December 5, 2013

By email

Toronto Preservation Services Board

Re: 562, 564 and 566 Spadina Crescent:

For the applicant I submit a report from Mark Hall, heritage consultant, in support of the application.

At the bottom of page 2, the staff report states that alterations to the rear of properties must not be higher than the ridge of the main roof line as seen from any point on the public sidewalk on the opposite side of the street. First, the roof is flat. There is no ridge. Second, there is no public sidewalk on the opposite side of the street. There is simply a curb. People cannot walk on or see from there.

The properties are in a HCD. They never would be designated for their individual heritage merits. The have no architectural value and are inconsistent with the surrounding heritage fabric. They are early twentieth century Edwardian buildings with a faux mansard roof at the front, like a Spanish revival colonial house.

In these circumstances, it is appropriate to assess them for their contribution or otherwise to the character of the HCD itself. The buildings are in a semi-circle of Victorian Gothic homes. The circular sweep of the street is an important element from heritage and urban design perspectives. The architectural expression of the buildings enclosing the sweep should be consistent.

All the other buildings edging the semi-circle except these have gables. All others except one (at the south corner) are three storeys high.

The present buildings are an anomaly. They detract from the heritage character and value of the circle and from the rhythm and continuity of the heritage built form. If the site were vacant, the proposal, possibly with some minor alterations, would be welcomed as being consistent and supportive of the heritage character of the immediate context.

There is no specific reference to these buildings in the HCD Conservation Plan, nor any
mention of Edwardian buildings at all, possibly because they are inconsistent with the HCD. The proposal is for a substantial increase in the type of housing that is needed in this area so close to the university and hospital.

Preservation staff have suggested that they would oppose any third floor addition whatsoever which is neither reasonable nor supportable by any policy of the HCD or otherwise. That position, regretfully, has been interpreted as effectively closing the door to any further discussions concerning additions. I believe that further discussions would be useful. If the Board adopts the staff recommendations which I hope it will not do, might I request that staff be authorized to continue discussions with the applicant on a "without prejudice" basis.

Thank you for your consideration.

Michael B. Vaughan, Q.C.

Yours very truly,

Michael B. Vaughan, Q.C.
MBV/gb