

West Side Community Council  
westsidecc.ca

December 8, 2016

Dima Cook  
FGMDA Architects

Dear Ms. Cook,

We, the representatives to the six community association members of the West Side Community Council, write in reference to the draft recommendations of the Heritage Study for West Queen West (WQW: Queen Street West, Roncesvalles–Bathurst), as presented at the public meeting of 29 November 2016. We make two points in this letter, the second of which is the letter’s primary message:

(1) We oppose the central draft recommendation, to alternately designate and not designate as HCDs four segments of WQW, of approximately equal length; the excluded segments are claimed to lack the ‘integrity’ required to adequately express heritage attributes. In our view, it is implausible that significant stretches of WQW fail to adequately express their heritage attributes; and the consequences of the refusal to designate would likely be quite regrettable.

(2) We propose an alternative, more historically adequate segmentation of WQW into four *Areas of Special Identity* (ASIs: please refer to the map attached as Schedule 4): (I) *Niagara ASI* (Bellwoods–Bathurst); (II) *Garrison Creek–Dundas Road ASI* (Dovercourt–Gore Vale); (III) *Beaconsfield ASI* (Gladstone–Lisgar); (IV) *Parkdale ASI* (Roncesvalles–Dufferin). With a segmentation reflecting genuine historical trajectories, the integrity of each ASI snaps into place: the apparent *lack* of integrity of some of the recommended segments is due just to their artificiality. We sketch recommendations tailored to each ASI for bringing it within the Part V-designation framework.

(1) The draft segments WQW, at Dufferin, into ‘Parkdale’ and ‘Trinity’ segments; the Parkdale segment is then further segmented at Jameson, and the Trinity segment at Shaw. The proposal is then to designate under Heritage Act Part V the eastern Parkdale and Trinity segments under one or more Heritage Conservation Districts (HCDs); but to withhold this designation from the respective western segments, and instead use a mix of ‘spot-designation’ of selected properties under

Heritage Act Part IV, Area-Specific Policies, and Character Area guidelines under the *Avenues and Mid-Rise Buildings Study* (AMRBS).

We applaud the recommendation that the eastern segments in Parkdale and Trinity be designated under Part V (however, as will emerge below, we do not agree with the precise form recommended).

But we are, as you will no doubt understand, surprised and saddened by the recommendation to withhold HCD designation from the western segments, the consequences of which, we fear, could well be a matter for tremendous regret. As we discuss in Schedule 1: (A) we worry that the proposed alternatives to HCD designations would be ineffective, and perhaps even counterproductive, at preserving heritage resources by stemming redevelopment; (B) reading the tea-leaves on the patterns of redevelopment this exercise is ready to deem appropriate, we are distressed at their scope; (C) we believe that this would powerfully undermine the context these areas provide for a wide range of other entities.

Moreover, as we discuss in Schedule 1(D), we find much to dispute in the claim that the excluded segments lack the ‘integrity’ required of an HCD: in particular, we doubt that the light-duty empirical basis for the exclusions is duly proportional to the gravity of their likely effects.

Although in our experience, many Toronto residents are sympathetic to various rationales for intensification, news of the proposal to parcel out Queen West into conserved and unconserved segments has been uniformly met with dismay. Queen Street West is uniquely iconic in Toronto’s self-image, and we suspect that redevelopment of significant stretches into districts more banal and less human-scaled would be widely regarded as a betrayal of values our city holds paramount—as a bleak mirror-image of Bill Davis’s rightly celebrated cancellation of the Spadina Expressway. We must not underestimate the magnitude of what is proposed; and the proposal cannot be allowed to go forward unless and until we are confident that there is no reasonable alternative.

(2) **Fortunately, a reasonable alternative is close at hand.** The proposed segmentation of WQW does not correspond to particularly natural junctures in the actual heritage resources of WQW. We understand that the proposed segmentation was principally a work-flow solution for the HCD Workgroup, so there is no special reason to be dedicated to it: we should keep an open mind that the *real* ‘Areas of Special Identity’ (ASIs) are delineated differently. And, because the notion of the ‘integrity’ of an area cannot help but make reference to *the boundaries of that area* (how things are *outside* the area does not matter for integrity *inside* the area),

it is very important to get the boundaries to correspond to the actual distribution of heritage resources across ASIs. After all, **the widespread appreciation for WQW is presumably very largely because of its ability to communicate its heritage resources.** Surely the people of our city are not subject to a vast illusion: the job of the HCD is not to deny what people see, but to respect and conserve it. To make that happen, we have to *understand* what people see; and for that, we have to accurately articulate the *structure* of the ASIs people are seeing.

**We want to suggest the following alternative segmentation into ASIs,** as better reflecting the facts of geography and history, in their continued influence on our experience:

**(I) East from Walnut/Bellwoods, to Bathurst—the *Niagara ASI***

It is at Walnut/Bellwoods that Garrison Creek intersected Queen: prior to the 1861 construction of the Queen car to Ossington (then, ‘Dundas Road’), this was the western extent of the urbanized area (compare the 1857 Fleming map: [bit.ly/1857-fleming](http://bit.ly/1857-fleming)). As such, its genesis and structure is generally continuous with more easterly reaches of Queen Street.

For this reason, this segment should be **brought under the regime of the existing Queen West HCD**, either by extending its boundaries to Walnut/Bellwoods or by designating a generally comparably-designed district of its own.

**(II) West from Walnut/Bellwoods, across Dovercourt—the *Creek–Road ASI***

It is here that Queen passes through the *Garrison Creek–Dundas Road* neighbourhood: an ‘edge of town’ district (compare the 1878 Copp-Clark waterworks map: [bit.ly/copp-clark](http://bit.ly/copp-clark)) evolving slowly until 1861, and then increasingly rapidly through the mid-1890s—bounded above by Garrison Creek and below by the Military Reserve and later PLA, and centered commercially on (what is now the ‘Ossington Strip’) the final segment of the 1816-completed western military highway, the Dundas Road.

The Creek–Road neighbourhood began with a dense working-class core (focused initially on meat-packing, transportation, and hospitality, and later also on construction), surrounded by the estates of a number of businessmen, professionals, and officials (along Dovercourt, and nearer to the Creek on Halton and scattered through the Trinity lands). Through the 1870s, working-class presence thickened on streets like Foxley, Argyle, and Givins and Shaw below Argyle (Shaw—together with Crawford—was extended below Queen only in the late 1880s); and from the

1880s, the neighbourhood filled out over two decades into subdivisions both modest (Fennings, Brookfield, Rolyat) and more extravagant (Dovercourt and upper Givins; and, in relation to Trinity College, Crawford and Upper Shaw).

Throughout the neighbourhood's early history, Trinity College and PLA were seen collectively, as prestigious area institutions, and those City Fathers who resided here were often affiliated: Peter Trowern, Kivas Tully, Bishop Strachan. With the gradual deaccession of the PLA lands in the late 1880s, came development along its new boundaries: from Strachan to Shaw, a mix of residential and industrial; on and below Queen, with the southward extension of Dovercourt and Lisgar, a mix of residential and commercial development, including in this segment The Great Hall (former YMCA, built to mirror the Methodist Church at Argyle and Dovercourt). (Compare *On the Ossington Strip*, [bit.ly/theossingtonstrip](http://bit.ly/theossingtonstrip); *Between the Bridge and the Brewery*, [bit.ly/b-bridge-brew](http://bit.ly/b-bridge-brew))

This Creek–Road neighbourhood, because of its singular geographical, political, and economic origins, was then and remains now strikingly distinct from any other in Toronto, and its segment of Queen Street is appropriately diverse. This diversity involves a complex interplay of heritage resources, variously of tremendous physical, historical, and/or contextual value. Their tight concentration can make the space challenging to read (in the space of a dozen blocks: a former college and creek, now a beloved park; a string of delightful Victorians; a stately old home; an attractive factory-conversion; several more Victorians; the CAMH lands; along these, to the north, a stretch of often very high-quality Victorians, the dramatic intersection with Ossington, a series of blocks of tastefully-matched Victorians; with the end of the CAMH lands, another block of Victorians, now on both sides, culminating in the Great Hall).

**But this diversity should not be mistaken for incoherence:** instead, it is the emblem of the many converging forces from which this neighbourhood coalesced, and a powerful record of its incomparable cultural heritage value.

We think that this segment *should not* be brought under the regime of the existing Queen West HCD. Instead, **its uniqueness requires sui generis treatment, in a carefully-designed HCD of its own.** We discuss some of the details in Schedule 2. (We also raise for your consideration the prospect of folding into this district, the pending *Ossington Strip* HCD nomination, in light of the inextricable historical linkages between the two street-segments.)

### **(III) West across Lisgar, to Gladstone—the *Beaconsfield ASI***

It is here that Queen traces the southern boundary of the *Beaconsfield Village* neighbourhood, developed starting in the mid-1880s, as a posh, through-designed commuter neighbourhood, accessible from Parkdale Station; across the street at Lisgar, east of the Abell industrial lands, Queen also picks up the matching Carnegie Library and Post Office. The commercial buildings along this stretch of Queen generally reflect the posh origins of the neighbourhood, and include the Drake and Gladstone. (Compare City Planning on 1144 and 1142 Queen West: [bit.ly/queen-1144-1142](http://bit.ly/queen-1144-1142).)

This segment is within the nominated boundary of the original WQW HCD: we think **this segment should be brought under the regime of its own *Beaconsfield HCD***, and that it should likely be folded in with the *Beaconsfield Village* HCD nomination; and that its boundaries should include the Library and Post Office. It is true that, to the west of the Post Office, the south side is occupied by new-build. But bear in mind that in its initial development, that area was graced by smoke-belching factory and railroad lands: those were clearly no part of the posh district then, and its integrity now is scarcely undermined by their replacement.

#### **(IV) Dufferin to Roncesvalles—the *Parkdale ASI***

It is here that Queen runs through *Parkdale*, incorporated as a village in 1879 after a few decades of railroad-stimulated growth, then annexed by Toronto in 1889.

Parkdale growth was stimulated by transit and lake access (compare [bit.ly/whence-parkdale](http://bit.ly/whence-parkdale)). From the 1850 arrival of the railroad, settlement spread west from the Dufferin stop even before the construction of Parkdale Station. The same year saw the construction of the north–south Brockton Road, connecting Queen to Bloor and intersecting roughly mid-way with Dundas Road, the center of settlement in what would become the Village of Brockton: before 1879, this was the last turn up to Dundas before Keele, and many early buildings clustered here.

The lake views from the high ground on the north side of Queen across farmland between Dufferin and Macdonell and down to the lake until about 1875 encouraged early buildings on the north side of Queen. Trees along King between Roncesvalles to Beaty blocked such views and the associated development directly north. When trees planted in 1870s grew to block the lake views in eastern Parkdale, four-storey buildings appeared on the eastern part of Queen Street north side.

Pre-annexation buildings are found in several clusters: on the north side of Queen, in each of the three blocks between Lansdowne and Brock; and on both sides, east of Brock. Two further isolates are the polychrome Ocean View Hotel, at the western terminus, between King and Queen; and another polychrome at Macdonell.

The distribution of post-annexation buildings with individual physical heritage merit is more complex, and is discussed in detail in Schedule 3(A). In a nutshell and with the existence of scattered exceptions noted: east from the Fuller–Macdonell block, the north side consists almost entirely of physical-heritage buildings while on the south side, they are clustered at the eastern end; west from the Fuller–Macdonell block, the south side consists of physical-heritage buildings, while on the north side, buildings of plausible physical-heritage merit are found west to Callender and again toward the western end.

We recommend that **this segment should be brought under an HCD of its own.** Despite its diversity, and the uneven distribution of its physical heritage assets, and of their internal stylistic and period heterogeneity, the segment remains recognizably Queen West and recognizably Parkdale. There are, to be sure, imperfections in the streetscape: we sketch out a strategy for accommodating these in Schedule 3(B). Finally, we call attention to the importance of economic considerations in planning for this segment: Parkdale’s historical and social value as a ‘landing site’ is as much a part of its cultural heritage, if not more so, than its physical value. We sketch out a strategy for accommodating this in Schedule 3(C).

**In conclusion,** we believe that this proposal for segmentation into the *Niagara; Creek–Road; Beaconsfield; and Parkdale ASIs* is historically well-grounded, and is adequate to the lived experience of interacting with WQW. We believe that once WQW is seen as having the structure we describe, the heritage values to which the people of Toronto are so strongly responsive, appear to fall into place. We therefore recommend it as offering an appropriate framework for conserving the heritage of

this complex and historic street.

Sincerely yours,

Ric Amis (Chair, WSCC), Parkdale RA  
me@ricamis.com

Graham Caswell, Active 18  
graham@made-creative.com

Todd Hofley, Liberty Village RA  
thofley@gmail.com

Randy Kerr, Beaconsfield Village RA  
randy@beaconsfieldvillagera.com

Benj Hellie, Ossington CA  
benj.hellie@gmail.com

Domenic Valela, Trinity Bellwoods CA  
dvalela@live.ca

Attachments:

- A. Schedule 1: Development of concerns with recommendations
- B. Schedule 2: *Garrison Creek–Dundas Road HCD*
- C. Schedule 3: *Parkdale HCD*
- D. Schedule 4: Map

## SCHEDULE 1: CONCERNS WITH DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS

(A) We believe that the **proposed alternatives to HCD designation would not provide significant heritage protection over the status quo**: indeed, clarifying the planning regime for the excluded segments would signal to developers that there would be no roadblock to redevelopment, and would likely encourage or even set in motion extensive redevelopment activity.

1. HCDs exist in order to preserve *districts*, because **spot-designation under Part IV** cannot do so. Spot-designation cannot require heritage-reinforcing redevelopment of non-designated properties. Because a proposal for spot-designation is not linked to a broader context, the property-owner can reasonably protest that the property at issue is nothing special ('look at all the others just like it—and mine is in terrible condition!'). We understand that land-owners pushed back strongly against the HCD: presumably, they will also push back against spot-designation. If they succeed in their push-back against the HCD, presumably they will succeed also in their pushback against spot-designation.
2. We note, moreover, puzzling **lacunae in the 'Representative examples of historic typology'** diagram (slide 26). We take special note of these because they are presumably a precursor to recommendations for spot-designation.

In western Trinity: the decision to include, on the Beaconsfield–Lisgar block, only the Drake itself is particularly puzzling, particularly in light of the recent celebration of this block by City Planning [bit.ly/queen-1144-1142](http://bit.ly/queen-1144-1142). Dovercourt–Fennings east of the two corner buildings is of consistent design. The polychrome buildings on Brookfield–Ossington should be conserved.

In western Parkdale: the consistency of design of the Callender–Fuller buildings, to the contrary, is what their representativeness amounts to.
3. Concerning **AMRBS Character Areas**: Appendix A of the AMRBS discusses such likely analogues as 'Bloordale' *et al*, 'Little Italy', and so forth: the recommendations invariably 'refer to Performance Standards 19D and 19E' and occasionally to '19G'. 19D and 19E call for mid-rise redevelopment to continue historical cornice lines below the half-dozen or more upper stories, and to create an appearance of fine-grained retail rhythm in the facades of large-format at-grade retail spaces; 19G calls for other cosmetic gestures.

4. Finally, any **area-specific policy** will need to conform with Queen West's designation as an *Avenue*, and will consequently require height limits to be brought in line with the 20 m Major Street 'planned ROW'. (In practice, we have found that to invariably mean a floor, rather than a ceiling as intended.)

(B) A **very plausible outcome** would be an extensive transformation, in a perceptible timeframe, of the excluded segments. Land-owners have been quietly (or sometimes not-so-quietly!) assembling very large parcels in the excluded segments; with the redevelopment-encouraging planning regime recommended, little aside from availability of capital would stand in the way of redevelopment for a stretch of eight–ten-storey buildings.

Using the 'historic typology' map as a guide to the **likely-affected areas** (and making allowances for the particularities of relevant prevailing tenancy arrangements), these would include: in western Parkdale, nearly the entire north side of Queen, and about half of the south side; and in western Trinity: the Drake Hotel block, across from the designated Post Office and recently celebrated by City Planning; much of the Lisgar–Dovercourt block, across from the Carnegie Library, and the Dovercourt–Fennings block, across from the Great Hall; the lot and buildings further east along Fennings, giving context to the Great Hall and the other nearby buildings; and perhaps eventually the bulk of the Givins–Shaw block, in its tight connection with the historic *Givins Quarter* neighbourhood to the north.

(C) It is important to prevent this, because the existing streetscape in the excluded segments **provides important context** for a range of other entities:

1. The entirety of the Old City of Toronto, for which Queen West, with its distinctive rhythms and typologies in relation to the adjacent residential districts, provides the archetype;
2. Queen Street, West and East, as a whole;
3. The *included* segments, both individually and in their connection to one another;
4. The historically rich Ossington Avenue;
5. Trinity-Bellwoods Park and the CAMH Wall and Parklands;
6. The dramatic conclusion of Queen Street at its intersection with King, Roncesvalles, and the Queensway;
7. The beautiful Nineteenth-Century neighbourhoods running north from, having evolved alongside, and existing in harmonious fit with, the western Trinity segment;

8. The leafy early-Twentieth-Century neighbourhoods existing in a comparable relationship with the western Parkdale segment;
9. The heritage-worthy buildings making up the existing streetscapes in the excluded segments, themselves—the Great Hall, Carnegie Library, Post Office, Drake and Gladstone, and the hundreds of vintage ‘background’ buildings accompanying them.

(D) To the best of our discernment, the **principal case for exclusion of the western segments is the absence of ‘sufficient integrity and character defining elements’**: in particular, that in the Parkdale segment, ‘North side buildings are built out to the front property line, whereas the buildings on the south side have occasional setbacks’; and in the Trinity segment, while the ‘South streetscape is composed of primarily contemporary structures with set-backs for pedestrians’, this contrasts with the ‘Narrow vertical rhythm of facades on [a] north streetscape’ of ‘Predominantly two to three storey buildings’. Apparently, these contrasts are believed to obliterate the ‘common thematic, architectural or associative characteristics that unify, relate to, and communicate the cultural heritage values of the district’ required for ‘coherence’ and therefore ‘integrity’.

We would like to **raise several objections** to this line of reasoning:

1. The stretch of the south side of Queen Street actually within the HCD boundary excludes the CAMH lands, and is in consequence only 4.5 blocks long. The north side is nine blocks long, so the street frontage of the western Trinity segment is 13.5 blocks long. One-third of this is on the south side. Of this one-third, 1.5 blocks consists of designated buildings, so the amount of non-contributing frontage in this segment is no more than three blocks long, or 22%. Finally, this frontage is isolated, at the far southwestern corner of the segment.

The complaint against the segment is then that it contains 22% non-contributing frontage, all of which is isolated in a remote corner, and that for this reason, the segment cannot communicate its heritage values. **A fraction just over a fifth of the segment, and an isolated one, cannot sensibly be regarded as obliterating the heritage expression of the whole.**

We note also that **in the recently-designated *Historic Yonge* HCD, the level of ‘noncontributing’ property rises nearly to 50%**; south of Gloucester, the noncontributing component on the east side is interrupted only at half-block stretches below Dundonald and above Maitland. We do not see what principle could justify the asymmetry with the recommendation for the western Trinity segment.

2. **We note any range of cases in which properties within an HCD are across the street from the non-HCD region.** In the present case, this includes the properties to the south of Trinity-Bellwoods Park. There are many others: for *King-Spadina*, stretches of Richmond, King, and Simcoe; for *Baby Point*, stretches of Jane; for *Harbord Village*, stretches of Spadina, Robert, and Major; for *Casa Loma*, stretches of Malgund; for *St. Lawrence*, stretches of King and George; for the *Garden District*, stretches of Jarvis and Sherbourne; for *Cabbagetown NW*, both sides of the peninsula facing Sherbourne; for *Weston*, stretches of Church and Jane; for *Yorkville*, stretches of Scollard and Davenport; and for *Riverdale*, stretches of First. We do not see how the presence of non-HCD properties on the CAMH lands could disqualify the western Trinity segment as HCD material.

3. We cannot help but note the contrast between this judgement and the **City Planning** claim, in their recommendation to designate 1142 and 1144 Queen West, that ‘The two buildings support the **historic character of the West Queen West neighbourhood**’ ([bit.ly/queen-1144-1142](http://bit.ly/queen-1144-1142)). Here they are referring to our *Beaconsfield ASI*.

But we note that the lands in question are those which directly face the problematic 22% of the western Trinity segment, where they are best in position to work their integrity-obliterating magic. **The judgement here of City Planning is in direct conflict with the judgement in the draft recommendations;** the greater wealth of detail of the City Planning report recommends its judgement over that of the draft recommendations.

4. As a point of ‘procedural legitimacy’, we are confident in our recollection of repeated assurances that the **CAMH redevelopment was in no way precedential**, and that the populace need therefore not ‘worry its little head’ about whatever went on there. We call on the sources of this promise to honor it. In this context, for purposes of adjudicating the WQW HCD, it would be appropriate to treat the CAMH lands as consisting of the historic 1850 PLA cupola, surrounded by bucolic parkland and stately trees.

—Now that we are in the appropriate frame of mind, wouldn’t you agree that this perfectly well mirrors and reinforces the heritage attributes of the north side buildings?

5. **Queen Street is, historically, the first concession road, and is as such inherently a boundary** between very early 19th-C lot subdivisions and attendant plans and uses, and the 'Park Lot' system which would impose a very different variety of subdivision and use.

In the western Trinity segment, the south side was at first under the Military Reserve; then under the PLA; following the arrival of the rail lines, the Abell Company acquired the western terminus from south of Beaconsfield–Lisgar; in the late 1880s, the PLA sold off enough of its western edge to allow extension of Dovercourt and Lisgar for residential subdivision on both sides, and enough of its eastern edge to do the same for Crawford and the east side of Shaw.

It is in consequence of this that the south side involves a pocket of 'period-representative' buildings from east of Dovercourt to west of Lisgar (aside from a small incursion just west of Dovercourt); but also involves larger plots of land to the east and west—significant chunks of which have, in the last decade, been directed by various authorities for 'intensification'. This contrast is therefore **exactly what expresses the history of the area**, a fact to which City Planning is sensitive in their discussion of 1144 and 1142 Queen West.

6. One cannot help but worry about the **apparent triviality** of the allegedly disintegrating factors. 'Primarily contemporary structures with set-backs for pedestrians' are supposed to obliterate the capacity of the tremendously historic western Trinity segment to express its heritage potential? Really? To speak frankly, this is a suggestion many will find hard to take seriously.

## **SCHEDULE 2: GARRISON CREEK–DUNDAS ROAD HCD**

This ASI can be segmented into four ‘character regions’ (CRs), reflecting the influence of historical development on built form and open space; in addition, the *Queen–Ossington* intersection is highlighted as a distinguished locale. The character regions are: (A) *Brookfield CR*, Dovercourt–Ossington; (B) *Givins CR*, Ossington–Shaw; (C) *Massey CR*, Shaw–Massey; (D) *Strachan CR*, Massey–Walnut.

The earliest-developed of the character regions was *Givins CR*, followed shortly by *Massey CR*: at the bottom of Park Lot 24, smallholds had been sold off already by 1802. The Blue Bell Tavern was attested by 1834, and a series of buildings were here by 1851. The nucleus of the Creek–Road neighbourhood was the *Givins Quarter*, a cluster of working-class households around Givins and Rebecca, with neighbouring stretches running both ways on Queen and up Dundas Road, and to a lesser extent, Shaw, over to Crawford, where they ran up against Trinity College. The others were significantly later developing, as new land was subdivided and brought under residential use on newly-created side streets over the 1870s and 1880s. These influences are felt in the distinctive attributes of each character region.

In each of the *Givins* and *Massey CRs*, we witness, to some extent, the ‘perils of early success’. Buildings from the 1860s or early 1870s still took up much of Ossington–Crawford by the time broad-based prosperity arrived here in the later 1880s. Two of these are still seen on Shaw–Crawford, but those further west are gone: Ossington–Givins was rebuilt with extant buildings in the late-1880s, around the same time Trinity College deaccessioned Massey–Crawford. Development in the *Brookfield* and (to a lesser extent) *Massey CRs* is from an intermediate wave, starting in the late 1870s. One strand moved east from Dovercourt to Fennings (commercial development for posh Dovercourt residents). Another simultaneously moved west from Ossington to Brookfield, then, eventually (by 1890) to Fennings (commercial development for the less opulent residential streets of Brookfield and Fennings).

In consequence, the north side of Queen in this ASI initially finds uniformly excellent buildings on Ossington–Givins; uniformly very good buildings on Dovercourt–Fennings and east of Crawford; and excellent corner buildings flanking good-quality polychromes on Fennings–Brookfield and Brookfield toward Ossington. On Givins–Shaw and Shaw–Crawford, the more cheaply-built earlier commercial buildings have aged less well, and many have been demolished.

A concurrent story, running in the *Strachan* and *Massey CRs* and influencing the development of the south side of Queen, is the successive deaccessioning of eastern strips of the Military Reserve and then PLA lands. The Farr Brewery was established at Queen and Walnut in 1820. The Military Reserve lands were transferred to the PLA in 1850, and by 1857, a street grid running east from the west side of Strachan Avenue had been established. Some time by the early 1880s, residential development arrived on the lands south of Trinity College east of Strachan. Only by about 1882 does the name Massey Street appear for what had been the back-end of the residential lots down Strachan (indicating the arrival of Massey Manufacturing by the tracks at King); and only around 1888 are the PLA lands deaccessioned to Shaw and Shaw and Crawford run south to King—and that very same year, the Farr Brewery burns down, and its lands are immediately subdivided and redeveloped.

The perils of early success are manifest to some extent. Early buildings between Strachan and Massey have not survived; intermediate-stage buildings a bit further east have (along with an early stately house), but mixed in with new-build redevelopment; the best buildings are those that replaced the brewery. Finally, Shaw–Crawford and Crawford–Massey were developed late: the residential to the south did not prove popular, and the four half-block-width lots on Queen were evidently too costly for all but industrial purchasers, selling at the rate of one per decade over the early 20th Century.

We urge the following **heritage-conservation goals for the *Creek–Road ASI***, in no particular order. First, the *Queen–Ossington intersection* should be celebrated: as one of the most historically significant intersections in Toronto, steps should be taken to ensure that its heritage attributes are duly respected: in particular, the fire-house clock-tower on Ossington should be restored, and views to it should be conserved.

Second, the Givins Quarter is of great contextual, historical, and physical value in its coevolution from very early days with the nearby stretches of Queen and of Ossington, and its conservation should be an important goal of the *Creek–Road ASI*: unfortunately, it is encroached upon to the east by the very deep lots on the Givins–Shaw block of Queen, and to the west by the vacant stockyards land at the center of the Ossington–Rebecca–Givins–Queen block. To conserve the Givins Quarter in its relationship to the *Givins CR*, it should be a goal of the *Creek–Road ASI* to acquire these lands for the public realm: the stockyards lands, as a mid-block park; and the rear portion of the very deep lots, by running Pridham Place (a spur laneway off Shaw) westward to link up with the J-laneway eastward from Givins.

Third, the commercial buildings in the *Brookfield CR* are of contextual, historical, and physical value, and should be conserved: redevelopment of vacant or new-build land should strengthen and reinforce the existing heritage attributes.

Fourth, because of the off-diagonal distribution of open-space between the *Brookfield/Givins CRs* and the *Strachan CR*, overlain with the Queen-car interchange, the intersection at Shaw expresses a dramatic geographical ‘torsion’, contributing strongly to the idiosyncratic, electrifying character of this intersection: it should be encouraged to reinforce of this contextual value by redeveloping lower-quality early buildings in the *Givins* and *Massey CRs*.

Fifth, in the *Massey* and *Strachan CRs*, Trinity Park is an amazing heritage resource, and its conservation is of paramount importance. In particular, the buildings in the *Strachan CR* are of generally high quality and should be conserved; the buildings on the south side of the *Massey CR* are, with the exception of the hotel at Strachan, of high quality and should be conserved (if the hotel is to be redeveloped, its height should be less than the building to its west to conserve sunlight in the park); and finally, the parking areas flanking Strachan are ugly and undermine the park and the Strachan Gates: they should be planted with trees.

### **SCHEDULE 3: *PARKDALE HCD***

#### **(A) POST-ANNEXATION PHYSICAL-HERITAGE BUILDINGS**

Characterizing the distribution of post-annexation buildings with individual physical-heritage merit will be assisted by segmenting the ASI at the Fuller–Macdonell block. In the eastern segment, on the north side, nearly all the post-annexation buildings date to the 19th Century. On the south side, the Jameson–Close block consists entirely of pre-1920 buildings, and isolates are found just to the west, as well as on the corners of Dunn, and to the east of the library; but for two-and-a-half blocks east of Close, the buildings are one-storey, large-format retail.

In the western segment, on the north side, we can recognize three subsegments. (i) Westward to Callender: here, the prevailing building type and age is the two-story, ‘Type A’, early-20th-Century shop front: an interesting exception is at the corner of Fuller. (ii) Westward to the middle of the Roncesvalles–Triller block: here, significant gaps are interspersed with later ‘Type A’ buildings. (iii) Westward to Roncesvalles: the last half block consists of an interesting Edwardian block, two less interesting buildings, and two early-twentieth century Romanesque buildings. On the south side, running west from the Hydro building to the Ocean View Hotel, we observe primarily first-rate early-20th-Century buildings (though on each block, a building of lesser heritage merit occupies a largeish lot).

#### **(B) HCD DESIGN: PHYSICAL VALUE**

We strongly recommend that the HCD for *Parkdale ASI* draws a significant line between ‘contributing’ and ‘noncontributing’ buildings, and recognizes areas of prevailing noncontribution as opportunities for redevelopment, in order to strengthen and reinforce the ability of the district as a whole to express its cultural heritage, through design specifications requiring harmony with nearby heritage assets; and also to increase the population living within a short walk of the western terminus, which suffers from its isolation and miniscule residential ‘watershed’.

More specifically, we recommend the following. In the Western segment, the resources of highest value are the Ocean View and ‘end of the world’ vista. These should be conserved by sharply limiting heights: west of Triller to the existing roof line; west of Wilson, to four storeys; elsewhere, to five. Conservation of the period-characteristic ‘Type A’ buildings in subsegment (i) should be a goal, with vertical additions encouraged; in subsegment (ii), mixed-use redevelopment should be encouraged. On the south side, east of Triller, mixed-use redevelopment of non-contributing buildings (including the Edwardian semi-detached houses) should be encouraged; for contributing apartment blocks, vertical additions to five storeys should be encouraged.

The eastern segment needs less work. Mixed-use redevelopment to five storeys should be encouraged for the large-format, one-storey retail buildings on the two-and-a-half blocks east of Close.

#### (C) HCD DESIGN: HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL VALUE

It is part of Parkdale’s cultural heritage to serve as a ‘landing site’ for New Canadians. We are well aware that new-construction residents are typically affluent, and that new-construction retail rents are typically high. If the redevelopment we discuss significantly increases the cost of living in Parkdale, heritage would be destroyed, instead of conserved. We therefore attach economic policy recommendations to our built-form recommendations: a high ratio of affordable rental units, for individuals and families, must be required in new development; retail floorplate sizes should be limited to twice those in nearby conforming buildings; and, for local-owner retail tenants serving daily needs, the added cost in retail rents stemming from the customary incrementation of retail-space rates for new construction should be mitigated through a city rebate on rents above those prevailing in local older buildings.

SCHEDULE 4: MAP

