

## Kensington Market HCD Study - CCM #2 – Comment Summary

**Date:** February 9, 2017

**Time:** 6:30-9pm

**Location:** St. Stephen's Community House, 91 Bellevue Avenue

---

The following comment summary includes notes taken by the Project Team at the CCM #2 meeting held on February 9<sup>th</sup>, 2017. At the end of the presentation, three questions were posed to the crowd:

1. Have we captured the values and attributes that reflect your ideas about Kensington?
2. What are your thoughts on the Proposed Heritage Conservation District Boundary?
3. What would you like a Heritage Conservation District to achieve?

Through that discussion, and comments received following the meeting via email, the comments received can be broken down into the following broad categories: values and attributes; the proposed boundary; character areas; what would you like an HCD to achieve?, traffic, recent developments (and other threats), and property standards/other.

### Values & Attributes

- There are different views on what Kensington Market is
- Dynamism is a distinguishing characteristic – how might HCD restrict dynamism?
- Diversity and inclusion – both age and ethnicity
- Low-scale (height and size) is a key attribute
- Walkability is key to Kensington
- Maintaining diversity and culture of acceptance
- Affordability played a key role in the evolution of the market
- Rental, ownership and affordability are important to the mix
- The unintended mix of uses within buildings – new buildings may not fit in because we need to allow for the evolution at the right scale
- The relationship between ground floor and street/public space is important – we can't lose that relationship
- Contributing and non-contributing criteria are limiting and truncate the entire process of preserving the area
- Residential units above ground floor retail is very typical – how can this be assessed?
- This is a village focused on people first thus needs to remain at a human scale
- Little park space we have has strong influence on community (Dennison Square)
- We should clearly define the values and attributes that a plan cannot protect and who should be responsible
- On page 47 of the presentation, the following Design and Physical Attributes should be introduced:

- *ongoing and incremental modification of residential buildings that promote and reflect individual tastes*
- *the offbeat and eclectic nature of the built form as a result of incremental and ongoing modification to properties and buildings*
- On page 46 of the presentation, the Contextual Value should be revised to state:
  - *As a layered neighbourhood that includes altered structures set within residential and former residential streets, the district is a place reworked by successive generations of ethnic and social outsiders.*
- Institutional buildings are important in the area (e.g. church, hospital, synagogue and fire hall).

## Proposed Boundary

- We are looking at boundary as 2D space – we should approach it in 3D perspective to address the problem of development along the edges
- The issue with the boundary is the boundary streets
- The proposed boundary may work
- “The boundary is like an egg – if the outer shell (the boundary streets) breaks we are all breakfast”
- The boundary is hazy – an attribute
- Are we defining Kensington Market? Definition has changed over time
- Boundary is larger than Kensington Market – “Greater Kensington Area”
- The boundary should not include boundary streets (College, Bathurst, Spadina) – these are outside Kensington, not within.
- The HCD boundary should correspond to the “Kensington Special Identity Area” as outlined in SASP 197. This long recognized area is classified low density mixed commercial and residential and its boundaries comprise what is and has been considered to be the actual “Kensington Market” proper over the past several decades. It is also essentially the area that the original HCD nomination was intended to protect, but it is not the current KM BIA area which includes properties outside the “Market” zone such as Toronto Western Hospital and low density residential streets.
- The heritage evaluation of the Study Area bounded by College-Spadina-Dundas-Bathurst has provided valuable insights into the community at large. It would be appropriate and very desirable to make recommendations for zoning and planning guidelines to City Council to preserve small scales of future development in the areas adjacent to the proposed as defined by SASP 197.
- support the inclusion of both sides of the 4 major boundary streets to protect the Market’s boundary integrity. As a strategy against rampant and ill-planned proposals, it would have been a way of preventing the proposed RioCan development on Bathurst, or “Carmen’s local grocer” and high-rise on College.

## Character Areas

- Need to treat residential areas differently than commercial areas (separate guidelines)
- West side acts as a community, east side is more fractured

## What would you like an HCD to achieve?

- HCD should limit demolitions
- HCD should prohibit chain stores
- Are we preserving storefronts? What about the back ends of buildings?
- Would an HCD limit land assembly like the Byward Market HCD?
- Will the study be part of a secondary plan or will it be an update to the SASP?
- Height should be restricted to “tree-top” height with maximum 3 storeys everywhere except College St.
- Most of the small narrow residential properties within the final designated HCD area to be classified as non-contributing unless individual property owners would like to opt-in and be considered for designation as contributing on the basis of significant qualifying features. This is to preserve the preeminent heritage value of diversity that is strongly manifest in physical and design attributes. A non-contributing status precludes unintended outcomes such as future modifications being subject to static formulaic heritage criteria that ironically would hinder preservation of local cultural values of diversity and individuality.
- Larger individual historic properties in the Study Area should be nominated for the City's Heritage Register, but the HCD boundary should coincide with the Special Identity Area shown on the attached map.
- The HCD Study team should make recommendations for zoning controls on the scale, height, massing, and setbacks of future buildings throughout the entire Study Area to protect the fine grained qualities of the residential components.
- Prevent the sanitization of traditional market features like shop awnings
- Maintaining the small scale of Kensington Market, perhaps by requiring that all changes to properties must “respect historical lot lines”, i.e. that assembly of properties (for development) would not be permitted
- Including the boundary streets (College, Spadina, Dundas and Bathurst), at least on the sides adjacent to Kensington Market, as the outside boundaries of the study area. Rationale: Historically, many properties on these boundary streets have been part of Kensington Market; and, any development on the boundary streets (on the same sides as Kensington Market) could have a significant impact on the character of Kensington Market (particularly on deep lots)

## Traffic

- People use the neighbourhood to pass through to other areas of the City
- People speed through the Market streets as if they are thoroughfares and it is dangerous

- Limit traffic to 25km/hr with more police presence
- We need more pedestrian Sundays and car-free shopping days on weekdays

## Recent Developments (and other threats)

- Proposed development on College Street comes deep into Kensington Market due to the lot depth of these development sites. Therefore, the relationship of the back of buildings is important.
- How will an HCD affect development applications on Bathurst, College and Spadina?
- We are demolishing affordable rental spaces for condominiums – the slums of tomorrow
- Currently four demolition applications within the Kensington area
- Demolition should be limited
- How change is being described should be reviewed – watch out for interpretations
- Consider the impact of UofT students have on rental stock and on the infrastructure in Kensington – There is a historical relationship between Kensington Market and UofT – Kensington Market represents services to the UofT students
- Developers' projects undermine the small grocers in the market and vitality of entire neighbourhoods. Big box shops do not belong near or in Kensington, protection against their construction must be i.e. Historic designation would begin the process to prevent this from the start.
- The Kensington Market HCD Study/Plan and other area studies must not limit the capacity to construct a high-rise building potentially on the following properties:
  - 281, 283, 285, 289 College Street; 8,10,14,16,18,20,22 Oxford Street; 291 College Street and 8R Oxford Street; 295 College Street; 446-448-450 Spadina Avenue
  - An application for rezoning some of these properties is imminent (lands owned by applicant include 289 and 291 College and 8R Oxford Street – other properties may be acquired).

## Property Standards/Other

- Garbage is a problem in the market
- Address hygiene problem in the neighbourhood and a lack of public washroom facilities
- Marijuana dispensaries are an issue in the market
- Visitors to the Market should have better etiquette – especially towards the elderly
- Enforce character of a true market which can be defined by its hours of operation. Business hours of operation are different for grocers than they are for pubs and bars.
- Prevent the Market from becoming an entertainment hub.
- We don't want any change in the Market.

**Please note** that the comments presented above are from the public either in the form of participation at the public meeting, feedback forms or through emails to the study team and do not necessarily represent the opinions of the study team.