

West Annex Phase II Heritage Conservation District Study

Local Advisory Community (LAC)

Meeting #2 Summary of Feedback

Meeting Details

Date: Monday, June 22, 2026

Location: Online (Zoom Meeting)

Time: 5:30pm – 7:30pm

Attendees

The meeting was attended by the following:

Project Team	Affiliation
- Tamara Anson-Cartwright, Heritage Planning, Policy and Research Program Manager - Ana Martins, Heritage Planner - Emma Doedens, Heritage Planner	City of Toronto – Heritage Planning
- Dima Cook, Architect, Principal, Director - Edward Houle, Heritage Advisor	EVOQ Architecture
- Zoie Edwards Browne, Associate - Marissa Irene Uli, Community Engagement Specialist	LURA Consulting

LAC Members	Affiliation
Dan Seljak	Resident
Riley Millican	Resident
Yohann Paris	Resident
Janet Lee	Resident
Mark Sherman	Resident
Sandra Shaul	Annex Residents Association
Rebecca Gimmi	Annex Residents Association
Zsafia Schvan-Ritecz	University of Toronto
Non-LAC Members	Affiliation
Dianne Saxe	Councillor - Ward 11 University-Rosedale

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

LAC Members	Affiliation
Paul O'Leary	Royal St George's College

1. Meeting Purpose

The second Local Advisory Committee (LAC) meeting was held to discuss the West Annex Phase II Heritage Conservation District. The meeting purpose was to:

- Provide updates on the West Annex Phase II Heritage Conservation District (HCD) Study, process and progress;
- Present preliminary character analysis and updated historical background,
- Highlight feedback received from stakeholder interviews; and Indigenous engagement sessions
- Discuss and seek feedback to inform the direction of HCD Study recommendations.

2. Presentation and Process

Zoie Edwards Browne (LURA) facilitated the meeting and provided a land acknowledgement, welcomed all LAC members, reviewed the meeting purpose and agenda.

Emma Doedens and Ana Martins (City of Toronto) presented an overview of City updates including HCD Study timeline and Indigenous engagement activities and feedback.

Dima Cook and Edward Houle (EVOQ) presented the West Annex II HCD Study preliminary character analysis and updated historical background which included:

- Historic background updates
- Preliminary character analysis (contemporary boundaries, views and landmarks, eras of construction, architectural stylistic influences, typologies, building elements, etc.)
- Preliminary HCD boundary proposal and character sub-areas

Following the presentation, Zoie provided a brief overview of feedback received during stakeholder interviews completed since LAC Meeting #1. Zoie then presented discussion questions and led a guided discussion to gather detailed feedback from LAC members.

(For further information and the completed engagement activity summaries, please visit the project webpage: [West Annex Phase II Heritage Conservation District Study – City of Toronto](#))

3. Summary of Feedback – (June 22, 2026) LAC Meeting #2

The summary below includes feedback from the LAC members discussed during Meeting #2 (June 22, 2026) and received after the meeting by email until July 6, 2026. This summary was prepared by LURA Consulting. It is not intended to be a verbatim record of responses; rather, it summarizes and synthesizes the feedback shared throughout the meeting. Four main discussion questions were used during the guided discussion. The feedback received is organized by discussion question and theme. City staff and consultant comments are included for informational purposes only.

Question #1: Based on the information presented to-date, are there features of the neighbourhood's built-form or urban character that stand out or give the West Annex a sense of place that are missing or need to be highlighted?

- LAC members highlighted that every street has its own distinct personality and culture.
- LAC members supported the information presented about Huron Street south of Prince Arthur, but some members felt there are a few significant properties within this area, such as two houses on the west side (Ecology House – Outside of Study Area), where efforts for restoration have been made.
- LAC members supported the interpretation of porches within the character analysis and discussed whether balconies in the Study Area are versions of sleeping porches such as those found in older homes on Madison Avenue.
- Suggestion to include Taddle Creek Park as it is an anchor for the West Annex and, east of Spadina, it is the equivalent of Jean Sibelius Square'.
 - Taddle Creek Park is significant for its history and as community space for residents year-round.
 - Taddle Creek Park was highlighted as part of the heritage streetscape and intimately connected to 50 Prince Arthur. Some suggested that both Taddle Creek Park and 50 Prince Arthur should be included collectively, another comment suggested that a city park property does not require protection.
- Architectural significance of mosaics in apartment buildings, and gardens and lawns designed in a way for outdoor transition. 145 St George highlighted as something special on the interior as the lobbies function as transitional zones between public and private spaces.
- 33 Wells construction date should be reviewed as multi-unit dwellings were not permitted by the City at the date noted in the presentation.
 - Post meeting update: The property at 33 Wells was constructed in 1911 and appears in the fire insurance map of 1912. The property is associated with architect Ewart G. Wilson and builder Alfred W. Reid.

Question #2: Is there anything to expand upon or add to the heritage evaluation?

- One LAC member questioned the heritage evaluation only highlighting 1 landmark building east of Spadina.
- LAC members felt that landmarks should include significant residential buildings, not only large, monumental structures.
- Suggestion to include distinctive houses within the heritage evaluation landmarks such as 53 Walmer Road., the York Club (last mansion on Bloor Street), 388 Brunswick Avenue (corner house with distinct architectural features), and 50 Prince Arthur.
- Suggestion to include cultural institutions, with specific reference to the NCCT and Alliance Francaise as well as the Italian Cultural Institute, and Chinese Consulate. KESKUS International Estonia Centre and Tartu College (not in the Study Area) were also highlighted as well as Uno Prii apartment buildings.
- NCCT specifically highlighted as a landmark building.
- Raised concern of displacement of rooming house tenants at 262 and 266 St. George for construction of 12 story building, with emphasis on tenant right to return.

Question #3: Looking at the current study area draft boundary, are there things you would change, exclude, or add?

- Some LAC members were concerned with the lack of inclusion of Bloor Street's historical buildings that are current commercial (with specific example of Bahá'í Centre and Snowdon Pharmacy).
- Stories of place were raised as important. It was suggested to balance the inclusion of intangible cultural heritage in addition to streetscapes and architectural preservation.
- Some LAC members discussed Dupont Street and viewed it as the edge of the neighbourhood. Some noted alterations on the side façades of houses and felt the properties along Dupont Street play a transitional role for the neighbourhood and currently have a dull street façade. One LAC member encouraged thoughtful consideration for how Dupont Street could become a more 'active' street, rather than the 'back-end' of the Annex neighbourhood.

Question #4: Do you agree with the three preliminary character sub-areas at St. George Street, Spadina Road and Walmer Road? Why or why not?

- Generally, LAC members were supportive of the character sub-areas.

- There was a suggestion to extend the Walmer Road sub-area boundary further north as well as considering changes with Dupont Street based on additions of apartments in the area.

Additional Comments

Stakeholder Interviews

- Suggested to interview a resident who has lived in the Annex since 1938 and has a working-class perspective to provide to the study.

Communication

- Concern with outreach and communication from CCM#1, due to Canada Post strike and impact of timing for CCM#2 after an election with a potentially new Councillor.
- Suggestion to develop communication approach for CCM#2 early-on.
- Suggestion to share CCM#2 flyer with LAC members to help spread the word.
- Potential to outreach during community fall events such as Corn Festival.

Other

- Appreciation for Indigenous engagement feedback overview.

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.

- **The recommendations describe that some buildings will be considered for Part IV Designation where they don't fit into an HCD. Will there be an update on this before or at the next LAC meeting?**
 - The recommendations for potential Part IV Designations for some properties within the study area can be part of an HCD Study, this has been done in the past.
- **What category will fraternities and sororities fall under?**
 - While they have similar characteristics to rooming houses, they are a sort of student housing that we are viewing as their own category.
- **Regarding built form typology, were recessed entrances counted as porches?**
 - Yes, and we are looking at how to account for this subtle difference in the report.
- **Why is there inconsistency with building periods and inclusion in the boundary such as buildings at the south of Huron that were built during the identified period of significance and appear to be within the period but are not included in the boundary.**
 - Yes. In some cases, streetscapes have changed significantly, and context has been lost. This is why we have suggested to exclude parts of these

particular streetscapes from an HCD, even if we can recognize that individual buildings may hold historical interest.

- **Why are Bloor Street buildings not included?**
 - Bloor Street was excluded from the Council-approved study area boundary; however as part of the Study, we are considering the relationship of the Study Area with Bloor Street.
 - Interviews will inform the history part of the document and capture the social history of the neighbourhood within it. The HCD at its basis is a planning tool rather than heritage interpretation. The heritage conservation district study involves looking at the study area's community history to identify patterns and trends, rather than by individual building.
 - Recent experience has shown that separating commercial from residential neighbourhoods is a successful approach for HCD designations.
- **Were additions and modernizations on homes a factor that was considered in their evaluation?**
 - This is something that we are thinking about. For architectural interest, to a certain degree, we can identify the style or if it has been altered to the degree that parts of a property visible from the public realm have lost significant stylistic features. This may come into play when identifying contributing and non-contributing properties. This has allowed us to reconsider and update for accuracy some of the date of construction data, and to reflect on modifications that are compatible with certain streetscapes.
- **Will there be different regulations going into each of the sub-districts? Will those regulations include ways to diversify within those sub-areas?**
 - HCDs regulate what is visible from the street and do not regulate height or density but rather how to build compatibly. An HCD does not restrict density or use but guides how to manage renovation, reuse and redevelopment changes.
 - Sub-areas allow us to offer additional recommendations for regulations specific to sub-character areas. It is a possibility, and part of why we are considering having potential HCD sub-areas.
 - While the formation of these regulations is still in progress, recommendations do consider a variety of factors for redevelopment or modifications within an HCD.
- **Are there considerations for historical significance and stories in addition to streetscapes?**
 - Historical significance is part of the consideration of a potential HCD district within the legislation of the Ontario Heritage Act. Intangible heritage isn't itself protected by the OHA, but the evaluation of buildings/landscapes for cultural heritage value can take into account their associations with historic stories, events, individuals, groups or practices.

We try to look at the intangible heritage as much as possible as seen with importance of porches to the community.

- **How will infill construction 1951 onward be treated?**
 - Current thinking is that fairly small-scale buildings from that period are not part of what is characteristic about the 1955-1979 period. Focus is upon mid to high-rise apartment buildings with construction older than 40-50 years. Contemporary period are either too recent to be considered heritage or do not demonstrate a consistent pattern that would be relevant for a potential HCD.
- **With the next community consultation occurring in November, after the election, how will the community be notified? A new Councillor would not have the extensive reach of the current Councillor.**
 - Internal conversations regarding communication strategies are in progress. The e-subscribe is also available through the project webpage.

4. Wrap-Up and Next Steps

The project team thanked LAC members for their input and discussion, which will be used to further the HCD Study.

Zoie Edwards Browne reminded LAC members that if they have any more comments or questions, they should email LURA by July 6, 2026. All input will be considered for the West Annex HCD Study. LAC members will also be able to review the draft summary once it is available. The next LAC members meeting will be planned for Fall 2026.