

Baby Point Heritage Conservation District Study

Old Millside Community Advisory Group Meeting #2

Thursday, November 9, 2017

Humbercrest United Church, West Hall

16 Baby Point Road, Toronto

7:00 pm - 9:00 pm

Meeting Summary

1. Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introductions

Susan Hall, the facilitator from Lura Consulting, welcomed Community Advisory Group (CAG) members and thanked them for attending the session. Ms. Hall led a round of introductions of CAG members, City of Toronto staff and the project consultants from EVOQ, ASI and Lura Consulting and reviewed the meeting agenda. She explained that the meeting would provide CAG members with the opportunity to learn about, and offer input to, the Baby Point Heritage Conservation District (HCD) Study. She explained that the meeting would provide CAG members with an update of the work completed to date, present the findings and analysis for the neighbourhood, as well as the draft recommendations.

CAG members were informed that a summary of the meeting would be circulated to the group. The following individuals attended the meeting:

Community Advisory Group Members	Project Team Member
Albert Cohen	Alex Corey, City of Toronto
Jane Craig	Susan Hughes, City of Toronto
Karene Dumoulin	Dima Cook, EVOQ (Consultant team – lead)
Michael Doody	Reece Milton, EVOQ (Consultant team)
Niki Kavakonis	David Robertson, ASI Heritage (Consultant team – archaeology)
Oleh Leszczyszyn	Susan Hall, Lura Consulting (Facilitator)
Peter McBurney (Old Millside Residents Association - HCD Liaison Officer)	Lily D’Souza, Lura Consulting (Facilitator)

The meeting agenda is included as Appendix A.

2. Presentations

An overview presentation covering the following topics was provided to CAG members:

- **Baby Point HCD Study Overview and Process**
Alex Corey, City of Toronto

Baby Point Heritage Conservation District Study
Old Millside Community Advisory Group Meeting #2 Summary

- **HCD Preliminary Research**
Dima Cook, EVOQ
- **Archaeological Framework and Key Considerations**
David Robertson, ASI

The presentation was posted on the [Heritage Conservation Districts in Toronto blog](#) following the meeting.

3. Guided Discussion

CAG members were given the opportunity to ask questions of clarification and comment on the study results and draft recommendations presented. A summary of the CAG feedback is presented below, and organized by the themes and questions used to guide the discussion.

History

Discussion Question: Do you have any comments on or information to add to the history of Old Millside?

CAG members did not have specific information to add to the history of Old Millside. They posed questions of clarification about the Home Smith regulations on new development within the neighbourhood. Key points from the project team's responses are summarized below.

- Home Smith Regulations – Enforcement of the regulations imposed by Robert Home Smith ended around World War II; however a 1941 Township of York bylaw extended the Home Smith regulations. The City is currently tracing the regulation's history to determine whether it applied to Old Millside, and how long it was in force.

CAG members advised that deep set-backs of houses from the front property line are a key part of Old Millside's character and should be retained through policies. They also suggested that the retaining wall on Humbercrest Boulevard should be maintained and included in the story of the neighbourhood's history.

One CAG member provided a revised date of construction of a home from that shown in the presentation.

Landscape

Discussion Question: Are there any individual properties, views, or features within Old Millside that you think are important in defining its character?

CAG members identified the view to the Humber River from Old Millside is significant. It was also noted that the "stairs" provide a gathering spot for neighbourhood children, and that Cushman Park is used for tobogganing in the winter.

Baby Point Heritage Conservation District Study
Old Millside Community Advisory Group Meeting #2 Summary

Boundary

Discussion Question: Does the potential HCD boundary accurately reflect your understanding of the HCD research analysis/study results? Are there areas that should be re-considered for inclusion/exclusion?

CAG members were supportive of the potential HCD boundary as it relates to Old Millside. They posed questions of clarification regarding the proposed HCD boundary. Key points from the project team's responses are summarized below.

- The current direction is to exclude the majority of Old Millside from the recommended Baby Point HCD area, as Old Millside has a fundamentally different character in terms of the style and appearance of its houses than Baby Point.
- There is still a need to consider the archeological potential of Old Millside; recommendations for tools or mechanisms to conserve potential archaeological resources are still being determined by the consultant team.

Archaeology

Discussion Question: Do you have any questions or comments about the archaeological review conducted as part of the HCD Study in Old Millside?

CAG members posed questions of clarification about the process of how archaeological potential is determined, mechanisms available to protect archaeological resources, completed archaeological assessments, and the status of archaeology as part of the study process. Key points from the project team's responses are summarized below.

- Process to determine archaeological potential – Early, reputable historical accounts and mapping from the 19th and early 20th centuries provided a starting point. These suggest a long history of use by various First Nations prior to and following European arrival. Criteria developed by the Province (e.g., proximity of land to water within 250 m) were also used to model archaeological potential. The majority of the Baby Point and Old Millside neighbourhoods would be captured based on that criterion alone.
- HCD as a tool to protect archaeology – It is possible for Old Millside to be designated an HCD for archeological reasons exclusively. In this case, the HCD would regulate architecture, housing styles, massing, built form etc.; instead, it would only speak to archaeology (e.g., excavation work on property). It would ensure that when a change is proposed that may impact archaeological resources, appropriate steps are taken to ensure they are identified, documented and removed.
- Tools to protect archaeology – Currently tools to protect archaeology are limited. Staff in Heritage Preservation Services currently monitor applications submitted for properties with archaeological potential to the Committee of Adjustment and building permits, and may request an archaeological assessment be undertaken as a condition of an application. Owners are often unaware that they are required by the Province to undertake an archaeological assessment for certain types of work until they have submitted an application. An HCD, however, would ensure that owners are aware of these requirements, and also ensure that the City is notified when a

Baby Point Heritage Conservation District Study
Old Millside Community Advisory Group Meeting #2 Summary

permit is submitted on these properties. The City is also currently reviewing other potential tools and mechanisms to protect archaeological resources; therefore, the mechanisms may evolve.

- Archaeological assessments completed to date – Four archaeological assessments have been completed on properties in Old Millside; these assessments were triggered through development applications. The assessments completed so far are not however sufficient enough to discount the archeological potential of the area, given the area’s history and past uses.

CAG members commented they would prefer another means to protect archaeological potential than a HCD. One question put forward by a CAG member was if it is possible to require an archaeological assessment via the existing development approvals process (i.e., when digging for other purposes). Another CAG member commented that sufficient tools to protect archaeological potential should be developed and administered using a streamlined approach. It was also noted that more information and communication is needed to ensure residents are aware of the rules/responsibilities pertaining to archaeological assessments.

Community Engagement

Discussion Question: What are your thoughts on the suggested format for the next community meeting? Should there be one meeting, or separate meetings for Baby Point and Old Millside?

CAG members expressed support for separate meetings for Baby Point and Old Millside as this would continue the approach used to consult with residents from each neighbourhood (i.e., independent CAG meetings), and avoid confusion given the results of the overall HCD study and draft recommendations.

There was some range in CAG feedback regarding the format for the community meeting. One suggestion was to consider the purpose and objectives for the next community meeting, and what impact residents’ input will have the study recommendations when making a decision about the format. Another suggestion was for a town hall format based on the information presented at the CAG meeting.

Discussion Question: What information should be presented at the meeting so residents understand the HCD Study results and any recommendations?

CAG members provided the following suggestions:

- Make the presentation and discussion questions available to residents in advance of the community meeting to allow time for information to be absorbed and understood.
- Consider postponing the next community meeting until recommendations for new tools/mechanisms to protect archaeology are available.
- Focus information and materials specific to Old Millside.

In relation to this, additional feedback from a CAG member suggested the following FAQs to help inform and educate residents before the next community meeting.

Baby Point Heritage Conservation District Study
Old Millside Community Advisory Group Meeting #2 Summary

- Most of the Old Millside area is to be excluded from the architectural restrictions imposed by the HCD recommendation. What are the options for residents under existing rules if they object to the size of a redevelopment in the area?
- From a homeowner's perspective, what is the difference between a HCD and ASA as it relates to the protection of archaeology?
- Under the existing ASA rules what am I obligated to do as a homeowner, particularly if I want to...
 - build an extension
 - replace an existing extension
 - plant a tree
 - replace a tree
 - plant a bush
 - build a new fence
 - replace an existing fence
 - put in a swimming pool
 - put in a new flower bed
- What are the extra costs to me as it relates to the ASA rules for each of the above (approximate costs or a range)?
- As part of the field assessment, my house is designated as one where "archaeological potential is confirmed". Under what circumstances would that be changed to one designated as "cleared of archaeological potential"?
- What archaeological finds have there been in the Old Millside area (as opposed to Baby Point)? If there are few finds what is the basis for continuing to designate the Old Millside as an ASA?

Additional Discussion

CAG members asked if future consultation will occur once tools to protect archaeological resources have been identified. Key points from the project team's responses are summarized below.

- Future CAG meetings – The timelines presented are in relation to the HCD study. CAG members may be invited to be part of a consultation process to discuss archaeology as part of a future City initiated study.

4. Wrap Up and Next Steps

Alex Corey thanked CAG members for attending the meeting and explained that the meeting summary would be circulated in the near future. He informed CAG members that the second public meeting is anticipated in early 2018.

Baby Point Heritage Conservation District Study
Old Millside Community Advisory Group Meeting #2 Summary

Appendix A – Agenda

Baby Point Heritage Conservation District Study

Old Millside Community Advisory Group Meeting #2

Thursday November 9, 2017
Humbercrest United Church, East Hall
16 Baby Point Road, Toronto
7:00 pm – 9:00 pm

AGENDA

Meeting Purpose:

- Provide an update of the HCD Study work completed to date;
- Present findings and analysis of the neighbourhood;
- Present and discuss draft recommendations;
- Address questions and concerns from CAG members;
- Discuss community engagement; and
- Review next steps

7:00 pm Agenda Review, Opening Remarks and Introductions

- Susan Hall, Lura Consulting, Facilitator
- Alex Corey, City of Toronto, Heritage Preservation Services

7:10 pm Presentation

- Baby Point HCD Study survey and analysis of the Old Millside neighbourhood and draft recommendations – Dima Cook, Senior Associate, EVOQ Architecture

7:45 pm Guided Discussion

- Susan Hall, Facilitator, Lura Consulting

8:55 pm Wrap Up and Next Steps

- Susan Hall, Facilitator, Lura Consulting
- Alex Corey, City of Toronto

9:00 pm Adjourn