



**STAFF REPORT
ACTION REQUIRED**

**Supplementary Report: Official Plan Five Year Review -
Amendment to Adopt New Heritage and Public Realm
Policies**

Date:	February 4, 2013
To:	Planning and Growth Management Committee
From:	Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning Division
Wards:	All Wards
Reference Number:	P:\2013\Cluster B\PLN\PGMC\PG13015

SUMMARY

On October 12, 2012 the Planning and Growth Management Committee held a special public meeting under Section 26 of the Planning Act to consider amendments to the Official Plan heritage and public realm policies as part of the current Official Plan Review. The proposed policies reflect changes to Provincial legislation and improve heritage conservation practices throughout the City. The proposed amendment also adds policies to the Public Realm section of the Official Plan to provide for the protection of important views.

At its' meeting of October 12, 2012, the Committee heard deputations and adjourned the special public meeting until January 28, 2013 and directed the Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning to form a working group and report further to Planning and Growth Management Committee at its January 28, 2013 meeting. Committee re-commenced and adjourned the matter at this meeting and directed that the matter be further considered at its February 28, 2013 meeting. This report recommends the adoption of the attached Official Plan Amendment containing new heritage policies and public realm view policies that further amend the policies that were before Committee on October 12, 2012, to reflect the discussions and final recommendation of staff in response to comments received from the working group.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The City Planning Division recommends that:

1. City Council amend the Official Plan substantially in accordance with the proposed Official Plan Amendment appended as Attachment No. 1.
2. City Council authorize the City Solicitor to make such stylistic and technical changes to the proposed Official Plan Amendment as may be required.
3. City Council declare by resolution to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing that the Official Plan Amendment:
 - a. conforms with Provincial Plans or does not conflict with them;
 - b. has regard to the matters of Provincial Interest listed in Section 2 of the Planning Act; and
 - c. is consistent with policy statements issued under subsection 3(1) of the Planning Act.

Financial Impact

The recommendations in this report have no financial impact.

DECISION HISTORY

At its meeting of July 11, 12 and 13, 2012 City Council considered recommendations regarding draft new Official Plan policies contained in a staff report dated May 24, 2012 as amended by Planning and Growth Management Committee on June 18, 2012. Council received the draft Official Plan Heritage Policies and directed staff to consult with the public at large, Community Preservation Panels, City Divisions and BILD to obtain their feedback. Council directed the Chief Planner to conduct a public open house on these policies in September 2012 and to report back with final recommendations and an Official Plan amendment on heritage policies to the October 12, 2012 meeting of Planning and Growth Management Committee for a Special Public Meeting in fulfillment of Section 26 of the Planning Act. The consultations occurred over the summer of 2012, the open house was held in September 2012 and proposed Official Plan Amendment No. 199 was submitted to the Planning and Growth Management Committee.

At its meeting of October 12, 2012 the Planning and Growth Management Committee held a special public meeting under Section 26 of the Planning Act to consider adoption of Official Plan Amendment No. 199 containing new heritage policies and public realm view policies as part of the 5 Year Review of the Official Plan. Committee also considering a supplementary report dated October 10, 2012 that recommended amendments to the Official Plan Amendment No. 199 resulting from deputations to the October 1, 2012 special meeting of the Toronto Preservation Board regarding Amendment No. 199 presented at this time.

After hearing deputations, Planning and Growth Management Committee took the following actions:

1. Adjourned its Special Public Meeting under Section 26 of the Planning Act until January 28, 2013 to discuss the proposed revisions to the Official Plan Heritage policies.
2. Directed the Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning, to form a working group consisting of members of the development and preservation community to ensure principles of heritage, vista and view corridors are protected, and report to the Planning and Growth Management Committee on January 28, 2013.
3. Referred a motion by Councillor Vaughan to the Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning, for consideration and reporting back. The Chief Planner and Executive Director, Planning was requested to consider:
 - a. Adding side bar definitions for the phrases 'minimizing impact' and 'adjacent'.
 - b. Bringing forward view corridor provisions for the fire hall clock tower on Queen Street East in the Beaches and One Spadina Circle consistent with the Bloor Street Visioning Study and, if needed, additional protection for the Knox College Building silhouette.

At its meeting of January 28, 2013, Planning and Growth Management Committee recommenced the Special Public Meeting under Section 26 of the Planning Act to consider proposed Official Plan Amendment No. 199 introducing heritage and public realm policies resulting from the Official Plan Review. Committee received a report dated January 7, 2013 from the Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning Division that recommended Committee defer consideration of the matter and further adjourn the statutory public meeting on the matter to the Committee meeting of February 28, 2013 in order to allow staff additional time to meet with and consider feedback from the working group. Committee adjourned the statutory Special Public Meeting under Section 26 of the Planning Act to be continued at the Committee meeting of February 28, 2013.

COMMENTS

Working Group Composition

City Planning Division staff formed a working group consisting of representatives from BILD (development industry interests) and members of the Heritage Advisory Committee, representing various interests of the heritage preservation community. The Heritage Advisory Committee was the Committee established to provide advice and a sounding board on the formulation of the policies. The working group met to discuss the proposed heritage and public realm view policies on November 27, 2012. Staff

considered the input and comments of the working group and sent out a revised set of the policies to reflect the issues raised in their deliberations that City Planning staff were prepared to support. The working group met again on January 11, 2013 to discuss the revised policies. As not all discussions were concluded on the revised policies, Planning Staff also received written submissions from McCarthy Tetrault on behalf of BILD, Heritage Toronto and ERA Architects.

City Planning staff recommend a number of changes to the policies in response to the advice and submissions of the working group. Official Plan Amendment No. 199 as proposed to be revised as a result of these discussions, and recommended for adoption, is found in Attachment 1 to this report and identified as Proposed Amendment No. 199. Some of the issues raised by BILD and ERA are broad and fundamental and would alter the direction of the policies, and therefore are not supported by staff and are not included in the Proposed Amendment No. 199 attached to this report.

BILD continues to have concerns with a significant number of the policies in the proposed Official Plan Amendment No. 199 in essence touching on most of the subsections of the heritage policies and public realm view policies. BILD also requested further meetings and face-to-face negotiations such as those that occurred in the Ontario Municipal Board settlement process after UDI/GTHBA (BILD predecessors) appealed the 2002 Official Plan.

BILD has set out key principles regarding the heritage and view policies as follows:

- 1 Views must be appropriate and described with precision.
2. The relative extent and quality of the heritage cultural values to which policies are to be applied must be capable of being challenged.
3. The application of policy directives should be commensurate with, or proportional to, the extent and quality of heritage conservation values in issue.
4. Heritage evaluations must always take place in the context of the consideration of all other applicable land use planning considerations.

Staff concur and have responded to the concern that the description of protected views should be more precise and have added a new Schedule 4 to the Official Plan that provides a detailed description of each proposed view to be listed in the Official Plan. Staff agree with BILD that heritage policies are one aspect of Official Plan policies to be considered and reconciled with others in making land use decisions. It is for precisely that reason that policy 5.6.1 of the Official Plan states that the Plan has to be read as a whole to understand its comprehensive and integrative intent for setting priorities and making decisions.

While some of the important changes requested by BILD have been incorporated into proposed Amendment No. 199, incorporating all of the changes requested by BILD would considerably weaken the usefulness of the Official Plan heritage policies in preserving Toronto's heritage resources in the coming years and decades. As the majority of deputants before Committee have supported the direction of the proposed Official Plan

heritage policies and requested adoption, and as the amendments represent good planning and heritage conservation, staff recommend that Committee and Council proceed with the adoption of proposed Amendment No. 199.

Revisions to General Heritage Policies

The general heritage policies have been reorganized to provide a logical progression as suggested by working group members. Policies 1 to 4 address the progression of creating the Heritage Register, identifying and evaluating properties and heritage conservation districts with potential cultural heritage value or interest, designating them, and conserving them using consistent Council-adopted criteria.

Policy 2 has been altered to reflect that heritage conservation districts, not just individual properties of potential heritage value will be identified and evaluated, and that the evaluation of the cultural heritage value of a heritage conservation district may also consider social or community value and natural or scientific value. A new sidebar has been added to inform the reader that criteria for evaluating the potential cultural heritage value of proposed heritage conservation districts are included in the Council-adopted document, *Heritage Conservation Districts in Toronto: Procedures, Policies and Terms of Reference*. The description of the evaluation more precisely cites consistency with Provincial regulations, rather than simply 'using provincial criteria'. A sentence has been added to the end of Policy 2 to state that properties that demonstrate cultural heritage value are significant for the purpose of Section 2.6 of the Provincial Policy Statement in order to connect the evaluation of cultural heritage value with the relevant part of the Provincial Policy Statement.

Provincial staff on the working group identified an issue with proposed Policy 3 that states that archaeological sites could be protected by including them on the Heritage Register and in some cases designating them under the Ontario Heritage Act. Once archaeological sites are publicly identified there is a greater probability that they might be disturbed. Policy 3 has been revised to refer to 'known' archaeological sites so that only those publically identified would be included on the Heritage Register and/or designated.

In the original Amendment No. 199 considered at the October 12, 2012 statutory public meeting, Policy 3 provided that properties on the Heritage Register would be conserved and maintained consistent with standards and guidelines adopted by Council. The non-statutory sidebar contained the reference to the specific documents adopted by Council to guide their conservation. Representatives of the development industry suggested that it would be clearer and more transparent to state in the policy that the Council-adopted *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada* would be the basis for the conservation of properties on the Heritage Register. Staff have incorporated this change and revised Policy 4.

The adaptive re-use of properties on the Heritage Register is encouraged in Policy 5 of the original Amendment No. 199 and is contained in Policy 6 of proposed Amendment No. 199 attached as Attachment No. 1 to this report. The revised policy clarifies the

standards for adaptive reuse to be used are those in the Council-adopted *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada*.

In original Amendment No. 199, Policy 12 provided that the 'City would develop a consultation protocol' for matters related to properties on the Heritage Register and archaeological sites and artifacts that are of interest to First Nations and Métis. The revised Policy 13 now specifies that the City will develop such a Protocol 'in collaboration' with First Nations, Métis and the Provincial Government. The revised Policy 13 does not reference the term 'consultation' to avoid confusion over differing requirements for such consultation at federal, provincial and municipal levels of government.

Revisions to 'Raising Heritage Awareness' Policies

Policy 15 in the original Amendment No. 199 spoke to promoting heritage properties and archaeological sites and artifacts through educational programs, museums, local celebrations and other programming opportunities. Provincial staff on the working group raised the issue that the promotion of archaeological sites would pinpoint their location and increase the likelihood of the sites being disturbed. The policy, now revised as Policy 16, refers only to 'publicly known' archaeological sites and artifacts so that sites not known to the general public would not be promoted.

A First Nations member of the working group made the group aware of an emerging 'Moccasin Identifier' program to identify important First Nations sites. The sidebar which refers to the interpretation and commemoration of 'lost sites' has been amended to include co-operation with First Nations in commemorating such sites.

Revisions to Heritage 'Incentives' Policies

Policy 18 in the original Amendment No. 199 provided that the conservation and maintenance of designated heritage properties funded through grants or incentives would be completed to 'the highest standard of conservation'. Working group members pointed out that such an absolute standard may be inappropriately limiting. Staff have proposed revisions to Policy 19 that refers to achieving 'excellence in conservation' consistent with Council's adopted standards and guidelines.

BILD representatives on the Working Group pointed out that the density/gross floor area exemption for the preservation of a designated heritage property, or a substantial portion of one, contained in Policy 20 in the original Amendment 19 could be interpreted as putting an absolute cap on total floor area equal to the zoned permissions plus the additional gross floor area of the heritage structure being retained. This could inadvertently trigger a requirement for the submission of an Official Plan amendment for density, where none would otherwise be required. This is resolved in the proposed Policy 21 by specifying that the additional gross floor area specifically provided through the gross floor exemption policy, not the additional floor area of the entire project, will not exceed the area of the heritage structure being retained.

The same policy previously provided that no additional density would be granted for the incorporation of facades or historic building elements into new development. It was the intention of staff that historic building elements referred to elements such as lintels, windows or other features. Working Group members pointed out that historic building elements could comprise a substantial portion of a heritage building. The policy has been revised to refer to 'isolated building elements' rather than historic building elements.

Revisions to Heritage Impact Assessment Policies

City staff and Working Group members were in consensus that the Official Plan should address the actual content of a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA). Policy 23 of proposed Amendment No. 199 provides that an HIA will address all applicable heritage conservation policies of the Official Plan and demonstrate conservation options and mitigation measures that are consistent with those policies. In addition, a new sidebar sets out in detail the type of information that would generally be included in a separate conservation strategy.

BILD representatives on the Working Group were of the opinion that Policy 22 in the original proposed Amendment No. 199 did not make clear why it was necessary to require a Heritage Impact Assessment when a building adjacent to a property on the Heritage Register was demolished. Revised Policy 24 now clarifies that the reason is to ensure the physical stability of the property on the Heritage Register.

Revisions to Policies Relating to Development of Properties on the Heritage Register

BILD's solicitor raised concern with Policy 26 of the original Amendment No. 199 in that it stated that new construction on, or adjacent to, a property on the Heritage Register should be designed to 'minimize' visual and physical impact on the heritage property. The concern related to the point that to 'minimize' the impact most effectively might preclude any construction. This same concern was expressed at the October 12, 2012 statutory public meeting. Committee requested staff to add a definition of 'minimizing impact' to clarify the policy intent. The policy intent was to design new construction in a manner that would mitigate the visual and physical impact on the heritage property. The revised Policy 27 in the proposed Amendment No. 199 now states that new construction should 'mitigate' visual and physical impacts on the heritage property. The policy further articulates aspects of the design of the new construction to be considered such as scale, massing, materials, height, building orientation and location relative to the heritage property.

The policy addressing the relocation of a heritage building or structure within a property on the Heritage Register, now proposed Policy 30, is essentially the same but has been revised to delete repetition in the policy.

Revisions to Archaeological Resource Policies

The proposed Amendment No. 199 presented to Planning and Growth Management Committee at the October 2012, statutory public meeting contained a policy that

permitted development and site alteration on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential only where the archaeological resources have been assessed and conserved. The Working Group noted that the resources should be documented as well as assessed and conserved. Policy 36 has been revised to include documentation.

The initial policy in Amendment No. 199 identifying in-situ preservation as the preferred conservation strategy for an archaeological site provided alternatives where in situ conservation 'is not possible'. The Working Group raised the point that it is always 'possible' to provide in situ conservation on an archaeological site simply by halting its development. This was not the policy intent and revised Policy 36 in Attachment No 1 to this report now refers to alternatives where 'in situ conservation is not feasible' clarifying that the policy was not intended to preclude development on the site.

Where lands proposed for development may include archaeological resources or constitute an area of archaeological potential a policy requires the owner to undertake studies by a licensed archaeologist to, among other matters, provide the City with a copy of the Provincial concurrence letter recognizing the completion of the Archaeological assessment. BILD's solicitor raised the point that the Province may choose not to issue such letters in the future. Proposed Policy 38 requires the City to receive the Provincial Concurrence letter only where one is issued by the Province.

Where archaeological resources are encountered or documented and found to be First Nations or Métis in origin the original version of OPA NO. 199 called on the development proponent to provide a copy of the Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment report(s), prior to the development proceeding, to the First Nations or Métis with the closest cultural affiliation and in whose traditional territories the archaeological resources were found. BILD's representatives did not wish to have the responsibility of assessing what First Nations or Métis group the reports should be submitted to. This is a valid concern. As the City receives a copy of the Archaeological Assessment report(s), proposed Policy 39 now states that the City will provide a copy of the Archaeological Assessment reports to the relevant First Nations or Métis group(s) identified in the Stage 1 and 2 archaeological reports.

The same policy originally required consultation with the relevant First Nations or Métis group(s) to identify conservation or interpretation approaches. Because the word 'consultation' has different requirements for different levels of government in this context, the policy now calls for 'engagement' with the relevant First Nations or Métis group(s) to obtain input on appropriate conservation or interpretation approaches.

Cultural Heritage Landscapes

The discussion concerning Cultural Heritage Landscapes was the subject of differing and conflicting opinions. The policies as proposed in the original Amendment No. 199 allowed for Cultural heritage landscapes to be identified and included on the register – enabling the use of both Part IV and Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act, as well as listing

without necessarily designating. The policies also encouraged a full suite of other planning tools to be considered for their applicability to the goals of conserving cultural heritage landscapes.

Feedback from some stakeholders suggested that utilizing the Ontario Heritage Act for the protection of cultural heritage landscapes was too restrictive, while other stakeholders had serious concerns that not evaluating properties for the purpose of including them on the heritage register would result in an arbitrariness of how this resource type is identified and conserved.

The Provincial Policy Statement indicates that Cultural Heritage landscapes of cultural heritage value shall be conserved. Accordingly, staff proposed that the conservation of cultural heritage landscapes of cultural heritage value is best addressed by using the Ontario Heritage Act, which also contains regulations for determining cultural heritage value. Employing established criteria in concert with the Ontario Heritage Act, while also allowing for other supportive planning tools removes the arbitrariness of identifying and protecting cultural heritage landscapes.

As a result, the previously proposed policies remain unchanged, as they strike a balance between the widely ranging concerns of the stakeholders in the working group.

Revisions to Views Policies Arising

The policies related to views, both in the Heritage and Public Realm sections of the proposed Amendment No. 199 were the subject of the most extensive changes from the original Amendment No. 199. There was a consensus that as much precision as possible should be given to the description of the views to be protected. To that end a new Schedule 4 is proposed to be added to the Official Plan with more detailed descriptions of the prominent building, structure, landscape or natural feature that is the subject of the view and the point of origin of the view in the public realm.

Revised Policy 10 makes reference to the importance of views from the public realm to prominent buildings, structures, landscapes and natural features identified on Maps 7a and 7b and makes reference to their description in Schedule 4 to the Official Plan. BILD expressed a concern that the general statement in Policy 9 about the importance of views might be misused in the future to protect views not specifically listed on Maps 7a and 7b and Schedule 4. The revised Policy 10 now provides a transparent and fair process for the consideration of additional important views. It states that additional views from the public realm to prominent buildings, structures, landscapes and natural heritage features may be added to Maps 7a and 7b and Schedule 4 through amendment to the Official Plan. A sidebar has also been added to clarify that Maps 7a and 7b do not represent an exhaustive list of important views across the City, and that the maps will be modified from time to time to include additional views by way of the Official Plan amendment specified in Policy 10.

Policy 9 of Section 3.1.1, Public Realm originally stated that public works and private development will maintain, frame and, 'where possible', create public views to important natural and human-made features from the public realm. BILD representatives pointed out that this could be interpreted in a way that would result in no development on a site in order to 'create' such a public view. Policy 9 has been revised to call for the creation of such public views 'where possible through project design' which should clarify that the policy is not intended to sterilize a development site.

The portion of the original Policy 10 that dealt with views of the skyline of the Downtown and Central Waterfront and North York Centre also raised concerns among BILD representatives as potentially affecting the placement, height or design of new buildings within those geographic areas. A new separate Policy 11 has been proposed to clarify that these views are dynamic and include new buildings within these areas, which should allay concerns about the intent of the policy.

The policies proposed for Section 3.1.5 of the Official Plan dealing with views of heritage properties has also undergone changes. Where a view shown on Maps 7a and 7b is a view of a property on the Heritage Register, this has now been indicated on those maps. A new Policy 47 has been inserted to provide certainty and clarity that it is simply views from the point of origin to heritage properties identified on Maps 7a and 7b that are to remain unobstructed. The policy regarding views of the Queens Park Legislative Assembly, Old City Hall and City Hall has been relocated to Section 3.1.5 as these are all views of Heritage properties. It is only in the instance of these three properties that view protection will include the prevention of any further intrusions visible above and behind the building silhouette, in addition to protecting the view to the buildings from any further obstruction.

The policy pertaining to assessing the heritage impact when a view may be compromised has also been moved to Section 3.1.5 as heritage impact only applies where the view of a heritage property is involved.

Revisions to Definitions

New definitions were requested by the working group for the terms 'cultural heritage landscape' and 'integrity', which were added to this version. The definition of adjacent and alteration has also been slightly modified on the advice of the working group.

Concerns were raised that the definition of 'adjacent' may be too far reaching, where properties separated by open space may not be a reasonable measure (for example if they were on opposite sides of High Park). The definition has been modified to indicate that this definition applies when a property is immediately across from, or near to a property on the register.

The definition of alteration now refers to alterations on other properties that have the potential to impact or change a property on the heritage register. The intent of this change

is to ensure that if an application to develop an adjacent property is made, it may require a heritage permit where it will have an effect on the property on the register.

The definition of cultural heritage landscape is taken from the Provincial Policy Statement and was previously included in OPA NO. 199 as a sidebar to the section on cultural heritage landscapes. It has been relocated to the definitions section, but has not been changed in any other way.

A definition for integrity was created for OPA NO. 199. It is an adaptation of the definition of integrity used in the UNESCO operating guidelines for the World Heritage properties. Adapted to local use it now refers to cultural heritage value and attributes, consistent with the Ontario Heritage Act and current provincial practice.

CONTACT

Kerri A. Voumvakis, Director
Strategic Initiatives and Policy Analysis
City Planning Division

Tel. No. 416-392-8148
Fax No. 416-392-3821
E-mail: kvoumva@toronto.ca

SIGNATURE

Jennifer Keesmaat, MES, MCIP, RPP
Chief Planner and Executive Director
City Planning Division

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment No. 1: OPA NO. 199, View Protection and Heritage Conservation Policies, Schedule 4, View Descriptions, Map 7a, Map 7b.

AMENDMENT NO. 199

ATTACHMENT NO. 1

Authority: Planning and Growth Management Committee Item No.____ as adopted by City Council at its meeting of _____.

CITY OF TORONTO

BY-LAW No. -2012

To Adopt Amendment No. 199 to the Official Plan of the City of Toronto with respect to the Public Realm and Heritage Policies

WHEREAS authority is given to Council under the *Planning Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c.P. 13, as amended to pass this By-law; and

WHEREAS Council of the City of Toronto has provided information to the public, held a public meeting in accordance with Section 17 of the *Planning Act* and held a special public meeting in accordance with the requirements of Section 26 the *Planning Act*;

The Council of the City of Toronto HEREBY ENACTS as follows:

1. The attached amendment No. 199 to the Official Plan of the City of Toronto is hereby adopted..

ENACTED AND PASSED this day of April, A.D. 2013.

FRANCES NUNZIATA
Speaker

ULLI S. WATKISS
City Clerk

AMENDMENT NO. 199 TO THE OFFICIAL PLAN OF THE CITY OF TORONTO

The following text and schedule constitute Amendment No. 199 to the Official Plan for the City of Toronto, being an amendment to Section 3.1.1, 3.1.5, 5.6 maps 7 to 34 inclusive and Schedule 3 "Application Requirements:"

1. Section 3.1.1, The Public Realm, is amended by deleting policy 9, substituting therefore the following policies 9, 10 and 11 and renumbering existing policies 10 to 18 inclusive, accordingly:

9. Views from the public realm to prominent buildings, structures, landscapes and natural features are an important part of the form and image of the City. Public works and private development will maintain, frame and, where possible through project design, create views from the public realm to important natural and human-made features.
10. Views from the public realm to prominent, buildings, structures, landscapes and natural features identified on Maps 7a and 7b are important and are described in Schedule 4. Additional views from the public realm to prominent buildings, structures, landscapes and natural heritage features may be added to Maps 7a and 7b and Schedule 4 through amendment to the Official Plan.

SIDEBAR: Maps 7a and 7b identify a selection of important views across the City, however this selection of views is not exhaustive. These maps are living documents which may be added to or modified from time-to-time, through an Official Plan Amendment. If a view is not included on this map, it should not be assumed that it does not warrant inclusion on the map at a later time.

11. Public works and private development will maintain views from the public realm to the skylines of the *Downtown and the Central Waterfront, North York Centre, and Scarborough Centre* shown on Maps 7a and 7b. These views are dynamic and are expected to evolve over time to include new buildings constructed within the Downtown and Central Waterfront, the North York Centre and the Scarborough Centre.

2. Section 3.1.5, Heritage Conservation, is deleted in its entirety and replaced by the following:

HERITAGE CONSERVATION

Toronto's cultural heritage can be seen in the significant buildings, properties, districts, landscapes and archaeological sites found throughout the city. Their protection, wise use and management demonstrate the City's goal to integrate the significant achievements of our people, their history, our landmarks, and our neighbourhoods into a shared sense of place and belonging for its inhabitants.

The City's significant heritage properties tell stories about the forces and events that have shaped Toronto. They reveal the City's historical geography; a lakefront terrain carved by rivers and valleys that 11,000 years ago first allowed our First Nations to hunt and fish, and later farm. The Plan policies call for an engagement protocol with First Nations and the Métis for heritage properties and archaeological sites that may be of interest to them, as well as ensuring that information is provided to First Nations and Métis where archaeological resources are found to be First Nations or Métis in origin.

Our cultural heritage includes both the tangible and intangible values and attributes of the distinct towns, villages, and cities that have come together to create the Toronto we know today. They enable us to reflect upon the diversity of our communities and neighbourhoods, and our distinct role as a provincial capital. The scale, number and significance of our cultural heritage resources is described in an on-going process of identification, evaluation and preservation that includes a Heritage Register and a comprehensive mapping of the City's archaeologically sensitive areas and sites. The identification of heritage properties that tell our City's stories is an on-going process.

Our heritage properties represent a collective past and their protection, use and adaptive reuse also enrich our daily experience of the City; from commuting through Union Station and dining at the Distillery District, to hiking the Humber River and Rouge Valleys, which were important trade routes and the sites of large and vibrant First Nations settlements. We celebrate communally in squares in front of the Scarborough and North York Civic Centres and City Hall. Consciously or unconsciously, our heritage resources are part of our daily experience of our City.

Cultural Heritage is an important component of sustainable development and place making. The preservation of our cultural heritage is essential to the character of this urban and liveable city that can contribute to other

social cultural, economic and environmental goals of the City. As a result, heritage conservation is integrated within the policies in many other sections of this Official Plan. The heritage policies of this Plan not only promote the preservation of important heritage buildings and structures but also the public views of them for the enjoyment of Torontonians. Schedule 4 describes the significance of each of the views of important heritage properties shown on Maps 7A and 7B.

The conservation of natural heritage is also an important element of heritage conservation in Toronto. The Official Plan provides for the conservation of Toronto's urban forest, ravines and river valleys in policies protecting the Natural Heritage System contained in Section 3.4 and Map 9 of the Plan. The conservation of important heritage resources includes those policies protecting Toronto's Natural Heritage Areas.

As Toronto continues to grow and intensify this growth must recognize and be balanced with the ongoing conservation of our significant heritage properties, views, natural heritage system, and landscapes. In this context, the regulatory tools available to the City will be used to conserve the significant cultural heritage values and attributes of our heritage properties. Preservation of cultural heritage resources not only enriches our lives, it is an important shared responsibility and a prominent civic legacy that we must leave for future generations.

GENERAL HERITAGE POLICIES

1. The Heritage Register will be maintained and will contain all properties and Heritage Conservation Districts of cultural heritage value or interest that are designated under Parts IV and V of the Ontario Heritage Act, and may also include properties that are not designated but have been identified by Council for their cultural heritage value or interest. The Heritage Register will be publicly accessible.
2. Properties and Heritage Conservation Districts of potential cultural heritage value or interest will be identified and evaluated to determine their cultural heritage value consistent with provincial regulations, where applicable, and will include the consideration of cultural heritage values including design or physical value, historical or associative value and contextual value. The evaluation of cultural heritage value of a Heritage Conservation District may also consider social or community value and natural or scientific value. The contributions of Toronto's diverse cultures will be considered in determining the cultural heritage value of properties

on the Heritage Register. Properties that demonstrate cultural heritage value are significant for the purpose of section 2.6 the Provincial Policy Statement.

SIDEBAR: Criteria for evaluating the potential Cultural Heritage Value of proposed Heritage Conservation Districts are included in *Heritage Conservation Districts in Toronto: Procedures, Policies and Terms of Reference*.

3. Significant heritage properties, including Heritage Conservation Districts and archaeological sites that are publicly known, will be protected by designating them under the Ontario Heritage Act and/or including them on the Heritage Register.
4. Properties on the Heritage Register will be conserved and maintained consistent with the *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada*, as revised from time to time and as adopted by Council.

SIDEBAR: The *Ontario Heritage Toolkit: Heritage Places of Worship* is a useful reference document for making decisions about how to approach the protection and *alteration* of places of worship included on the Heritage Register.

5. Proposed *alterations*, development, and/or public works on or *adjacent* to, a property on the Heritage Register will ensure that the *integrity* of the heritage property's cultural heritage value and attributes will be conserved, prior to work commencing on the property and to the satisfaction of the City. Where a Heritage Impact Assessment is required in Schedule 3 of the Official Plan, it will describe and assess the potential impacts and mitigation strategies for the proposed alteration, development or public work.
6. The adaptive re-use of properties on the Heritage Register is encouraged for new uses permitted in the applicable Official Plan land use designation, consistent with the *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada*.
7. Prior to undertaking an approved *alteration* to a property on the Heritage Register, the property will be recorded and documented by the owner, to the satisfaction of the City.
8. When a City-owned property on the Heritage Register is no longer required for its current use, the City will demonstrate excellence in

the conservation, maintenance and compatible adaptive reuse of the property.

9. When a City-owned property on the Heritage Register is sold, leased or transferred to another owner, it will be designated under the Ontario Heritage Act. A Heritage Easement Agreement will be secured and monitored, and public access maintained to its heritage attributes, where feasible. This policy may not apply to City-owned properties in Heritage Conservation Districts that are not considered to be individually significant.
10. A heritage management plan will be adopted by Council. The heritage management plan will be a comprehensive and evolving strategy for the identification, conservation and management of all properties on the Heritage Register, unidentified and potential heritage properties.
11. A protocol will be developed to co-ordinate and direct actions of the City and its agents in the event that a property on the Heritage Register is threatened by an emergency such as a fire, flood, wilful damage or other unanticipated events. This protocol will address the conservation of the heritage property once the primary life and safety objectives of evacuating and ensuring public safety have been completed.
12. Designated heritage properties will be protected against deterioration by neglect through the enforcement of heritage property standards by-laws.
13. In collaboration with First Nations, Métis and the Provincial Government, the City will develop a protocol for matters related to identifying, evaluating and protecting properties and cultural heritage landscapes on the Heritage Register, archaeological sites and artifacts where they may be of interest to First Nations, or Métis

RAISING HERITAGE AWARENESS

14. The development of neighbourhood heritage initiatives will be encouraged throughout Toronto to promote an understanding of local history and the evolution of our neighbourhoods and open spaces.
15. Potential and existing properties of cultural heritage value or interest, including *cultural heritage landscapes* and Heritage

Conservation Districts, will be identified and included in area planning studies and plans with recommendations for further study, evaluation and conservation.

16. Properties on the Heritage Register and publicly known archaeological sites and artifacts will be promoted through educational programs, museums, local celebrations and other programming opportunities.
17. Commemoration of lost historical sites will be encouraged whenever a new private development or public work is undertaken in the vicinity of historic sites, such as those where major historical events occurred, important buildings or landscape features have disappeared or where important cultural activities have taken place. Interpretation of existing properties on the Heritage Register will also be encouraged.
 1. **SIDEBAR:** Commemoration and interpretation programs that recognize various cultural or ethnic groups can add to the overall understanding of the City's lost sites, including co-operation with First Nations in programs commemorating and interpreting sites of importance. This may include, among others, programs such as the emerging moccasin identifier program.

INCENTIVES

18. Incentives for the conservation and maintenance of designated heritage properties will be created and made available to heritage property owners.
19. Conservation and maintenance of designated heritage properties funded in whole or in part through incentives such as grants, tax rebates or other mechanisms will achieve excellence in conservation, consistent with Council adopted standards and guidelines.
20. Publicly funded institutions such as universities, schools and hospitals will be required to enter into a Heritage Easement Agreement as a condition of accepting heritage conservation or maintenance incentives.
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:

- a) the application includes the conservation of a heritage building or structure on a property designated under the Ontario Heritage Act;
- b) additional gross floor area specifically provided through this policy will not exceed that of the heritage building or structure being retained;
- c) the additional floor area will not detract from the heritage property and will not conflict with any other Official Plan policies;
- d) excellence in the conservation of the values, attributes, character and three-dimensional *integrity* of the heritage property is achieved and additional density will not be granted for the incorporation of facades or isolated building elements into new development;
- 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; and
- f) the conserved heritage building or structure is protected in a Heritage Easement Agreement and the agreement and necessary by-laws are enacted prior to approval of the site plan for the entire development.

HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

22. A Heritage Impact Assessment will address all applicable heritage conservation policies of the Official Plan and the assessment will demonstrate conservation options and mitigation measures consistent with those policies.

SIDEBAR: Heritage Impact Assessments enable the City to obtain information about the potential impacts a development or *alteration* may have on a property on the Heritage Register. They provide a basis for establishing how impacts may be mitigated or avoided, whether the impacts are acceptable, and how the cultural heritage values and attributes will be conserved.

23. A Heritage Impact Assessment will evaluate the impact of a proposed *alteration* to a property on the Heritage Register, and/or to properties *adjacent* to a property on the heritage Register, to the

satisfaction of the City.

24. A Heritage Impact Assessment will be required for the proposed *demolition* of a property on the Heritage Register, and/or properties *adjacent* to a property on the Heritage Register to ensure its physical stability and the integrity of its cultural heritage values and attributes, to the satisfaction of the City.
25. In addition to a Heritage Impact Assessment, the City may request a Heritage Property Conservation Plan to address in detail the conservation treatments for the subject heritage property. The City may also request a Heritage Interpretation Plan to promote a heritage property or area, to the public.

SIDEBAR: A Heritage Property Conservation Plan is a detailed technical description of how the conservation strategy contained in an approved Heritage Impact Assessment will be implemented. It may also be requested to assist in the review of complex restoration projects. The conservation plan is expected to build on the information provided in the HIA. It generally contains, but is not limited to, the following:

- a. A description of the approved conservation strategy as contained in a referenced HIA, including treatments and principles to be applied to the cultural heritage resources being conserved;
- b. Identification of any proposed changes to previously approved strategies;
- c. Detailed scope of work including an updated condition assessment, all necessary technical and engineering studies or reports, architectural and restoration plans and drawings, and a full written description of proposed interventions accompanied by a detailed cost estimate;
- d. A strategy for the monitoring and protection of the heritage property, and adjacent heritage properties, during construction;
- e. Schedule for conservation work, inspection, maintenance, and phases;
- f. Sign guidelines and plans, lighting plans and detailed landscape plans, as required by the City; and

- g. Recommendations for short or long term maintenance and the qualifications for anyone responsible for conservation work.

DEVELOPMENT ON PROPERTIES ON THE HERITAGE REGISTER

- 26. New construction on, or *adjacent* to, a property on the Heritage Register will be designed to protect the cultural heritage values, attributes and character of that property and to mitigate visual and physical impact on it, including considerations such as scale, massing, materials, height, building orientation and location relative to the heritage property.
- 27. Where it is supported by the cultural heritage values and attributes of a property on the register, the conservation of whole or substantial portions of buildings, structures and landscapes on those properties is desirable and encouraged. The retention of facades alone is discouraged.
- 28. The owner of a designated heritage property will be encouraged to enter into a Heritage Easement Agreement where the City considers additional protection beyond designation desirable due to the location, proposed *alteration*, and/or the nature of that property.
- 29. Heritage buildings and/or structures located on properties on the Heritage Register should be conserved on their original location, however a heritage building or structure on a property on the Heritage Register may be relocated within its property or development site where:
 - a) the heritage building or structure is not attached to or adjoining another building or structure;
 - b) the location, orientation, situation or view of the heritage building is not identified in the Official Plan or as a cultural heritage value or attribute of the property, and/or the proposed relocation will not negatively affect the cultural heritage values or attributes of the property;
 - c) the heritage building or structure that demonstrates the identified cultural heritage values and attributes is being conserved in its entirety and will not be demolished, disassembled and/or reconstructed;
 - d) the relocation on site does not conflict with any applicable Heritage Property Conservation District plans;
 - e) a Heritage Conservation Plan is submitted that

demonstrates that the *removal* and relocation of the building or structure within its existing property will not pose any physical risk to the heritage building and/or structure, its cultural heritage values and attributes, to the satisfaction of the City; and

- f) these and any other related conditions are secured in a Heritage Easement Agreement prior to *removal* and relocation on site.

HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

30. Potential Heritage Conservation Districts will be identified and evaluated to determine their significance and cultural heritage values, in a Heritage Conservation District study. Heritage Conservation Districts that have been evaluated to be significant for their cultural heritage value will be designated and conserved.

31. Heritage Conservation District studies and plans will be conducted in accordance with Council adopted policies.

SIDEBAR: Council has adopted *Heritage Conservation Districts in Toronto: Procedures, Policies and Terms of Reference* for the study and planning of all Heritage Conservation Districts in the City. It can be downloaded at http://www.toronto.ca/heritage-preservation/heritage_districts.htm.

32. Impacts of site *alterations*, developments, municipal improvements, and/or public works within or *adjacent* to Heritage Conservation Districts will be assessed to ensure that the *integrity* of the districts' heritage values, attributes, and character are conserved. This assessment will be achieved through a Heritage Impact Assessment, consistent with Schedule 3 of the Official Plan, to the satisfaction of the City.

33. Heritage Conservation Districts should be managed and conserved by approving only those *alterations*, additions, new development, *demolitions*, *removals* and public works in accordance with respective Heritage Conservation District plans.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

34. The Archaeological Management Plan will be implemented and maintained to manage archaeological resources and areas of archaeological potential.

35. Development and site *alteration* will be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential only where the archaeological resources have been assessed, documented and conserved. Any *alterations* to known archaeological sites shall only be performed by licensed archaeologists.
36. Preservation in situ is the preferred conservation strategy for an archaeological site. Where in situ conservation is not feasible, archaeological resources may be subject to excavation whereby the information and artifact assemblages are safeguarded in an alternative location, to the City's satisfaction.
37. Where an archaeological site or resource is found to have cultural heritage value, and in situ conservation is possible, in situ conservation should be secured in a heritage easement agreement.
38. Upon receiving information that lands proposed for development may include archaeological resources or constitute an area of archaeological potential, the owner of such land will undertake studies by a licensed archaeologist to:
 - a) assess the property in compliance with Provincial Standards and Guidelines for Consulting Archaeologists, and to the satisfaction of the City;
 - b) assess the impact of the proposed development on any archaeological resources;
 - c) identify methods to mitigate any negative impact that the proposed development may have on any archaeological resources, including methods of protection on-site or interpretation and curating; and
 - d) provide to the City a Provincial concurrence letter recognizing the completion of the Archaeological assessment where one is issued by the Province.
39. Where archaeological resources are encountered or documented, as part of a development application or public work, and found to be First Nations or Métis in origin:
 - a) the City will provide a copy of the Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment report(s) to those First Nations

or Métis with the closest cultural affiliation to those resources, and in whose traditional territories the archaeological resources were found prior to the development proceeding;

- b) engagement by the proponent and their licensed archaeologist with the First Nation or Métis with the closest cultural affiliation and in whose traditional territory the significant archaeological resources are situated, should occur to obtain input on appropriate conservation or interpretation approaches; and
- c) publicly owned lands with significant archaeological resources of First Nations or Métis origin may be deemed not suitable for development.

40. Archaeological discoveries, and their cultural narratives, should be interpreted for the public through innovative architectural and/or landscape architectural design, public art installations, or other public realm projects associated with the site.

41. The City will provide a repository and take possession of all archaeological artifacts and records of archaeological assessment activities undertaken in the City, for the purpose of maintenance, research and exhibition.

42. The City may require an archaeological assessment for marine archaeological remains and artifacts, to be conducted by a licensed marine archaeologist, when a development is proposed in the water or along the waterfront and/or shoreline.

CULTURAL HERITAGE LANDSCAPES

43. Potential *cultural heritage landscapes* will be identified and evaluated to determine their significance and cultural heritage values. Significant *cultural heritage landscapes* will be included on the Heritage Register and/or designated under either Part IV or Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act.

44. In addition to protection under the Ontario Heritage Act, other planning tools and strategies for the protection of *cultural heritage landscapes* may be investigated and employed, as determined by the City.

SIDEBAR: Allan Gardens and the Fort York and Garrison

Common National Historic Site are examples of significant *cultural heritage landscapes* in the City of Toronto. (photos to be included)

VIEWS OF HERITAGE PROPERTIES

The policies for the protection of views to heritage properties of this section should also be read with specific regard for the view policies in Section 3.1.1 of this Plan, where applicable.

45. The view to a property on the Heritage Register will be conserved where:
 - a) the view is included on Map 7a or 7b and/or;
 - b) The view is identified in the Council adopted cultural heritage values or attributes for a property on the Heritage Register; and/or
 - c) The property is identified as a landmark in the cultural heritage values or attributes of a property on the Heritage Register.
46. Public and private development will preserve views to the heritage properties, identified on Maps 7a and 7b, unobstructed.
47. The Queens Park Legislative Assembly, Old City Hall and City Hall are public ceremonial sites of exceptional importance and prominence. Protection of views from the public realm to these three properties, identified on Maps 7a and 7b, will include the prevention of any further intrusions visible above and behind the building silhouette, as well as protecting the view to the buildings from any further obstruction. The identified views from the public realm, to and beyond these properties, will be conserved.
48. A Heritage Impact Assessment may be required where a development application may obstruct or detract from a view included as a cultural heritage value or attribute of a property on the Heritage Register and/or a view identified on Map 7a or 7b, to the satisfaction of the City. Views identified on Maps 7a and 7b may also need to be assessed for their potential cultural heritage value.

SIDEBAR: Views of prominent heritage properties are important. Those views can support the prominence and surroundings of heritage properties, and raise awareness of them. The view of a heritage property may also support or

relate to the cultural heritage values and attributes of a property on the Heritage Register, where this is documented in a designation bylaw or view study.

DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of Section 3.1.5 the following definitions shall apply:

Adjacent: means those 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 impact a property on the heritage register; or as otherwise defined in a Heritage Conservation District Plan adopted by by-law.

Alteration: is any change to a property on the Heritage Register in any manner including its 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.

Cultural Heritage Landscape: a defined geographical area of heritage significance which has been modified by human activities and is valued by a community. It involves a grouping(s) of individual heritage features such as structures, spaces, archaeological sites and natural elements, which together form a significant type of heritage form, distinctive from that of its constituent elements or parts. Examples may include, but are not limited to, Heritage Conservation Districts designated under the Ontario Heritage Act; and villages, parks, gardens, battlefields, mainstreets and neighbourhoods, cemeteries, railways and industrial complexes of cultural heritage value.

Demolition: is the complete destruction of a heritage structure and property from its site, including the disassembly of structures and properties on the Heritage Register for the purpose of reassembly at a later date.

Integrity: as it relates to a heritage property or an archaeological site/resource, is a measure of its wholeness and intactness of the cultural heritage values and attributes. Examining the conditions of integrity requires assessing the extent to which the property includes all elements necessary to express its cultural heritage value; is of adequate size to ensure the complete representation of the features and processes that convey the property's significance; and the extent to which it suffers from adverse affects of development and/or neglect. Integrity should be

assessed within a Heritage Impact Assessment.

Removal: is the complete and permanent dislocation of a heritage resource from its site, including relocation of structures to another property.

3. Policy 2 of section 5.6, 'interpretation' is amended by deleting the first two sentences and replacing them with the following: 'Maps 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7A, 7B and 9(C) inclusive are part of the Official Plan. Maps contained in Chapters Six and Seven are part of this Plan with the exception of Maps 25 to 35 inclusive.'
4. Schedule 3, Application requirements, of the Official Plan is amended by:
 - a. Deleting the term "Heritage Impact Statement" wherever it appears and replacing it with the term "Heritage Impact Assessment;"
 - b. Placing a dot in the matrix box that has "Official Plan" as the vertical axis and "heritage Impact Assessment/Conservation Plan" as the horizontal axis
 - c. Delete the words "Inventory of Heritage Properties" wherever it appears and replacing them with the words "Heritage Register."
5. Insert Schedule 4, as shown in Appendix No. 1 to this amendment, immediately following Schedule 3 of the Official Plan.
6. Insert the maps 7a and 7b as shown in Appendices 2 and 3 to this amendment immediately in front of the existing map 7 of the Official Plan, and renumber the existing maps 7 to 34 inclusive, accordingly.

APPENDIX NO. 1

Schedule 4: Description of Views

This schedule describes the views identified on maps 7a and 7b of the Official Plan. Views described are subject to the policies set out in section 3.1.1. Described views marked with [H] are views of heritage properties and are specifically subject to view protection policies of section 3.1.5 of the Official Plan.

A. PROMINENT AND HERITAGE BUILDINGS, STRUCTURES & LANDSCAPES

A1. Queens Park Legislature [H]

This view has been described in a comprehensive study and is the subject of a site and area specific policy of the Official Plan. It is not described in this schedule.

A2. Old City Hall [H]

The view of Old City hall includes the main entrance, tower and cenotaph as viewed from the southwest and southeast corners at Temperance Street and includes the silhouette of the roofline and clock tower. This view will also be the subject of a comprehensive study.

A3. Toronto City Hall [H]

The view of City Hall includes the east and west towers, the council chamber and podium of City Hall and the silhouette of those features as seen from the north side of Queen Street West along the edge of the eastern half of Nathan Phillips Square. This view will be the subject of a comprehensive study.

A4. Knox College Spire [H]

The view of the Knox College Spire, as it extends above the roofline of the third floor, can be seen from the north along Spadina Avenue at the southeast corner of Bloor Street West and at Sussex Avenue.

A5. Knox College [H]

The view of Knox College, located in Spadina Circle north of College Street and between the north and southbound lanes of Spadina Avenue, where it wraps around the property, can be seen clearly and in its entirety (including its spire) from College Street at the southwest and southeast corners of College at Spadina, as well as from the Spadina streetcar right of way, when traveling toward or from the property on the streetcar at College Street.

A6. Osgoode Hall [H]

The south facing façades of Osgoode Hall can be viewed in whole or part through and over the fence surrounding its property (the fence is also part of the view) from the following locations:

- i. The southeast and southwest corners of York Street at Richmond Street,
- ii. The southwest corner of University Avenue at Queen Street West.

A7. University College [H]

The view of University College includes the full view of the south facing façade and tower of the building as viewed from both the northwest and northeast corners of Kings College Road at College Street.

A8. The Grange [H]

The Grange south facing façade, and the path leading up to it through the park, can be viewed in its entirety from the southeast and southwest corners of John Street at Stephanie Street.

A9. Yorkville Library & Yorkville Fire Station #312 Tower [H]

The south facing façade of the Yorkville Library and tower of Fire Station #312 can be viewed from the southeast corner of Yonge Street at Yorkville Avenue. The tower of Fire Station #312 can also be viewed from all four corners of Yorkville Avenue at Bay Street.

A10. Flatiron Building [H]

The main facades and tower of the Flatiron Building, facing east, can be viewed from the following locations:

- i. The northeast and southeast corners of Front Street East at Market Street.
- ii. The northeast corner of Front Street East at Jarvis Street.

A11. St. James Cathedral Spire [H]

The spire of St. James Cathedral can be viewed from the following locations:

- i. The southwest and northwest corners of King Street East at Church Street.
- ii. Between Church Street and Market Street (across from Farquhars Lane), on the north side of Front Street East, looking north through the pedestrian pathway and Sculpture Garden.

A12. Princes' Gates [H]

The central portal and north and south wings of the Prince's Gates, facing east, can be viewed in their entirety from the northeast and southeast corners of Lakeshore Boulevard West at Fort York Boulevard

A13. St. Mary's Church [H]

St. Mary's Church and its distinctive spire can be seen in its entirety on axis with Adelaide Street West at Bathurst Street from the southeast and northeast corners of Adelaide Street West at Portland Street.

A14. Fort York [H]

Views into Fort York under the Gardiner Expressway show some of its buildings, land forms and artifacts from the following locations:

- i. Fleet Street at Grand Magazine Street,
- ii. Fleet Street at Iannuzzi Street,
- iii. Coronation Park through June Callwood Park, Bastion Street and Gzowski Boulevard.

A15. Rogers Centre

From King Street West at John St and at Blue Jays Way, a portion of the Rogers Centre stadium and domed roof including the integrated public art installation – "The Audience" by Michael Snow – can be viewed.

A16. CN Tower [H] and Rogers Centre Dome

The CN Tower, together with the domed roof of the Rogers Centre, can be viewed clearly from the north shore of Toronto Island Park just beyond the northern terminus of the Avenue of the Islands.

A17. Casa Loma [H]

The view of Casa Loma shows much of its south facing façade and, in particular, the towers on the property, most notably the Scottish Tower, from the east side of the intersection of Dupont Street and Spadina Road.

A18. Summerhill Station Clock Tower [H]

The clock tower at the former Summerhill train station can be seen from Yonge Street from the following locations:

- i. Alcorn Avenue from the west side of Yonge Street
- ii. Walker Avenue from the west side of Yonge Street
- iii. The southwest corner of Yonge Street at Marlborough Avenue

A19. Upper Canada College Spire [H]

The spire alone can be seen clearly on approach to Upper Canada College from the intersection of Avenue Road at Balmoral Avenue.

A20. East York Civic Centre [H]

The form massing and design of the East York Civic Centre and its surrounding campus can be seen clearly from the following locations:

- i. The southeast corner of Coxwell Avenue at Mortimer Avenue,
- ii. The east side of Coxwell Avenue where it meets Memorial Park Avenue,

- iii. The northeast and southeast corners of Coxwell Avenue at Barker Avenue.
- A21. RC Harris Water Treatment Plant [H]
The sprawling RC Harris Water treatment plant can be seen in its entirety from many vantage points in close proximity to the property, from Lake Ontario.
- A22. University of Toronto Scarborough Campus
The tops of campus buildings can be seen rising above the natural ravine setting of Highland Creek from the south end of the Morningside Avenue Bridge.
- A23. Scarborough Civic Centre [H]
The Scarborough Civic Centre building form, massing and composition can be seen in its entirety from the northeast steps of Albert Campbell Square.
- A24. North York Civic Centre [H]
The North York Civic Centre can be viewed clearly from west side of Yonge Street, directly across Mel Lastman Square from the building. Some of the landscaping obscures the lower portions of the building, but its setting, massing and form can be clearly viewed from this vantage point.
- A25. York Cemetery Cenotaph
The Cenotaph terminates a view from the west side of Yonge Street which is framed by the buildings on both sides of North York Boulevard.
- A26. York Boulevard, York University Commons
The landscape within York Boulevard and the Commons, including the buildings which frame these spaces, can be viewed from the west edge of the intersection of York Boulevard with Keele Street.
- A27. Etobicoke Civic Centre [H]
The Civic Centre can be clearly seen in its entirety from the west side of the West Mall, on axis with the main entrance of the building. The clock tower can also be seen in part from this vantage point, and is also viewed from the intersection of Highway 427 south-bound off ramp at Burnamthorpe Road.
- A28. Beach Fire Station #227 Clock Tower [H]
The prominent clock tower can be seen rising above the roof of the main fire station building from the northwest corner of Queen Street East at Woodbine Ave.

B. SKYLINES

B1. Downtown/Financial District Skyline

- a. Gardiner Expressway (eastbound) at Kipling Ave
Buildings, including the CN Tower, which compose the Downtown/Financial District skyline, can be viewed in the horizon from the eastbound lanes of the Gardiner Expressway just past the Kipling Avenue overpass.
- b. Gardiner Expressway (eastbound) at Humber Bay Shores
Buildings, including the CN Tower, which compose the Downtown/Financial District skyline, can be viewed clearly from the eastbound lanes of the Gardiner Expressway at the bend just past Park Lawn. The view is across Jean Augustine Park and is framed by buildings in Humber Bay Shores.
- c. Fort York
Buildings, including the CN Tower, which compose the Downtown/Financial District skyline, can be viewed clearly throughout the grounds of Fort York.
- d. Toronto Islands (north shore)
Buildings, including the CN Tower, which compose the Downtown/Financial District skyline, can be viewed clearly from the north shore of Toronto Island Park.
- e. Jennifer Kateryna Koval's'kyj Park
Buildings, including the CN Tower, which compose the Downtown/Financial District skyline, can be viewed clearly from the waterfront edge of Jennifer Kateryna Koval's'kyj Park located at the terminus of Polson Street.
- f. Broadview Ave at Bain Ave
Buildings, including the CN Tower, which compose the Downtown/Financial District skyline, can be viewed clearly from Broadview Avenue at Bain Avenue across Riverdale Park East.
- g. Prince Edward Viaduct
Buildings, including the CN Tower, which compose the Downtown/Financial District skyline, can be viewed clearly from the south-east end of the Prince Edward Viaduct.
- h. Don Valley Parkway (southbound) south of Leaside Bridge
Buildings, including the CN Tower, which compose the Downtown/Financial District skyline, can be viewed clearly from the

southbound lanes of the Don Valley Parkway, at the bend just south of the Leaside Bridge.

- i. Sir Winston Churchill Park
Buildings, including the CN Tower, which compose the Downtown/Financial District skyline, can be viewed clearly from the footpath in Sir Winston Churchill Park rising above the natural ravine setting. The skyline is most visible in winter when the surrounding trees are without leaves.
- j. Top of Baldwin Steps (east of Casa Loma)
Buildings, including the CN Tower, which compose the Downtown/Financial District skyline, can be viewed clearly from the top of the Baldwin Steps located just east of Casa Loma.
- k. Casa Loma (south terrace)
Buildings, including the CN Tower, which compose the Downtown/Financial District skyline, can be viewed clearly from the south terrace of Casa Loma.
- l. Parc Downsview Park (top of The Mound)
Buildings, including the CN Tower, which compose the Downtown/Financial District skyline, can be viewed clearly from the top of The Mound.

B2. North York Centre Skyline

Buildings which compose the North York Centre skyline can be viewed clearly from Highway 401 in the eastbound lanes when travelling over the West Don River bridge.

B3. Scarborough Centre Skyline

Buildings which compose the Scarborough Centre skyline can be viewed clearly from Highway 401 in the westbound lanes when emerging from beneath the Neilson Road overpass.

C. IMPORTANT NATURAL FEATURES

C1. Scarborough Bluffs

The western portion of the Scarborough Bluffs can be viewed clearly from the waterfront edge of Scarborough Heights Park.

C2. Cathedral Bluffs

The Cathedral Bluffs can be viewed clearly from the eastern side of Bluffer's Park trail.

C3. West Highland Creek Ravine

The West Highland Creek and natural ravine setting can be viewed clearly from both sides of the Lawrence Ave E Bridge (looking north-west and south-east).

C4. Rouge Marsh

The Rouge Marsh and surrounding natural setting can be viewed clearly from the boardwalk lookout in Rouge Beach Park (looking north) located near the eastern terminus of Lawrence Avenue East.

C5. Rouge River and Rouge Park

The Rouge River and natural setting of Rouge Park can be viewed clearly from north side of the Kingston Road Bridge, and is most visible at the east boundary of the City of Toronto.

C6. Rouge Park

The natural setting of Rouge Park can be viewed from the north side of Sheppard Ave E, and is most visible at Glen Eagles Vista.

C7. Humber River

The Humber River and natural ravine setting can be viewed clearly from both sides of the Dundas St W bridge (looking north-west and south-east) and the Bloor St W bridge (looking north and south).

C8. Humber Marshes

The Humber Marshes and surrounding natural setting can be viewed clearly from the western edge of Riverside Dr just north of South Kingsway (looking north-west).

C9. Lake Ontario

Lake Ontario can be viewed clearly beyond the termini of Norris Crescent, Miles Road, Lake Crescent, Royal York Road, Sand Beach Road, and Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Tenth, Eleventh, and Twelfth Streets. These "windows on the Lake" are framed by trees and landscaped setbacks.

APPENDIX NO. 2: MAP 7A



