

Report of the Working Group to Consider Options to Improve the Advisory Role of the Toronto Preservation Board

Executive Summary

In her presentation of December 2, 2019, the Senior Manager Heritage Planning invited the Toronto Preservation Board to make recommendations about improvements to the advisory capacity and more timely input of Board members. The presentation also included discussion about the significant impact of Bill 108 as it affects heritage decision making.

Since that meeting, board members have written to the Chair of the Board with thoughts and suggestions. At the January 27, 2020 meeting of the Board, a working group comprising five members of the Toronto Preservation Board and one staff member from Heritage Planning was struck to discuss the issues and suggestions and make recommendations that would address these concerns.

The working group met several times over a seven month period, consulted with heritage consultants and other professionals and discussed the thoughts and suggestions outlined in the letter from the Chair of the Toronto Preservation Board dated January 20, 2020. (attached)

Four critical concerns are detailed in the report which must be addressed to ensure preservation of the city's cultural heritage landscape:

- Minimal participation by heritage professionals during early project discussions and peer project reviews
- Narrow focus on project review limiting discussion of heritage and the cultural landscape
- Incomplete and graphically poor project information provided to the Toronto Preservation Board
- Lack of opportunity for public comments and deputations

Immediate changes are necessary to strengthen heritage oversight of development proposals. Ideally these can occur within the current framework of the planning process and implemented within the statutory mandate of the Board not requiring Council approval. Inaction or lengthy delays in procedural approvals will result in a loss of heritage attributes and the cultural landscape in our city.

The working group proposes the following recommendations for consideration by the Toronto Preservation Board :

1. Allow for early participation in pre-application consultations by Heritage Planning with discussion including broader contextual concerns. For some projects, members of the Toronto Preservation Board, independent heritage professionals or other professionals with a track record in conservation and planning of cultural heritage resources might also be asked to participate. This will provide an overview of important heritage concerns at an early stage in the project.
2. Identify issues in the pre-application discussion and include discussion of them in the heritage impact assessment and in the staff report to the Toronto Preservation Board when the project is considered for approval.
3. Increase opportunities for local community participation by expanding the role of the Community Preservation Panels to include the review of redevelopment proposals.

4. Establish a Heritage Review Panel of heritage professionals made up of a roster of heritage preservation professionals and other professionals with a track record in conservation and planning of cultural heritage resources. Members of the Panel would be called on to:
 - a. Provide expertise at Community Preservation Panels.
 - b. Participate as members of the Design Review Panel to increase heritage presence.
 - c. Review projects that are not scheduled for review by the Design Review Panel.
5. Expand the membership of the Design Review Committee to include additional heritage professionals to ensure that all projects with potential heritage impacts will have the benefit of this expertise. Heritage Planning should collaborate with other Planning and Urban Design staff in the preparation and presentation to the Design Review Panel. Minutes of the meeting should be given to the Preservation Board at the time of their issuance.
6. Expand opportunities for early and frequent public participation. This should occur with the preparation of heritage impact assessment, discussion of the project at the Community Preservation Panels, and public consultation meetings.
7. The working group further recommends that

A pilot Heritage Preservation Panel should be established for a two year period to:

- participate in early project discussions at Community Preservation Panels when heritage resources are being considered.
- participate in early pre-application Planning discussions
- review projects that are not scheduled for the Design Review Panel

The two year “pilot” project not requiring major committee or inter-departmental staff re-organization would be introduced to test recommendations. An evaluation of the pilot initiative could provide some helpful insights for a more robust and longer-term re-structuring of the heritage review process that the current Toronto Preservation Board considers is necessary.

8. Complete the city-wide survey of heritage resources. Heritage preservation requires a comprehensive up to date heritage inventory of listed and designated properties. Acceleration of this initiative will provide Heritage Planning with the necessary tools to do their work.

Working Group Membership

Robert Allsopp
Matthew Gregor
Geoff Kettel
Elizabeth Sisam
Kim Storey

The working group gratefully acknowledges Joe Muller’s participation, providing staff support and background information.

I. Introduction and Background

The Toronto Preservation Board provides advice to Toronto City Council on matters stipulated in the Ontario Heritage Act. It is an advisory body comprised of seven (7) citizens appointed by City Council, the Chair of each Community Preservation Panel and one (1) member of City Council.

The Toronto Preservation Board's mandate is to provide advice to Council on matters relating to Part IV and Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act, including, but not limited to: designation of heritage properties or conservation districts and inclusion on the Inventory of Heritage Properties; applications to alter, demolish or remove designated or listed heritage properties; applications to repeal by-laws which designate individual properties as heritage properties and proposed heritage easements or covenants.

The Toronto Preservation Board also consults with the City's four Community Preservation Panels (one for each Community Council district). The Community Preservation Panels are City of Toronto-appointed committees, reporting to the Toronto Preservation Board, that recommend properties and areas which should be considered for heritage protection and conservation, and support and encourage an understanding and appreciation of the City's built heritage.

In her presentation of December 2, 2019, the Senior Manager Heritage Planning invited the Toronto Preservation Board to make recommendations about improvements to the advisory capacity and more timely input of Board members.

The presentation also included discussion about the significant impact of Bill 108 as it affects heritage decision making. A brief summary of the relevant aspects of Bill 108 to this discussion is appended. Of particular importance is that Bill 108 will impact identification, notification and application processes. Timelines and protection will be diminished. The Bill will also remove Council's final authority for Part IV designations. The Bill received royal assent on June 6, 2019.

Since that meeting, board members have written to the Chair of the Board with thoughts and suggestions. At the January 27, 2020 meeting of the Board, a working group comprising five members of the Toronto Preservation Board and one staff member from Heritage Planning was struck to discuss the issues and suggestions and make recommendations that would address these concerns.

Specific issues that were identified are detailed further in this report. They include:

1. Project information: too little, too late,
2. Narrow focus or project review by Heritage Planning,
3. Limited discussion of heritage concerns through project review by Planning and,
4. Lack of opportunity for public comments.

II. Jurisdictional review

The group conducted a limited Jurisdictional review. Most major cities in Canada have Municipal Heritage Committees with similar mandates and powers. Toronto is set apart from other jurisdictions in Canada due to its size, population, and development pressures. The vast majority of the information gathered pertained more to procedural issues (minutes, committee composition, etc.). While important, it did not address the larger issue of improving the depth and breadth of review of the working group's focus.

The current situation in Toronto may be unique given the provincial context of the Government of

Ontario developer oriented approach to planning imperatives with little respect for municipal governance and local priorities, and even less for heritage.

III. Consultations with heritage and other professionals

The working group interviewed qualified heritage conservation professionals including the heritage representative on DRP and others working in a consulting capacity for applicants in the preparation of HIAs. Also interviewed were other private sector architects, including a co-chair of DRP and a former Director of Urban Design.

All observed that the exercise the working group was engaged in is necessary and worthwhile, and that it is important to retain the Toronto Preservation Board in its current role of advising Community Council and City Council.

Several of the “non-heritage” professionals interviewed had little understanding of the limited mandate of Preservation Board and its restrictive operational procedures. Some, with insight into the process, considered the Board’s current role as largely a rubber-stamp of staff reports.

A common observation is that heritage and Heritage Planning staff are on the side-lines of the larger planning and urban design review process. This is reflected in professional representation of the DRP, with only one of the seventeen Panel Members, representing heritage expertise.

Almost all referred to the operational “isolation” of Heritage Planning from the other sections of City Planning even though Heritage Planning now reports to the Director of Urban Design. While there is a recognition that City Planning and Heritage Planning operate within the framework of separate Provincial Acts, there seems to be an unnecessary level of disassociation. That “heritage” has become a separate and isolated item on the check-list of design considerations of city-building is of deep concern shared by many members of TPB and many of the individuals interviewed. Integration will become even more critical as cultural heritage landscape criteria become more commonly applied to heritage reviews. The urban design ‘lens’ should be a large part of the assessment of cultural heritage landscapes and how these are affected by streetscape and the public realm. These aspects are often points of contention in the Board’s late review of development projects.

One heritage professional interviewed commented that the heritage staff would often receive the project late as well, causing their reports to be late, resulting in their input taking on less weight. The heritage reports or approach were often swayed by Councillors’ input into the process. The heritage professional also suggested that ‘peer review’ of the heritage reports would allow for further support and weight for the heritage reports.

Some commented that reviews are governed by legislated limitations as applied by the Official Plan, Heritage Conservation District Plans, and other city policy documents as opposed to guidelines that are more in depth and when applied, capture the spirit and intent of the legislation. The limitation to policies rather than guidelines establishes the requirement for staff to ‘keep in their lanes’ during discussions with other planning disciplines, making the conversation very narrow.

There was concern that the recommendations of the working group should not result in extending the application process by adding more layers of approvals. Lengthening the process must be avoided to achieve success. Several observed that project reviews would best occur prior to

submitting project applications, because plans are complete by the time of the application. Having project reviews during the pre-application period would not compromise the time limitations of the approval process, and would provide the applicants a reasonable amount of time to respond to valid heritage concerns both in the particular and in the larger context, rather than having objections leveled at the end of the design process.

One suggestion was for heritage experts, who are not members of the TPB, to participate in pre-application discussions, in an advisory role, much like the Design Review Panel. The Board could not participate in this process. Another suggestion was that one additional heritage expert on the DRP would signal more respect for the heritage comments which were seen as peripheral to the central considerations of the development being reviewed. Generally, more weight given to the role of heritage input in the early stages of projects was seen as a positive improvement, with a more comprehensive representation of the heritage community instead of one heritage consultant pitted against another. As stated earlier; however, only a small percentage of development applications are reviewed by the Design Review Panel. Many significant projects with heritage concerns might not be included in the selection.

IV. Project approval process

Projects that come before the Board are typically larger in scale and/or impact, as they reflect heritage planning decisions that may not be delegated to Heritage staff: applications for substantial alterations, demolition, or for which staff have recommended refusal. These projects are most often affiliated with applications under the Planning Act or Building Code Act, although Heritage Planning and Board recommendations to Council are for decisions under the Ontario Heritage Act.

In several recent instances the Board decided not to adopt staff recommendations pertaining to projects. Instead, the Board has recommended adoption of staff recommendations that pertain to designations, but not staff recommendations pertaining to projects which demonstrate failure to comprehensively address the important project issues. This is because important relevant contextual information has not been made available to the TPB and/or because the information has been provided too late in the project review process, or that relevant information is outside of the purview of Heritage Planning.

Proponents pre-consult formally and informally with the City Planning Division. At the formal pre-application meeting, Planning staff review pre-submission material, and identify what documentation will be required to file a complete application. That may include Heritage Impact assessments or other materials. Informal consultation meetings are often held prior to the formal pre-application meeting, where proponents seek to gain preliminary guidance and feedback on proposals, application requirements and draft studies. These may be one or several informal meetings with Planning staff while the project is in its early conceptual stage. (In reviewing heritage planning processes in other major Canadian cities, only one instance of a “pre-application workshop” was found. It occurred in Vancouver (Sept. 30, 2019) and the applicants of the project were government agencies.)

Applications in Toronto become part of the public record only when they have been formally submitted: proponents may engage stakeholders before this stage, but it is not mandatory.

Because of legislative timing requirements under Planning Act and Ontario Heritage Act,

identification of overall and heritage planning priorities are often subject to discussion and negotiation at the formal and informal pre-consultation stages, guided by municipal heritage policy in the Official Plan, Secondary Plans, Urban Design Guidelines, and Part IV and V designation by-laws, among others. When a Planning application is submitted, it is evaluated to determine whether it is complete. If so, it is publicly posted for comment. Based on this and City staff input, revised applications may be resubmitted. Selected projects are also considered by the City of Toronto Design Review Panel which makes recommendations to staff. City Planning determines whether or not the application will be supported at Committee and Council. Heritage Planning reports to Council through the Toronto Preservation Board. Community Councils are scheduled, prepared and presented, usually in conjunction with Community Planning reports to Council through Community Council or PHC.

V. Issues related to the current situation.

The working group discussed several suggestions that had been made to the Chair of the Preservation Board and other concerns that arose during the course of discussions.

1. Project Information: too little too late

Earlier consultation and presentation of proposals by staff to the Preservation Board are necessary and particularly important in light of the Planning deadlines under Bill 108. Project information is currently presented to the Preservation Board, at a very late stage of the planning process: the last opportunity to review the project before Community Council and City Council meetings leading to project approvals. The municipal meeting schedule is such that Preservation Board is typically not more than one or two weeks prior to Community Council closely followed by City Council all within the same meeting cycle.

In light of the contracted planning review deadlines under Bill 108, there now will be less time to discuss and review projects after the application has been submitted. The pre-application discussions therefore are significantly more important.

2. Narrow focus by Heritage Planning

The material distributed to the Preservation Board is very detailed and comprehensive in historical fact; however, it is limited in its overview of context as related to other heritage resources and the cultural landscape within a broader setting. The ability of Heritage Planning to review projects with necessary breadth is limited because the City-wide heritage survey and many planning studies, including HCDs and CHRAs currently backlogged (some for many years) are on hold with no priority for completion. Simply put, not all of the tools are in the toolbox.

There is also limited and often incomplete information about other proximate developments in the pipeline. Staff reports are sometimes unclear with respect to alterations to heritage resources. Frequently the entirety of the proposal must be pieced together by the Board at the meeting when deliberation occurs.

Graphic reproduction is poor and, in many instances, restricts the view of the proposal to the heritage resource, neglecting to include, for example, a tall building tower above the building that is to be protected or incorporated in the project. This produces frustration on the part of the Board who are to review and comment yet unable to factor in the

development writ large.

No consideration of contextual implications of redevelopment projects is conducted by the City. Heritage Planning reviews projects within the limited purview of applicable legislation currently in place recognizing that appeals will be lost because the Tribunals will only be able to reference legislated policies. The narrow focus that is adhered to eliminates a broader view of the city's cultural heritage landscapes and areas that are valuable and should be preserved or sensitively altered. This restricts the Preservation Board's ability to discuss, review and comment on projects comprehensively.

Some projects may be included on the Design Review Panel's agenda, but the Design Review Panel considers projects late in the process and even then their discussion and minutes are not provided to the Preservation Board (or City Committees or Council) .

3. Limited discussion of heritage concerns

As stated earlier, projects are first seen by City Planning many months (sometimes as many as 9 -12 months) prior to formal submission of an application involving round table discussions or pre-application meetings. These discussions are meant to provide an overview of the proposal to various departments involved in project review and to solicit feedback. It is at these meetings that early direction is given to proponents. We understand that Heritage Planning does not have an opportunity to voice strong opinions at the pre-application discussions, if invited at all. In many instances reference is only made to the property on the Heritage Register rather than taking a broader view of properties included in the heritage nominations file and the contextual setting (including cultural heritage landscapes) . If heritage concerns are not expressed at this early stage, they cannot be factored into the development concept in a meaningful way.

When the application is finally submitted all supporting reports and documentation can be found on the city's Application Information Centre (AIC). However, these reports are viewed by the applicant as being close to final, because they have worked diligently to prepare material that responds positively to direction given by participants at the early round table discussions many months earlier. Considerable expenditures have been incurred by the applicant to this point so it is not surprising that revisions are only very minor in nature.

4. Limited heritage presence in the Design Review Panel discussions.

The City's Design Review Panel (DRP) comprises 17 private sector design professionals - architects, landscape architects, urban designers and engineers addressing broad urban design, architectural, planning, landscape, transportation and sustainability issues. Of these, only one member is a heritage professional bringing a professional heritage focus. It is virtually impossible for that member to attend all DRP meetings. The heritage professional is usually notified in advance of agenda items with heritage issues. On major development projects, the "lone heritage voice" is often over-ridden by those with more development-driven perspectives. More heritage professionals on design review panels would provide valuable insights and analyze heritage aspects of design deeply in relation to the Ontario Heritage Act, City guidelines for listed and designated properties or HCDs.

The current DRP reviews only selected projects from across the city, and many projects that

impact heritage resources do not come before the Panel. As a result, important projects with significant heritage concerns are not included. Consideration of all heritage projects would be onerous and difficult to manage both by the city and in scheduling panelists who already give freely of their time to participate.

An early suggestion to expand the DRP to include more heritage professionals would allow “heritage” dimensions to be reviewed as an integrated aspect of a comprehensive urban design analysis. However, a significant concern remains, that of the timing of the review which is 9-12 months after initial pre-application discussions, well after the course of the project is set.

5. Lack of opportunity for public comments

There is very little opportunity for the public to participate or comment on projects under the current approval process.

Heritage Impact Assessments (HIA) are undertaken to evaluate the impact that a proposed development or site alteration will have on the cultural heritage resource and to recommend an approach to the conservation of the resource within the context of the proposed development. Their depth and breadth are discussed at the pre-application meeting and work on the HIA begins at this very early stage. They are submitted with all other required reports at the time of application. All the reports, including the HIA, are currently made available to the public on the Application Information Centre (AIC). Unless there is general knowledge of the impending project there is no apparent reason for the public to view the site. There should be an opportunity for the public to comment on the HIA before it becomes final and is bound into the application. The 9-12 month pre-application timeframe is the best opportunity for public input.

The statutory requirement for public consultation is one public consultation meeting. Where notice is given of upcoming developments, notifications are restricted to immediate neighbourhoods. Heritage issues and upcoming developments’ effects on a greater cultural heritage framework are quite often of interest and concern to a larger heritage community. There is no forum available to allow for comprehensive heritage review and detailed discussion. The ability to reach that larger constituency should be considered as an important component of overall improvements to project review.

Another opportunity for the public to hear more about certain projects (at the discretion of staff and applicant) is at the DRP during a peer review by private sector design professionals. However, it is difficult to obtain agendas prior than one week ahead of the meeting and in-person attendance is difficult as the meetings are held during working hours. There is no opportunity for the public to ask questions or make comments at these meetings.

When the project is discussed at the Board, the heritage consultant engaged by the applicant provides a brief overview of the proposal and answers questions posed by Board members. Deputants are permitted to comment, but as with other Committees there is no participatory discussion.

There are two more opportunities for the public to provide comments by way of

deputations, at Community Council or Standing Committee (ie PHC) meetings, however at this point the project is in its final approval stage. As it stands, there is virtually no opportunity for the public to provide comments and participate in discussions in a meaningful way.

6. Create a Heritage Review Panel

An early suggestion was to create an advisory panel composed of heritage professionals to work parallel to the current Design Review Panel. It would offer advice to city staff and the Design Review Panel on heritage aspects of proposals under consideration. Panel members could be selected from a roster of qualified heritage conservation professionals from the membership of the Canadian Association of Heritage Professionals and/or have extensive heritage expertise. The selection of the panel member would be determined by the participant best matched to the project being reviewed and be included in the pre-application discussion. Members of the Heritage Review Panel (HRP) would not be Toronto Preservation Board members; however, the HRP could liaise with the Preservation Board to give fuller explanation of issues and recommendations.

An important limitation of this recommendation is that it could add further steps in the review process. Projects having significant impact on adjacent cultural heritage resources would be subject to the separate reviews of DRP and a new HRP. However, creating an entirely new and “special” review panel may also tend to harden the boundaries between Heritage Planning and the other Planning sectors.

Members of the HRP and DRP could also be cross appointed to better inform each review panel of the issues discussed. This would require coordination of project review timetables between the two panels for those projects that are to be discussed by both groups.

A second important very important concern is that similar to project review by DRP, project review by the HRP would occur too late in the process to have any real impact.

7. Make better use of the existing Community Preservation Panels

This suggestion proposed creating four preservation boards, one for each district that would each have a community preservation panel attached to it. (It is unclear why four distinct boards would be required over the existing panel structure.)

Currently the Panels review developments through the stages of the development application process and are able to look for proposals with a heritage impacts. The Panels can do with more staff support. Members of the Community Preservation Panels would engage in pre-application discussions to review projects in each district and forward their recommendations to the TPB as currently occurs but with the added benefit of early project review.

Panels could also be strengthened by including one member of the Toronto Preservation Board when projects affecting heritage resources are discussed or include the members at large as members of Panels. This concept requires detailed thought and consideration.

VI. Recommendations

Immediate changes are necessary to strengthen heritage oversight of development proposals. Ideally these can occur within the current framework of the planning process and implemented within the statutory mandate of the Board not requiring Council approval. Inaction or lengthy delays in procedural approvals will result in a loss of heritage attributes and the cultural landscape in our city.

The following recommendations are proposed for consideration by the working group:

1. Allow for early participation in pre-application consultations by Heritage Planning with discussion including broader contextual concerns. For some projects, members of the Toronto Preservation Board, independent heritage professionals or other professionals with a track record in conservation and planning of cultural heritage resources might also be asked to participate. This will provide an overview of important heritage concerns at an early stage in the project.
2. Identify issues in the pre-application discussion and include discussion of them in the heritage impact assessment and in the staff report to the Toronto Preservation Board when the project is considered for approval.
3. Increase opportunities for local community participation by expanding the role of the Community Preservation Panels to include the review of redevelopment proposals.
4. Establish a Heritage Review Panel of heritage professionals made up of a roster of heritage preservation professionals and other professionals with a track record in conservation and planning of cultural heritage resources. Members of the Panel would be called on to:
 - a. Provide expertise at Community Preservation Panels.
 - b. Participate as members of the Design Review Panel to increase heritage presence.
 - c. Review projects that are not scheduled for review by the Design Review Panel.
5. Expand the membership of the Design Review Committee to include additional heritage professionals to ensure that all projects with potential heritage impacts will have the benefit of this expertise. Heritage Planning should collaborate with other Planning and Urban Design staff in the preparation and presentation to the Design Review Panel. Minutes of the meeting should be given to the Preservation Board at the time of their issuance.
6. Expand opportunities for early and frequent public participation. This should occur with the preparation of heritage impact assessment, discussion of the project at the Community Preservation Panels, and public consultation meetings.
7. The working group further recommends that

A pilot Heritage Preservation Panel should be established for a two year period to:

- participate in early project discussions at Community Preservation Panels when heritage resources are being considered.

- participate in early pre-application Planning discussions
- review projects that are not scheduled for the Design Review Panel

The two year “pilot” project not requiring major committee or inter-departmental staff re-organization would be introduced to test recommendations. An evaluation of the pilot initiative could provide some helpful insights for a more robust and longer-term re-structuring of the heritage review process that the current Toronto Preservation Board considers is necessary.

8. Complete the city-wide survey of heritage resources. Heritage preservation requires a comprehensive up to date heritage inventory of listed and designated properties. Acceleration of this initiative will provide Heritage Planning with the necessary tools to do their work.

Bill 108 - More Homes, More Choice Act
(from Heritage Planning presentation Dec 2019)

- On May 2, 2019, the Province issued Bill 108, the More Homes, More Choice Act
- Bill 108 amends 13 pieces of legislation including the Ontario Heritage Act (OHA)
- Schedule 11 details substantial changes to the OHA. Regulations governing transitional and other matters are pending and will prescribe the following:
 - Principles
 - Listing of Heritage Properties -contents of the notification
 - Content of designation by-laws
 - Prescribed Event
 - Complete Application for Alteration and Demolition Permits

• Overall, the City's position is that the proposed legislation will have significant impacts to the City relating to heritage conservation (identification, notification, application processes, timelines and protection). Most importantly, it will remove Council's final authority for Part IV designations.

Principles: New section 26(0.1) will require Council to consider a set of prescribed principles when exercising its decision-making authority under prescribed sections of the Act.

Timing: 90 day timeline for decision on alteration and demolition permit requests 90 day timeline on when municipalities can give Notice of an Intention to Designate after a "prescribed event" 120 day timeline for Designation by-laws to be passed (90 days following the end of the objection period)

Process: New complete application process for alteration and demolition of designated properties
Notice required for listings, owners can object
New appeal process for designations, LPAT to have final authority

Designations and Heritage Conservation Districts:

Designation by-laws –new mandatory content

- Abolishes the Conservation Review Board
- New right of appeal from final decisions related to designation by-laws passed by a municipality, as well as from final municipal decisions on applications for alteration under Part IV.
- For designation by-law related decisions -Conservation Review Board (CRB) objection process to be replaced with a 30 day period to object to the municipality before a final decision is made (ie. 30 days after a NOI is issued).
- Part IV designation and alteration appeals will be heard by the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (LPAT)
- The LPAT will have final authority in the designation appeals process, and can dismiss, repeal or amend designation bylaws

Tracking Status

- This item was considered by [Toronto Preservation Board](#) on January 27, 2020 and was adopted without amendment. City Council has delegated authority for this matter to the Toronto Preservation Board and therefore, the decision is final.

Toronto Preservation Board consideration on January 27, 2020

PB13.8	ACTION	Adopted	Delegated	
--------	--------	---------	-----------	--

Proposed Amendments to the Planning Process and the Toronto Preservation Board

Board Decision

The Toronto Preservation Board:

1. Requested the Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning to consider options to improve the advisory role of the Toronto Preservation Board.

Origin

(January 20, 2020) Letter from the Chair, Toronto Preservation Board

Summary

In her presentation of December 2, 2019, Mary MacDonald, Senior Manager Heritage Planning, invited the Toronto Preservation Board to make recommendations about improvements to the advisory capacity and more timely input of Board members. Since the meeting, board members have written to me with their thoughts and suggestions.

These include:

- Consultation and presentation by staff to Preservation board at an earlier stage of the planning process, especially in light of the contracted planning deadlines under Bill 108;
- For the Board to make more informed judgements in its recommendations regarding proposed alterations to heritage properties, more complete and graphically clear information should be appended to Staff Reports. (Similar in quality to the information package provided in proponent submissions to the City Design Review Panel)
- The creation of a Heritage Design Review Panel (DRP) composed of heritage

professionals that would work parallel to the current design review panels, offering advice to staff rather than Council, on heritage aspects of proposals. At present, of the 17 members of the DRP, only one is a heritage professional. Having the parallel heritage panels could expedite the planning process by bringing heritage issues to the forefront with recommendations earlier in the process. The heritage design review panels could liaise with Preservation Board to give fuller explanation of issues and recommendations;

- The creation of four preservation boards—one for each district--that would each have a community preservation panel attached to them;
- The addition of more heritage professionals on the design review panels who would analyse the heritage aspects of design deeply in relationship to the Ontario Heritage Act and City guidelines for listed and designated individual properties or HCDs; or a cross-appointment between the design review panels and the heritage review panels, so that each were better informed of the other's issues and recommendations; and
- Earlier and more options for public deputations, beginning with design/heritage design review panels as well as Preservation Board.

As Chair of the Toronto Preservation Board, on behalf of the Board, we would like to propose a new business item to the agenda called Proposed Amendments to the Planning Process and the Toronto Preservation Board.

Background Information

(January 20, 2020) Letter from the Chair, Toronto Preservation Board - Proposed Amendments to the Planning Process and the Toronto Preservation Board

(<http://www.toronto.ca/legdocs/mmis/2020/pb/bgrd/backgroundfile-145324.pdf>)

Motions

Motion to Adopt Item moved by Ms. Sandra Shaul (Carried)

Source: Toronto City Clerk at www.toronto.ca/council