

West Toronto Junction Heritage Conservation District Study Local Advisory Community (LAC) LAC Meeting #2 Summary of Feedback

Table of Contents

Meeting Details	1
Attendees	1
1. Meeting Purpose	2
2. Presentation and Process	2
The Ontario Heritage Act (Part V)	2
Area study	2
Scope of study	2
Questions of Clarification	3
HCD Process and Policy	3
Built Form and Typology	4
Heritage Evaluation & Boundary	5
3. Revised Materials After the Meeting	5
4. Summary of Feedback – LAC Meeting #2	6
What We Heard	6
Building Typologies	6
Public Spaces, Gateways and Views	6
Architectural Styles & Character	7
Historic Context and Identity	8
Heritage Evaluation	8
Study Area Boundary	9
Policy and Planning Layers	9
Requested Materials & Analysis Updates	9
Resources	10
5. Wrap-Up and Next Steps	10
Appendix A: Additional LAC Feedback (Emails Received After the Meeting until November 21, 2025)	11
Email #1 – Submitted on 4 November 2025	11
Email #2 - Submitted on 4 November 2025	14

Email #3 - Submitted on 21 November 2025	14
Email #4 - Submitted on 21 November 2025	16
Appendix B: Additional LAC Feedback (Emails with LAC Summary Feedback Received until December 22, 2025)	34
Email #5 – Submitted on 22 December 2025	34
Email #6 – Submitted on 22 December 2025	35

West Toronto Junction Heritage Conservation District Study Local Advisory Community (LAC) LAC Meeting #2 Summary of Feedback

Meeting Details

Date: Thursday, October 30, 2025

Location: West Toronto Baptist Church (3049 Dundas St W, Toronto, ON M6P 1Z5)

Time: 6:30pm – 8:30pm

Attendees

The meeting was attended by the following:

Project Team	Affiliation
Tamara Anson-Cartwright, Program Manager, Heritage Planning, Policy and Research Clint Robertson, Heritage Planner Kishmita Arora, Planner, Community Planning (West) Vera Autilio, Urban Designer	City of Toronto – City Planning and Development Review Division
Dima Cook, Architect, Principal, Director Emily Cheng, Senior Architect	EVOQ Architecture
Zoie Edwards Browne, Associate Marissa Irene Uli, Community Engagement Specialist	LURA Consulting

LAC Members	Affiliation
Carol Jolly	The Junction BIA
Charles Hazell	Junction Heritage Conservation District Board
Diana Fancher	West Toronto Junction Historical Society
Domitillah Antoinette	West Bend Community Association
Eleni (Helen) Vassilakos	Junction Residents Association
Kenneth Sharratt	West Toronto Junction Historical Society
Janet Di Bernardo	The Junction BIA
Jim Baxter	West Bend Green Community
Mario Silva	Junction Residents Association
Marilyn Miller	Junction Heritage Conservation District Board
Marybeth McTeague	West Bend Green Community
Observers	Affiliation
Mark Strifler	Ward 4 Parkdale-High Park Councillor Office
Alisha	Charles Hazell Assistant

LAC members who sent regrets and were unable to attend included the following:

LAC Members	Affiliation
Katherine Goodenow	West Bend Community Association

1. Meeting Purpose

The second Local Advisory Committee (LAC) meeting was held to discuss the West Toronto Junction Heritage Conservation District Study. The meeting purpose was to:

- Provide an update on the West Toronto Junction Heritage Conservation District (HCD) Study;
- Present the results from the survey and character analysis, and get feedback on the direction of the HCD Study recommendations; and
- Seek feedback on identified potential properties that contribute to the heritage character.

2. Presentation and Process

Zoie Edwards Browne (LURA) facilitated the meeting and welcome LAC members and provided a land acknowledgement, reviewed the meeting purpose, agenda and led a round of introductions of LAC members and project team staff.

Clint Robertson (City of Toronto) presented an overview and process of the HCD Study, as well as a brief update on Indigenous engagement process with sub-consultant Acosys. A highlight of the Ontario Heritage Act (Part V) is provided below.

The Ontario Heritage Act (Part V)

Area study

40 (1) The council of a municipality may undertake a study of any area of the municipality for the purpose of designating one or more heritage conservation districts. 2005, c. 6. s. 29.

Scope of study

(2) A study under subsection (1) shall,

- (a) examine the character and appearance of the area that is the subject of the study, including buildings, structures and other property features of the area, to determine if the area should be preserved as a heritage conservation district;
- (b) examine and make recommendations as to the geographic boundaries of the area to be designated;
- (c) consider and make recommendations as to the objectives of the designation

Dima Cook (EVOQ) presented the West Toronto Junction HCD Character Analysis and preliminary Heritage Evaluation, which included:

- Junction HCD Study Updates
- Historic Land Use and Periods of Development
- Architectural Styles
- Number of Storeys
- Building Typologies
- Landmarks, Gateway and Views

- Heritage Survey - preliminary Evaluation and Integrity review

Following the presentation, Zoie led a guided discussion to gather detailed feedback from LAC members.

Questions of Clarification

LAC members asked questions during and after the meeting which are highlighted below. City staff and consultant comments are included throughout for informational purposes only.

HCD Process and Policy

- **Does an HCD control height or density?**
 - City staff noted that an HCD does not set height. Height and density are influenced by policy and zoning; however, the HCD determines how the development integrates into the neighbourhood character and streetscape.
- **Does an HCD override zoning or the Official Plan (OP)?**
 - City staff noted that the Official Plan (OP) takes precedence in the event of a conflict. An HCD can guide considerations of character, form, and heritage value. While zoning provides numerical regulation for height, density and setbacks. These are laid out, and decisions must balance all three.
- **Can an HCD protect the interior of the buildings?**
 - Staff highlighted that an HCD cannot protect what is inside the building.
- **Can a developer ask for an OP amendment within an HCD?**
 - City staff noted that a site-specific OP amendment can be requested, even if they are inside an HCD boundary.
- **How important are Ontario Land Tribunal (OLT) decisions on future HCD?**
 - City staff noted that a Tribunal (OLT) decision sets a precedent and helps guide how HCD policies are interpreted. The St Lawrence OLT decision and language was a highlighted example. This OLT decision was shared with the LAC membership. The OLT decision can be found [here](#).
- **What consultations are happening with Indigenous communities?**
 - On June 18, 2025, from 1 to 2:30 p.m., the first Indigenous Advisory Circle meeting was held virtually. Knowledge keepers and elders came to the meeting to share. A summary of the meeting is available [here](#). On September 15, 2025, from 5 to 8 p.m., an in-person Urban Indigenous Engagement session was held at the Annette Street Public Library. A summary will be posted soon on the [website](#).
- **How will Indigenous input be used?**
 - City staff stated an Indigenous perspective will help inform how the study describes place and landscape, what cultural values should be recognized, as well as how community identity is described.

- **How does active community spirit and cohesion factor into HCD decision-making?**
 - It depends on the relationship between the community and what is built.
- **Can a building from the 1960s be listed/designated?**
 - Yes, any building of any age can be listed or designated.

Built Form and Typology

- **What are some areas on the typology map shown as white?**
 - The consultant explained that those areas do not fall under the defined Main Street Commercial Typology. They may represent buildings or blocks that do not fit the criteria or category.
- **What are Main Street Commercial Type 1?**
 - The consultant shared that Main Street Commercial Type 1A is a two-storey flat-roofed building with a pronounced parapet (unless removed), a recessed glazed entrance and either residential or continuous commercial space on the upper level. The percentage of glazing is approximately 90% on the ground floor and 25-40% on the upper level. Building heights range between 6 to 10 metres and widths between 4 to 10 metres. Main Street Commercial Type 1B is similar to type 1A; however, these properties are typically 10+ metres in width, or are significantly wider than their neighbouring commercial buildings. Main Street Commercial Type 1C is similar to Type 1A; however, these buildings have a chamfered corner.
- **What are Main Street Commercial Type 2?**
 - The consultant shared that Main Street Commercial Type 2A is a three-storey flat-roofed building with a pronounced parapet (unless removed), a recessed glazed entrance and either residential or continuous commercial space on the upper two levels. There are four instances of type 2A that have chamfered lots. The percentage of glazing is approximately 90% on the ground floor and 25-40% on the upper levels. Building heights range between 10 and 13 metres and widths between 4 and 10 metres. Main Street Commercial Type 2B is similar to Type 2A; however, this subtype often incorporates a multi-storey oriel window or shallow sloped roof overhang at the parapet. Main Street Commercial Type 2C is a 1960s/70s version of type 2A, however these are 5-6 metres in width.
- **Why are buildings grouped into typologies?**
 - The consultant explained that grouping helps identify what architectural family they belong to, how they relate in terms of storefronts, windows and proportion and which collective form contributes to the street character.
- **Does siding prevent a building from contributing to an HCD?**
 - The consultant explained that siding alone does not disqualify a building. If the building is still legible for their story and form is visible, then it can retain its value.
- **Can institutional building be included in the typologies list/map?**

- The consultant received this suggestion and provided the information in updated materials provided after the meeting.
- **Is Campbell Block considered commercial?**
 - The consultants will review the Campbell Block to confirm.

Heritage Evaluation & Boundary

- **What is a “zero criteria” building?**
 - The consultants explained that zero-criterion buildings are those that do not score any of the evaluation criteria.
- **Is there a weighted analysis?**
 - It is more of layer process.
- **How many criteria does a building need to meet to contribute?**
 - The consultants explained that if the building meets one or two criteria of the heritage evaluation, then it can be considered contributing. This is especially true if the block has overall integrity.
- **Does ‘loss of integrity’ remove a building’s heritage value?**
 - The consultants explain that it is not always the case. If the historic story remains legible, the building may still be valuable even if they are renovated or altered.
- **Could the study area change if contributing areas are concentrated at the edges?**
 - The consultants explained that it is possible. If the edges demonstrated integrity or concentration, then the boundary can be reconsidered.

3. Revised Materials After the Meeting

After the meeting (November 7, 2025), updated Heritage Evaluation and Character Analysis information was provided electronically to the LAC membership to address questions and comments raised during the meeting about Heritage Evaluation maps and Character Analysis information handout materials. The revised materials provided to LAC members after the meeting included the following changes:

1. Building Typologies: revisions to residential typology to only include detached, semi-detached, and townhouses, (there are not enough condos or low rise apartments buildings to merit a typology and thus were removed). Non-prevailing typologies (i.e., less than 5 examples per building type) were added as a category.
2. Heritage Evaluation: addition of property addresses on streetscapes, as well as property index for presentation slides. 3077 Dundas marked as new therefore not meeting any criteria. Streetscapes reordered properly for the south side of Dundas St W between High Park and Pacific & Pacific and Medland. South streetscape between Annette and Humberside moved to its own slide.

LAC members were invited to share additional comments by November 21, 2025.

4. Summary of Feedback – LAC Meeting #2

The summary below includes feedback from the LAC members discussed during Meeting #2 (October 30, 2025) and received by email, after the meeting (by November 21, 2025). This summary was prepared by LURA Consulting. It is not intended to be a verbatim record of respondent feedback; rather, it summarizes and synthesizes the feedback received.

The feedback received in the 'What We Heard' section is organized by topics. This is followed by resources provided for review.

Details of emails received after the meeting are listed in **Appendix A**.

What We Heard

Building Typologies

- LAC members wanted clarity on building typologies, including the definition and mapping of all types.
- Concern with simplicity of focus on 2 commercial typologies.
- Members suggested more broader and nuance categories such as:
 - Institutional buildings (including banks)
 - Blocks (e.g., Campbell Block)
 - Commercial–Apartment Block at corners
 - Recessed entrances as an outstanding and characteristic feature
- Concern with buildings listed as “non-prevailing” because it has a negative connotation and groups together diverse, rare, or unique building types (banks, hotels, churches, theatres, garages).
- LAC members highlighted the importance of bank typologies and noted that ‘landmark’ categorization does not capture their architectural and contextual importance. Banks are architect-designed, use high-quality materials and classical details, and are distinct contributors to the built form. Noted examples include:
 - Former Bank of Toronto (Carrère & Hastings, 1910) – an architectural jewel
 - Former Dominion Bank / Scout Logistics (John Lyle, 1925)
- Residential upper-storey accommodation is a significant part of character and an important type of housing.
- Residential areas on Dundas Street West reflect its role as Main Street and Central Business District (CBD) (as referred to by LAC members) of West Toronto Junction; these are cultural landscape elements.

Public Spaces, Gateways and Views

- Public spaces such as local parks contribute to the Study Area value
- Important gateways to the CBD include:
 - The eastern gateway at the convoluted intersection at Dundas Street West /Dupont Street/Annette Street/Old Weston Road.

- The western gateway at the intersection of Dundas Street West and Runnymede Road (which was also, until 1995, the boundary between the City of Toronto and York), outside the Study Area.
- The north-south gateway at Keele Street/Weston Road and Dundas Street West (although it quickly angles off northwest). It is also the only north-west to south street between Dufferin Street and Jane Street.
- Consider including a category for corner lots which offer public space and transition zones.
- Corner conditions require deeper understanding beyond entrances as they reflect street grid angles and create unique interior and exterior views.
- LAC members noted that the area has more through views than traditional gateways. Example of important views include:
 - High Park Avenue, McMurray Avenue and Medland Street towards Dundas Street West
 - Mavety Street and from St Johns Road towards Dundas Street West
 - 108 Vine Avenue, from the east side of Pacific Avenue looking north from Dundas to the Sweet Potato, industrial building, outside the Study Area
 - North on High Park towards Dundas Street West
 - South along Keele Street emerging from under the railway bridge and into the Study Area
 - North on Keele from Annette
 - Views of James Hall at Dundas and Pacific,
 - Entering the Study Area from the west along Dundas, where the house forms, Park and narrower street announce a different area,
 - Entering the Study Area from the east where the curving street gives views of the streetscape, announcing a new area.

Architectural Styles & Character

- The study should identify the most relevant and best represented characteristic styles that define the Junction which includes:
 - Late Victorian red brick
 - Edwardian Classicism stone/yellow brick
 - Post-WWI yellow brick with stone trim (occasionally also deeper red brick with stone trim)
 - Art Deco examples
- Interest in whether newer styles such as Modernist, New Traditional, and Contemporary styles are considered for heritage significance.
- Interest in buildings that are newer developments with character such as the former Starbucks at southeast corner of Dundas and Quebec. LAC members want to understand if there is opportunity to highlight redevelopments that support maintaining character and highlight those to encourage similar sympathetic development.

Historic Context and Identity

- LAC members emphasize the importance of the Junction's broader story (beyond the Study Area), such as historical uses, ownership continuity, cultural life and evolving character that remains visible today.
- The Junction area has a mix of historical and contemporary elements, which is a defining aspect that should be reflected in the analysis.
- The Junction business district and town development were spread over the area, which is another defining aspect.
- The Junction area developed from a scattered rural population to a bustling municipality, with Dundas Street becoming a central street despite businesses and institutions being spread across a wider area.
- LAC member noted the significant role of immigrant populations, particularly Jewish settlers, in shaping local businesses and institutions. It calls for recognition of Dundas's historical importance as the Main Street of the town/city, reflecting its role in the community's growth and the diverse needs of its people.
- Dundas grew as the Main Street and CBD from east to west. Buildings and residential elements reflect this evolution.
- Food and produce wholesalers played a major economic role in the area as well as shaping certain blocks.

Heritage Evaluation

- Some LAC members expressed concern with the rating criteria of buildings and feel that many buildings from the late 19th–mid 20th century could score at least two criteria of Criteria 1, 4, 7, and 8.
- Concern with some buildings that could have 3-4 criteria but are listed as no heritage value.
- Some LAC members feel that photos are out of date and do not show recent store signage changes, restorations and the integrity mapping contains errors, inconsistencies and is too simplistic.
- Many buildings categorized as “compromised” still show coherence, authenticity, and common characteristics per the City’s HCD Terms of Reference.
- Concerns were raised about buildings that are identified as ‘lost integrity’ and want to better understand how integrity assessments influence the analysis process and what impacts it may have on future demolitions.
- LAC members noted that some buildings that appear modern are older and historically meaningful.
- Some contemporary mid-20th-century buildings (e.g., Salvation Army Shelter, 1960s plaza at Pacific) should be recognized as heritage-significant examples of their era.
- Some highlighted concerns with proposed integrity factors:
 - Over-cladding: consideration of reversibility, and that stucco can be a compatible alteration
 - “Over-building”: unclear and needs definition and examples
 - Fenestration changes do not necessarily eliminate legibility
- Several one-storey shops are rare survivors and should be recognized.

- Some buildings labeled as compromised in the Study Area retain original storefront typology, consistent rooflines and heights, original fenestration placement or legible patterns and brick under cladding (which could be reversed).
- Some members expressed that closed-in porches and stucco are reversible and not grounds for lost integrity. It was suggested to re-evaluate properties disqualified due to stucco.
- Several new infill buildings should be acknowledged as sympathetically designed such as # 2926, 3077, 3018–3020 in the updated mapping
- Some buildings have strong associative value such as the first Loblaws store, Shox and Vesuvio's.

Study Area Boundary

- LAC members discussed whether there is a possibility of extending the Study Area to include nearby streets such as Keele Street and Annette Street on the south side.
- The depth of the lots, the wide sidewalks, and the Main Street characteristics of residential areas north and south of Dundas Street West are essential contextual elements and warrant consideration to extend the Study Area boundary.
- 3351 Dundas Street at Runnymede and Dundas Street West was initially built as a bank and should be considered if the boundary could be extended further west of Gilmour Avenue.

Policy and Planning Layers

- LAC members were interested in the different layers of planning policies and how they interact with heritage policies, taking precedence in certain areas.
- LAC members wanted clarification on provincial standards, thresholds and how analysis aligns with the work.

Requested Materials & Analysis Updates

- LAC members requested clearer mapping, including references and numbers on the page. After the meeting, the project team provided updated character analysis and heritage evaluation material to address this request.
- LAC members desire additional maps for building meeting specific criteria as well as all typologies, institutions including banks, properties that maintain character despite redevelopment, and estimated construction dates.
 - LAC members highlighted that Pacific Dundas-Northwest corner development was approved for demolition but is now back on the market for sale.
 - Post Meeting Note: Some of the listed feedback about material updated noted above was provided to LAC members through updated character analysis and heritage evaluation materials after the meeting.
- Requests received after the meeting:

- Updated photographic documentation including new infills that fit existing character, and Type 2 Commercial.
- Clearer labels on mapping such as Type 1A, 1B and 1C.
- Re-evaluate all buildings marked as compromised where changes are reversible or where typology remains legible.
- Re-colour and remove “shadow” developments from maps (between McMurray Avenue and Pacific Avenue). Include blocks with strong historical or associative value in mapping and analysis.

Resources

Articles and papers submitted to review by LAC members are highlighted below:

- Changing the Narrative – State of Heritage Report 2019
- Older, Smaller Better – Measuring how the character of buildings and blocks influences urban vitality 2014
- The Globe and Mail Article – Soulless “Big Box” 2025
- TSNS 2020 Neighbourhood Equity Index – Methodological Documentation 2014
- Dudas- Roncesvalles – Urban Design Guidelines
- Dundas-Junction Urban Design Guidelines Draft 2025 (to be completed end of January 2026)
- Evaluation Study (Miro QR Code)
- Heritage Planning by Harold Kalman
- West Toronto Junction Historical Walking Tour article on West Toronto Junction Business District Revisited

5. Wrap-Up and Next Steps

Zoie Edwards Browne, Clint Robertson, and Dima Cook thanked LAC members for their input and discussion, which will be used to further the HCD Study process. The next LAC members meeting will be planned for early 2026 following review of the feedback and further assessment by the project team.

Appendix A: Additional LAC Feedback (Emails Received After the Meeting until November 21, 2025)

Email #1 – Submitted on 4 November 2025

Slides – Heritage Evaluation

The are several overall problems with these slides, they lack consistency and they contain mistakes.

In terms of consistency: when a three-storey building has siding on the cornice it is OK, but if a two- storey building has siding on the cornice it is shown as compromised. When a three-storey building is covered over in stucco it is fine, but when a two-storey building has any stucco at all on the façade it is shown as compromised.

North Streetscape Gilmour Ave. to St. John's Place

Houses on either side of the Church, with the exception of 3212, are not compromised as front porch modifications can easily be reversed. The shapes and materials, overall design features, remain original.

South Streetscape Gilmour Ave. to St. John's Road

3223-5 is not compromised, just a frame semi covered in siding, which it would need to be in order to survive. 3229 is in more or less original state, 3237 is in the process of being restored and is definitely not compromised.

North Streetscape St. John's Place to Clendenan Ave.

The two buildings west of the corner should not be labeled compromised because of stucco and extra signage, they both have original window placement and nods to cornices or covered cornices. Some of the small buildings are iffy, windows appear to be the same

North Streetscape Clendenan Ave. to Quebec Ave.

The two buildings next to the northwest corner look to be original, with the exception of one window and there is obviously something interesting under the siding, which should not make it compromised.

The Beaux & Babbles building is original, should not be listed as compromised because its cornice is encased in siding. The two buildings immediately east of it are more or less original as well with same roof lines and window placement, stucco should not make them compromised.

South Streetscape Clendenan to Quebec Ave.

More or less agree

North Streetscape Quebec Ave. to McMurray Ave.

The two buildings on the northeast corner should not be shown as compromised because of siding over cornice; we have a photo of the original building. 3038 Dundas is not compromised, neither is 3036.

South Streetscape Quebec Ave. to High Park Ave.

The building at the corner of Quebec was demolished and a new building put up in the 2000s (much better architecture and materials) The earlier building, probably from the 1880s, was very basic with a concrete block extension. This brings up the question of what is worth preserving? In any event nothing of the older building was preserved.

North Streetscape McMurray Ave. to Pacific Ave.

The buildings on the east end are no longer part of a development proposal and should not be considered as such. The three on the east end of that group should be orange or green as should the corner building. The development originally approved for this site was abandoned several years ago due to problems with financing and the building(s) are for sale. Please re colour and delete shadow development in the background.

South Streetscape High Park Ave. to Pacific Ave.

The red brick building immediately west of the corner is not new, it was built in 1922 and has been proposed for listing. (I did the original research!) The rear addition only, not visible from the street, is new. The building has been added to in exemplary fashion for a heritage structure.

3001 Dundas W. is the site of a proposed 5 storey development, a building permit was issued in 2023, but there are no signs of activity. It was the (former?) Shallow Pentecostal Church, dating from the 1890s with a built-over porch.

Of particular interest is the 60s blond brick building on the southwest corner of Pacific, originally there was a frame building on the site which had been demolished by 1938. It was torn down for a used car lot and not replaced by a building before the Royal Bank, formerly located in the corner storefront, built the current row of shops in 1962-3. Can we list/designate a building from the 1960s? This little plaza is a perfect fit for the corner and the stores are never vacant. The recesses in front of the stores, unfortunately not shown on the side, allow patio seating space for the three restaurants without obstructing the sidewalk, and the variety store is one of the few left which is financially viable.

South Streetscape Pacific Ave. to Medland Street

Originally the façade of 2967 was identical to the metal façade of 2959 and we would welcome anyone who would reproduce that in whatever modern materials could be used!

North Streetscape Pacific Ave. to Keele St.

The three buildings west of the Treasury at 2900-02-04 should not be listed as compromised. They are easily returned to original detail and built by a well-known builder who has other buildings on the street. The Pretty Clean Shop and Noctua Bakery

(formerly Vesuvios) this was originally a one storey building more or less the same from the 1950s. There were a couple of furriers at/near this location and they probably liked the security of having single storey shops.

South Streetscape Medland to Mavety to Keele St.

The two-storey row between the fake 3-storey building and Studio Cycle is more or less original with some façade tweaking and windows in original placement, should not really be listed as compromised. The motorcycle store at 2923 is the first

Loblaws Groceteria beginning in 1919 and has had several storefronts throughout its tenure, ending in 1958 (when it moved to the No Frills location on Pacific). The last Loblaws storefront more or less conforms to the present one. As the First Loblaws store, it merits special consideration. This is documented on the company website, with a Dictionary of Canadian Biography entry shown and on Wikipedia. No doubt all those produce wholesalers on the east end of our main street, influenced the decision to locate the first store in the Junction!

North Streetscape Keele to Heintzman St. and Indian Grove

The Salvation Army Women's Shelter – was built new in the 1960s (possibly 1950s) originally as a motel, replacing the Occidental Hotel. It is not compromised, just ugly!

South Streetscape Keele to Indian Grove

The Orthopedic Services store is the same form and window placement as the original very plain building; the brick has just been stuccoed over, so not compromised. Shox at 2825-7 was a florist in 1925, most likely single storey originally. It was later a By-way and then Shox. Several of the two-storey buildings between condo and Shox have original window placements and you can see from the roof line that they were part of a row, so not all compromised. 2815 & 2815 ½ shows how the row would have originally looked. 2815 ½ was Booth's Hobby Shop from the 1930s to 1984, when Mr. Booth had to move to a retirement home. The condo by the way was originally Roseland Hall, bowling alley and sweets shop before it was McBride Cycle; originally designed to be, but never used as, a theatre.

North Streetscape Indian Grove to Watkinson Ave.

Accurate

South Streetscape Indian Grove to Indian Rd. Cres.

The McMaster McIntyre office at 277-81 was originally a garage with no architectural features; it was redone with no architectural features in the 1960s or early 70s. How is that compromised?

The southeast corner was a brick building with no outstanding features other than a terra cotta decoration on the corner of the 2nd storey which was replaced by a window. The other windows are the same size and shape and the building has been covered in stucco, but basically the same.

North Streetscape Watkinson Ave. To Old Weston Road

The garage was always a garage, how is this compromised? Take that sign off the top of the condo!

South Streetscape Indian Road Crescent to Annette St.

Again, this is city rearrangement of the intersection, this time in 1946, removing Indian Road, which would have gone through between Lucy McCormack School and the YMCA. The YMCA building has been there since 1948, but a new extension across the front in 1980 obscures the original

building. There were grocery wholesale businesses on the school site. In fact, there were five wholesale produce stores and a warehouse on the block in 1935. Food played a major part in the economy of the junction. Farmers west of the city brought produce in to sell to wholesalers.

Email #2 - Submitted on 4 November 2025

Following up on the second LAC meeting the JHCDB would like to provide detailed comments and analysis. In order to do this we will need copies or links to all the maps shown at the meeting and incorporating any changes that were made immediately following the meeting. We asked to see all the typologies developed for the Study, a list of all the properties that met only one criteria and a description of the criteria used to determine which properties had lost integrity. We also asked to have street numbers keyed to the maps so we can comment on individual properties.

At the meeting I noticed that Mavety Street was misspelled and the maps on page 6 were reversed so that the two corner buildings at Pacific on the south streetscape between High Park and Pacific and Pacific and Medland appeared to be at either end of the streetscape and not on the same corner.

We noted that there should be a category for new buildings that are in-deeping with the existing character, We also noted that the buildings on the North West corner of Pacific were unlikely to follow the existing approved plan and would still require site plan approval and so could still be incorporated into a new development and therefore should be evaluated for heritage value.

Overall we want to take a closer look at the application of heritage criteria, how the integrity ratings were arrived at and whether some historic values may be re-evaluated.

Thank you for all your hard work to date. We now have a solid framework to build on. We look forward to supplying more detailed feedback once we have had a chance to review all the mapping.

Email #3 - Submitted on 21 November 2025

A summary of the gateways and boundaries for the proposed heritage district

There are three obvious gateways to the main business district for West Toronto Junction/Toronto Junction/West Toronto. The eastern gateway is the convoluted intersection at Dundas/DuPont/Annette/Old Weston Road and the western gateway is the intersection of Dundas and Runnymede Road, which was also until 1995 the boundary between the City of Toronto and York.

The north south gateway is obviously Keele/Weston Road at Dundas although it quickly angles off northwest. It is also the only north(west)-south through street between Dufferin and Jane. However, from 1840 until the 1970s when the Old Weston Road Bridge was closed and then demolished, Old Weston Road was a much more important gateway than it is today. Consequently, some of the earliest development was at Dundas and Old Weston Road. The location of West Toronto CP Station at this intersection in 1911 emphasized its importance as a gateway for rail travellers.

Runnymede Road, originally known as Elizabeth Street, also had some scattered early development in York, preceding the founding of West Toronto Junction by a few years, aimed at providing services to a scattered rural population, including Swansea to the south. The first school in the area, was on the west side of Runnymede at St. John's Road in York, the first church at St. John's Road and Dundas. The scattered rural population could arrive at these institutions from Runnymede Road and/or Dundas.

Beginning in the 1890s they could also come in from the west along Dundas by streetcar.

So, although Keele & Dundas became the centre of the business district, in fact businesses and institutions were scattered along the length of Dundas between Old Weston Road and Runnymede, much as the population of the village/town/city was also scattered across a wide area, pulled in to main street Dundas from both ends. As the population increased, so too did the number of businesses and institutions that served it. The Dundas Highway between Old Weston Road and Runnymede Road became the "Main Street" for West Toronto Junction with all the varied businesses and services to be expected in a municipality of scattered residential development and major industrial areas that also acted as both a regional shopping centre and point of sale for agricultural products from suburbs and towns to the west.

It is also important to keep in mind that the streets between Dundas and the rail line, Vine and Maria in particular, were home to a largely immigrant population of factory workers between the turn of the century and the 1960s. The early Jewish population which built the Maria St. Synagogue were also early builders and business people on Dundas west of St. John's Road, followed by other nationalities, including the Macedonians and Maltese. So local businesses on Dundas adjacent to these streets catered to their particular interests and needs.

Finally, the boundaries of the Junction Heritage District along Dundas need to reflect it as the Main Street of the town/city with clear gateways at each end, and not just a cluster of buildings at Keele and Dundas.

Email #4 - Submitted on 21 November 2025

General Comments

The first two presentations are very thorough and detailed. However, as there is only one more LAC meeting, there is a concern about what is still missing and that the final document will just be a revision of what has already been presented. It is also a shared opinion that the presentations are missing the highlights and special features that make the Junction's Dundas St W. main street unique. Without giving them emphasis, there is a risk that the Junction's significance will not be truly communicated and understood and instead it is represented as just another generic Toronto main street. The Junction is unique in its history, this section of the Junction is part of a greater whole, a complete town, separate from Toronto, built around the railways, with a different development history. The Junction main street expresses the pride and creative industry of its townspeople and the connected nature of its historic cultural landscape including industrial, commercial, residential and institutional elements.

In reviewing the recent consultants report, we discussed the May 2020 Context Statement report by Common Bond. That report saw the Junction in much larger terms than is the case with the current study. The 2020 study looked at Industrial, institutional, residential, cultural, recreational and all the other aspects in addition to commercial. Since May 2020, Toronto Planning deliberations placed the emphasis on the current Study Area. The emphasis is now being placed solely on the various aspects of the commercial heart of the original area. This focus may have led to a lack of appreciation for the full significance of the Study Area. A lack of appreciation for the bigger picture may have led to the very narrow focus that the study team has adopted.

See below for a POSTSCRIPT summary of the Context Report prepared by Mr. Chat GPT just to refresh everyone's mind where we started with such a big picture and how it has become so completely focussed on one, albeit critically important, part of the Junction.

The following comments are keyed to the revised mapping submitted to the LAC after our second meeting.

REVISED MAPPING

The following slides were either presented at the LAC 2 meeting, or were circulated to the LAC members following the meeting. Our comments have been keyed into the appropriate slides

LAC COMMITTEE @ SUPPLEMENTAL MEETING MATERIALS

Question, could we be given copies of the information gathered on individual properties and estimated construction dates for the buildings in the Study Area if available?

Architectural Styles

Comment - Multiple architectural styles are listed but what are the most relevant and best represented styles that define the Junction? There are outstanding examples of Late Victorian (red brick), Edwardian Classicism (stone and yellow brick) and Post World War 1 typically yellow brick with stone trim and occasionally deeper red brick with stone trim – THA offices are an example of the first. Finally, Art Deco is present (Community Junction, 2934 Dundas W, Cornerstone, 2886 Dundas W). These styles are usually in the best designed buildings, often still well-preserved and they should be pulled out as characteristic. I haven't seen any photographic documentation which shows an appreciation and awareness of their contribution.

New Complementary Construction - I agree with ___ suggestion regarding buildings that try to respond to the existing character and I think they should be documented and understood even if only built within the last 10-15 years. The former Starbuck at the south east corner of Dundas and Quebec is, I believe, the one Jim mentioned but there is another on the north side of Dundas too, between Pacific and Keele. Some developers have appreciated the character and tried to respond. Are these buildings just pastiche or an indication of something more important? If they were discussed and highlighted could that encourage more sympathetic development?

Question, Did the newer styles like Modernist, Other, New Traditional or Contemporary ever “score” as having heritage significance? Some fit well into the character and built with the pride of place that is characteristic of the area. We also requested that new infill that fits with the existing character should be noted somehow in the presentation materials, this would provide guidance for the next phase in planning.

- **Main Street Vernacular buildings,**
- **Examples of Main Street Vernacular (Late 19th to Early 20th C)**
- **Number of Storeys for buildings**
- **Building Typology,**

Focussing on only two categories is too simplistic as it only focusses on commercial buildings distinguished by being either 2 or 3 storeys.

The Typology section should also include institutional buildings, such as banks as well as buildings known as blocks (such as the Campbell block) as this is where the unique and special features reside. I don't believe that an overriding additional category of landmarks will sufficiently address the rich architectural complexity of the district. These buildings may be landmarks but they should be understood as outstanding contributors to the built form and streetscape.

Banks

In the most recent document, sent after the 2nd meeting, the former Bank of Toronto, at the north east corner of Dundas W and Keele (2854) was shown in a photograph, and described as “non-prevailing” – this is such a negative phrase. This bank should be seen as, in my view, one of the architectural jewels of the Junction. It was designed in 1910 by the New York firm of Carrere & Hastings, renowned for their magnificent New

York Public Library (1897-1911) on Fifth Avenue and its stone elevation is beautifully proportioned and crafted and owes its inspiration to the Palazzo Massimi (1532-5), Rome. The Junction's banks are very distinct from the commercial buildings and were architect-designed. Their use of the classical style, stone cladding and details (sometimes including brick), two-storey orders of columns and pilasters, carved details, solid rather than glazed ground floor etc. and very elegantly and beautifully designed makes them especially important. Finally, there is the former Dominion Bank, now known as Scout Logistics, 3351 Dundas St W, designed by John Lyle in 1925, at the south-east corner of Runnymede and Dundas W – no columns and red brick but still with classical details in the doorcase, windows, and at the frieze and pediment. This represents an important transition in bank design by one of Canada's most influential architects in the interwar period and is an example of a building responding to a non-90-degree angle site (see discussion below under Landmarks). I am not sure that describing the banks as landmarks, sufficiently recognizes their contribution to the built form of the Junction nor to the streetscape.

Blocks

Blocks, such as the Campbell Block and others composed of as little as two commercial units but usually more, should also be identified as a typology so that they are clearly understood and recognized in both the study and a plan for their contribution to the character and variety of Dundas St West. (Two are on the north side of Dundas between St John's Place and Clendenan Ave, 2 more on the north between McMurray and Pacific and of course many more)

Commercial – Apartment Block set at a corner

This typology is commercial facing Dundas and residential facing the residential side streets with residential at the upper floors facing both streets. Two examples of this are Henry's, 2783 Dundas Street West, SE corner with Indian Grove, and LB Heating and AC, 2753 Dundas St W, SE Corner Indian Road. There are likely many others.

This expands on the two commercial categories typologies included in the latest materials. The two categories developed should also acknowledge 1-2 storeys of residential accommodation above. This residential element is a significant part of the character of the Junction but also represents an important type of housing in the neighbourhood. And as we are in the middle of a housing crisis, rental housing provision etc. to overlook this seems to be a big omission.

Recessed Entrances

These are one of the outstanding characteristics of the street and they date from a variety of periods, and many have well-preserved details, terrazo floors, spectacular glass work etc. Has there been any reference to them? (THA Office, Hole in the Wall, 2867 Dundas W, Community Junction, 2934 Dundas W, are a few examples)

Comment – The residential typology located at either end of the Study Area denotes an important feature of the street. Dundas Street, in this area, served as the Main Street

and Central Business District for the Town of West Toronto Junction. The street was built out from east to west growing out from the original railway Junctions and locating at nodes along Keele Street and Runnymede Road. The remaining residential areas on Dundas connect to the residential neighbourhoods to the north and south of the Main Street, are part of the cultural landscape and are reminders of how this portion of Dundas Street was built out.

Non-Prevailing Typologies

Comment – Does the terminology “Non-Prevailing” have a slightly negative connotation? These can be rare survivors or unique, like bank buildings or hotels or theatres or single-story garages or institutions like churches or schools. It’s difficult to include typologies for all these different forms, so their importance is harder to rate. Calling them all Non-Prevailing is not helpful.

Examples of Non-Prevailing Typologies

Comment - The Dollarama façade appears to be A Type 2 Commercial? Some of the others appear to be Type One.

Residential House forms – no comments

Main Street Commercial Type 1

Comment – Its not clear exactly what the red dotted lines are denoting, maybe a bit of description would help. Could you include labels for Type 1A, Type 1B and I C, if appropriate, or note that there is a written description elsewhere in the report? (MM)

Main Street Commercial Type 2

Comment – again if you could label the photos as Type 2 A, B or C, it would convey more information on these types.

Landmarks, Gateways and Views.

Comment – Corners - The treatment of corners in the Junction needs to be more carefully understood – it’s not just about entrances – Doc’s Green Door Lounge, 3106 Dundas W, is a case in point. Corner entrances are important but, in the Junction, they also reflect the street grid where the angles of crossing streets are not at 90 degrees – both the form of the Campbell Block and the former Bank of Toronto are influenced by the non-90-degree angle and they create interesting views from the interiors. It would be good if the buildings where special things are happening at the corners would be documented and investigated further as a characteristic of the Junction.

Comment, it might be helpful to have another category added for corner lots. It is a typical condition where side streets intersect with Dundas, the corner picks up the residential set backs from the side street and offers more public space at the corner for things like parking, gardens, seating, or outdoor dining. Pacific is a good example of this with its wide corner space used for rental bikes, a plaque for the BIA etc.

Other viewsheds we noted were;

- north on High Park into Dundas,
- south along Keele Street emerging from under the railway bridge and into the area
- north on Keele from Annette
- views of James Hall at Dundas and Pacific,
- north from Dundas on Pacific to the Sweet Potato, industrial building,
- entering the area from the west along Dundas, where the house forms, Park and narrower street announce a different area,
- entering the area from the east where the curving street gives views to the streetscape, announcing a new area.

Heritage Evaluation – List of Criteria for determining potential heritage value

Heritage Evaluation – mapping of % Criteria Achieved

There is a problem with the rating system used here, some properties appear to be under-rated. Most properties that were built in the late 19th to mid 20th C and have Type 1, Type 2 or Main Street Vernacular typologies should be rated with at least 2 of the following criteria;

- Criteria 1. These properties have physical value because they are representative of a style, type expression, material or construction method.
- Criteria 4. These properties have historical value or associative value because they have a direct association with a theme (development of Dundas St as the CBD of the Toronto Junction)
- Criteria 7. These properties have contextual value because they define, maintain or support the character of the district.
- Criteria 8. The properties have contextual value because they are physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to each other.

Heritage Evaluation Mapping (Discussion of Integrity)

This map is showing Integrity and Lost Integrity “A building loses its integrity when the façade is overclad, the building has been over-built, or the original fenestrations are no longer legible”

Comment - My questionable math indicates about 300 addresses in the Study Area so the % of properties with up to 5 criteria could be over 75%. However, if all the mapped properties showing loss of legibility are factored in the number drops to about 45%?

Comment - There are several overall problems with these slides, they lack consistency and they contain mistakes.

In terms of consistency: when a three-storey building has siding on the cornice it is OK, but if a two-storey building has siding on the cornice it is shown as compromised. When a three-storey building is covered over in stucco it is fine, but when a two-storey building has any stucco at all on the façade it is shown as compromised.

Comment - These integrity findings on the following slides appear to be based on an overly simplistic approach to "integrity".

It's worth looking more carefully at the approach to integrity described in the City's Guide to HCDs in Toronto (pge29);

"The integrity of associative values can be determined by the ability of a district and its individual resources to represent its physical state contemporary to the time of an identified historic association or periods of significance.... Some areas and individual resources, although poor in condition, retain much of their authentic attributes, style, materials and sense of place and can be returned (through careful restoration) to good condition. It's important to understand that **condition is not the same as integrity**. (my emphasis MM) The following two integrity criteria must be addressed to provide a basis for designation:

Visual functional, or historic coherence is reflected in the consistency of resources related to the cultural heritage values and character of the district. It can be determined by analyzing resources in a district to understand if there are common thematic, architectural or associative characteristics (many have common characteristics MM) that unify, relate to and communicate the cultural heritage values of the district.

Authenticity means that a district can convey its cultural heritage values through its authentic attributes. To be authentic a district should retain most ("most" implies some can be missing- MM) of its original or appropriate materials, layout and structures related to its identified values. Where alterations and infill exist (allows for alterations - MM) they are generally sensitive, compatible and reinforce the cultural heritage values of the district" (pge 29),

Many of the properties showing lost integrity can still demonstrate common characteristics with visual, functional or historic coherence. Many of the properties still retain original or appropriate materials. Where alterations exist, they can be considered, in some cases, to be sensitive and compatible.

The consultants propose 3 factors for evaluating integrity. It appears to be applied in such a way that if any integrity is affected, the property no longer is considered to have heritage value at all even if it was found to originally have 3 to 4 criteria. This approach is too constricting and misses out on significant properties and rows of buildings that still support the character of the area.

The first factor, "over-cladding" should not be considered a make-or-break criteria for loss of integrity unless it can be shown that there is no possibility of restoring or recreating hidden features. Stucco over brick can be considered a sensitive and compatible alteration, it has been commonly used for many years to cover soft or damaged brick.

The second proposed factor for integrity is “when the building has been over-built”. Could this one please be explained? Is this referring to additions like extra floors, or a whole new façade? Additions can be in-keeping with the original. Perhaps some examples of over-building in the area could be provided?

The third criteria “original fenestrations are no longer visible.” Changes to fenestration, such as replacement windows, does not necessarily lead to loss of legibility and can be a reversible alteration. Where openings have changed the original fenestration pattern may still be legible on the façade.

The comments on the following streetscape slides notes instances where we would disagree with the findings of a loss of integrity. These properties should be re-evaluated. Many of the buildings shown as lacking integrity in the following mapping date from the period of the late 19th to mid 20th C. and still support the legibility of the streetscape through building heights, datum lines, store front typology and placement of windows. These buildings should be categorized as supporting the heritage character of the area.

There are also concerns as to how these properties will fare in subsequent planning stages, Will they be open to demolition?

(see detailed comments that follow)

The following discussion of Legibility was provided by Ken Sharratt.

Question – Should the addition of stucco on a masonry building lead to its total loss of heritage character? What Chat GP had to say on the issue should be considered;

If a building had stucco placed over bricks, can the building that otherwise meets the criterial for historic designation be considered eligible for heritage designation?

ChatGPT said:

Yes, a building with **stucco over brick** can still be considered eligible for heritage designation, but the evaluation depends on **how the stucco affects the building’s historic integrity**. Here’s a careful breakdown:

1. Material Integrity

- Original materials (brick, stone, wood) are **important character-defining features**.
- Stucco covering brick **alters the material appearance**, which may reduce integrity in terms of **materials and workmanship**.
- However, stucco is sometimes **reversible or historically sympathetic**, especially if:

- It was applied historically (within the building's period of significance).
- It is a traditional lime-based or compatible material.

2. Other Aspects of Integrity

The Secretary of the Interior standards evaluate seven aspects:

Aspect	Consideration with Stucco
Design	Shape, roofline, windows, and architectural features intact?
Setting	Surroundings still reflect historic context?
Materials	Brick is hidden, but if stucco is sympathetic, it may be acceptable
Workmanship	Original brick craftsmanship obscured, may reduce integrity
Feeling	Historic character still recognizable?
Association	Original function or historic significance remains clear?
Location	Still on original site?

If all other aspects remain strong, the building **may still be eligible**, though the stucco will be a factor in the assessment.

3. Reversibility

- If the stucco is **removable without damaging the brick**, the building's original material could be restored, improving eligibility.
- If the stucco is **permanent or has damaged the brick**, designation may still be possible, but it depends on whether the building's **historic character is still clearly conveyed**.

4. Historical Precedence

- Many heritage registers list buildings with stucco over brick as eligible, particularly if the **stucco itself has historical significance** (e.g., early 20th-century finish or decorative stucco work).
- The key question is whether the building **still conveys its historic character** and significance.

Summary

- Stucco over brick **does not automatically disqualify a building** from heritage designation.
- Eligibility depends on:
 - Whether the stucco was historically appropriate or reversible.
 - Whether the building **retains other character-defining features** (form, windows, rooflines, detailing).
 - Whether the building's **historic character and significance** are still clearly conveyed.

We are suggesting that the process of evaluation should continue and properties exempted because of the addition of stucco should be re-evaluated using the above mentioned eligibility criteria.

Property Index

North streetscape between Gilmour Avenue and St. Johns Place

Comment -Houses on either side of the Church, with the exception of 3212, are not compromised as front porch modifications can easily be reversed. The shapes and materials, overall design features, remain original.

Comment – The houses have not had much alteration, closed in porches are a common and reversible alteration.

South streetscape between Gilmour Avenue and St. Johns Road

Comment - 3223-5 is not compromised, just a frame semi covered in siding, which it would need to be in order to survive. 3229 is in more or less original state, 3237 is in the process of being restored and is definitely not compromised.

Comment – Again closed in porches are a common, reversible alteration. I agree with DF's assessment of 3237. It has been preserved.

North streetscape between St. John's Place and Clendenan Ave.

Comment - The two buildings west of the corner should not be labeled compromised because of stucco and extra signage, they both have original window placement and nods to cornices or covered cornices. Some of the small buildings are iffy, windows appear to be the same.

Comment – 3150 and 3152 tie in quite well with 3154's typology, despite some alterations. While 3152 appears to have had its window altered on the second floor, it still shares the same façade height and roofline, still has some decorative metalwork

at the cornice line and still has a familiar door and window placement on the street level. CH notes you can still see bricks under the large second floor window so it may be a false façade feature.

3150 has a new rusticated cladding but appears to have retained original fenestration on the second level and has familiar typography with storefront windows and doors on the street level.

The 4 buildings from 3142-3150 are all very similar and support the character of the street. They have familiar street fronts, (except 3144 which has altered its large window) All have a single window on the second level and share the same roofline. Any changes are reversible. 3142 and 3148 are still brick clad, the other two have had stucco added.

The photo of 3138 is dated, there was new signage added at least two years ago (Junction Chemist).

3112 appears to be relatively intact, it has a single window opening on the second floor and a typical storefront

3108-10 has cladding on the second level that could be removed; however, the photo is out of date, the street level now has pink Moorish arches added to the façade.

North streetscape between Clendenan Ave and Quebec Ave

Comment - The two buildings next to the northwest corner look to be original, with the exception of one window and there is obviously something interesting under the siding, which should not make it compromised. (3100-3102)

The Beaux & Babbles (Beau and Baubles? MM) building is original, should not be listed as compromised because its cornice is encased in siding. The two buildings immediately east of it are more or less original as well with same roof lines and window placement, stucco should not make them compromised.

Comment – 3100 3102 Both storefronts at street level appear to be original. Cladding is reversible. While 3102 has a window alteration on the second level, 3100 fenestration is the same as 3104. Both have a consistent height to 3104.

3096 Is a familiar Type 1 storefront with typical street level typology, two stories and a single window opening on the second floor (with a concrete rusticated sill the proper size for the window). It appears to have been built in the late 19th to mid 20th century, why does it not meet two heritage criteria?

3094 (Martial Arts) has unfortunate cladding but still retains a typical type one storefront configuration, fenestration and consistent height.

3084 to 3092 These three storefronts are typical with familiar street level configurations, (Beau and Bauble has a lovely divided glass transom) similar heights and 3092 has its original brick cladding.

3082 appears to support the streetscape as a Type 1. Some brick repairs have been done or may be needed. Metal storm windows appear to be covering an original sash. Why is this one not rated?

3076 to 3080 (Monkey Sushi) is an interesting building, it appears to be an older building with new brick cladding, this can be seen at the building edges and where original corner stones have been left revealed (photos available). The window locations could be original and the storefronts are typical of the street. The height is typical.

South Streetscape between Clendenan Ave. and Quebec Ave.

Comment - 3113 has a typical storefront, one altered window opening, brick cladding, consistent height, why is it lacking integrity?

3107 could possibly be identified as a sympathetically designed infill?

3093 still has a decorative frieze at the cornice, has consistent height, storefront, and cladding (look at sills are the window openings original?)

North Streetscape between Quebec Ave. and McMurray Ave.

Comment - The two buildings on the northeast corner should not be shown as compromised because of siding over cornice; we have a photo of the original building. 3038 Dundas is not compromised, neither is 3036. (** It appears the addresses are incorrect here. It should be 3050-3052?.

Comment – 3050-3052 appear to be typical unaltered Type 1 buildings.

3064-3072 appear to be contributing to the heritage context. Some are in a poor state of repair and one has altered windows on the second level (3072) other than that the typography is consistent, height, materials and storefronts are consistent.

South streetscape between Quebec Ave and High Park Ave.

Comment - The building at the corner of Quebec was demolished and a new building put up in the 2000s (much better architecture and materials). This brings up the question of what is worth preserving? In any event nothing of the older building was preserved.

Comment – Should 3077 be mentioned as a new infill in keeping with the heritage character?

21 North Streetscape between McMurray Ave and Pacific Ave.

Comment - The buildings on the east end are no longer part of a development proposal and should not be considered as such. The three on the east end of that group should be orange or green as should the corner building. The development originally approved for this site was abandoned several years ago due to problems with financing and the building(s) are for sale. Please re-colour and delete shadow development in the background.

The Pretty Clean Shop an Noctua Bakery (formerly Vesuvio's) this was originally a one storey building more or less the same from the 1950s. There were a couple of furriers at/near this location and they probably liked the security of having single storey shops.

Comment – 3008-3010 This one storey buildings should have their building dates checked, I think they were built in the significant period of growth and so could rate as historic and still remaining as a rare survivor.

Is 3018-3020 a new building? It appears to be a type 2 and if new infill could be described as sympathetic to the overall character of the area.

3024 looks like it's been altered on the upper stories but retains its storefront configuration at street level.

2990 appears to have a sympathetic alteration, the addition of a third storey? This should not affect the integrity rating the building because it still has a type 2 typology with typical window placements, material, and storefront.

South Streetscape between High Park and Pacific & Pacific to Medland

Comment - 3001 Dundas W. is the site of a proposed 5 storey development, a building permit was issued in 2023, but there are no signs of activity. It was the (former?) Shallow Pentecostal Church, dating from the 1890s with a built-over porch.

Of particular interest is the 60s blond brick building on the southwest corner of Pacific, originally there was a frame building on the site which had been demolished by 1938. It was torn down for a used car lot and not replaced by a building before the Royal Bank, formerly located in the corner storefront, built the current row of shops in 1962-3. Can we list/designate a building from the 1960s? This little plaza is a perfect fit for the corner and the stores are never vacant. The recesses in front of the stores, unfortunately not shown on the side, allow patio seating space for the three restaurants without obstructing the sidewalk, and the variety store is one of the few left which is financially viable.

2995 has a new front on it but still retains the original configuration of the recessed flanking doors up to the upstairs apartments which retain their original terrazzo tiling and recessed doors with diagonal placements.

3009 and 3011 have had alterations but are still legible as Type 1, the second level of both show brick pilasters, 3011 has a typical storefront. Their roofline is consistent with 3013.

South Streetscape Pacific to Medland Street

Comment - Originally the façade of 2967 was identical to the metal façade of 2959 and we would welcome anyone who would reproduce that in whatever modern materials could be used!

Comment - 2989 still has its fenestration pattern and original street level storefront intact. (the addition on the back is not visible from the street)

North streetscape between Pacific Avenue and Keele St.

Comment - The three buildings west of the Treasury at 2900-02-04 should not be listed as compromised. They are easily returned to original detail and built by a well-known builder who has other buildings on the street.

Comment - 2926 is a new building but should be noted as a bold attempt to fit in with the street. 2918 has two windows on the second level and an intact storefront on the street level. 2906 and 2910 have their original storefront configuration and 2910 has its original fenestration on the second floor.

2900-2904 a row of three, 2904 and 2902 appear to be intact (2902 windows could be slightly altered but still paired), they have matching cornice treatments, original brick and original storefronts, why have they lost all integrity? 2900 supports this row of three and has a centre window on the second floor and a well-designed storefront in keeping with the streetscape.

2878 appears to be in poor condition but is still restorable, see the decorative brick work surviving on the cornice line.

South streetscape between Mavety Street and Keele Street, and Medland Street and Mavety Street

Comment - The two-storey row between the fake 3-storey building and Studio Cycle is more or less original with some façade tweaking and windows in original placement, should not really be listed as compromised. The motorcycle store at 2923 is the first Loblaws Groceteria beginning in 1919 and has had several storefronts throughout its tenure, ending in 1958 (when it moved to the No Frills location on Pacific). The last Loblaws' storefront more or less conforms to the present one. As the First Loblaws' store, it merits special consideration. This is documented on the company website, with a Dictionary of Canadian Biography entry shown and on Wikipedia. No doubt all those produce wholesalers on the east end of our main street, influenced the decision to locate the first store in the Junction!

(Please note, The store at 2909 is not a fake 3 story, there appears to be a third story there but it is hard to see because of the characteristic diagonal side line of the building - it doesn't hit the street at right angles).

Comment - The loss of legibility rating for these properties from 2911 to 2919 is not supportable, when you look at the individual storefronts. The fenestration is intact, storefronts are typical of Type 1, roof lines are consistent. They support one another and several have had very nice façade renovation and renewal. Stucco cladding is in keeping with historic materials in the area.

2923 has a direct relationship with an important event and person (the first Loblaws store) and is a rare survivor of a one storey building.

2909 appears to have a renovated façade, in keeping with the character of the street.

2907's appearance is now different from what is pictured here, it has a centrally located window opening on the second floor and a restored original storefront at the street level. It appears to fit in better now than when this photo was taken. (MM)

North Streetscape between Keele Street and Heintzman Street and Heintzman Street to Indian Grove

Comment - The Salvation Army Women's Shelter – was built new in the 1960s (possibly 1950s) originally as a motel, replacing the Occidental Hotel. It is not compromised, just ugly!

Comment – The Salvation Army Shelter at 2808 is a product of its time and does not appear to have been altered, It should be evaluated as a Contemporary design from the 1960s (Brutalism?) and as a rare hotel infill building. (Hotels were once much more common). It does not appear to have lost any integrity.

South Streetscape Indian Grove to Indian Rd. Cres.

Comment - The Orthopedic Services (2829-31) store is the same form and window placement as the original very plain building; the brick has just been stuccoed over, so not compromised. Shox at 2825-7 was a florist in 1925, most likely single storey originally. It was later a By-way and then Shox.

Several of the two-storey buildings between condo and Shox have original window placements and you can see from the roof line that they were part of a row, so not all compromised. 2815 & 2815 ½ shows how the row would have originally looked. 2815 ½ was Booth's Hobby Shop from the 1930s to 1984, when Mr. Booth had to move to a retirement home.

The condo by the way was originally Roseland Hall, bowling alley and sweets shop before it was McBride Cycle; originally designed to be, but never used as, a theatre.

Comment - Note - Shox and Vesuvio's (further west) were the main organizers of the fight to remove the "dry" zoning from the street and bring back liquor licenses in the 1990s. Shox signage proudly announces it is the "First Saloon since 1903" and it was called the "Local Option" after the local plebiscite to end Prohibition in the area.

Could we please take another look at the row of stores from 2821 to 2815? They appear to be original with minor changes, (albeit in poor condition) . Looking at the fenestration on the second floors 2821 and 2815 are the same and 2817 and 2819 are mirror images of each other. 2815 is still intact with brick voussoirs and an original storefront. Three in this row appear to have original storefront typology at the street level. They support the character of this block. The new Provincial Guide to Heritage Conservation Districts does not mention integrity as a criteria but says current condition should be noted. It also advises that the overall objective of an HCD plan is "to provide policies and guidelines that will assist in the protection and *enhancement* of the heritage value of the district , (my emphasis MM) (Secton 3.3.3. The condition of this row is reversible and restoration could be facilitated as part of a designation.

North Streetscape between Indian Grove and Watkinson Ave.

No Comments.

South Streetscape between Indian Grove and Indian Road Cres.

The McMaster McIntyre office at 2777-2781 was originally a garage with no architectural features; it was redone with no architectural features in the 1960s or early 70s. How is that compromised?

The southeast corner was a brick building (2755-2763) with no outstanding features other than a terra cotta decoration on the corner of the 2nd storey which was replaced by a window. The other windows are the same size and shape and the building has been covered in stucco, but basically the same.

Comment - What is the date of construction for this building? It appears to be original with some minor alterations. It has three typical storefronts, one with a chamfered entrance and most of the windows appear to be in their original location. It anchors this block.

North Streetscape between Watkinson Ave. and Old Weston Road

Comment - The garage was converted to a Coffee Time shop and it looks like a condo sales office now, all with the same configuration. Take that sign off the top of the condo!

South Streetscape between Indian Road Cres. And Annette Street

Comment- Again, this is City rearrangement of the intersection, this time in 1946, removing Indian Road, which would have gone through between Lucy McCormack School and the YMCA. The YMCA building has been there since 1948, but a new extension across the front in 1980 obscures the original building. There were grocery wholesale businesses on the school site. In fact, there were five wholesale produce stores and a warehouse on the block in 1935. Food played a major part in the economy of the junction. Farmers west of the city brought produce in to sell to wholesalers.

Comment – 2617 - 2665 How does the stretch have 3-4 criteria yet no rating on the final potential heritage value mapping? It shows up as contemporary architecture and as a Landmark. It is important to the historic context as the older section of the CBD and perhaps the block should be included as part of the cultural landscape because of its historic value.

South Streetscape between Annette Street and Humberside Ave.

Comment – This orphaned section (0 criteria rating) relates best to the west edge of the Study Area where there are other residential buildings. Again these house forms relate to the history of how the CBD was built out and how it connects to the rest of the Town. The semi detached houses appear to be unaltered. 2591 may be an early apartment building or commercial residential and has the characteristic chamfered

corner and a recessed door. Is 2611 an older building? (I can't get a good look at it from the mapping)

POST SCRIPT (Produced by ChatGPT)

SUMMARY OF THE WEST TORONTO JUNCTION HISTORIC CONTEXT STATEMENT FINAL – MAY 13, 2020

The report defines the West Toronto Junction study area as an irregularly shaped district. While it does *not* provide a total area measurement (such as hectares or square kilometres), it clearly describes the geographical extent of the historical area.

According to the report:

- The historic area is bounded by:
- Bloor Street to the south
- Jane Street and Runnymede Road to the west
- Northland and Rowntree Avenues to the north
- The CNR and CPR railway lines and Dorval Road to the east

Based on the West Toronto Junction Historic Context Statement, the focal point of the historical district is the intersection of Dundas Street West and Keele Street.

Why it Became the Focal Point

1. Convergence of Major Transportation Routes

Dundas Street West was one of the earliest and most important transportation corridors through the area, and Keele Street connected directly to early industrial sites and nearby settlements. Their intersection naturally became a hub for movement, travel, and commerce.

2. Early Commercial Development Concentrated Here

By the late 1800s, banks, shops, offices, hotels, and mixed-use buildings clustered around this intersection, making it the first and largest commercial centre in the Junction.

3. Growth Driven by Industry and Workers

Industrial employers (factories, rail facilities, etc.) located close to the junction of the rail lines north of Dundas. Workers lived nearby, and businesses serving them grew around Dundas & Keele.

4. Transportation Connectivity (Railways & Streetcars)

By 1891, two street railway franchises intersected at or near Dundas & Keele. This ended the area's isolation and further reinforced the intersection as the commercial and social centre.

5. Real Estate Boom Concentrated in the Commercial Core

During the early 1890s land boom, Dundas Street—especially its central blocks near Keele—saw the highest commercial land values and the greatest number of real estate offices.

This node has remained the symbolic and functional nucleus of the Junction from its earliest development through the 20th century.

The study area developed a full range of community-supporting functions, clustered mainly along Dundas Street West, Keele Street, Annette Street, and near industrial zones.

Main Community Functions in the Study Area

1. Commercial Functions (Historic Main Street)

A strong commercial core developed at Dundas Street West & Keele Street, containing banks, retail shops, offices, hotels, mixed-use main-street buildings, and professional services. This became the principal commercial district.

Corner commercial uses also appeared along Davenport Road, Old Weston Road, and Annette Street.

2. Industrial & Employment Functions

Industry was a major force in shaping the Junction:

Early industrial/manufacturing activities include:

- Foundries
- Piano factories (Heintzman, Nordheimer)
- Soap works
- Flour mills
- Carriage manufacturers

Food & stockyard industries

The Union Stock Yards and surrounding meat-packing plants (Swift, Gunns, Harris Abattoir) became one of the province's major industrial clusters.

These activities attracted workers and stimulated residential and commercial growth.

3. Residential Neighbourhoods

Large areas of the study area were built as residential districts with varied character:

- South of Dundas: larger detached houses and more established residential character
- North of Dundas: worker housing close to industries and railways

By 1910, residential neighbourhoods had become extensive and were a key community component.

4. Institutional / Civic Functions

A major institutional node formed along Annette Street, featuring:

- Methodist, Presbyterian, Baptist churches
- Salvation Army barracks
- Schools (Annette Street School, Carlton, St. Clair, Humberside Collegiate)

Later additions included:

- Annette Street Public Library (1907–08 expansion)
- Runnymede Public Library (1929–30)

5. Community & Cultural Functions

The area developed significant cultural and community institutions, including:

- Places of worship:
 - Victoria Presbyterian Church
 - St. Cecilia's Roman Catholic Church
 - Congregation Kneseth Israel Synagogue (1912)
- Community halls & lodges:
 - Masonic Temple
 - Lakeview Lodge Mechanics' Hall

These served social, cultural, religious, and community-building functions.

6. Parks & Recreation

Early 20th-century recreation facilities included:

- Baird Park (c. 1913)
- Oakmount Park / Lithuania Park (c. 1924)
- Local amenities such as swimming pools and recreation centres in later developments

7. Transportation & Infrastructure

The study area became a major transportation hub with:

- A dense railway network that shaped industrial and residential patterns
- Streetcar lines (DSR, C&SER, later TTC) along Keele, Davenport, Dundas, and Bloor

Infrastructure facilities included hydro-electric substations and transit infrastructure supporting urban growth.

Produced by: ChatGPT

Appendix B: Additional LAC Feedback (Emails with LAC Summary Feedback Received until December 22, 2025)

Email #5 – Submitted on 22 December 2025

Comments on Feedback from Meeting #2

Heritage Context and Identity

Next to last bullet point

It is true that in the overall timeline Dundas West developed as a main street east to west, with the most important nodes initially at Old Weston Road and at Keele which both featured taverns/hotels as early as the 1830s for Old Weston Road and the 1850s for Keele. However, beginning in the 1880s there was also small scale development from the west as well. As previously noted, the first school was on the west side of Runnymede at St. John's Road and the first church at Dundas and St. John's Road, both on donated lots. There were frame houses and coal yards and a group of brick stores and early residential rental buildings on the north side, west of Gilmour, as early as 1889. The corner stores were later demolished for a used car lot, leaving two originally residential, now commercial, storefronts with residential units above. So although not as substantial as the development at the east end, and with a pattern of development that included more house form buildings, the west end of the main street of West Toronto Junction had also begun to fill in by the 1880s with its first "important" architect-designed building, a hardware store at 3358 Dundas St. W., put up by a Jewish builder in 1910, followed by the two adjacent commercial rows in 1911. These buildings are contemporary with, actually built just before, the banks and other Edwardian buildings near Keele. All of this of course was facilitated by the Toronto Suburban Street Railway, bringing in customers from Lambton, York and points west.

Heritage Evaluation

Last bullet point

While I agree that the first Lolaws store and Vesuvios have strong associative value, I'm not sure what associative value Shox has; apparently it started out as a florist (wholesale?) and then became a Bi-Way or other bargain store, more research needs to be done on that.

Study Area Boundary

Again 3358 Dundas W. is just as important as the 1920's bank across the street in delineating the western boundary of the business district. And it was designed by a local architect, even more appropriate.

Email #6 – Submitted on 22 December 2025

Please note the following:

1 Meeting Purpose

The meeting was well managed by LURA and productive. Discussions were engaging, informative and frank as would expect given the task and importance of the HCD.

There was concern over the direction of the HCD study recommendations and the methodology. We trust that discussion has taken place regarding these concerns and adjustments were and will continue to be made.

2 Presentation and Process

The overview or The Ontario Heritage Act (Part 5) summarized the intent of the HCD Study and what it shall do. The update by EVOQ described the WTJHCD Character Analysis and Preliminary Heritage Evaluation as represented under 7 headings. We were look forward to seeing written text on these subjects. Please confirm when they will be issued.

Questions of Clarification

These were discussed in some detail and questions requiring follow up were identified in three categories :

- HCD Process and Policy
- Built form and Typology
- Heritage Evaluation and Boundary

The responses to the questions is very helpful and appreciated. In some cases as one might expect, the responses were either not sufficiently developed in the space provided or the answer was unclear.

3 Revised Materials After the Meeting

This material included changes in the following:

Building Typologies

The expanded definition is understood to recognize mixed use residential / Commercial typologies such as are abundant and varied in the Junction HCD. Neither does it recognize building depth and other critical functional and defining properties.

It does not recognize block buildings or large scale two storey commercial typology. Typology and singularity contribute to significance and ranking which is why it is important to be inclusive and have a detailed and well developed explanation.

The exclusion of midrise commercial/residential ("condos") needs to be discussed. They are present in the Junction HCD and they are a typology. They are negotiated in relation to other typologies and have an impact on both block development, street scape and public space. They are an emerging typology that will continue to assert itself into the HCD, they are represented in policy and they must be presented so they can be discussed and carefully considered by the community and the City.

Heritage evaluation & boundary

Similar to Typology there is a need for a more developed response. One stand out concern is the tendency in the graphics and explanation to direct the work towards a bundled approach where heritage buildings or blocks are represented as isolated rather than a whole as is the way they are experienced now. The idea of a Town needs to be conveyed and embraced as a unique and driving force You.

4 Summary and Feedback – LAC Meeting # 2