous community services are located within adaptively re-used house-form buildings on Gerrard Street. Properties on the south side of Gerrard Street between George and Sherbourne streets are included within this *character sub-area*.

5.4.5 5 - Shuter Street

On Shuter Street, the low-scale (2-3 storey) house-form buildings oriented towards the parks with soft landscaped front-yards establishes an edge that frames the open space, Moss Park, to the south. Properties on the north side of Shuter Street between George and Sherbourne streets are included within this *character sub-area*.

5.4.6 6 - Dundas Street East

Dundas Street East, running through the heart of the District, is characterized by its evolution from a residential street to a commercial thoroughfare, ~~represented by~~reflected in the range of house-form buildings, adaptively re-used house-form buildings for commercial use and purpose-built commercial buildings on the street. It is expected that Dundas Street will continue to evolve and grow, while conserving the cultural heritage value and heritage attributes of this character sub-area. Dundas Street has the potential to be a vibrant retail strip serving residents of the District. Properties on both sides of Dundas Street East, between George and Sherbourne streets as well as properties along Sherbourne Street shown on the maps on pages 41 and 105 are within this *character subarea*.

5.4.7 7 - George Street

George Street forms part of the neighbourhood component of the Garden District. It functions as the western edge of the District displaying a primarily residential streetscape character with house-form buildings and soft-landscaped front-yards. Institutional buildings, including the Seaton House, a legacy of the historic and ongoing significance of social services within the District is located within the George Street *character sub-area*. Although only properties on the east side of George Street are within the District, the full public right-of-way on both sides of the street are also included within the District and this *character sub-area*.

5.4.8 8 - Sherbourne street

Sherbourne Street forms part of the neighbourhood component of the Garden District. It functions as the eastern edge of the District displaying a primarily residential streetscape character with house-form buildings and soft-landscaped front-yards. There are few instances of apartment buildings ranging from 7 to 13 storeys and some vacant lots, however, the predominant residential streetscapescale character remains intact. North of Dundas Street, properties on both sides of Sherbourne Street are included within this *character sub-area*. South of Dundas Street, only properties on the west side of Sherbourne Street, excluding properties identified in the Dundas Street East *character sub-area* as shown on the map on page 41, and the full public right-of-way on both sides of the street are within this *character sub-area*.

(Map – to be revised)

5.5 PARKS AND PUBLIC SPACES

The two parks within the Garden District lay the foundation for the landscape tradition that shapes the history, evolution and character of the District.

5.5.1 Allan Gardens

Allan Gardens functions as a landscaped anchor at the north end of the Garden District. It has been designated under Part IV of the ~~Ontario Heritage Act~~ Ontario Heritage Act since 1986, amended in 2013 (by-law no. 1091-2013).

Allan Gardens contributes to the *cultural heritage value* of the District as a lasting remnant of the 1855 plan of subdivision of the Moss Park Estate lands and as a public park providing open space for civic, cultural and recreation pursuits in Toronto since G.W Allan donated the original 5-acre portion of the Gardens to the Toronto Horticultural Society in 1861. While the inclusion of Allan Gardens within the District recognizes the park's relationship to and its function within the Garden District HCD, the park's Part IV designation by-law provides a greater level of detail regarding the *cultural heritage value* and individual *heritage attributes* of the property.

5.5.2 Moss Park

Moss Park functions as the southern landscaped terminus to the Garden District. It contributes to the *cultural heritage value* of the District as a lasting remnant of the 1855 plan of subdivision of the Moss Park Estate lands. The 1855 plan illustrates a design intent of Allan Gardens as the formal landscaped gardens to the north of a residential enclave, with the Moss Park estate house set in a picturesque landscape to the south.

The *cultural heritage value* and ~~attributes~~ attributes of Moss Park lies in its relationship to the Garden District neighbourhood and its function as the southern landscaped terminus connected to Allan Gardens. It has evolved from 19th century picturesque estate lands, where Moss Park Creek, a tributary of Taddle Creek, once flowed, to a neighbourhood community park supporting active, community and recreational uses.

Figure 7: Allan Gardens functions as a landscape anchor at the north end of the Garden District.

Figure 8: Moss Park functions as the southern landscape terminus to the Garden ~~D~~istrict.

5.6 ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Archaeological resources include artifacts archaeological sites, and marine archaeological sites. The identification and evaluation of such resources are based on archaeological field work undertaken in accordance with Part VI of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. When redevelopment is proposed for any lands that incorporate areas of archaeological potential, it triggers an archaeological assessment and evaluation process.

The City of Toronto's *Archaeological Management Plan* identifies a small proportion of land that retains Areas of Archaeological Potential within the District boundaries. This Plan contains *policies* that pertain to areas of archaeological potential within the Garden District HCD.

(Map)

6.0 Policies and Guidelines for Contributing Properties

- 6.1** Understanding
- 6.2** Existing Part IV Designations
- 6.3** Combined Properties
- 6.4** Demolition
- 6.5** Removal and Relocation
- 6.6** Maintenance
- 6.7** Code Compliance
- 6.8** Restoration
- 6.9** Alteration
- 6.10** Massing
- 6.11** Roofs
- 6.12** Exterior Walls
- 6.13** Windows and Doors
- 6.14** Entrances, Porches and Balconies
- 6.15** Storefronts
- 6.16** Signage
- 6.17** Front Yard Landscaping
- 6.18** Parking and Circulation

This section contains *policies* and *guidelines* intended to manage change within the District in order to meet the objectives of this Plan and to conserve ~~conserve~~ the District's *cultural heritage value*.

The *policies* (in **bold** font) ~~describe what is required when undertaking work on a property within the District. Policies are required components of the designating by-law and are not discretionary, unless otherwise indicated. set the direction for the management of the District in a clear and definitive way. The policies set the direction for the management of the District in a clear and definitive way. The direction provided by the policies use either 'shall' or 'should' language and are to be interpreted accordingly.~~

The *guidelines* (in regular font) provide suggested ~~methods of satisfying associated policies, but do not carry the mandatory weight of policy. Guidelines recognize that there may be a variety of strategies that could satisfy any given policy. ways in which the HCD Plan policies might be achieved, however there may be other methods for satisfying related polices. Guidelines are useful directions on how to meet the policies of the HCD Plan.~~

6.1 UNDERSTANDING

Parks Canada's Standards and Guidelines ~~Guidelines~~ for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada provides the basis for the *policies* and *guidelines* for *contributing properties*. The Standards and ~~Standards and Guidelines~~ has been adopted by the Toronto City Council. Its *conservation* approach established the *conservation process* –understanding, planning, and intervening. The appropriate *conservation* treatment ~~treatment~~ should be determined by qualified heritage professionals depending upon the work proposed.

6.1.1 Alterations to a contributing property shall be based on a firm understanding of how it contributes to the *cultural heritage value* and heritage attributes ~~heritage attribute~~ of the District.

- a. In order to determine appropriate interventions, the following should be taken into account:
 - Architectural style;
 - *Character sub-area*;
 - Period of significance;
 - The intentions and design principles of the original architect or builder;
 - The changes that have been made to the building over time; and
 - The building's existing condition.
- b. The cause of any distress, damage or deterioration of heritage fabric should be determined prior to planning any interventions to determine the appropriate scope of work and to preserve ~~preserve~~ as much of the heritage fabric as possible.
- c. Avoid creating a false sense of the historical evolution and development of the *property* by adding historic building features or components from other places, properties or periods.

6.1.2 Alterations to a contributing properties shall be conducted according to the stages of the *conservation process*, and using recognized *conservation treatments*.

6.1.3 Alterations to a contributing property may be permitted only once the *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes* of the District, as expressed through the *property*, have been documented and described, and the impact of any proposed *alteration* on those values and attributes has been determined.

6.1.42 A Heritage Impact Assessment shall be submitted to the City and shall evaluate the impact of any proposed *alteration* or *addition* on the *contributing property* to the satisfaction of the Chief Planner and Executive Director of City Planning.

6.2 EXISTING PART IV DESIGNATIONS

All properties located within an HCD are designated under Part V of the ~~-Ontario Heritage Act~~Ontario Heritage Act. Some properties located within the Garden District HCD are also designated under Part IV of the ~~- Ontario Heritage Act~~Ontario Heritage Act, which protects the *cultural heritage value* of individual properties and their identified *heritage attributes*. These properties are designated by municipal by-law containing a Statement of Significance that defines its *cultural heritage value* and attributes as an individual *property*. Interventions on properties designated under Part IV must also conserve ~~conserve~~ the individual *property's cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes*.

6.2.1 In addition to the requirements of this Plan, the identified *heritage attributes* for an individual *property* that is designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* shall be conserved.

(Map)

6.3 COMBINED PROPERTIES

Combined properties ~~Combined properties~~ include consolidated properties (combining *contributing* and *non-contributing properties*), as well as *contributing properties* that contain significant vacant space upon which *new development* could occur. In both cases, it is essential that the *conservation process* be followed and *conservation treatments* identified to conserve ~~conserve~~ the *contributing property* in the design of any *addition* or *new development*.

6.3.1 Alterations to combined properties ~~combined properties~~ shall conserve the portion(s) of the property identified as *contributing* to the District according to Section 6 of this Plan.

6.3.2 New development on those portions of combined properties ~~combined properties~~ identified as *non-contributing* shall be consistent with Section 7 of this Plan.

6.3.3 A Heritage Impact Assessment shall be submitted to the City and shall evaluate the impact of any proposed *new development, alteration or addition* on the *contributing* portions to the satisfaction of the Chief Planner and Executive Director of City Planning.

- a. The City will confirm through the Heritage Permit process those portions of the property that are considered *contributing* and *non-contributing* for the purposes of identifying applicable *policies* and *guidelines*.

6.4 DEMOLITION

The City of Toronto's Official Plan requires a Heritage Impact Assessment for the proposed *demolition* of a *property* on the City of Toronto's Heritage Register. The Heritage Register includes all properties designated under Part V of the OHA. Article IV of the Municipal Code requires that heritage permit applications be submitted for the proposed *demolition* of any *property* located in a HCD. The Property Standards By-Law protects heritage properties in HCDs from *demolition* by neglect. The Municipal Code and the Property Standards By-Law require that the *demolition* of properties in HCDs may only take place in accordance with the OHA, and the Official Plan requires that the *demolition* of properties in HCDs be in accordance with respective HCD plans.

6.4.1 The *demolition* of *primary structures on contributing properties* ~~-may shall~~ not be permitted, unless:

- The *integrity* of the *contributing property* for which the *demolition* application has been submitted has been lost; and

- The loss of ~~*integrity*~~ *integrity* of the *property* is not the result of *demolition* by neglect, deferred *maintenance* or purposeful damage to the *property*.

a. A peer review of the *demolition* application may be required at the expense of the applicant, if requested by the City.

6.4.2 Do not ~~*demolish*~~ *demolish* a building on a *contributing property* with the intention of reconstructing it.

6.4.3 As per the City of Toronto's Property Standards By-law, ensure that *contributing properties* are protected against *demolition* by neglect.

6.5 REMOVAL AND RELOCATION

The City of Toronto's Official Plan states that buildings or structures located on properties included on the Heritage Register should be ~~*conserved*~~ *conserved* on their original location, and that their *removal* or *relocation* may only be permitted where the *removal* is supported by the *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes* of the *property*. The Official Plan also states that *relocation* may only be permitted where it does not conflict with any applicable HCD plans.

In the Garden District HCD, the location of buildings or structures on *contributing properties* relative to the *property* lines has been identified as a ~~*heritage attribute*~~ *heritage attribute*. This includes but is not limited to the

setback of residential properties from front and side lot lines.

6.5.1 The *removal* of buildings or structures from a *contributing property* ~~may shall~~ not be permitted unless the building or structure is unrelated to property in the~~its~~ statement of contribution.

6.5.2 The *relocation* of a building or structure within a *contributing property*, intact and excepting its sub-surface foundations, may be permitted if the *relocation* is a modest adjustment from its existing location and conserves ~~preserves~~ the relationship of the structure's built form to the *public realm*.

6.6 MAINTENANCE

Article V (Heritage Property Standards) of the City of Toronto Property Standards By-Law (Chapter 629 of the Municipal Code) specifies minimum standards for *maintenance* and occupancy of Part IV and Part V designated heritage properties, as well as minimum standards for repairing and replacing *heritage attributes* in order to ensure that the heritage character and the visual and structural heritage integrity of the building or structure is ~~-conserved~~conserved.

6.6.1 Contributing properties shall be maintained ~~maintained~~ to ensure the conservation and integrity of the District's cultural heritage value and heritage attributes.

- a. ~~Maintain~~ Maintain the form, craftsmanship, material, detail, and assemblies of *contributing properties*.
- b. ~~Maintain~~ Maintain the relationship of the built form to the *public realm*.
- c. ~~Maintain~~ Maintain and monitor *contributing properties* on a regular basis using *recognized conservation treatments*.

6.7 CODE COMPLIANCE

The principles of minimal intervention and reversibility, as described in Standard 3 of the *Standards and Standards and* ~~*Standards and*~~ *Guidelines*, should be considered when undertaking work related to code compliance. An understanding of the intent of the codes is essential for developing approaches that meet that intent without negatively impacting the *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes* of the District. Reviewing alternative compliance strategies and new technological solutions is encouraged. *Interventions such as restorations and repairs to contributing properties will have regard for conservation while being in compliance with the applicable codes and standards such as the Ontario Building Code.*

6.7.1 Upgrades to contributing properties to comply with current codes and standards pertaining to health, safety, security, accessibility ~~accessibility~~ and sustainability shall conserve ~~conserve~~ the cultural heritage value and heritage attributes of the District and the integrity of the contributing property.

6.8 RESTORATION

The *restoration* of a *contributing property* may be appropriate when the *cultural heritage value* of the *property* is connected to a specific period in its history. *Restoration* must be based on thorough supporting historic documentation of the built form, materials and features being recovered.

6.8.1 When undertaking a *restoration* project on a *contributing property*, building features from the period to which a building is being ~~restored~~ restored that have been removed or damaged ~~are encouraged to~~ should be re-instated.

- a. Features from the period to which a building is being ~~restored~~ restored should be *repaired* rather than replaced.
- b. ~~Restore~~ Restore, where possible, deteriorated, lost or removed *heritage attributes* based upon thorough supporting historic documentation.
- c. Do not create a false sense of the historic evolution and development of the *property* by adding features from other places, properties, periods, events or features that never coexisted on the ~~property~~ property.

Figure 9: ~~Restoration~~ Restoration of ~~contributing properties~~ contributing properties must be based on thorough supporting historic documentation of the built form, materials and features being ~~recovered~~ conserved.

6.9 ALTERATION

Alterations to contributing properties may be proposed in order to ensure the properties' continued use, to ensure *accessibility* and to increase sustainability. *Alterations* include *rehabilitation* and *additions*, and should be undertaken in conjunction with the *preservation* of the District's *heritage attributes*. *Alterations* may be supported when they meet the objectives, comply with the *policies* and maintain the intent of the *guidelines* of this Plan. The goal of *alterations* should be to minimize the impact of any *addition* or change to the *property* on the District's *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes*, as well as any other considerations as required by applicable Part IV designations and heritage easement agreements as noted in section 6.2 of this Plan.

6.9.1 The alteration of contributing properties shall be complementary with and support subordinate to the District's cultural heritage value and heritage attributes.

- a. *Complementary alteration* should reference the architecture, materials, features and built form of the *contributing property*, and the history of the *property* including changes made over time.

6.9.2 New materials shall be physically and visually complementary to the materials of the contributing property.

6.9.3 Alterations to contributing properties shall include the conservation preservation of the District's heritage attributes.

- a. Conserve ~~Preserve~~ rather than replace *heritage attributes* when designing *alterations*.
- b. Evaluate and document the existing condition of the *property* including District's s *heritage attributes* prior to designing *alterations*.

6.9.4 The alteration of contributing properties shall not diminish or detract from the heritage integrity of the District.

6.9.5 A Heritage Impact Assessment shall be submitted to the City and shall evaluate the impact of any proposed alteration to a contributing property to the satisfaction of the Chief Planner and Executive Director of City Planning.

6.10 MASSING

Massing relates to the exterior form of a building and its spatial relationship to its immediate context, including the space in front, behind, beside and above the building where visible from the *public realm*. It pertains to the overall proportions of the building, its relationship to its *adjacent* properties and its impact on the scale and character of the streetscape and *public realm*. Massing is interrelated to the composition of street facing elevations, the roof, as well as architectural expression of the building or structure in its entirety.

The existing massing in the Garden District is reflected in the dominant residential character of the Garden District, defined by 2-3 storey house-form buildings with front-yard setbacks and spaces between buildings. These *policies* and *guidelines* have been developed to recognize the variations of characteristics of each *character sub-area* (described in Section 5.4), providing guidance on how *additions* can be accommodated in a manner that ~~conserves~~ and enhances the *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes* of the District.

6.10.1 Additions to contributing properties shall ~~conserve~~ conserve the primary structure of contributing properties so that its ~~three-dimensional~~ three-dimensional integrity is ~~conserved~~ conserved along the streetscape.

- a. *Additions* should be located ~~towards~~ the rear of existing buildings on *contributing properties* and should not be located on street facing elevations or in the front-yards of *contributing properties* (except for storefront ~~additions~~ on Dundas Street East, see Section 6.15).

6.10.2 Additions to contributing properties within George, Pembroke, Sherbourne, Gerrard and Shuter Street character sub-areas shall be designed to be complementary with the scale, height, massing and form of the *contributing property*, *adjacent contributing properties* and the District's *heritage attributes*.

6.10.3 In the Dundas Street East character sub-area, the podium portion of new development taller than the primary structure of contributing properties shall be designed to be complementary to the scale, height and massing of the contributing property and adjacent contributing properties in the Dundas Street East character sub-area.

6.10.43 Additions to contributing properties shall ~~preserve~~ preserve the relationship between the built form and the *public realm*.

6.10.54 Additions to a contributing property within George, Pembroke, Sherbourne, Gerrard and Shuter Street character sub-areas shall conserve ~~conserve~~ the front-yard and side-yard setback condition of the street established by *adjacent contributing properties*.

6.10.65 Additions to contributing properties shall conserve ~~conserve~~ the three-dimensional character of *contributing properties* in their *character sub-area*:

Pembroke Street, Gerrard Street and Shuter Street Character Sub-Areas:

6.10.76 Additions to contributing properties within the Pembroke, Gerrard and Shuter Street character sub-areas shall not exceed the height of ~~the roof ridge of~~ the *primary structure*.

- a. Existing rear wings and additions ~~additions~~ to *primary structures* may be demolished.
- b. Rear *additions* should be stepped a minimum of 6 inches below the existing roof ridge to allow for construction allowances.

Dundas Street East, George Street, and Sherbourne Street Character Sub-Areas:

Site and Area Specific Policy 461 (OPA 82) 82 identifies areas within these *character sub-areas* where heights greater than the predominant scale of 2-3 storey house-form buildings are permissible. ~~The following Policies~~ 6.10.8 and 6.10.9 provide direction on how to conserve ~~conserve~~ the scale and three-dimensional character of these *character subareas* while accommodating additional height.

6.10.87 New development and a Additions taller than ~~the roof ridge of~~ the *primary structure of contributing properties within the George Street and Sherbourne Street character sub-areas* shall be located behind the *primary structure*.

- a. Existing rear wings and additions ~~additions~~ to *primary structures* may be ~~demolished~~ demolished.

6.10.9 In the Dundas Street East character sub-area, new development and additions taller than the roof ridge of the primary structure of house-form contributing properties should be located a minimum 1 metre behind the roof ridge, and new development and additions taller than the flat roof contributing properties should provide a minimum stepback of 5 metres from all streetwalls fronting onto a public right-of-way.

- a. Existing rear wings and additions to primary structures may be demolished.

6.10.108 In the George, Pembroke, Sherbourne, Gerrard and Shuter Street character sub-areas, projecting balconies or cantilevered portions of *additions to contributing properties* shall not be permitted above the *primary structure*.

6.10.11 In the Dundas Street East *character sub-area*, projecting balconies or cantilevered portions of *additions to contributing properties* may be permitted where it can be demonstrated that they do not negatively impact the *cultural heritage value* of this *character sub-area* and its overall streetscape, and do not detract from the visual prominence and legibility of the *contributing property*.

ALL CHARACTER SUB-AREAS:

Existing rear wings and additions to ~~*primary structures*~~ may be ~~*demolished*~~.

PEMBROKE STREET, GERRARD STREET & SHUTER STREET CHARACTER SUB AREAS:

Additions to ~~*contributing properties*~~ shall not exceed the height of the roof ridge of the ~~*primary structure*~~.

~~DUNDAS STREET~~, GEORGE STREET ~~and~~ SHERBOURNE STREET CHARACTER SUB AREAS:

~~*New development and additions*~~ taller than ~~the roof ridge of~~ the primary structure shall be located behind the ~~*primary structure*~~.

6.11 ROOFS

The diversity of roof types found within the district, as a result of the range of architectural styles found in the District contribute to the *cultural heritage value* of the District that create its residential streetscape character. Roof types found in the District include flat; hipped; mansard; and front, side and cross gable. Roofs include aspects of practical and decorative architectural detail such as: gables, dormers, turrets, brackets, raised parapets, gutters, fascias, soffits, trim, flashing, downspouts, as well as assemblies of vapour barriers, water proofing and insulation, etc. that shall all be considered in the strategy for the *conservation* of roofing as a whole.

The stability of the roof assembly, insulation, vapour barrier and structure below the visible roof material is important to ~~conserving~~ *conserving* the roof itself, as is the condition, performance and *integrity* of parapets and rainwater diversion elements.

Figure 10: Mansard roof in the Garden District HCD

Figure 11: Gabled roof in the Garden District HCD

Figure 12: Hipped roof in the Garden District HCD

Figure 13: Turret roof in the Garden District HCD

6.11.1 ~~Restore~~ Restore where possible deteriorated original or ~~restored~~ restored roof features of a *contributing property* ~~with regard according~~ to form, design, material and detail based upon thorough supporting historic research.

6.11.2 *Repair* rather than replace damaged or deteriorated original or ~~restored~~ restored roof features of a *contributing property*.

6.11.3 Where original or ~~restored~~ restored roofs of a *contributing property* are deteriorated beyond *repair*, replacements ~~shall be in-kind, and~~ shall ~~maintain~~ maintain the historic form, profile, appearance, materiality and features of the roof.

a. Replace only those historic roof features that have deteriorated beyond *repair*, rather than replacing the entire roof.

6.11.4 Where replacement in-kind of original or ~~restored~~ restored roof features of a *contributing property* is not technically possible, replacements shall be physically and visually *complementary* to the *contributing property* and the District's *heritage attributes*, and shall ~~maintain~~ maintain the form, profile, appearance, material and features of the roof.

a. Many roofs within the District have been replaced with modern materials. Existing replacement materials, including asphalt, may be replaced in-kind.

6.11.5 *Alterations* shall ~~conserve~~ conserve the roof form and profile of *contributing properties*.

- a. Minor *alterations* may be permitted where determined to be appropriate, including the installation of features to increase building performance and life cycle.
- b. The design, massing and placement of *alterations* should ~~conserve~~ conserve the historic roof form and profile of the building, as viewed from the *public realm*.
- c. If it is not technically possible to locate *alterations* out of view of the *public realm*, ensure that they do not negatively impact the District's *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes*, and the *integrity* of the *contributing property*.
- d. The form, materials and colours of eavestroughs and downspouts should not negatively impact the District's *cultural heritage value*, *heritage attributes*, or the *integrity* of the *contributing property*.

6.11.6 *Alterations* shall ~~conserve~~ conserve roof features of *contributing properties*.

a. Historic roof features should not be *removed*.

6.11.7 New rooftop elements on *contributing properties*, including mechanical penthouses, vents, drainage components, sustainable technologies, satellite dishes, skylights, metal chimneys, flues and decks shall be located out of view of the *public realm*.

- a. If it is not technically possible to locate the rooftop elements so that they are out of view of the *public realm*, ensure that they are appropriately screened. Use screening material that is *complementary* with the *heritage attributes* of the District.

6.12 EXTERIOR WALLS

Exterior walls include: foundation walls, raised basements and walls from the ground through attic level, and may include the walls of projecting elements such as parapets, bays and turrets. Walls may be designed as flat planes with projections or recesses, with decorative masonry detail or plain masonry coursing. Exterior walls have openings at the locations of windows and doors, and the masonry openings are often finished at their heads, sides and sills with modest or decorative treatments dependent on the style and design of the building.

The form, detail and materiality of exterior walls of contributing properties are important to the *integrity* of each *contributing property*, *character sub-area*, and to the District overall.

Figure 14: Exterior brick wall of a ~~contributing property~~ *contributing property* in the Garden District HCD.

6.12.1 Restore ~~Restore~~ where possible deteriorated original or restored ~~restored~~ exterior wall features of a *contributing property* with regard ~~according~~ to form, design, material and detail based upon thorough supporting historic research.

6.12.2 *Repair* rather than replace damaged or deteriorated original or restored exterior wall features of a *contributing property*.

6.12.3 Where original or restored ~~restored~~ exterior wall features of a *contributing property* are deteriorated beyond *repair*, replacements shall ~~be in-kind~~, conserve ~~conserving~~ the composition, materials, size, finishes, patterns, detailing, tooling, colours and features of the wall.

6.12.4 Where replacement in-kind of original or restored ~~restored~~ exterior wall features of a *contributing property* is not technically possible, replacements shall be physically and visually *complementary* to the *contributing property* and the District's *heritage attributes*, and shall maintain ~~maintain~~ the composition, materials, size, finishes, patterns, detailing, tooling, colours and features of the wall.

6.12.5 *Alterations* shall conserve ~~conserve~~ exterior wall form and style of *contributing properties*.

- a. Minor *alterations* may be permitted where determined to be appropriate, including the installation of features to increase building performance and life cycle.

- b. The design, massing and placement of *alterations* should ~~conserve~~ conserve the historic exterior wall form and style as viewed from the *public realm*.
- c. If it is not technically possible to locate *alterations* out of view of the *public realm*, ensure that they do not negatively impact the District's *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes*, and the *integrity* of the *contributing property*.

6.12.6 Alterations ~~Alterations~~ shall conserve ~~conserve~~ exterior wall features and details of contributing properties ~~contributing properties~~.

- a. ~~Conserve~~ Conserve the composition, materials, size, finishes, patterns, detailing, tooling and colours of exterior walls.
- b. Damaged or deteriorated exterior wall features should be ~~repaired~~ repaired rather than replaced.
- c. Replace only those exterior wall features that have deteriorated beyond repair.
- d. Historically unpainted masonry surfaces should not be painted. Paint from masonry surfaces should be removed in a manner that does not damage the historic materials.
- e. Historically painted surfaces, including masonry, wood and metal, should be ~~maintained~~ maintained.
- f. Brick masonry should be repointed using an appropriate and compatible mortar mixture and traditional pointing methods. Interventions should be tested to determine the appropriate mortar to match the historic composition.
- g. The application of waterproofing and water repellent coatings should be avoided.
- h. Surface draining, especially from drainpipes, should be directed away from foundation walls to prevent water damage.

6.12.7 *Additions to contributing properties* shall use exterior wall materials that are physically and visually *complementary* to the District's *heritage attributes*, and that do not negatively impact the integrity of the *contributing property*.

6.13 WINDOWS AND DOORS

The form, shape and detail of window and door openings and their features are important to the *integrity* of *contributing properties*, *character sub-area*, and the District overall. Windows punctuate an elevation and establish the horizontal and vertical datum lines that organize and structure an elevation. Similarly, doors and door openings often provide a focal point for an elevation and structuring the geometry and rhythm of its bays. Within the District, windows, doors and their features reflect the range of architectural styles (primarily residential), contributing to the District's *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes* that establish its streetscape character.

Exterior windows and doors often include architectural detail such as: plain, stained, or coloured glass, divided lights and materials of wood or metal, decorative treatments and hardware. The glazing may be set in original, distinctive frames of wood or metal, with divided lights. There may be mouldings that make the transition between the frame and masonry opening. Some window frames, door frames, sidelights, transoms and glazing are original to the building and these elements may be important features to the *property's* significance.

Figure 15: Window features in the Garden District HCD

Figure 16: Door features in the Garden District HCD

6.13.1 **Restore ~~Restore~~** where possible deteriorated original or **restored ~~restored~~** window and door features of a *contributing property* **with regard ~~according~~** to form, design, material and detail based upon thorough supporting historic research.

6.13.2 ***Repair*** rather than replace damaged or deteriorated original or **restored ~~restored~~** window and door features of a *contributing property*.

6.13.3 Where original or **restored ~~restored~~** window and door features of a *contributing property* are deteriorated beyond *repair*, replacements shall **~~be in-kind,~~ conserve ~~conserving~~** the form, placement and style of the window or door.

6.13.4 Where replacement in-kind of original or restored window and door features of a *contributing property* is not technically possible, replacements shall be physically and visually *complementary* to the *contributing property* and the District's *heritage attributes*, and shall **maintain ~~maintain~~** the form, placement and style of the window or door.

- a. The use of non-historic window materials can be considered if their detailing, profile and exterior appearance are physically and visually *complementary* to the original window and their use does not negatively impact the *cultural heritage value* of the District.
- b. PVC or fiberglass windows should not be used.

6.13.5 ***Alterations*** shall **conserve ~~conserve~~** the form, placement and style of windows and doors of *contributing properties*.

- a. Minor *alterations* may be permitted where determined to be appropriate, including the installation of features to increase building performance and life cycle.
- b. *Alterations* should **conserve ~~conserve~~** the form, placement, style, shape, height, and width of windows and doors as viewed from the *public realm*.
- c. The solid-to-void ratios of *contributing properties* should be **~~conserved~~ conserved**.
- d. Historic window and door openings should not be removed or modified.
- e. If it is not technically possible to locate *alterations* out of view of the *public realm*, ensure that they do not negatively impact the District's *heritage attributes*, and the *integrity* of the *contributing property*.
- f. Historic window glazing should be **~~conserved~~ conserved**. Replacement glazing may be considered only when the historic glazing is being retrofitted with sealed glazing units.

- g. When retro-fitting windows with sealed glazing units, new windows should closely match original window assemblies, including muntin and glazing configuration.
- h. The historic muntin and sash profile and dimensions of windows should be ~~conserved~~.
- i. Historically operable windows should be ~~conserved~~, where they exist.

6.13.6 Alterations shall conserve ~~conserve~~ the features and details of windows and doors of contributing properties.

- a. Conserve ~~Conserve~~ the material, details, assemblies and craftsmanship of windows and doors
- b. Damaged or deteriorated window and doors features should be *repaired* rather than replaced.
- c. Replace only those window and door features that have deteriorated beyond *repair*.

6.13.7 Windows and doors located on an *addition* to a *contributing property*, that are visible from the *public realm*, shall be physically and visually *complementary* to the District's *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes*.

- a. Contemporary design and materials may be used for windows and doors on an *addition* to a *contributing property*, providing they do not have a negative impact on the *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes* of the District.
- ~~h. The historic muntin and sash profile and dimensions of windows should be conserved.~~
- ~~i. Historically operable windows should be conserved, where they exist.~~

~~**6.13.6 Alterations shall conserve the features and details of windows and doors of contributing properties.**~~

- ~~a. Conserve the material, details, assemblies and craftsmanship of windows and doors~~
- ~~b. Damaged or deteriorated window and doors features should be repaired rather than replaced.~~
- ~~c. Replace only those window and door features that have deteriorated beyond repair.~~

~~**6.13.7 Windows and doors located on an addition to a contributing property, that are visible**~~

~~from the public realm, shall be physically and visually complementary to the District's cultural heritage value and heritage attributes.~~

a. ~~Contemporary design and materials may be used for windows and doors on an *addition* to a contributing property, providing they do not have a negative impact on the cultural heritage value and heritage attributes of the District.~~

6.14 ENTRANCES, PORCHES & BALCONIES

The wide variety of entrance types and treatments reflect the range of architectural styles (primarily residential) found in the District, which contributes to its *cultural heritage value* and creates its streetscape character. Features of entrances, porches and balconies in the Garden District include, but are not limited to: stairs, ramps, railings, porticos, canopies, gables, pilasters, balustrades, metal work, woodwork detail and decorative treatments.

Figure 17: Entrance features of a ~~contributing property~~ contributing property in the Garden District HCD.

6.14.1 Restore ~~Restore~~ where possible deteriorated original or restored entrance, porch and balcony features of a *contributing property* according to form, design, material and detail based upon thorough supporting historic research.

6.14.2 *Repair* rather than replace damaged or deteriorated original or restored ~~restored~~ entrance, porch and balcony features of a *contributing property*.

6.14.3 Where original or restored ~~restored~~ entrance, porch and balcony features of a *contributing property* are deteriorated beyond *repair*, replacements shall be in-kind, conserving ~~conserving~~ the form, placement and style of the entrance, porch or balcony.

6.14.4 Where replacement in-kind of original or restored ~~restored~~ entrance, porch or balcony features of a *contributing property* is not technically possible, replacements shall be physically and visually *complementary* to the *contributing property* and the District's *heritage attributes*, and shall maintain ~~maintain~~ the form, placement and style of the entrance, porch or balcony.

a. The use of wood in the construction of new entrances, porches and balconies is encouraged.

6.14.5 *Alterations* shall conserve ~~conserve~~ the form, placement and style of entrances, porches and balconies of *contributing properties*.

- a. Minor *alterations* may be permitted where determined to be appropriate, including the installation of features to increase building performance and life cycle.
- b. *Alterations* should conserve ~~conserve~~ the form, placement, and style of entrances, porches and balconies as viewed from the *public realm*.
- c. If it is not technically possible to locate *alterations* out of view of the *public realm*, ensure that they do not negatively impact the District's *heritage attributes*, and the *integrity* of the *contributing property*.

6.14.6 *Alterations* shall conserve ~~conserve~~ the features and details of entrances, porches and balconies of *contributing properties*.

- a. Conserve ~~Conserve~~ the material, stairs, ramps, railings, porticos, canopies, gables, pilasters, balustrades, metal work, woodwork detail and decorative treatments, assemblies and craftsmanship of entrances, porches and balconies.
- b. Damaged or deteriorated entrance, porch and balcony features should be *repaired* rather than replaced.
- c. Replace only those entrance, porch and balcony features that have deteriorated beyond *repair*.

6.14.7 New entrances, porches and balconies on *contributing properties* shall be physically and visually *complementary* to the District's *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes*, in terms of design, scale, and material.

- a. Contemporary design and materials may be used for new entrances, porches and balconies, providing they do not have a negative impact on the *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes* of the District.
- b. Avoid creating a false historical appearance.

6.14.8 Integral garages shall not be permitted, except for structured below-grade parking garages for properties located within the Dundas Street East *character sub-area*.

6.15 STOREFRONTS

Storefronts are entrances to commercial buildings, often with large windows to allow for the display of goods. Storefronts are found within the Garden District's Dundas Street *character sub-area*. There are some purpose-built commercial buildings with storefronts, however, storefronts are typically not original to the buildings on Dundas Street but have been added as residential buildings were adaptively re-used for commercial use. Storefront *additions* in Garden District have accumulated *cultural heritage value*, reflecting the evolution of Dundas Street from a residential street to a commercial thoroughfare.

Most storefronts in the District have experienced several *alterations* as a result of rapidly changing commercial requirements, however there are a few intact storefronts remaining. In general, storefronts are considered 'historic' if they were added within the District's period of significance (1855-1930).

Figure 18: Storefronts on Dundas Street East

6.15.1 ~~Restore~~ Restore where possible deteriorated historic storefronts on a *contributing property* in the Dundas Street East *character sub-area* according to form, design, material and detail based upon thorough supporting historic research.

6.15.2 Repair rather than replace damaged or deteriorated historic storefronts on a *contributing property* in the Dundas Street East *character sub-area*.

6.15.3 New storefront additions on a *contributing property* in the Dundas Street East *character sub-area* shall be physically and visually *complementary* with, subordinate to, distinguishable in terms of the form, appearance, materials and detailing, and minimize the loss of District *heritage attributes*.

a. New storefront *additions* in the Dundas Street East *character sub-area* should not overwhelm the *contributing property*.

6.16 SIGNAGE

In the Garden District, there are few instances of signage found on storefronts, storefront *additions* and on house-form buildings. They are typically found on buildings used for commercial uses in the Dundas Street East *character sub-area*. However, signage is also found on institutional buildings.

All applications for new signage on *contributing properties* will be reviewed in accordance with the City of Toronto's Sign By-Law and the definitions and regulations specified therein. The *policies* and *guidelines* here provide additional direction on the application of the by-law to *contributing properties* so that new signs will not negatively impact the *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes* of the District.

6.16.1 Signage shall be located in a manner that is physically and visually *complementary* to the architecture of the *contributing property*.

- a. Signage should not block, obscure or otherwise negatively impact the historic features of exterior walls, roofs, windows and doors on *contributing properties*.
- b. Storefront signage should use historic signage fascia boards, where they exist.
- c. Where signage is being mounted directly on a building, attachments should be made through mortar joints and not masonry units, using non-corrosive fasteners. Use existing holes in the fascia board, where they exist.
- d. New signage should be attached in a manner that ensures *removal* will not cause damage to the exterior wall of the building.

6.16.2 Signage materials on *contributing properties* shall be physically and visually *complementary* to the District's *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes*.

6.17 FRONT YARD LANDSCAPING

The overall collection of generous *setbacks* with landscaped front yards contributes to the residential streetscape character of the District, and on Pembroke Street, creates a green connection between Allan Gardens and Moss Park. Common front yard landscaping in the District includes fencing, which defines the edge of the *property* and also provides privacy and security. In some cases, fencing obscures views from the street to the building facade. In other cases, metal fencing design with some ornamentation allow for filtered views to the front facade, while still delineating *property* boundaries. Screening occurs when ornamental fencing or evergreen material is used to block views, whereas buffering is defined as allowing filtered views, such as partially enclosed fence (e.g. picket fencing) or a deciduous shrub border.

While the landscape undergoes constant change, both seasonally and as it matures, these *policies* and *guidelines* provide direction on how the overall landscape character of the District will be- ~~conserved~~conserved.

Figure 19: Front yard landscaping on Pembroke Street

6.17.1 Soft landscaped front yards on *contributing properties* shall be- ~~conserved~~conserved.

- a. Soft landscapes should be maximized.
- b. Paved parking areas within front yards are not permitted.
- c. Historic fencing in front yards, where it exists, should be ~~conserved~~conserved and retained.
- d. Where possible, use historical photographs or documentation to guide the addition of fences, walls and steps on *contributing properties*.
- e. Front yard fences should be of a design that permits views to the front facade of the building. Vegetative material, such as shrubs and hedges, may also be used instead of, or in conjunction with fencing.
- f. Landscape components, such as fences or shrub hedging may be used to screen or buffer garbage storage areas or service areas that are visible from the *public realm*.
- g. Chain link fencing is strongly discouraged.

6.17.2 The installation of new amenity lighting on *contributing properties* shall not adversely affect the *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes* of the District.

- a. The design of lighting schemes and individual lighting fixtures including their material, scale, colour, and brightness should be *complementary* to the character of the streetscape. The design of new lighting should not imitate historic lighting schemes or fixtures.

6.18 PARKING AND CIRCULATION

Parking and circulation in the District is shaped by the 1855 Plan of Subdivision of the Moss Park Estate. It was planned prior to the common use of the automobile. Rear laneways provides circulation to the rear of properties to access parking. Parking is thus largely concealed behind buildings or is limited to street parking. This contributes to the streetscape character of the neighbourhood, which was planned prior to the common use of automobile.

Walkways, or pathways that lead to front entrances, or laneways that lead to rear parking contribute to the District's *cultural heritage value* and heritage attributes that create its streetscape character.

6.18.1 Walkways and laneways on *contributing properties* that contribute to the *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes* of the District shall be ~~conserved~~conserved.

a. Paths that mark the entrance to the building should remain visible from the street.

6.18.2 Parking shall not be located in front yards of *contributing properties* and integral garages facing the streetscape shall not be permitted except for vehicular access to structured below-grade parking for properties located within the Dundas Street East *character sub-area*.

- a. New parking spaces must be designed and located so that they are as unobtrusive as possible, ensuring that front lawns and tree plantings are maintained.
- b. Parking should be located to the side or rear of buildings.
- c. Garages and other ancillary structures should be located towards the rear of the lot.
- d. In the Dundas Street East *character sub-area*, the vehicular access to below-grade parking should be designed to minimize its visual impact on the streetscape.

7.0 POLICIES AND GUIDELINES FOR NON-CONTRIBUTING PROPERTIES

- 7.1** Understanding
- 7.2** Adjacency to Contributing Properties
- 7.3** Combined Properties
- 7.4** Demolition
- 7.5** New Development and Additions
- 7.6** Massing
- 7.7** Articulation and Proportions
- 7.8** Roofs
- 7.9** Exterior Walls
- 7.10** Signage
- 7.11** Front Yard Landscaping
- 7.12** Parking and Circulation

This section contains *policies* and *guidelines* intended to manage change within the District in order to meet the objectives of this Plan and to conserve ~~conserve~~ the District's *cultural heritage value*.

The *policies* (in **bold font**) ~~describe what is required when undertaking work on a property within the District. Policies are required components of the designating by-law and are not discretionary, unless otherwise indicated. set the direction for the management of the District in a clear and definitive way. The policies set the direction for the management of the District in a clear and definitive way. The direction provided by the policies~~ use either 'shall' or 'should' language and are to be interpreted accordingly.

The *guidelines* (in regular font) provide suggested ~~methods of satisfying associated policies, but do not carry the mandatory weight of policy. Guidelines recognize that there may be a variety of strategies that could satisfy any given policy. ways in which the HCD Plan policies might be achieved, however there may be other methods for satisfying related policies. Guidelines are useful directions on how to meet the policies of the HCD Plan.~~

7.1 UNDERSTANDING

New development should be designed to conserve ~~conserve~~ and enhance the District's *heritage attributes*. *New developments* contribute to the overall character and sense of place of the District, and shall respect and build upon its *cultural heritage value*. Each project must therefore start with an understanding of the District's *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes*.

7.1.1 ***New development on non-contributing properties shall complement the District's cultural heritage value and heritage attributes while reflecting its own time.***

- a. Avoid creating a false historic appearance. Design *new development* to be *complementary* to but not replicate the architectural style of *adjacent contributing properties*. ~~erties.~~
- b. *New development will be reviewed for conformity to the policies and guidelines of each character sub-area.*

7.2 ADJACENCY TO CONTRIBUTING PROPERTIES

The City of Toronto's Official Plan requires proposed *alterations*, *new development* and/or public works *adjacent* to properties on the Heritage Register ensure that the *integrity* of the *adjacent properties' cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes* be retained, prior to work commencing and to the satisfaction of the City. All properties within the District are include on the Heritage Register; therefore, any *alteration* to a *property* within or *adjacent* to the District must conserve ~~conserve~~ the *adjacent properties' cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes*.

7.2.1 ***Alterations to a non-contributing property or properties adjacent to the District shall conserve ~~conserve~~ the cultural heritage value and heritage attributes of the District and adjacent contributing properties.***

- a. The impact of any proposed *alteration on adjacent contributing properties* or the District will be described and evaluated through a Heritage Impact Assessment.

7.3 COMBINED PROPERTIES

Combined properties ~~Combined properties~~ include consolidated properties (combining *contributing* and *non-contributing properties*), as well as *contributing properties* that contain vacant space upon which *new development* could occur. In both cases, it is essential that the *conservation process* be followed and *conservation treatments* identified to conserve ~~conserve~~ the *contributing property* in the design of any *addition* or *new development*.

7.3.1 Alterations ~~Alterations~~ to combined properties ~~combined properties~~ shall conserve ~~conserve~~ the portion(s) of the *property* identified as *contributing* to the District according to Section 6 – *Policies and Guidelines for Contributing Properties*.

7.3.2 *New development* on those portions of combined properties ~~combined properties~~ identified as *non-contributing* to the District shall be consistent with Section 7 – *Policies and Guidelines for Non-contributing Properties*.

7.3.3 A Heritage Impact Assessment shall be submitted to the City and shall evaluate the impact of any proposed *new development* or *addition of non-contributing* portions of a *combined property* on the *contributing portions* to the satisfaction of the Chief Planner and Executive Director of City Planning.

- a. The City will confirm through the Heritage Permit process those portions of the *property* that are considered *contributing* and *non-contributing* for the purposes of identifying applicable *policies* and *guidelines*.

7.4 DEMOLITION

Non-contributing properties do not represent the *cultural heritage value* of the District and can therefore be demolished ~~demolished~~ without a negative impact on those values. However, maintaining ~~maintaining~~ the predominant built form, *streetwall* and rhythm of buildings and structures within the District is important to preserving ~~preserving~~ its *integrity*. *Demolition* should therefore be closely followed by construction. *Demolition* that results in empty lots or other gaps in the urban fabric is strongly discouraged.

7.4.1 The *demolition* of buildings or structures on *non-contributing properties* may be permitted.

7.4.2 If permission to demolish ~~demolish~~ a building or structure on a *non-contributing property* is granted, *demolition* shall not begin until plans for the replacement building(s) have been submitted and approved by Toronto City Council, and a heritage permit issued by the City.

- a. Ensure that the replacement building(s) conform to applicable *policies* contained in Sections 6, 7 and 8 of this Plan, as well as the Official Plan and applicable zoning by-laws.
- b. Ensure that substantial progress is made in the construction of the replacement building(s) within two years of the *demolition* of the previous building.
- c. If construction of the replacement building(s) is delayed due to unforeseen circumstances, the City of Toronto may require interim landscape treatment of the site.

7.5 ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS

New development and additions to non-contributing properties are reviewed for their impact on the applicable *character sub-area, adjacent contributing properties*, and the District.

7.5.1 *New development and additions to non-contributing properties* shall ~~not~~ be permitted ~~except~~ where the proposed work has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the *heritage attributes* of the District shall be appropriately conserved~~conserved~~.

- a. The documentation, description and mitigation measures for any *new development* or *addition to non-contributing properties* will be described through a Heritage Impact Assessment satisfactory to the Chief Planner and Executive Director of City Planning.

7.5.2 *New development and additions to a non-contributing property* shall be physically and visually *complementary* to the *character sub-area*, and shall not negatively impact the *heritage attributes* and *integrity* of the District and any *adjacent contributing properties*.

7.6 MASSING

Massing relates to the exterior form of a building and its spatial relationship to its immediate context, including the space in front, behind, beside and above the building where visible from the *public realm*. It pertains to the overall proportions of the building, its relationship to its *adjacent* properties and its impact on the scale and character of the streetscape and *public realm*. Massing is interrelated to the composition of street facing elevations, the roof, as well as architectural expression of the building or structure in its entirety.

The existing massing in the Garden District is reflected in the dominant residential character of the Garden District, defined by 2-3 storey house-form buildings with front-yard *setbacks* and spaces between buildings. These *policies* and *guidelines* have been developed to recognize the variations of characteristics of each *character sub-area* (described in Section 5.4), providing guidance on how *new development* and *additions* on *non-contributing properties* can be accommodated in a manner that ~~conserves~~ and enhances the *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes* of the District.

7.6.1 *New development and additions to non-contributing properties within the George, Pembroke, Sherbourne, Gerrard and Shuter Street character sub-areas shall be designed to be complementary to the scale, height, massing and form of adjacent contributing properties, and the District's heritage attributes, particularly with respect to the heritage attributes associated with each character sub-area.*

7.6.2. In the Dundas Street East character sub-area, the podium portion of new development on non-contributing properties shall be designed to be complementary to the scale, height and massing of the adjacent contributing properties in the Dundas Street East character sub-area.

7.6.32 *New development and additions to non-contributing properties within the George, Pembroke, Sherbourne, Gerrard and Shuter Street character sub-areas shall conserve ~~conserve~~ the front-yard and side-yard setback condition of adjacent contributing properties.*

7.6.43 *New development and additions to non-contributing properties shall conserve the three dimensional ~~three-dimensional~~ integrity of contributing properties in their character sub-area:*

Pembroke Street, Gerrard Street and Shuter Street Character Sub-Areas:

7.6.54 *New development and additions on non-contributing properties within the Pembroke, Gerrard and Shuter Street character sub-areas shall not exceed the height of the roof ridge of adjacent contributing properties.*"

Dundas Street East, and George Street and Sherbourne Streets Character Sub-Areas:

Site and Area Specific Policy 461 (OPA 82)~~82~~ identifies areas within these *character sub-areas* where heights greater than the predominant scale of 2-3 storey house-form buildings are permissible. The following policies provide direction on how to conserve ~~conserve~~ the scale and three-dimensional character of these *character subareas* while accommodating additional height.

7.6.65 Any portion of *new development* and *additions* on *non-contributing properties* within the George Street and Sherbourne Street character sub-areas that are taller than ~~the roof ridge of~~ *adjacent contributing properties* shall step back to the rear of the *primary structure* of *adjacent contributing properties*.

7.6.7 In the Dundas Street East character sub-area, any portion of new development and additions above the podium or base building on non-contributing properties that are taller than the roof ridge of adjacent house form contributing properties should be located a minimum 1 metre behind the roof ridge of adjacent contributing properties, and any portion of new development and additions above the podium or base building on non-contributing properties that are taller than the adjacent flat roof contributing properties should provide a minimum setback of 5 metres from the streetwall of adjacent contributing properties.

7.6.86 Projecting balconies on portions of *new development* and *additions* on *non-contributing properties* above the roof ridge of *adjacent contributing properties* shall adhere to the same standard of stepbacks ~~stepbacks~~ as the main walls.

(Diagram)

7.7 ARTICULATION AND PROPORTIONS

Horizontal and vertical articulation refers to the rhythm and patterns and datum lines established by the architectural treatment of *contributing properties'* street-facing elevations. Fenestration patterns, bay distribution and material treatment, floor heights and material treatment are all components that establish the vertical and horizontal articulation of buildings on a given streetscape. Window and door openings establish the proportions and solid-to-void (wall surface to window/door openings) ratios of a building.

Responding to the patterns of horizontal and vertical articulation and proportions of window and door openings established by *contributing properties* in the District allows *new development* and *additions* to conserve ~~conserve~~ the streetscape character and overall context of the District.

7.7.1 *New development and additions on non-contributing properties shall conserve ~~conserve~~ the horizontal rhythm articulated in the façades of adjacent contributing properties.*

- a. The horizontal rhythm of floor heights on *new development* and *additions* should be articulated.
- b. Horizontal articulation of *new development* and *additions* should align with the horizontal articulation of *adjacent contributing properties* such as datum lines, window heads, and articulated floor levels.

7.7.2 *New development and additions on non-contributing properties shall conserve ~~conserve~~ the vertical rhythm articulated in the façades of adjacent contributing properties.*

- a. Street facing elevations should incorporate vertical articulations that reflect the predominant building widths and pattern of bay widths of *adjacent contributing properties*.

~~**7.7.3 *New development and additions on non-contributing properties shall conserve existing proportions and solid-to-void ratios found prevailing in the District.***~~

- ~~a. *The overall dimensions and appearance of window and door openings should be in keeping with the general character of those found in the District.*~~

7.7.34 *New development and additions on non-contributing properties shall not include*

integral garages except for structured below-grade parking garages for properties located within the Dundas Street East character sub-area.

7.7.45 *New development and additions on non-contributing properties shall not include blank walls facing the public realm.*

7.8 ROOFS

The roof form of a building helps define its overall massing, proportions and scale. Consideration should be given to its expression, its junction with the exterior wall, and impact on *adjacent contributing properties*.

7.8.1 New rooftop elements on *non-contributing properties*, including mechanical penthouses, vents, drainage components, sustainable technologies, satellite dishes, skylights, metal chimneys, flues and decks should ~~shall~~ be located out of view of the *public realm*.

- a. If it is not technically possible to locate the rooftop elements so that they are out of view of the *public realm*, ensure that they are appropriately screened. Use screening material that is *complementary* with the *heritage attributes* of the District.

7.9 EXTERIOR WALLS

The exterior walls of *contributing properties* express the overall materiality of buildings in the District. *New development* and *additions* to *non-contributing properties* conserve ~~conserve~~ and enhance *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes* of the District when materials and finishes that are *complementary* to the exterior walls of *contributing properties* are used. Contemporary materials may be used to create a contrast between *new development* and historic buildings. For portions of *new development* and *additions* that are higher than the roof ridge of *adjacent contributing buildings*, contemporary materials such as glass can add a lightness to a building and mitigate some of its visual impact.

7.9.1 Cladding materials used on exterior walls of *new development* and *additions* on *non-contributing properties*, that are visible from the *public realm*, shall be physically and visually *complementary* to the *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes* of the District.

- a. The materials used predominantly on *contributing properties*, such as brick and stone, should be used for *new development and additions*. A wider range of materials are permitted on portions of *new development* and *additions* that rise above the roof ridge of *adjacent contributing properties*, providing they do not negatively impact the *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes* of the District.
- b. Contemporary materials may be permitted, providing they do not negatively impact the *cultural heritage*

value and heritage attributes of the District.

- c. Synthetic materials such as vinyl or aluminum siding, concrete fibre board, synthetic wood products, and Exterior Insulation and Finish Systems (EIFS) are discouraged on exterior walls that are visible from the *public realm*.

7.10 SIGNAGE

In the Garden District, there are few instances of signage found on storefronts, storefront ~~additions~~ additions and on house-form buildings. They are typically found on buildings used for commercial uses in the Dundas Street East *character sub-area*. However, signage is also found on institutional buildings.

All applications for new signage on *contributing properties* will be reviewed in accordance with the City of Toronto's Sign By-Law and the definitions and regulations specified therein. The *policies* and *guidelines* here provide additional direction on the application of the by-law to *contributing properties* so that new signs will not negatively impact the *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes* of the District.

7.10.1 Signage on *non-contributing properties* shall be physically and visually *complementary* with the District's *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes*, in terms of placement, scale, and materials.

7.11 FRONT YARD LANDSCAPING

The overall collection of *contributing properties* with generous setbacks with landscaped front yards contributes to the residential streetscape character of the District, and on Pembroke Street, establishes a green connection between Allan Gardens and Moss Park. Front yard landscaping on *non-contributing properties* presents an opportunity to enhance the continuity of the landscape character of the District.

7.11.1 Soft landscaped front yards on *non-contributing properties* shall be maximized, except in the Dundas Street East *character sub-area*, where it is encouraged.

- a. Paved parking areas within front yards are not permitted.
- b. Front yard ornamental fences should be a maximum 1 metre in height. If fencing is to be taller than 1 metre in height, it should be of a design that permits views to the front facade of the building. Vegetative material, such as shrubs and hedges, may also be used instead of, or in conjunction with fencing.
- c. Landscape components, such as ornamental fences or shrub hedging may be used to screen or buffer garbage storage areas or service areas that are visible from the *public realm*.
- d. Chain link fencing is strongly discouraged.

7.11.2 The installation of new amenity lighting on *non-contributing properties* shall not adversely affect the *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes* of the District.

- a. The design of lighting schemes and individual lighting fixtures including their material, scale, colour, and brightness should be *complementary* with the character of the streetscape. The design of new lighting should not imitate historic lighting schemes or fixtures.

7.12 PARKING AND CIRCULATION

Parking and circulation in the District is shaped by the 1855 Plan of Subdivision of the Moss Park Estate, designed prior to the common use of the automobile. Rear laneways provides circulation to the rear of properties to access parking. Parking is thus largely concealed behind buildings or is limited to street parking. This contributes to the streetscape character of the neighbourhood, which was planned prior to the common use of automobile. This has an impact on the character of both *contributing* and *non-contributing properties* alike.

7.12.1 Parking shall not be located in front yards of *non-contributing properties* and integral garages facing the streetscape shall not be permitted except for vehicular access to structured below-grade parking for properties located within the Dundas Street East *character sub-area*.

- a. New parking spaces must be designed and located so that they are as unobtrusive as possible, ensuring that front lawns and tree plantings are -maintained~~maintained~~.
- b. Parking should be located to the side or rear of buildings.
- c. Garages and other ancillary structures should be located towards the rear of the lot.
- d. In the Dundas Street East *character sub-area*, the vehicular access to below-grade parking should be designed to minimize its visual impact on the streetscape.

8.0 Policies and Guidelines for Parks and Public Realm

8.1 Allan Gardens

8.2 Moss Park

8.3 Views

8.4 Streetscape and Laneways

8.5 Utilities and Public Works

This section contains *policies* and *guidelines* intended to manage change within the District in order to meet the objectives of this Plan and to ~~conserve~~ conserve the District's *cultural heritage value*.

The *policies* (in **bold font**) ~~describe what is required when undertaking work on a property within the District. Policies are required components of the designating by-law and are not discretionary, unless otherwise indicated. set the direction for the management of the District in a clear and definitive way. The policies set the direction for the management of the District in a clear and definitive way. The direction provided by the policies use either 'shall' or 'should' language and are to be interpreted accordingly.~~

The *guidelines* (in regular font) provide suggested ~~methods of satisfying associated policies, but do not carry the mandatory weight of policy. Guidelines recognize that there may be a variety of strategies that could satisfy any given policy. ways in which the HCD Plan policies might be achieved, however there may be other methods for satisfying related policies. Guidelines are useful directions on how to meet the policies of the HCD Plan.~~

8.1 ALLAN GARDENS

Allan Gardens, with its landscape quality and designed elements, provides an anchor to the Garden District as a *cultural heritage landscape*. Allan Gardens contributes to the *cultural heritage value* of the District as a lasting remnant of the 1855 Plan of Subdivision of the Moss Park Estate lands and as a public park providing open space for civic, cultural and recreation pursuits in Toronto since G.W Allan donated the original 5-acre portion of the Gardens to the Toronto Horticultural Society in 1861. It functions as the northern landscaped anchor to the Garden District neighbourhood, which is bookended by Moss Park to the south. It has been designated under Part IV of the ~~Ontario Heritage Act~~ Ontario Heritage Act since 1986, revised in 2013 (by-law no. 1091-2013). While the inclusion of Allan Gardens within the District recognizes the park's relationship to and function within the Garden District HCD, the park's Part IV designation by-law provides a greater level of detail regarding the *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes* of the *property*.

In addition the Part IV designation, existing documents that provide guidance for the *conservation* and management of Allan Gardens include: Allan Gardens Landscape Revitalization Strategy & Management Plan (2006); A Heritage Conservation Management Strategy for Allan Gardens (2002, revised 2004); and Allan Gardens Market Research/Financial Viability Study (2001). The following *policies* and *guidelines* are intended to build upon, but not replace, these documents. They put the key vision and principles for Allan Gardens developed in these guiding documents into a *policy* framework that recognizes the park's relationship to and function within the Garden District HCD. The existing guiding documents should continue to be referred to in the ongoing, daily *maintenance* and operations of Allan Gardens.

While Allan Gardens is identified as a *contributing property* in the Garden District HCD, the *policies* and *guidelines* contained in Section 6.0 of this Plan are not applicable to this *property*.

8.1.1 Alterations, additions and new development shall conserve ~~conserve~~ the cultural heritage value and heritage attributes identified in the Part IV designation by-law for Allan Gardens.

8.1.2 The function of Allan Gardens as a designed landscape anchor to the Garden District as a cultural heritage landscape shall be conserved ~~conserved~~.

8.1.3 The physical connection of Allan Gardens to Moss Park shall be conserved ~~conserved~~.

8.2 MOSS PARK

Moss Park functions as the southern landscaped terminus to the Garden District. It contributes to the *cultural heritage value* of the District as a lasting remnant of the 1855 Plan of Subdivision of the Moss Park Estate lands. The 1855 plan illustrates a design intent of Allan Gardens as the formal landscaped gardens to the north of a residential enclave, with the Moss Park estate house set in a picturesque landscape to the south.

The contribution of Moss Park to the *cultural heritage value* of the District lies in its relationship to the Garden District neighbourhood and its function as the southern landscaped terminus connected to Allan Gardens. It has evolved from 19th century picturesque estate lands, where Moss Park Creek, a tributary of Taddle Creek, once flowed through, to a neighbourhood community park with active, community and recreational uses.

While Moss Park is identified as a *contributing property* in the Garden District HCD, the *policies* and *guidelines* contained in Section 6.0 of this Plan are not applicable to this- property ~~property~~.

8.2.1 The relationship of Moss Park to the Garden District as its southern landscaped terminus connected to Allan Gardens shall be conserved ~~conserved~~.

- a. The portion of Moss Park that forms the terminus of Pembroke Street should remain an open landscape.
- b. The historic Moss Park Creek (its alignment and topography), First Nations land uses and the historic Moss Park Estate should be commemorated.

8.3 VIEWS

8.3.1 Views along Pembroke Street looking northward from Moss Park to Allan Gardens and looking southward from Allan Gardens to Moss Park shall be ~~conserved~~conserved.

8.3.2 Views along Dundas Street East looking eastward to All Saints Church, located at 223 Sherbourne Street, shall be conserved.

8.4 STREETScape AND LANEWAYS

8.4.1 The street and laneway network established by the 1855 Plan of Subdivision for Moss Park Estate shall be ~~conserved~~conserved.

- a. The existing alignments, street elevations, layout pattern and road widths should be regularly ~~maintained~~maintained and retained when resurfacing or upgrades are undertaken.
- b. Remnant laneways from the c1855 Plan of Subdivision should be retained.
- c. Fences may be erected on property lines abutting laneways.

8.4.2 The mature street tree canopy shall be conserved.

- a. Where possible, the volume of soil that is provided for the tree root system should be generous and measures for structural soils or planting cells should also be included to encourage sustainability of the tree collection.
- b. Tree plantings can either be grouped together or uniformly spaced along the length of the street.
- c. Street trees should be monitored to ensure that they remain in healthy condition and should be removed when they enter into a hazardous condition (i.e. die back on the overhanging branches).
- d. Dead trees should be removed and replanted in prompt succession to ~~maintain~~maintain the vitality of the streetscape.
- e. All other applicable City standards and by-laws for tree planting and *maintenance* should be followed.

8.5 UTILITIES AND PUBLIC WORKS

8.5.1 Public works and utility upgrades shall meet the requirements of this Plan.

- a. Utility boxes and meters should be located in an inconspicuous but accessible location, preferable along the side of the building.

8.5.2 Heritage ~~Planning~~Preservation Services shall be consulted prior to work relating to public works and utility upgrades being undertaken within the District.

8.5.3 Installation of under and above ground services, and other public works or utilities shall avoid non-reversible and visible *alterations to contributing properties or adjacent to contributing properties.*

9.0 Archaeological Resources

9.1 Archaeological Resource Requirements

9.1 ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS

In general, the City of Toronto's ~~Archaeological Management Plan~~ ~~Archaeological Management Plan~~ assigns archaeological potential on a simple “yes” or “no” basis. Either a *property* exhibits archaeological potential or it does not. Research undertaken for the Garden District HCD Study and Plan has refined this approach for each of the properties that exhibit archaeological potential by categorizing each *property* according to the types of activities that would likely require an archaeological assessment, or review of the need for an archaeological assessment on the part of City staff, prior to activities that will result in some form of ground disturbance that might not otherwise be subject to archaeological planning control outside of a designated HCD.

Table 1: Development/<i>Alteration</i> Types for Properties with Archaeological Potential within the Garden District HCD	
Category	Development/<i>Alteration</i> Type
1	<i>Additions</i> to existing structures requiring subsurface disturbances
2	New structures/installations in open space areas within other part(s) of the <i>property</i> requiring subsurface disturbances
3	Foundation <i>repair/alteration</i> to existing buildings
4	New service hook ups or <i>repairs</i> to a building frontage with a minimal <i>setback</i> and originating from the adjacent adjacent right-of-way
5	New service hook ups or <i>repairs</i> to a building set back from the right-of-way of origin
6	Landscape <i>alterations</i> requiring subsurface excavation/grade changes

Table 2: Properties with Areas of Archaeological Potential ~~Areas of Archaeological Potential~~ and Impact Categories of Concern

Address	Contributing or Non-Contributing	Alterations Requiring Assessment Review
218 Dundas Street E	Non-Contributing	2, 6
219 Dundas Street E	Non-Contributing	2, 6
231 Dundas Street E	<u>Non</u> -Contributing	1, 2, 3, 6
160 Gerrard Street (Allan Gardens)	Contributing	1, 2, 3, 5, 6
14 Pembroke Street	Contributing	1, 2, 3, 5, 6
46 Pembroke Street	Contributing	1, 2, 6
150 Sherbourne Street (Moss Park)	Contributing	1, 2, 3, 5, 6

10.0 Procedures

- 10.1** Heritage Permits Deemed to be Issued
- 10.2** Heritage Permit Process
- 10.3** Heritage Impact Assessment
- 10.4** Archaeological Assessment

10.1 HERITAGE PERMITS DEEMED TO BE ISSUED

Applications for erection, *demolition*, *alteration*, or *removal* of a building or structure within the District require a heritage permit. In accordance with Part V of the OHA and with Chapter 103 of the City of Toronto Municipal Code, certain classes of *alterations* are considered minor in nature and may be carried out ~~without~~ ~~without~~ applying for a heritage permit. These include:

- Painting of wood, stucco or metal finishes
- *Repair* of existing features, including roofs, wall cladding, dormers, cresting, cupolas, cornices, brackets, columns, balustrades, porches and steps, entrances, windows, foundations, and decorative wood, metal, stone or terra cotta, provided that they are *repaired* in kind
- Installation of eavestroughs
- Weatherproofing, including installation of removable storm windows and doors, caulking, and weatherstripping
- Installation of exterior lights
- Temporary commercial signage (ie. 'sale' sign in a window display)
- *Maintenance* of existing features
- Landscaping (hard and soft) that does not require subsurface excavation/grade changes
- *Repair* of existing utilities or public works
- Temporary or seasonal installations, such as planters, patios and seasonal decorations

Although a heritage permit is not required for the above classes of *alterations*, *property* owners and tenants are encouraged to conform to the spirit and intent of the Plan for all work undertaken on their properties.

10.2 HERITAGE PERMIT PROCESS

Owners of *property* within the District are required to submit a heritage permit application for *alterations* that are visible from the *public realm*. Proposed *alterations* are reviewed for consistency with this Plan, as well as with any applicable heritage designation by-laws, easement agreements or other heritage protections registered to the individual *property*. While other heritage protections may apply to specific interior or exterior portions of the *property* that are not visible from the *public realm*, this Plan does not apply to the *alteration* of interiors or to exteriors that cannot be seen from the *public realm*.

Section 10.1 of this Plan includes a list of minor *alterations* that do not require a heritage permit within the District.

Heritage Permit Process

(Chart)

10.3 HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The City of Toronto's Official Plan states that a Heritage Impact Assessment may be requested for development proposals on any *property* that is listed on the Heritage Register; this includes any *property* within the District. A Heritage Impact Assessment will be required to accompany any applications for a zoning by-law amendment, Official Plan amendment, consent to sever or site plan agreement. The Heritage Impact Assessment must be prepared by a qualified heritage professional. The purpose of a Heritage Impact Assessment is to describe and assess the existing physical condition of a heritage resource, the potential for the *restoration* and reuse of the heritage resource, and how the proposed *alteration* or development conserves ~~conserves~~ the heritage resource.

For additions ~~additions~~ to *contributing* and *non-contributing* properties:

"The City of Toronto may require heritage impact assessments for *additions* to *contributing* (also for non) properties to determine the impact of the *addition* on the *cultural heritage value* and [~~heritage~~ heritage] attributes ~~attributes~~ of the district."

For *demolitions*:

"A heritage impact assessment will be required to determine the impact of replacement buildings on the *cultural heritage value* and [~~heritage~~ heritage] attributes ~~attributes~~ of the district."

For *new development*:

"A heritage impact assessment may be required to determine the impact of new buildings and structures on the *cultural heritage value* and [~~heritage~~ heritage] attributes ~~attributes~~ of the district."

10.4 ARCHAEOLOGICAL ASSESSMENT

Areas of Archaeological Potential

For *contributing* and *non-contributing properties* within areas of archaeological potential, soil disturbance activities associated with large scale development, such as applications under the ~~Planning Act~~ *Planning Act*, will be subject to archaeological review by City staff and an archaeological assessment will be required prior to any on-site work.

Furthermore, proposed small-scale *alterations* to *contributing properties* and *non-contributing properties* will be subject to archaeological review by City staff and an archaeological assessment may be required prior to any on-site work that involves:

- *Additions* to existing structures requiring subsurface disturbances
- New structures/installations in open space areas within other part(s) of the *property* requiring subsurface disturbances
- Foundation *repair/alteration* to existing buildings
- New service hook ups or *repairs* to a building frontage with a minimal *setback* and originating from the ~~adjacent~~ *adjacent* right-of-way
- New service hook ups or *repairs* to a building set back from the right-of-way of origin
- Landscape *alterations* requiring subsurface excavation/grade changes.

Not all properties necessarily require review and/or assessment for all types of identified *alterations* (see Section 9.1).

11.0 Recommendations

11.1 Periodic Review

11.2 Heritage Awareness and Implementation

11.3 Heritage Interpretation

11.1 PERIODIC REVIEW

It is recommended that the City undertake a review of the Garden District HCD Plan and its objectives no more than ten years after it has come into force. The failure to review the contents of the Plan within the recommended review period will in no way invalidate the Plan or its ability to be enforced.

A preliminary review may be initiated by the City, who will initiate the review in coordination with the local HCD advisory committee. If the preliminary review determines that changes to the Plan are required then an in-depth review will be completed to determine the specific nature and content of changes to the Plan. An outside consultant may be retained for the purpose of complete the intensive review.

Changes to this Plan must be carefully considered, and only undertaken in the spirit of *conservation* which informed its preparation. Where Council accepts recommended changes to the Plan it will do so through an amendment to this Plan and its by-law.

11.2 HERITAGE AWARENESS AND IMPLEMENTATION

It is recommended that, following the approval of this Plan, City staff and the community meet to discuss the potential creation of an HCD Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee will serve as a conduit for community based feedback to the City regarding the consistency of heritage permit applications with the *policies* and *guidelines* of this Plan, and may also assist owners in understanding how to follow the *policies* and *guidelines* when planning *alterations* to properties within the District. The Advisory Committee will provide valuable input in decisions under the OHA, however it will not have the authority to issue permits or exemptions to the HCD Plan requirements, or to override decisions made by City staff or Council.

The City will provide a draft terms of reference for the Advisory Committee based upon that provided in [HCDs in Toronto](#)~~HCDs in Toronto~~, and modified as appropriate to reflect the unique stakeholder and community interests within the District.

The enactment of this Plan is also an opportunity to facilitate heritage awareness within the District as it relates to heritage-~~conservation~~conservation. City staff will work with BIAs, residents associations, the councillor's office, and other community members to increase awareness of the benefits of heritage conservation~~conservation~~ within the District, and to facilitate access to incentives available to owners of *contributing properties*. City staff will use the Plan to inform other City initiatives, including but not limited to culture and economic development.

11.3 HERITAGE INTERPRETATION

Recognized to have *cultural heritage value*, HCDs are cultural assets that can be leveraged in the place-making process, rooting the ongoing evolution of a District in a historic narrative, building a sense of place and neighbourhood identity. Public awareness and celebration of the *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes* of a place is an important component of successful *conservation*.

Heritage interpretation is an effective *conservation* tool, communicating, revealing and enhancing awareness of the *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes* of a place. Heritage interpretation takes on a wide range of forms, from plaques and interpretative signage to the programming of a building, to the design of site and landscape plans. To the extent possible, the planning and design of *new development*, *alterations* and *additions* should interpret the *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes* of *contributing properties*, *character sub-areas*, and the District as a whole.

Heritage interpretation is particularly important in the *conservation* of intangible heritage values that are not directly expressed in physical *heritage attributes*. For example, interpretive storytelling of Indigenous heritage and incorporation of Indigenous imagery and symbolism in interpretive design.

Heritage interpretation opportunities in the Garden District include: interpretive storytelling of Indigenous heritage, commemoration of the historic Moss Park Creek, Moss Park estate house and 1855 plan of subdivision.

Appendices

- A.** Definitions
- B.** Incentives
- C.** Character Sub-Area Maps
- D.** Index of Contributing Properties
- E.** Statements of Contribution
- F.** List of Non-Contributing Properties

A. Definitions

Accessibility f: -The degree to which an historic place is easy to access by as many people as possible, including people with disabilities.

Addition: New construction that extends an existing building's envelope in any direction, and which increases the building's existing volume.

Adjacent: Lands adjoining a *property* on the Heritage Register or lands that are directly across from and near to a *property* on the Heritage Register and separated by land used as a private or public road, highway, street, lane, trail, right-of-way, walkway, green space, park and/or easement, or an intersection of any of these; whose location has the potential to have an impact on a *property* on the Heritage Register.

Alteration: To change a *property* on the Heritage Register in any manner, including *restoration*, renovation, *repair* or disturbance, or a change, *demolition* or *removal* of an *adjacent property* that may result in any change to a *property* on the Heritage Register. ~~Alteration~~ and alter have corresponding meanings.

Archaeological Resources: Artifacts, archaeological sites, and marine archaeological sites. The identification and evaluation of such resources is based upon archaeological field work undertaken in accordance with the ~~Ontario Heritage Act~~ Ontario Heritage Act.

Character sub-area: A geographic area within the District that is a component part of the District and that contributes to the District's *cultural heritage value* while retaining unique *heritage attributes* that reflects a distinct character.

Combined property: A *property* that contains both *contributing* and *non-contributing properties* due to the consolidation of two properties, or a *contributing property* that contains significant vacant space in addition to buildings or structures.

Complement: To physically and visually *conserve* or enhance the *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes* of the District in regard to ~~alterations~~ alterations, *additions* and *new development*. To be physically complementary refers to the use of materials and construction methods that do not detract from or damage *heritage attributes*. To be visually complementary refers to the selection of materials and design, massing, proportions and details so as to ~~conserve~~ conserve and enhance the District's *cultural heritage value*. ~~Complementary~~ Complementary and complement have corresponding meanings.

Conservation: The identification, protection, management and use of built heritage resources, *cultural heritage landscapes* and ~~archaeological resources~~ archaeological resources in a manner that ensures their *cultural heritage value* is retained under the ~~Ontario Heritage Act~~ Ontario Heritage Act. Conservation can include *preservation*, *rehabilitation*, *restoration*, or a combination of these ~~conservation treatments~~ conservation treatments. ~~Conservation~~ Conservation and conserve have corresponding meanings.

Conservation process: As defined by the *Standards and Guidelines*, the sequential process of understanding, planning and intervening required when undertaking ~~conservation~~ conservation projects.

Conservation treatments: The actions of *preservation, rehabilitation, and restoration* as defined by the [Standards and Standards and Guidelines](#) to be used individually or in combination when undertaking [conservation conservation](#) projects.

Contributing property: A *property, structure, landscape element or other feature* of an HCD that supports the identified significant *cultural heritage value, heritage attribute and integrity* of the District.

Cultural heritage landscape: [A defined geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Indigenous community. The area may include features such as buildings, structures, spaces, views, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or association. Cultural heritage landscapes may be properties that have been determined to have cultural heritage value or interest under the Ontario Heritage Act, or have been included on federal and/or international registers, and/or protected through official plan, zoning by-law, or other land use planning mechanisms \(PPS 2020\).](#)

~~A defined geographical area that may have been modified by human activity and is identified as having cultural heritage value or interest by a community, including an Aboriginal community. The area may involve features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites or natural elements that are valued together for their interrelationship, meaning or association (PPS 2014).~~

Demolition: The complete destruction of a heritage structure or *property* from its site, including the disassembly of structures and properties on the Heritage Register for the purpose of reassembly at a later date. *Demolition* and *demolish* have corresponding meanings.

Guideline: Recommended methods of achieving an associated *policy*.

Heritage attributes: In relation to real *property*, and to the buildings and structures on the real *property*, the attributes of the *property*, buildings and structures that contribute to their *cultural heritage value* [as described in the District Significance section of this Plan and designation by-law of individual properties \(designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act\)](#). These include the materials, forms, location, spatial configurations, uses and cultural associations or meanings that contribute to the *cultural heritage value* of an historic place, which must be retained to [conserve](#) ~~preserve~~ its *cultural heritage value*.

Integrity: A measure of the wholeness and intactness of the *cultural heritage value* and *heritage attributes* of a *contributing property* or the District.

Maintenance: Routine, cyclical, non-destructive actions necessary to slow the deterioration of an historic place. It entails periodic inspection; routine, cyclical, non-destructive cleaning; minor *repair* and refinishing operations and the replacement of damaged or deteriorated materials that are impractical to save. *Maintenance* and *maintain* have corresponding meanings.

New development: new construction and/or [additions](#) ~~additions~~ to existing buildings or structures.

Non-contributing property: A *property, structure, landscape element or feature* of a district that does not support the overall *cultural heritage value, heritage attributes and integrity* of the District.

Podium: A type of base building - the lower portion of a tall building, designed to define and support adjacent ~~adjacent~~ streets, parks, and open space at an appropriate scale, integrate with adjacent ~~adjacent~~ buildings, assist to achieve transition down to lower-scale buildings, and minimize the impact of parking and servicing on the *public realm*.

Policy: ~~A rule for managing change on properties to conserve the cultural heritage value and heritage attributes of the District.~~ In this document, policies set the direction for the management of the District and are the primary means by which the Plan area's cultural heritage values and heritage attributes are conserved and change is managed.

Preservation: The action or process of protecting, *maintaining*, and/or stabilizing the existing materials, form, and *integrity* of a historic place or of an individual component, while protecting its heritage value. *Preservation* and *preserve* have corresponding meanings.

Primary Structure: The main structure of a ~~residential house-form~~ building on a contributing property, not including rear wings or additions ~~additions~~ that are not visible from the street.

Property: real *property*, including all buildings and structures thereof.

Public realm: Any public space, including but not limited to: streets, sidewalks, laneways, parks, and privately owned publically-accessible open spaces, walkways or easements.

Rehabilitation: The action or process of making possible a continuing or compatible contemporary use of a historic place or an individual component, while protecting its heritage value.

Removal: The complete and permanent dislocation of a building or structure from its *property* to another *property*.

Relocation: The dislocation of a building from one portion of a *property* and placement on to another.

Repair: *Maintenance* type work that does not require a significant material change and that has no negative impact on its *integrity*.

Restoration: The action or process of accurately revealing, recovering or representing the state of a historic place or of an individual component, as it appeared at a particular period in its history, while protecting its heritage value. *Restoration* and *restore* have corresponding meanings.

Setback: A horizontal distance measured at a right angle from any lot line to the nearest part of the main wall of a building or structure.

Step back: the measure by which a portion of a building mass above grade level is recessed from the wall of the building directly below.

Streetwall: The *streetwall* is the portion(s) of a building immediately fronting onto a street, forming a built form

edge to the adjacent ~~adjacent~~ right-of-way.

Three dimensional integrity: A building in three dimensions, on all of its sides including its roof planes.

B. Incentives

Incentive programs are critical *conservation* tools. They can provide funding support for *property* owners who are ~~conserving conserving~~ their properties, often at considerable expense.

The City of Toronto offers two heritage incentive programs to assist owners of eligible heritage properties with the cost of *conservation*: the Toronto Heritage Grant Program, and the Toronto Heritage Property Tax Rebate Program. Beyond providing funding support, these programs assist successful applicants in reaching the highest *conservation* standards possible for their projects.

The Toronto Heritage Grant Program provides matching grant funds for eligible heritage conservation ~~conservation~~ work to owners of properties that are designated under Part IV or Part V of the OHA. The program receives stable annual funding; at the time of writing, funding is at just over \$300,000 annually. Revisions to the program in 2015 have updated eligibility to include residential and tax-exempt properties exclusively.

The Heritage Property Tax Rebate Program offers a tax rebate of 40% of taxes paid on the portions of eligible properties that have been identified as attributes in a Heritage Easement Agreement. Revisions to the program in 2015 updated eligibility to include commercial or industrial properties exclusively, including properties within Heritage Conservation Districts. This update included revisions that recalculate rebates to provide matching funds for eligible *conservation* work. The provincial government shares the cost of rebates with the City according to the education portion of the *property* taxes.

C. Character Sub-Area Maps

D. Index of Contributing Properties

See Attachment D

E. Statements of Contribution

See Attachment E

F. List of Non-Contributing Properties

See Attachment F

G. Transition Provision

This Plan does not apply to those approvals identified in Appendix “G” (the “Listed Approvals”). For clarity such Listed Approvals are inclusive of instruments that have been approved in principle, either by a decision of Council or the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal, and of any pending or subsequent site plan applications which implement such approvals.

This Plan also does not apply to any modifications or changes to such Listed Approvals provided that such modifications or changes are substantially in accordance with the Conservation Plan related to the Listed Approval, if a Conservation Plan was required as part of the earlier application. For the purposes of this appendix, “approved in principle” shall mean an approval by City Council or the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal approving a proposal in principle, but does not require bills to have been adopted by Council or a final Order from the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal.

This appendix shall not be interpreted as to exclude or exempt a property from this Plan should a new development application(s) be proposed on a property that is not substantially in accordance with such Listed Approval.