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1.) Plan Summary

In recognition of their special character and cultural heritage value, more than 70 areas in Ontario have been designated as Heritage Conservation Districts under the Ontario Heritage Act. In maintaining their uniqueness and sense of place, 12 of these districts contribute to the rich history and dynamic landscape of the City of Toronto.

This Heritage Conservation District Plan is the result of a City of Toronto by-law authorizing a Heritage Conservation District Study to be undertaken for Lyall Avenue between Main Street and Malvern Avenue. It has been prepared for consideration by City Council, and proposes the formal recognition of Lyall Avenue as a Heritage Conservation District under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act.

The key components of this Heritage Conservation District Plan are:

- To provide a comprehensive analysis of the historical and architectural character of Lyall Avenue as a means to evaluate and establish the heritage character of the neighbourhood;
- To encourage and facilitate the participation and input of local residents, as well as the Municipality, in pursuing and promoting the awareness of the preservation of neighbourhood character;
- To develop design guidelines to assist property owners and decision makers in the assessment of appropriate changes and development proposals within the District.

Sanctioned under provincial and municipal heritage policy, this Plan includes an analysis of Lyall Avenue’s historical development and an architectural evaluation of its built form. It recognizes Lyall Avenue as a historic Toronto neighbourhood worthy of protection for its combination of turn-of-the-century architecture, historical patterns of development and streetscape character. Based on this analysis, this Plan recommends the creation of a Lyall Avenue Heritage Conservation District under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act, and forwards heritage guidelines as a tool to aid the City and the residents of Lyall Avenue in strengthening and protecting the neighbourhood’s significant character.
2.) Plan Background and Methodology

Lyall Avenue is well known to local residents as an avenue of special character. This tree-lined street with well kept turn-of-the-20th century architecture and a balanced streetscape preserves a strong connection with the historical development of East Toronto and the growth of Toronto in general. Recently, however Lyall Avenue has become a victim of its own appeal. Demolition and infill development have begun to erode some of the unique and historic attributes of Lyall Avenue.

In response to recent development pressures evident in their neighbourhood, a group of Lyall Avenue residents approached city staff early in 2004 to find out more about Heritage Conservation Districts and how they can assist in the protection and enhancement of their neighbourhood. Subsequently, city staff met with Lyall residents at two well-attended public meetings to gauge interest in proceeding with a heritage preservation study of their neighbourhood.

Following these discussions, an informal group of Lyall residents agreed to initiate the study process, and in September of 2004 a Staff Report was presented to Council and authority was granted to study Lyall Avenue as a potential Heritage Conservation District. By-law No. 835-2004 was passed on September 30th “to define Lyall Avenue between Main Street and Malvern Avenue as an area of the City of Toronto to be examined for future designation as a heritage conservation district”. Under the advice and guidance of Heritage Preservation staff, Lyall residents held an interview process and retained E.R.A. Architects Inc. (ERA) to act as a professional consultant for this study and Plan.

A process of public consultation, historical research and professional analysis was undertaken in compiling this Plan. Following a workshop held by ERA in May 2005, a team of community volunteers researched the history of each Lyall property included in the study boundaries. The directory listings, assessment roll searches, and historical images gathered by the community were reviewed by ERA and used to build a working property inventory of Lyall Avenue for the properties between Main Street and Malvern Avenue (Appendix 1.). These materials were reviewed and supplemented by ERA with community surveys and an interview with local historian, Gene Domagala. This research was used to develop an historical evaluation of the properties along Lyall Avenue, to identify key patterns of neighbourhood development, and to prepare appropriate guidelines for the protection and enhancement of the unique heritage character described in this Plan.
3.) Policy Provisions

The processes and procedures of the Lyall Avenue Heritage Conservation District Study were sanctioned under the terms laid out by Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act 1990, the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement and provisions of the City of Toronto Official Plan.

*The Ontario Heritage Act*

The Ontario Heritage Act represents the primary piece of Provincial legislation that regulates the protection of heritage resources within Ontario. A property that has been formally recognized under provisions contained in the Act is referred to as a “designated” property. According to Part V of the Act, as amended on April 28th 2005, the municipality may by by-law designate any area as a Heritage Conservation District. Based on these provisions, municipalities shall adopt a District Plan that identifies the cultural value of the District and provides principles for protecting that value.¹

*The 2005 Provincial Policy Statement*

The purpose of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), issued under the Planning Act, is to provide municipalities in Ontario with policy direction on matters related to land use planning and development. As it relates to the Lyall Avenue Heritage Conservation District Plan, Part V, Section 2.6 of the PPS states:

- Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.

- Development and site alteration may be permitted in adjacent lands to protected heritage property where the proposed development and site alteration has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved.²

---

The City of Toronto Official Plan

The Official Plan outlines Toronto’s vision for the future character of the City. As statutory policy, the Official Plan guides the City in its decisions on how best to achieve balanced change, growth, and development. In this case, the Official Plan addresses how the City of Toronto will implement and address municipal requirements set forth in the Ontario Planning Act and Ontario Heritage Act.

With reference to the identification and protection of heritage resources the Official Plan states:

- It is the policy of Council to designate property to be of architectural or historical value or interest and to take all necessary steps to ensure the preservation and conservation of all buildings, structures, and sites, including all areas in the public domain, within such districts.

- It is the policy of Council to designate Heritage Conservation Districts within the City on the basis of appropriate studies and to take all necessary steps to ensure the preservation and conservation of buildings, structures, sites, including all areas in the public domain, within such districts.5

Passed by City Council in November 2002, the new Official Plan is currently awaiting approval at the provincial level. Among other things, this new policy recognizes the importance of protecting stable neighbourhoods and heritage resources for their contributing qualities to the character of the city. The Official Plan states:

- Development will respect and reinforce the physical pattern and character of established neighbourhoods, with particular regard to…conservation of heritage buildings, structures and landscapes.

- Our heritage buildings, districts and landscapes create a unique sense of place and a rooted sense of local identity and continuity for Torontonians… Heritage conservation not only makes our neighbourhoods even more attractive, it also increases their desirability and value.

- Significant heritage resources will be conserved by… designating areas with a concentration of heritage resources as Heritage Conservation Districts and adopting conservation and design guidelines to maintain and improve their character.4

---

3 City of Toronto Planning and Development, *City of Toronto Official Plan* 1996, Section 5.
4. **District Objectives**

Developed as part of the Village of East Toronto, the late 19th and early 20th century residential development on Lyall Avenue is a strong example of the cultural patterns that contribute to the rich history of Toronto’s urban landscape. Unfortunately, recent developments tend to be less characteristic of the street’s established character and threaten to undermine the street’s historic value.

It is the objective of this District Plan to identify the heritage attributes that define the character of this neighbourhood and determine a framework to protect the cultural value of this community. It is the intention of this Plan to establish an understanding of Lyall Avenue within the historical evolution of Toronto and provide guidelines for future developments to complement and enhance this character.

5. **District Boundary**

The house types and streetscape features of Lyall Avenue represent a more grand and varied settlement pattern that is distinct from other residential housing in the area. This Heritage Conservation District Plan proposes a district boundary that includes all of the existing residential lots and structures fronting on Lyall Avenue between Main Street and Malvern Avenue.

![Lyall Avenue Diagram](image)
6. Statement of Cultural Heritage Value

The nature of the heritage character of Lyall Avenue lies in its place in the development of the historic Village of East Toronto. Lyall Avenue was first planned running east from the newly laid Main Street by a series of subdivision plans in the 1880s intended to accommodate the expansion of the Grand Trunk Railway’s freight yards and York Station south of Danforth Road (now Danforth Avenue).

The residential development of Lyall Avenue took place from the 1880s to the 1920s. As part of the East Toronto rail community, construction along Lyall Avenue exhibits an urban aesthetic absent in nearby suburban resort developments of the same period, e.g. the Beach. However, in contrast to neighbouring streets within the village, where the railroad developed large plots of land, the original fifty-foot lots along Lyall were mostly developed by individual landowners. The result of this is a street of detached homes exhibiting a mixture of vernacular architecture of the period including high Victorian, Edwardian Classical and Toronto Bungalow designs. The use of proportional massing, setbacks and siting of these vernacular constructions draws relationships in design and a rhythm in form.

The landscaped front and side yards of the lots along Lyall work in tandem with their vernacular designs to create a cohesive streetscape. These open spaces contribute a mature tree canopy and green space that create a comfortable relationship with the road and further unify the properties on Lyall Avenue into a distinct community.

The combination of these attributes, specifically the District’s development history, vernacular architecture, cohesive streetscape and natural landscape, has become a valued urban aesthetic typical of Toronto and worthy of recognition and protection.
7. **District Analysis**

Heritage attributes are the individual qualities of an area that add to the overall character of a place. As part of the heritage study undertaken in the development of this plan, a number of heritage attributes have been identified for their significant contribution to the valued heritage character of Lyall Avenue. These attributes include: Lyall’s historical relationship to the development of the Village of East Toronto; its mixture of vernacular architecture of the late-19th and early-20th century; a cohesive streetscape based on original lot patterns, appropriate setbacks and massing; as well as a mature landscape defined by a heavy tree canopy and front gardens.

7.1 **Historical Development**

*The Village of East Toronto*

Lyall Avenue developed as part of the Village of East Toronto in the mid 1880s, a railroad community centred around York Station and the new freight yard of the Grand Trunk Railway.

In 1883 the Grand Trunk Railway selected farmland five and half miles east of Toronto and just short of the existing York Station as the site of its new freight yard. Located just south of Danforth Road, the new construction cut short the existing Dawes Road and established Main Street, at the western edge of the railway yard, as the chief north-south corridor of the eastern part of the Township of York.

These marshalling yards and a new York Station on Main Street provided the impetus for the planning and development of the Village of East Toronto. The Grand Trunk Railway constructed workers’ houses on Lakeview Avenue (Gerrard Street), Swanwick Avenue and Stephenson Avenue. As well, a large YMCA was built just to the north of York Station, providing rooms for train crews and local residents with much needed space for community activities.

Largely through the organization of two principal landowners in the area, D.G. Stephenson and Benjamin Morton, the Village of East Toronto was first incorporated in 1888 with a population of 750. The first meetings of council focused on the repair of streets and lanes long neglected by York Township and the establishment of a volunteer fire brigade.

Despite its small size the Village of East Toronto was quite progressive. East Toronto maintained its own powerhouse at the corner of Wayland and Gerrard, secured water rights from the lake through a stretch of land between Balsam and Beech avenues, and housed its own hospital and library in the local YMCA. In 1893, a spur line of the Toronto and Scarboro Electric Railway Company was established into the village centre, connecting East Toronto to the greater City of Toronto. It ran up Walter Street from Kingston Road, over on Lyall Avenue and along Main Street. By 1900 electric street lighting was installed in the village. In contrast to other jurisdictions to the east of Toronto, these amenities allowed East Toronto to maintain a level of independence.
from other governing authorities and with it came a strong sense of community evident in Annual Arbour Day celebrations and regular sporting events.

The corner of Main and Gerrard streets developed as the commercial centre of the village. The site of three local banks and a large farmer’s market, this intersection also provided the area with a hardware store and dry goods supplier. Later merchants also came to include a Ford dealership, a silent movie theatre and ice cream parlour.

In 1903, the Village of East Toronto became a town of three wards. Over the next several years the need for service improvements between the wards and discussions of a new GTR line along the lakeshore began to weigh heavily on the town’s council. In 1908, despite significant reservations of many area residents, the Town of East Toronto, with a population of about 4,800, was annexed by Toronto. Improvements to infrastructure came slowly and the area remained somewhat isolated until the 1920s. Although the village had easy access to Toronto by train and streetcar, most residents chose to work, live and find their recreation close to home. The Beaches provided a nearby retreat and remained the place to go for many East Torontonians.

By the 1940s the Danforth yard ceased to operate as a freight yard, and in 1974 York Station was demolished and replaced by the Danforth GO Station, but the neighbourhood maintains many well-kept examples of its rich turn-of-the-20th century identity.
Figure 5. Goad’s Atlas of 1884 showing the future path of Main Street prior to the rail yard’s expansion.
Figure 4. Goad’s Atlas of 1890 showing first subdivision plans, new York Station, YMCA, and first Lyall homes.

Figure 5. Goad’s Atlas of 1903: light patches indicate new subdivision plans; no new developments appear on Lyall.
Figure 6. Goad’s Atlas of 1912 showing significant development, corresponding closely to Directory listings of 1907.

Figure 7. Goad’s Atlas of 1923 showing full development of lots along Lyall Avenue.
Lyall Avenue

Lyall Avenue was named for Edward Lyall Morton, son of Benjamin Morton, one of the area’s principal landowners. Subdivision plans indicate that the first surveys of Lyall Avenue began in 1884 to respond to a housing need prompted by the expansion of the Grand Trunk Railway yards between Lakeview Avenue and Danforth Road. By 1888, several plans owned by members of the Morton family and their associates laid out all the original fifty-yard lots along Lyall from Main Street to Catherine Street (now Pickering Street).

According to the Goad’s Atlases and available tax assessment records, the first homes on Lyall Avenue appeared in 1888, although some may date back several years earlier. These houses remained the only development on the street for a period of about twenty years. It was not until the turn of the century and the village’s incorporation as a town in 1904 that lots on Lyall Avenue were built-out significantly. Despite the fact that Grand Trunk Railways’ pulled its marshalling operations from the East Toronto site in 1909, residential development in the town continued and by 1923 Lyall Avenue closely resembled its current appearance.

More than half of the original houses on Lyall were sited at the centre of fifty-foot wide lots. The larger size of these homes was balanced by side yards to both the east and west and the use of bay windows, verandas and other projections show this ambition in design. The remaining original homes were sited to the side of their lots apparently to accommodate later subdivision. With small side windows and long, narrow layouts these houses exhibit a front-back relationship with the street. Their detached design and front yard setbacks distinguish them from denser development on neighbouring streets and relate them well to adjacent properties.
The comfortable siting and setbacks of these properties, as well as generous front yards appear to have been favoured by the prosperous middle-class of East Toronto. Demographic research shows that railway conductors and engineers, as well as accountants, clergy and merchants were some of the first to build and occupy many of the homes on this street. Among them was William Dunn of #33 Lyall, a well-known builder in East Toronto who may have built many houses in the area, including 33 and 47 Lyall. Other established members of the community include, Andrew Chalmers at #14 Lyall who owned a mill at the old Dawes Road and Danforth, A. Demary, the first of many to operate a doctor’s office at #2 Lyall, and Alexander McCowan the former sheriff of the York Township and later MPP. Many of these community members are known to have been long-time Lyall residents. Unlike the more resort-like developments of the Beach or the workers’ cottages along the railway, Lyall residents appear to have been more permanent. The fine detailing, shingling and brickwork of Lyall’s vernacular architecture reflects the prominence and level of commitment to the East Toronto community.

Figure 9. Approximate ages of construction where based on existing archival research. Where materials were absent or sources conflicted Toronto Directory listings or architectural reviews were used.
Figure 10. #74 Lyall in the late 1890s (Courtesy of David Van Dyke)

Figure 11. #33 Lyall c.1910 (Courtesy of John Duncan)
Figures 12. and 13. Charlie Dunn back from WWI in front of his parent’s home at #33 Lyall in 1916. (Courtesy of John Duncan)

Figure 14. Looking east from in front of #47 Lyall in the 1930s. Clara Jane Duncan, daughter of William J. Dunn a prominent builder in East Toronto who built #33 and #47 Lyall. (Courtesy of John Duncan)

Figure 15. Looking east from in front of #47 Lyall in March 2006. The street and the houses have changed little, while the tree canopy remains largely intact.
7.2 Architecture

The urban development of Lyall Avenue dates from the 1880s to the present, however the bulk of original development along Lyall appears to have occurred between 1880 and 1920. This period of construction during the growth and evolution of East Toronto, from a small rail village to a town, and finally a Toronto suburb, contributes a unique mix of architectural styles of the period that include variations on High Victorian, Edwardian Classical, and Bungalow designs.

High Victorian 1865 - 1900

At least five houses on the street have survived from the 19th century, including #22, #38, #50, #62, and #74, each possessing a building type unique to the street. The mode, size and architectural character of these Victorian era buildings mesh well with the simple style and detailing of the more prevalent turn-of-the-century architecture of the street.

Figure 16. # 22 Lyall (left) exemplifies High Victorian details

Figure 17. #74 Lyall represents typical Neo-Georgian farmhouse. This style was popular in the latter half of the nineteenth century because its second storey was “hidden”, providing a tax lower rate. While still common in rural Ontario, only a few remain in Toronto.
Edwardian Classicism 1900 - 1950

The majority of the houses on the street can be identified as having distinct features of Edwardian Classicism with simple, balanced (if not symmetrical) designs, and many windows. Lyall Avenue is dominated by the typical Toronto Edwardian four-square model. This large and practical brick house type displays robust but simple wood detailing most often found in the gable. Many houses on the street of the same vintage, though not of the classic four-square prototype, are similar in their massive and solid brick structures, often with different window detailing and expansive porches.

Figure 18. #6 Lyall exhibits simple stone accents typical of Edwardian styles

Figure 19. #26 Lyall shows square and simple design
While Edwardian Classicism is the dominant architectural style for early 20th Century development along Lyall, a few properties exhibit low-pitched roofs, wide verandas and varied building materials typical of bungalows in Toronto. This cottage-like construction is typical of many streets to the south in the Beach.
Contemporary Structures 1950 - present

Prior to the 1950’s most new homes on Lyall were added to the street by severing off sections of larger lots and building new houses adjacent to the existing buildings. This incremental subdivision contributed to the interesting mix of architectural styles on the street. For the most part this process resulted in the construction of homes sympathetic to the proportions of those adjacent, contributing to an eclectic but cohesive architectural character.

Mid-twentieth century developments in the area, though obviously more modern in appearance, are mainly in keeping with the materiality and massing that represent the architectural character of the street. However more recent developments interrupt the rhythm of the street. Through demolitions, extensive alterations and lot splitting these new developments often exceed the typical vertical height of 2-2.5 stories and infringe on established setback lines from the street and spacing between houses. In addition, these developments have largely ignored the materials palette, window types, and architectural detailing common to the area.

Figure 21. #51 Lyall constructed as infill after 1956 exhibits a style of its time but relates to the neighbourhood in height, setback and material.
Figure 22. #35 Lyall c1905 demolished 2004.

Figure 23. Splitting the original 50 ft lot, new developments #35A + B disregard established character in massing, lot occupation, materials and setbacks.

Figure 24. #35B (right) physically overwhelms the vernacular massing of neighbouring #37 c1905.
7.5 Streetscape and Open Space

In contrast to other streets in the neighbourhood, where both historical and modern development patterns have favoured semi-detached dwellings, Lyall Avenue remains mainly a street of detached residential homes. Its wide lot frontages, consistent setbacks, sizable front lawns, and modest ground floor heights above grade create a distinct relationship with the road that is unique in the area. A diversity of heritage homes, many having large front porches add interest and variation, while general heights of 2-2.5 stories and front yard setbacks add consistency.

The pedestrian-friendly nature of Lyall Avenue is of particular importance as the street acts as an important link to several area schools. Sidewalks exist on both sides of the street and are located directly at the street’s edge. Most homes have side driveways, many with garages at the side or rear. On street permit parking is allowed and in only a few cases have front yard parking pads or driveways been constructed. Traffic flows in both directions on the street and a public transit stop exists at the corner of Lyall Avenue and Main Street.

The comfortable spacing of the built form has providing for handsome front gardens, yards and tree growth. A mature tree canopy, composed of mostly Silver Maple and White Oak, is a key feature of Lyall’s landscape and works in tandem with front lawns to anchor Lyall Avenue’s streetscape character.
7.4 Heritage Evaluation

The architectural styles along Lyall Avenue are part of a chronology of East Toronto’s development. As a whole, the massing and proportion of these structures establish a distinct streetscape that is significant for its relationship between the built and natural environment.

As part of a Heritage Conservation District, all buildings are designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act. In this District Plan each building in the study area has been categorized to help clarify which buildings contribute to the heritage character of Lyall Avenue and guide the nature of future change in the area.

Using the Ministry of Culture’s Criteria for Property of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest a team of heritage professionals was consulted in order to determine the contributing quality of each property in the District. These evaluations are based on available documentation and existing architectural conditions. As the District character continues to evolve these evaluations should be reviewed on a regular basis to ensure that an accurate representation of their contributing qualities is maintained.

The Ministry of Culture’s Criteria for Property of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest identifies the following criteria for evaluation:

**Design or Physical Value**

The property:
- Demonstrates a rare, unique, representative or an early example of a style, type, expression, material, or construction method; or
- Displays a high degree of artistic merit or craftsmanship; or
- Demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement; or
- Demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of a particular builder, designer or theorist.

**Historical or Associative Value**

- Has strong associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization, or institution that has made a significant or unique contribution to a community; or
- Yields information that contributes to an understanding of a culture or community.

**Contextual Value**

- Is particularly important in establishing the character of an area; or
- Provides a physical, historical, functional, visual linage to its surroundings; or
- Create a symbolic, aesthetic or visual landmark.\(^5\)

---

The properties that meet one or more of the identified criteria have been categorized as ‘Contributing’. These properties are understood as having historical, cultural or architectural significance to the defined District. Conversely, those properties that fail to meet any one of the above criteria have been categorized as ‘Non-contributing’.

The majority of properties along Lyall are recognized for their contextual value in establishing a ‘visual lineage’. This aesthetic relates strongly to architectural attributes such as the proportions of porches, window openings and height, as well as the integrity of construction materials and detail. A number of the original houses on Lyall have been altered and have been evaluated based on the reversibility of these changes and their representation of the street’s existing architectural character.

Figure 26.
The following guidelines are designed for managing property alteration and development in the Lyall Avenue Heritage Conservation District with a view to protect and enhance those elements that contribute to cultural heritage value of the District.

These guidelines are not intended as strict regulations but are to provide assistance in the design and decision-making process. All alteration and development within the District will require prior approval of City of Toronto Heritage Preservation Services, and in some cases Council, unless exempted under the terms of the delegation by-law, in addition to other existing building and planning approvals. Assistance in interpreting these principles will be available from staff of Heritage Preservation Services.

As part of the study process all existing planning controls and policies of the study area have been reviewed for compliance with the following guidelines. It is recommended that the height limit and minimum lot frontages in the zoning by-law be reviewed and amended to more closely match the guidelines in this District Plan.

8.1 Definitions

Italicized terms included in these guidelines have the following meanings:

**Contributing Buildings:** Properties that contribute to the character of the District and/or are historically, architecturally or culturally significant as identified in the Heritage Evaluation or determined by further evaluation

**Non-Contributing Buildings:** Properties that do not contribute to the character of the District and/or are not historically, architecturally or culturally significant as identified in the Heritage Evaluation or determined by further evaluation

**District:** The Lyall Avenue Heritage Conservation District

**Heritage Character:** As defined by the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value in this Plan
8.2 Additions and Alterations to Contributing Buildings

Most construction in the District will occur as alterations and additions to existing buildings. It is the intent of these guidelines to encourage the preservation of existing contributing buildings, to aid sensitive and contextual design for new work and to strengthen and support the heritage character of the District.

8.2.1. Alterations and additions to buildings should maintain or enhance rather than detract from the existing architectural style and character of the building and those surrounding it.

8.2.2. Reasonable effort should be taken to repair rather than replace significant architectural elements.

8.2.3. Using contributing buildings in the District and the building concerned as a guide, alterations and additions should be consistent with their size, scale and proportion and level of detail.

8.2.4. No alteration or addition should visually overwhelm the building in question or neighbouring buildings.

8.2.5. Alterations and additions should maximize the use of materials that predominate in the building concerned or in buildings of similar architectural style in the District.

8.2.6. Existing wall to window ratio and proportion should not be materially altered.

8.2.7. Windows, doors and details should relate in scale and proportion to those of the existing building.

8.2.8. Height of an addition should not exceed the height of the ridge of an existing sloping roof or the height of the existing roof or parapet.

8.2.9. Principles and guidelines in paragraph 8.2.1 need not apply to alterations and additions that do not have significant visual impact when viewed from the street.

8.2.10. Integral garages and below grade entrances are not permitted.
8.3 Alterations/Additions to Non-Contributing Buildings

8.3.1. Alterations and additions to non-contributing buildings should contribute to and not detract from the heritage character of the District.

8.3.2. Alterations and additions to non-contributing buildings should be designed to be compatible with the contributing buildings of the District, in terms of scale, massing height, setback, entry level, materials and fenestration.

8.3.3 The roof profile and the location of the eaves lines or the roof parapet should be designed so that the apparent height of the building is compatible with that of its neighbours and is not visually overwhelming to neighbouring buildings.

8.4 Demolition

The guidelines in this section are to be applied to all buildings in the District.

8.4.1 Contributing buildings should not be demolished.

8.4.2. Demolition of a non-contributing building will generally be permissible if the replacement building, as shown in the building permit application, contributes to the heritage character of the District and is acceptable under these guidelines and the zoning by-law.

8.5 New Buildings

8.5.1 New buildings should contribute to and not detract from the heritage character of the District.

8.5.2 New buildings should be designed to be compatible with the District’s contributing buildings in terms of scale, massing height, setback, entry level, materials, and fenestration.

8.5.3 The roof profile and the location of the eaves lines or the roof parapet should be designed so that the apparent height and form of the roof is compatible with that of the streetscape.

8.5.4 Integral garages and below grade entrances are not permitted.

8.5.5 The ground floor elevations of new construction should be designed so its height above grade is compatible with that of the streetscape.

8.5.6 Remaining lot frontages should not be subdivided.
8.6 Landscape and Streetscape

8.6.1 The preservation of existing landscapes, trees and mature vegetation, in both the public and private realm, is encouraged.

8.6.2 The open space character of the District should be maintained through balanced setbacks and green frontages. Prohibit front yard parking.

8.6.3 The planting of species characteristic to the District is encouraged, especially when replacing dying specimens.

8.6.4 Protect existing street trees from damage due to site development, redevelopment and paving modifications, street and infrastructure works.

8.6.5 Views created by the canopy of mature street trees and sidewalks are essential to the character of the neighbourhood and should be protected.

8.6.6 An open view from the sidewalk to the building face contributes to the District's historical streetscape and should be maintained.

8.6.7 If required, the use of hedges or decorative fencing in iron or wood should be promoted.

8.6.8 The sensitive and timely replacement of dead or dying street trees by the City of Toronto Urban Forestry staff is strongly encouraged.

8.7 Adjacent Properties

8.7.1 Developments and alterations to properties adjacent to the defined District should be evaluated for their impact of the heritage character of the adjacent District under provision 2.6.3 of the Provincial Policy Statement.
9. Implementation

In designating the Lyall Avenue Heritage Conservation District, City Council takes the following actions:

- The Lyall Avenue Heritage Conservation District, with boundaries as illustrated in this Plan, is designated as a Heritage Conservation District under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act.

- All individual properties within the District are added to the City of Toronto’s Inventory of Heritage Properties as properties designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act.

- The District Plan is adopted by by-law to guide all development and demolition in the District.

Section 42 of the Ontario Heritage Act states that, no property owner in the Heritage Conservation District shall alter any part of the property, erect, demolish or remove any building or structure on the property, other than the interior of any structure without a permit.

The City of Toronto has adopted a streamlined process for the issuance of permits in Heritage Conservation Districts through delegation By-law No. 1005-2001. The following section describes this process and outlines those circumstances in which exterior alterations maybe deemed minor in nature and no permit is required.

9.1 Minor Alterations

Part V, Section 42(1) 1., of the Ontario Heritage Act specifies that permits are required for the alteration of any part of the property, other than the interior of any structure or building within a heritage conservation district. Therefore, under the Act and according to the Lyall Avenue Heritage Conservation District Plan, no heritage permit is required for interior alterations.

In addition, Toronto City Council has provided that a permit be deemed to have been issued for certain alterations to the external portions of a building or structure. Therefore, no heritage permit is required for:

- An alteration that is not visible from the street,
- Exterior painting of wood, stucco or metal finishes,
- Repair, using the same materials, of existing exterior features, including roofs, wall cladding, dormers, cresting, cupolas, cornices, brackets, columns, balustrades, porches and steps, entrances windows, foundations and decorative wood, metal, stone or terra cotta,
- Installations of eavestroughs,
• Weatherproofing, including installations of removable storm windows and doors, caulking and weatherstripping, and
• Installations of exterior lights.

Although a permit is not required in the above instances, property owners and residents are encouraged to conform to the spirit and intent of the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value for the Lyall Avenue Heritage Conservation District.

9.2 Heritage Permits Issued by City Staff

In Heritage Conservation Districts, City Council has authorized City staff to issue Heritage Permits on behalf of Council when the work is compatible with the guidelines of the Heritage Conservation District Plan. The proposed work can involve construction of a building or structure or alteration to the exterior of a building or structure, excluding those matters set out in Section 9.1 of this Plan.

Permit applicants are encouraged to meet with City staff in the Heritage Preservation Services section of the Planning Division regarding proposed work. These meetings will help City staff to understand the proposal and assist applicants in meeting the guidelines.

For any work requiring the issuance of a building permit, the building permit, once approved by Heritage Preservation Services staff, is deemed to be the Heritage Permit; no additional permit will be required.

Should an alteration not require a building permit but relate to a matter not exempt from the requirement of a heritage permit as described in Section 9.1 of this Plan, City staff may issue a separate heritage permit. These Heritage Permits are for alterations visible from the street and include, but are not limited to, such matters as:

• new aerials, antennas and skylights;
• new vents on the roof or from the basement;
• exterior air conditioning units;
• masonry cleaning or painting;
• any change in existing architectural features, such as windows.

In delegating authority to staff, City Council may decide that it, rather than staff, will make a decision on any permit application. At any time prior to the issuance of a Heritage Permit, City Council, at the request of the Ward Councillor, may consider a Heritage Permit application.
9.3 Heritage Permits Issued by City Council

When a heritage permit application does not, in view of City staff, comply with the District guidelines or when it involves the demolition of a structure in the Heritage Conservation District, City Council will decide on the application. In making its decision, Council will be provided with the advice of City staff and information provided by the applicant.
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Lyall Avenue Property Inventory
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**LYALL AVENUE PROPERTY INVENTORY**

**NORTH SIDE LYALL AVENUE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pl 597 Part of Lot 1</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>A.F. Demary</td>
<td>phys</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pl 597 Lot 2 with ROW</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Robt. Armstrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pl 635 Blk 11</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Thomas Speller</td>
<td>carpenter</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pl 635 Blk 11 Pt Lots 19 &amp; 20</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>J.Marshall</td>
<td>letterman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pl 635 Blk 11 Pt Lots 20 &amp; 21</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Andrew Chalmers</td>
<td>miller</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pl 635 Blk 11 Pt Lots 20&amp;21</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>M.L. Strachan</td>
<td>mus. Tchr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Pl 635 Blk 13 Pt 20</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Richard Strachan</td>
<td>revered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Pl 635 Blk 13 Pt Lot 20</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Jacob Curtis</td>
<td>stone cutter / mason</td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Pl 635 Blk 13W Pt Lot 21</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Joseph Treblecock</td>
<td>manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Pl 635 Blk 13 Pt Lot 21</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Wm. J. Dunn</td>
<td>contr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Pl 635 Blk 13 Lot 22</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Andrew Taylor</td>
<td>bricklayer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Pl 635 Blk 13 Pt Lots 22 &amp; 23</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Mary Spian</td>
<td>widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Pl 635 Blk 13 Pt Lots 23 &amp; 24</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Louis Robertson</td>
<td>engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Pl 635 Blk 13 Pt Lot 24</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>George Taylor</td>
<td>engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Pl 635 Blk 13 Pt Lot 25</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>H. Sheaffer</td>
<td>engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38A</td>
<td>Pl 635 Blk 13 Pt Lot 11</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Jim Richardson</td>
<td>cleaner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38B</td>
<td>Pl 635 Blk 15 Pt Lot 11</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contributing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Pl 635 Blk 15W12</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>post 1920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Pl 635 Blk 15 Pt Lot 12</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Robert Reid</td>
<td>engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Pl 635 Blk 15 Pt Lots 12 &amp; 13</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Wm. Johnston</td>
<td>cond GTR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Pl 635 Blk 15E 30FT L13</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>David Martin</td>
<td>rent'd farmer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Pl 693 Blk 22 Pt Lot 11</td>
<td>1956</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Pl 693 Blk 22E11</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Archie Taylor</td>
<td>coalman GTR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Pl 693 Blk 22 Lot 12</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Geo. Gayton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Pl 693 Blk 22 Lot 13 Pt M10 Lot 13</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>Thomas Hutchinson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Pl 693 Blk 23 Pt Lots 21 &amp; 22 RP</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>William Clay</td>
<td>clerk, treasurer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Pl 109160 Pt 2</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Thos. J. Fitzbenny</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Pl 109160 Pt 2</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Pl 109160 Pt 2</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Henrietta Taylor</td>
<td>widow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Pl 109160 Pt 2</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>James Jones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Pl 109160 Pt 2</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Arthur Blakeley</td>
<td>motorman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Pl 109160 Pt 2</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Mc Hallie</td>
<td>engineer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The information includes the earliest appearance of listed names, their occupations, and the heritage evaluation of the properties.
**SOUTH SIDE LYALL AVENUE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Occupation/Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 63    | Blk | 1910 | Roy Blanchard | R. B. Chang
| 12    | Blk | 1910 | Arthur Asling | Baker
| 15    | Blk | 1907 | Milton Bissell | B. A. Chang
| 17    | Blk | 1907 | Hettie Hopkins | Tailoress
| 19    | Blk | 1907 | Jos. Gough | Gentleman
| 21    | Blk | 1907 | H. Doyle | Carpenter
| 23    | Blk | 1909 | Arthur Wadlow | Carpenter
| 25    | Blk | 1907 | Thos. Bradford | Carpenter
| 27    | Blk | 1907 | Margaret Renton | Widow
| 31    | Blk | 1909 | Edgar Gray | Producer
| 33    | Blk | 1907 | W. J. Dunn | Builder
| 35    | Blk | 1909 | Arthur Wadlow | Carpenter
| 37    | Blk | 1907 | Wm. Yonge | Carpenter
| 39    | Blk | 1907 | TG Humphrey | Carpenter
| 41    | Blk | 1907 | Lily Guiver | Dressmaker
| 43    | Blk | 1907 | Andrew Graham | Gentleman
| 47    | Blk | 1956 | post | 1920
| 49    | Blk | 1956 | post | 1920
| 51    | Blk | 1910 | unfinished house | Contributing
| 61    | Blk | 1910 | M. O. L. Blk 3 Blk 27 | Contributing
| 63    | Blk | 1910 | M. O. L. Blk 7 Pt 4 | Contributing
| 65    | Blk | 1923 | post | 1920
| 67    | Blk | 1907 | Wm. Booth | Lather
| 69    | Blk | 1909 | John Mason | Carpenter
| 71    | Blk | 1910 | Alfred Burslem | Carpenter
| 73    | Blk | 1923 | post | 1920
| 75    | Blk | 1907 | Charles McReath | Artist
| 77    | Blk | 1923 | post | 1920
| 79    | Blk | 1909 | George Cray | Produce dealer

*available Goad's Altas' (Fire insurance maps): 1884, 1890, 1899, 1903, 1910, 1923, 1956

^available listings: City of Toronto Directories 1909 - 1920, Village of East Toronto 1907, Assessment Rolls 1889 - 1984, 1905 (North side)

**NOTE:** Above materials were cross referenced with available community surveys
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