

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



October 1, 2013

Mary L. MacDonald, Acting Manager, Heritage Preservation Services
City of Toronto
100 Queen Street West, 17th Floor, East Tower
Toronto, ON M5H 2N2

2013 OCT -2 P 3: 31

RE: 262 BESSBOROUGH DRIVE - INTENTION TO DESIGNATE UNDER
PART IV, SECTION 29 OF THE ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT

Dear Mary,

This letter is a response to the City of Toronto's staff report, dated August 21, 2013, regarding the intention to designate 262 Bessborough Drive under Part IV, Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act. While we are in support of designating the property, we ask that amendments to the Statement of Significance be considered.

On page two, in the last paragraph it states that the house was constructed c.1898. Elsewhere in the report it is established that the house was constructed c.1883, which is accurate.

The first phrase and the fifth bullet point under heritage attributes on page seven refers to Bessborough Avenue, which should be Bessborough Drive.

The description and heritage attributes include reference to a 2½-storey house. The structure is 2 storeys.

We are concerned regarding the wording of bullet three under the heritage attributes. The use of placement is not supported with any information in the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or by the history of the creation of the lot. As indicated by the 1913 plan of subdivision, a regular series of lots were created that give no regard to the presence of the existing house. The current lot is comprised of three subdivision lots as well as a lane allowance reflecting that original subdivision that gave no regard to the existing house. We agree that the location and orientation of the farmhouse within the larger original 200 acre farm lot adds to the heritage value of the site. However, the heritage building's precise location and/or placement within the current lot does not have significance.

We also request clarification on the inclusion "mature trees" within bullet three under the heritage attributes. As indicated by the arborist report (dated February 25, 2013, prepared by Al Miley & Associates), many of the existing trees located on the front yard of the property are non-native species and do not relate to the period of the original farmstead, nor to the subdivision of Leaside, which was originally planted with native species. (Elm trees) As many of the mature trees currently on the property are nearing the end of their life, they will likely

be required to be removed within the near future. We would thus recommend the removal of "mature trees" to maintain the long-term relevance of the heritage attributes.

We trust these comments are helpful and would ask that these amendments be considered.

Sincerely,

Andrew Pruss, Principal

1924 GOADS FIRE INSURANCE PLAN (location of Thomas G. Elgie House circled in red)

