

Margaret Sexton - Toronto Preservation Board-October 1, 2012 (Reference to item PB 16.1)

From: Berta Pavlov <[REDACTED]>
To: "msexton@toronto.ca" <msexton@toronto.ca>
Date: 9/27/2012 12:03 PM
Subject: Toronto Preservation Board-October 1, 2012 (Reference to item PB 16.1)

Dear Committee members:

As homeowners of a house on Miles Road (Ward 6), we are so proud that our city is moving forward to implement policies that will protect the very special waterfront views that make our city such a special place to live and work in. We truly believe that in order to be a "World Class City", you must first protect the heritage of what made this city. It is not only the importance of our heritage building structures but also our waterfront and the views of what we have built in the past and hopefully continue to build with respect for our existing communities and waterfront in the future.

With sincere gratitude and appreciation for all the hard work being done by this committee and our city council.

Berta & Larry Pavlov
[REDACTED]

Margaret Sexton

From: brian graff <[REDACTED]>
To: <msexton@toronto.ca>
Date: 9/28/2012 11:23 AM
CC: <councillor_vaughan@toronto.ca>, "Geoff Kettel" <gkettel@gmail.com>, <councillor_wongtam@toronto.ca>, "Councillor McMahon" <councillor_mcmahon@toronto.ca>

To the Toronto Preservation Board:

The Official Plan Five Year Review: Official Plan Amendment to Adopt new Heritage and Public Realm Policies is coming before the P&GM Committee on the 12th of October.

I would like to ask that Map 7A in the document be changed to add in some crucial views or structures in Ward 32 – this would also include changing the lists on the last 2 pages of the file.

The 3 or 4 actual beaches in Ward 32 (Woodbine, Kew, Balmy, and Scarboro Beach) are all important “natural features”, and in addition, the Leuty Lifeguard station, and the Boardwalk, should be added to the lists as natural features, landscapes or buildings, as appropriate.

I would also say that in addition to the R.C. Harris Water Plant, very clearly The Beach Fire Hall on Queen St. East, and its clock tower are another key feature worthy of inclusion, and the views of it need to be preserved. Since the list already includes the Yorkville Firehall Clock Tower, and the Summerhill Station Clock Tower, I do not see why there would be a reason that the one at 1904 Queen East should be excluded, particularly given the concerns raised throughout the Queen Street East Visioning Study.

There might be a case for adding in other structures as well, such as the Beaches Library.

Lastly, the definition of Cultural Heritage Landscapes” (CHL) now seems to be identical to that used in the *Provincial Policy Statement*, where the definition includes “mainstreets” and other areas that are not “landscapes” in the common traditional sense, but would include *streetscapes* or *complexes of industrial buildings* as well.

But this section of the proposal, it still only includes only 2 examples of CHLs – both are areas with large open spaces (Fort York and Allen Gardens) and to make it clear that the city will use this CHL provision to protect “mainstreets” like Queen East Street in The Beach, I would ask that the examples be expanded to include at least one “mainstreet” as an example of a CHL, perhaps by adding the Queen Street West HCD in Councillor Vaughan’s ward as a 3rd example.

Please look at this section in section 44

In addition to protection under the Ontario Heritage Act, other planning tools and strategies for the protection of cultural heritage landscapes may be investigated and employed, as determined by the City.

It would be useful if an example of a tool or strategy were cited, such as use of Area Specific Policies (Secondary Plans) or greater inclusion of heritage in the Guidelines included in the 2004 Companion document to the Official Plan.

Also, as the PPS says that the city “shall conserve” Cultural Heritage Landscapes, then please add something to the effect that: if an area has been identified as a CHL or Potential CHL, this “shall” be a

consideration in any decisions relating to zoning, OPAs or Site Plan Control.

The use of "may" in the text is also weak, given the inclusion of the phrase "as determined", particularly when the PPS uses "shall conserve" making conservation of any and all CHLs an obligation.

Please review these matters with City staff, and please make sure the appropriate recommendations are submitted and accepted when this comes up for discussion and a vote at P&GM Committee, and at City Council for inclusion in the Official Plan.

Regards

Brian Graff
B.E.S., B. Arch., M.B.A.

From: [REDACTED]
To: <msexton@toronto.ca>
Date: 9/28/2012 2:57 pm
Subject: PB16.1: Official Plan Five Year Review: Official Plan Amendment to Adopt new Heritage and Public Realm Policies

Mr. Robert Saunders, Chair
Toronto Preservation Board

I am writing in support of the report from the Chief Planner and Executive Director, City Planning with regard to the proposed amendments to the Toronto Official Plan to strengthen Heritage and Public Realm Policies which will be discussed at your meeting of October 1, 2012.

I firmly believe that the adoption of the proposed amendments to the Toronto Official Plan will lead to a more livable and vibrant city and will create a culture that promotes economic growth and prosperity.

Thank you

Michael Harrison

September 30, 2012

Toronto Preservation Board

Dear Preservation Board,

Eglinton Park Residents' Association proposes that the collection of old public buildings at the High Point on Yonge, at Montgomery, just north of Eglinton, be declared a view worthy of designation and protection.

Our reasons are several.

1. We have there, tightly arrayed, three survivors of the old civic centre of North Toronto, an independent village before the city absorbed it. There is a fire hall (1932), a police station (1932), and a postal station (1936). The ensemble is a handsome emblem of history and of civic identity, well visible to the many pedestrians who throng that busy stretch of Yonge Street. This is no grand vista, but a more intimate view that ties us residents to our city.
2. Two of the three buildings (police station and post office) are by notable Toronto architects. They are fine examples of our city's Art Deco tradition. The post office, by Murray Brown, won a national prize (1939) from the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada. The police station is also a handsomely proportioned work. The architect, J. J. Woolnough, designed the Rosedale Viaduct and major Art Deco buildings, including the Horse Palace at the CNE. It has a well balanced Art Deco façade, facing Yonge. The fire hall, if less elegant and subtle, is agreeably Tudoresque.
3. The post office bears the extremely rare royal ciphre of Edward VIII, who abdicated before his coronation. There are almost no other of his ciphres in Canada.
4. The post office sits on the site of Montgomery's Tavern, home of the 1837 rebellion. In the small park out front is a flag pole with a plaque, explaining the fateful events there, where a failed revolt helped lead the way to representative government in Upper Canada.

In short, this whole group belongs together and speaks to the city.

Tom Cohen
Chair, EPRA

Toronto, Ward 16
440 Duplex Avenue, Toronto, Ontario M4R 1V4

EglintonParkResidentsAssoc@gmail.com

Re: Amendment No. 199 to the Official Plan of the City of Toronto

I live at #10 Heathbridge Park. Mr. Pete Hamill lives at 8 Windmill Road. We are hopeful that these amendments to the City's Official Plan will preserve our little community's important heritage values.

Our homes were planned to fit into a community of 54 properties on 5 streets after the Second World War by the Heathbridge Co-operative. This Co-operative was the first of its kind in Canada. Our district was one of 95 communities designated as potential Heritage communities, on a list submitted to the City for the purposes of the Official Plan. Until 1986, there was a covenant on the land, which regulated the size of sheds, and fencing, etc. Regulations were administered by executive members of the Co-operative. Houses were designed around cul de sacs, and afforded views over each others' properties, and/or parkettes, boulevards, and circles. Each house had large south facing solar windows designed to catch low angle rays from the sun in winter. Strategically placed trees shaded most homes in summer. With a little added insulation, most original homes do not require central air conditioning.

Mrs. Maureen Morrison, at 6 Orchard Green, presented reasons why the Heathbridge Park area merited a heritage designation to Scott Barrett, at City Hall. Her father, George Mitchell, was president of the Heathbridge Co-operative for many years. Mrs. Morrison regrets she is unable to attend today's meeting, and would like to be included in future proceedings. She has kept documents from the Heathbridge Co-operative, which she feels have archival merit, and would like to donate them to the Ontario Archives.

The Heathbridge Co-operative Community complies with the spirit of Amendment No. 199, which states "our cultural heritage includes both the tangible and intangible values and attributes of a distinct small village." The Amendment states further that "our heritage properties represent a collective past and their protection enriches our daily experience." Members chose plantings carefully when planning parkettes and boulevards - evergreens were planted on Evergreen Gardens, for example, and room for playground equipment was provided. The original residents decided on a policy described in Section 3.1.1 #9, The Public Realm. "Landscapes and natural features from streets and other public places are a significant part of the structure and image of the City." In addition, there was "a shared sense of belonging and place for the inhabitants" (3.1.5 Heritage Conservation) because side yards were as important as back yards. The front yards were shallow, and houses placed close to the street. This feature contributes to a friendly atmosphere. Residents were justly proud of their gardens - they preserved apple trees from the farmer's orchard, and saved mature oak trees - one is over 300 years old! They celebrated greenery with street names such as Heathbridge Park, Garden Circle, Orchard Green, Evergreen Gardens, and there was a sense of property being held in common. At least one neighbour encouraged children to pick raspberries from her bushes, others shared apple harvests, and perennial plantings. Two birch trees on our front lawn are a magnificent golden colour every fall, and a film company used them as a backdrop for a scene in a 1970s movie. Adjacent homeowners on another street were very upset when a builder's plans showed the removal of a very large magnolia tree from the backyard of a house on our street. Original homes were deliberately low in profile, with flat roofs, or shallow pitched designs that allow the sun to penetrate into the owner's and neighbours' side and back yards, ideal conditions for vegetables and flowers.

Margaret Atwood's father had a considerable property, but chose to build a small bungalow so that he could cultivate a large vegetable garden. My own property has 6 mature trees over 50 years old, including 2 black walnut trees that the organization, Not Far From the Tree will harvest next year. Before our garden became a shade garden, I grew tomatoes, lettuce, strawberries, rhubarb, and some beans. Four demolitions on 2 of 3 streets overlooking Heathbridge Park Boulevard, have resulted in the loss of more than 5 mature

trees, and their capacity for carbon storage. This is a tremendous loss. The trees that have been planted to replace them will never reach the size of the original ones, because oversized buildings have encroached on their space. Original Co-operative residents obviously respected the land, unlike recent builders, who are quick to demolish solidly built homes and trade green space for floor space. We welcome the change in policy stated in #21, that “Heritage Impact Assessment is required for proposed demolition.”

We are happy to see #28, which states that the “heritage structure is not to be re-oriented from the original orientation to face another street.” Several of our neighbours supported us by attending a Committee of Adjustment hearing, and signing a petition to block this kind of change planned by a developer.

I wish to re-emphasize a previous statement about heritage properties representing a collective past and their protection enriching our daily experience. Many people outside our community have told me that they love walking in this neighbourhood. The loss of original homes, and their wonderful part in the overall design is a very real personal loss for me and most of my neighbours. The newer, much more massive homes show the builder’s disregard for the land, and a blatant desire for money. Unlike older homes, most are neither individualized, nor suited to their sites. A builder has simply picked out a design, and plunked it onto a lot, with a few superficial adjustments. Architect James Murray, who co-ordinated planning and design, and worked with residents and Faculty of Architecture students, lived on our street. Under his guidance, as one of Toronto’s first urban planners, he worked with the Co-operative and city officials at the time to set aside land for parkettes, tennis court, school, and a small community centre. Our narrow streets were designed in a quieter, more intimate age. Extremely large construction and garbage trucks are very destructive, and not appropriate for use in our neighbourhood. The idea of scale has recently been poorly understood by Toronto’s city planners.

Many original homes had views through breezeways into the back yard. Their side yards were generous. This meant that houses were very bright inside. Newer houses, built right up to property lines, eliminate the play of light. I am glad that the Heritage conservation measures outlined in the new Official Plan call for preserving views and greenspace. A community of concrete walls does not make for a friendly neighbourhood. It does not make for a comfortable living space, inside or outside. It does not make it possible to grow one’s own food, increasingly necessary, as Canada faces a food shortage, according to the OECD. It also does not allow for the necessary sequestration of carbon and encourages the heat island effect. In fact, the newer buildings increase carbon emissions exponentially, through demolitions and the use of composite materials with high VOC (volatile organic compounds) which gas off, and add to already dangerous carbon loads. Because so many of the streets are cul de sacs, the heat island effect is magnified by further development.

By now, we should all appreciate that green space provides the lungs of the City. It is vitally important that the City recognize this fact by preserving as much as possible of original growth. Forty years ago, it was recognized that our neighbourhoods were on a major migratory flight path for many different kinds of birds. Many folk today do not appreciate this fact. Until very recently, 30% instead of 60% of original growth was thought necessary to sustain life on this planet. As we learn more about sustainability, and as oxygen supplies in the ocean dwindle, we need more than ever to preserve the flora that produce oxygen and sequester carbon. Every second breath we breathe comes from the ocean, where anoxic or dead spots are proliferating. To counter this, trees are our life preservers. Mature trees outside a building have demonstrated the ability to refresh air in that building. Again, I quote from the Heritage Conservation policy guideline ... “Preservation of our cultural heritage can contribute to environmental goals of the City, a legacy we must leave for future generations.”

I urge the Toronto Preservation Board to study the area of the Heathbridge Co-operative. I am hopeful that Heritage features described in Amendment No. 199 will become accepted as guidelines for preserving the rest of our fast disappearing legacy. The heritage features were planned by a group who respected the land

and designed their homes to fit into a design and value system far removed from one motivated solely by materialistic gain.

Submitted by Michael
10 St. Mary St., Suite 801
Toronto, Canada, M4Y 1P9
416 963.4497 T
416 963.8761 F

Mc Clellane
E.R.A.
Architects Inc.

October 1, 2012

Kerri A. Voumvakis, Acting Director
Policy & Research
Metro Hall, 22nd Floor
55 John Street
Toronto, ON, M5V 3C6

RE: DRAFT OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT NO. 199
REGARDING PUBLIC REALM AND HERITAGE
POLICIES

Dear Ms. Voumvakis,

Thank you for your consideration of our comments regarding the Toronto Official Plan Proposed Heritage Policies. ERA Architects very much appreciates the City of Toronto's commitment to conserving its cultural heritage and its efforts to refine and further strengthen the draft by-law. We have reviewed the revised draft of the proposed heritage policies and still continue to have concerns.

In general terms our goal has been to place heritage in a more significant position within the planning process and to ensure the policies are clear, transparent and fair to all stakeholders involved in the stewardship of the city's cultural heritage. We also believe that additional strategies may exist that would help to achieve this goal and position cultural heritage as an important city-building asset throughout the City of Toronto.

These goals are consistent with Councillor Milczyn's report of last year, *Balanced and Bolder - recommendations for strengthening Toronto's Official Plan*. In that document it was proposed that heritage conservation be strategically linked with other municipal objectives, that heritage conservation be collaborative between the public and private sector and that it look at the big picture.

"Buildings and landmarks are selected for preservation not only for their aesthetic qualities, but also for their roles in supporting local identity and the celebration of place. Thus, the benefits of preservation are most broadly realized by extending the scope of conservation beyond the establishment of the City's Inventory of Heritage Properties, whereby the success of this conservation strategy is measured numerically. Alternatively, preservation efforts should place stronger emphasis on the recognition of historical people, events, views, and beliefs and the significance of these elements in enriching the urban experience".

Similarly Councillor Wong-Tam's Initiative on Heritage of June 2011 recommended identifying "*the current gaps and shortcomings of current historic preservation of spaces and built form in the City of Toronto, and second, to provide an in-depth discussion of various heritage reform initiatives*".

The Councillor's Initiative recommended:

- *The value of heritage from an economic and environmental perspective are explore;*
- *Community recommendations for reforming historic preservation and restoration are investigated;*
- *Toronto's Heritage Preservation strategies are identified;*
- *Comparative heritage preservation initiatives in Ontario and in the United States are examined.*

We do not believe any of this basic groundwork has been done.

As we have stated before we feel that the Official Plan policies should set goals and objectives before focusing on regulatory and process issues. Those goals and objectives should inform the regulatory and process issues, rather than the other way around. The policies should also advance us beyond the status quo and demonstrate how we can address what is working and not working with existing policies in a strategic and implementable manner. Our full report, with its comparative analysis of the existing and proposed policies is still available at <http://era.on.ca/2012/09/10/proposed-official-plan-policies-era-comments-and-heritage-open-house/>.

In our report, for example, we proposed an agenda and goals for the city's cultural heritage that would position it as a component of sustainable development, better integrate it within planning processes, and define it equitably and in a way that is meaningful to citizens and neighbourhoods across the city. These goals provide direction on the forms of regulation, processes and tools that will be required to conserve and enhance the city's cultural heritage.

Among our goals, we proposed that:

- Toronto's cultural heritage resources will contribute to the city's social, environmental and economic development and the quality of life of all citizens.
- Cultural heritage is found and valued in all geographical areas and cultural communities, and will be used to promote and celebrate the diverse stories, narratives and eras that define the city.
- The City of Toronto will recognize and protect not only its landmarks and icons, but more modest places that contribute to the character and livability of

neighbourhoods and streetscapes across the city. To do so, it will employ a range of measures to identify places with heritage value.

- The city's heritage conservation program, policies and incentives will strike a balance between controlling changes to cultural heritage and facilitating its reuse. Measures to promote the use of cultural heritage resources to meet public and private sector objectives will be actively explored.

To achieve these goals it is necessary to expand how we understand cultural heritage in the City of Toronto, to recognize the limitations of the City of Toronto's Inventory of Heritage Properties, and build a stronger, more integrated approach to heritage within the planning process. None of this should weaken our protection of our cultural heritage resources, but should in fact enable us to steward them more intelligently and with more careful insight.

We trust that these comments are helpful and would welcome any opportunity to discuss them further with you or your staff.

Yours truly,



Michael McClelland

Attachments

cc.

Jennifer Keesmat, Chief Planner and Executive Director
Gregg Lintern, Director, Community Planning South District
Robert Freedman, Director, Urban Design
Mary MacDonald, Acting Manager, Heritage Preservation Services
Paul Bain, Project Manager, Strategic Initiatives, Policy & Analysis
Scott Barrett, Senior Coordinator, Heritage Preservation Services

ATTACHMENT

We would like to take this opportunity to respectfully submit additional comments regarding draft Amendment No. 199 to the Official Plan of the City of Toronto. In so doing, we will seek to clarify some of the recommendations that we made in our review of September 5th, 2012. (<http://era.on.ca/2012/09/10/proposed-official-plan-policies-era-comments-and-heritage-open-house/>.)

Section 3.1.5 Heritage Conservation

The overview appears to have been strengthened in the revised version by defining cultural heritage in broader terms, recognizing its role in improving the character and livability of the city's neighbourhoods and linking conservation to sustainable development. Nonetheless, the overview continues to be descriptive in nature. We believe that the policies could be significantly strengthened if they flowed from a series of explicit goals that explain why and how heritage conservation is undertaken within the City of Toronto.

Draft Policies 1 & 3:

The first sentence in Policy 3 repeats what is stated in Policy 1. This risks creating confusion. The second part of Policy 3 addresses a separate issue, namely the benchmark for the maintenance and conservation of properties listed on the Heritage Register.

We would also like to reiterate our original recommendation that a heritage assessment process be established, to supplement proactive listing of cultural heritage on the city's Heritage Register. This alternative process would be aimed at any property that is forty years of age or older, which are proposed for demolition. Its purpose would be to determine whether the property includes resources that would be eligible for listing on the City of Toronto's proposed Register or would meet the criteria for Part IV designation under the Ontario Heritage Act.

A two-tiered approach will help to ensure that more modest sites of heritage value within both urban and suburban neighbourhoods are not overlooked and could provide a more streamlined and financially sustainable approach for identification and stewardship.

Draft Policy 4:

In order to provide transparency for the policies, it is recommended that the trigger for a Heritage Impact Assessment (previously a planning application) be clarified. The term 'integrity' has not been defined and could be subject to a range of interpretations; its use in this context may be unnecessary.

Draft Policy 5:

As written, the purpose of this policy is unclear. The policy might be more meaningful if, as an incentive, a broader range of uses were permitted in order to encourage the adaptive reuse of heritage policies. As a result, the viability of heritage resources is enhanced and can be used as assets to be leveraged rather than liabilities.

Draft Policy 7:

It is recommended that the policy include a requirement that City-owned properties 40 years of age or older undergo heritage evaluation prior to their disposal.

Draft Policy 11:

Since recording and documentation of heritage properties can be both costly and time-consuming, it is recommended that the trigger for this requirement be clarified, the goal of the recording be explained and that guidelines regarding the level of recording and documentation be made available to property owners.

Draft Policy 15.

It is unclear why this policy would apply only to 'lost' heritage properties. It is recommended that this apply to heritage sites, more broadly.

Draft Policy 16:

It is recommended that incentives programs for the conservation and maintenance of heritage properties be expanded to include those that are listed on the Heritage Register, but not necessarily designated under the Ontario Heritage Act. This is particularly important as the incentive programs are not described and it may be beneficial to develop incentive programs specifically for listed properties.

Draft Policy 17:

Since the 'highest standard of conservation' is ambiguous (it would be difficult to define 'high' and 'low' standards of conservation), it is recommended that conservation and maintenance be consistent with the *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada*.

Draft Policy 18:

It is unclear which incentives this policy refers to. In order to encourage the retention and reuse of hospitals and educational facilities, it is strongly recommended that the requirement for an easement be waived.

Draft Policy 19:

F) Heritage Easement Agreements should be entered into by mutual agreement, as stated in Policy 24. There is currently a tendency to overuse this instrument, notably in the context of any planning applications involving heritage properties. It should be clarified in which circumstances this additional protection beyond designation is desirable.

Draft Policy 22:

As noted by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing in its letter of August 28th, 2012, it is important that the proposed policies be clear and that direction be provided regarding their implementation. It does not appear that the proposed views or the means by which they will be regulated have been sufficiently studied.

Draft Policy 25:

This policy appears to repeat what has already been set out in the Heritage Impact Assessment policies (Policies 20 – 23).

Draft Policy 26:

Please see comment above regarding Policy 25.

Draft Policy 27:

In order to maintain a consistent approach, this policy should be reworded to state that: 'the retention of facades alone is discouraged where the heritage attributes of the property include the whole or substantial parts of a building or structure'. Equally, this policy enters into too much detail as noted in comments on Draft Policy 28.

Draft Policy 28:

The policy regarding the relocation of buildings and structures on listed or designated properties on the Heritage Register enters into too much detail. It also neglects the fact that Council may, on the advice of a Heritage Impact Assessment, the *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada*, the Provincial Policy Statement and other considerations, decide to approve the relocation of a building or structure (something that

has happened frequently within the downtown core). E) Similar to Policy 27, the extent of a building or structure to be retained should be defined in relation to its heritage attributes.

Draft Policy 31:

The term 'integrity' should be removed from this policy.

Draft Policy 34:

It is recommended that the word 'will' be replaced with the word 'may'.

Draft Policy 35:

It should be clarified how the potential for in situ conservation will be determined.

Draft Policy 39:

This policy should be moved to the General Policies section, since First Nations heritage is not limited to archaeological sites.

Draft Policy 41:

It should be determined whether the feasibility of this policy has been assessed, and whether the City of Toronto is in a position to assume this responsibility.

Draft Policy 43:

This policy limits the potential to identify, sustain and enhance cultural heritage landscapes, by requiring that they be designated under Part IV or Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act. Rather, it is recommended that appropriate preservation measures for significant cultural heritage landscapes be derived from the evaluation of their cultural heritage values and on an informed understanding of how they function.

Draft Policy - Heritage Views

Please see comments regarding Policy 22.

Draft Policy - Definitions

We would support a series of broad based definitions, which will enable careful consideration of heritage resources, be included in the Official Plan including the following:

Cultural heritage: a group of resources inherited from the past, which people identify as a reflection of their constantly evolving values, beliefs, knowledge and traditions. It includes all

aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time. (adapted from the Council of Europe Faro Convention, 2011)

Historic environment: all aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time, including all surviving physical remains of past human activity, whether visible or buried. (adapted from English Heritage Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance on the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment, 2008)

Cultural landscape: any geographical area that has been modified, influenced or given special cultural meaning by people, and that has been formally recognized for its heritage value. Cultural landscapes are often dynamic, living entities that continually change because of natural and human-influenced social, economic and cultural processes. (Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada, 2010)

Conservation: the identification, protection, use and/or management of cultural heritage and archaeological resources in such a way that their heritage values, attributes and integrity are retained. This may be addressed through a conservation plan or heritage impact assessment. (Provincial Policy Statement, 2005)

To Mr. Robert Saunders
Chair
c/o Ms. Margaret Sexton, Committee Secretary
Toronto Preservation Board

Submitted by Jane Somerville
@ a thank you
@ Kark

Dear Ms. Sexton,

@ Geoff
@ Harrison, Michael
Tom Cohen
@ McAllister, Michael

(First of all, many thanks for sending the Agenda.) I would like to read parts of this letter today at the 2 meeting. Thank you.

Here is my response to Staff Report and Proposed Heritage Policies in Ontario Official Plan as per Toronto Preservation Board meeting Oct. 01, 2012.

@ Questions
@ some for

My interest in Heritage is because of at least six reasons!!

1. I have lived in Lawrence Park for almost 30 years and know the people, geography and history better than most residents (other than Alex Grenzebach!!) *Lead Barbara Falkenberg, "Lead Hill"*
2. Our home was nominated--and not by ourselves, the owners, so it's a good model for the current policy that a home may be nominated by neighbours, the City or a Committee, such as the NYCPP. *I am for 30 years on a list of protected home*
3. Heritage is an asset in the "hood" just as good schools, good roads and libraries. We need to build this asset in LP. *- bigger issue in LP*
4. Heritage is about "story-telling." Last night I attended a great play called *Dear Liar*. In a panel after the play, the lead actress, Ratna Pathak Shah, said that "telling stories is the business of life...." The older homes in LP are "story-telling" vehicles. They remind us of our personal and collective history--as per your good words on page 3 of the Staff Report. In addition, they show us the beauty of good craftsmanship and the sensuality of unusual materials--this is important for young children, especially, to see and feel and appreciate. *work for city proof*
5. I ran a publishing company for 18 years and "story-telling" was our core asset so I remain very committed to Heritage for it's power to tell stories and continue to reinforce our civility as a community.
6. Alex Grenzebach, Geoff Kettel and William Greer have mentored and prompted me in my studies and enquiries of this complicated issue called Heritage--without their help, I certainly would have abandoned this initiative long ago.

So, on to my questions and comments on the Staff Report on the OP and Heritage and the Proposed Heritage Policies:

copy comment

The most important goal of the new Heritage policies should be to delay demolition of a house or public building that has apparent Heritage Attributes, i.e., give the neighbourhood time to "nominate" (or whatever the future process may be) and allow the City professionals more time to study and evaluate before the decision to demolish or not. Please change the By-Laws or whatever needs to be done to accomplish this.

*11 points by status of nomination have
more information*

Personal Experience:

Our home, 24 Dinnick Crescent, Toronto, M4N 1L5, is nominated but I can't find it on the City's Heritage pages. I'm bringing this up because I have heard the same complaint from other folk in LP, i.e, they know their house has been nominated but can't find any reference to it on the City pages.

list houses website

This brings up the issue of funding: I understand that there are 7 homes in LP on the Heritage Preservation Services that have been nominated but have not been assessed by Staff--can we as residents help to move this along. Either with time or money or both?

Staff Report

26

volunteer

4. your page 8: **Cultural Heritage Landscapes:** seems that the Sherwood Ravine plus the LP Tennis Club and Bowling Club could be considered a Cultural Heritage Landscape. Please include in your proposed list.

5. Your page 8 on **Protections of View and Vistas:** Is it possible for a home in a neighbourhood to be a "landmark heritage building"? We considered 140 Dinnick Crescent to be such a home. It was Tudor Revival. Sat proudly at the junction of at least three streets. Was an integral part of the streetscape for three or four generations of residents in LP. There are other similar homes in LP. I am asking so, as these homes that are "individually significant" are nominated, we may mention in the nominations that they are a "landmark heritage buildings."

public building

Suggest include

The Proposed Heritage Policies:

Under Page 13 and 14: Policies #8 and Incentive # 14 and 15:

Your #8--many of the older homes in LP are not being kept up because they are inhabited by older folk who don't have the money, or the will or physical ability, to look after them. Is there any City service that could be invented OR does exist to assist them in the preservation of their heritage properties?

Your #14 and 15: this is very important in LP since young families always see a restoration of a heritage property as MORE \$\$ than a demolition. Can we help to create a new policy here of meaningful rebates? at the moment, we understand the top payment is approx. \$4000. Could you please change to a % of the restoration cost to the owner?

Your page 17 *26*

Cultural Heritage Landscapes

#36 an 37

*a benefit of more
BTA if a home is
restored*

Have you considered the ravines of Toronto to be Cultural Heritage Landscapes? Seems that they are a unique urban characteristic of Toronto just as Central Park is to New York.

Attachment #2 A: is Philosopher's Walk between the ROM and the RCM included? I don't see it.

Attachment #2 C: Please consider including the Sherwood Ravine from Yonge to Bayview--don't see it here.

There seem to be BIG budgetary restraints that prevent Heritage Preservation Services from getting the job done. We understand that this is a CHRONIC issue and not one solely created by the Ford Regime. Seems that the \$\$ issue should be brought up in the OP or elsewhere. Where would that be? What can we as residents do in LP to help increase your budget?

Sincerely,

Jane Somerville
resident

24 Dinnick Crescent, Toronto, M4N 1L5

for Heritage Old and New!!
in Lawrence Park