

6 February 2018

Dale Inc.  
385 Madison Ave.  
Toronto, ON MM4V 2W7

Attention: Boris Shteiman

email: [bshteiman@gmail.com](mailto:bshteiman@gmail.com)

RE: Proposed development for 5, 7, and 9 Dale Avenue, Toronto, ON

Dear Sir:

At your request I have reviewed the City's comments with respect to the application for your site and have provided the following comments which should be read as an addendum to my letter of support dated 30 October 2017. As previously stated, all three properties are designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act as they are located within the South Rosedale Heritage Conservation District Plan area. All three buildings are shown as Category "C" buildings within the HCD. Category C buildings are subject to the following provisions:

*"Demolition of buildings in the "C" category is generally considered appropriate only if the proposed replacement building, as shown in the issued building permit, is equally able or more able to contribute to the heritage character of the district and is acceptable under these guidelines and the zoning by-law."*

I previously examined the context of the proposed development along Dale Avenue and observed:

- the subject buildings are essentially concealed from view along the street. Only bordering walls and landscaping is prominent, which suggests that the removal of the buildings in favour of the new development will create no significant diminishment of the character of the district. Retention or recreation of the site landscape features should be reasonably considered to preserve the ambience of the street views.
- the subject buildings are of 1940's construction and, being of relatively recent construction, they contribute considerably less to the character of the district than the large number of much earlier dwellings, whether or not they are Class C.

- the site backs onto the Rosedale Valley ravine and will be essentially hidden from view from the south. It will create no adverse impacts to any residential or commercial areas to the south due to the open ravine.
- the design of the building, with its articulated units and local vernacular use of building materials, will provide a consistent residential edge to the south side of the street which will not have a negative impact on the residential quality of the community.
- precedents for the development of multi-family dwellings have been in place in Rosedale since the middle of the last century. Indeed, both immediately to the east of the development site and one property to the west are developed with mid-twentieth century low-rise apartment buildings. The proposed development will be of significantly better design than these precedents and will fit the building pattern previously set as a matter of the historical evolution of this part of the community.
- as it is my understanding that a land assembly of this type is not possible in any other part of the South Rosedale, it is highly unlikely that the proposed development would set a negative precedent for future development in South Rosedale.
- a considerable amount of design effort by a team of very accomplished designers has considered and incorporated heritage attributes of the neighbourhood. In my opinion, the development will contribute more strongly to the HCD than the existing structures and will be the product of exceptional design skills.
- the proposal includes extensive ravine revitalization which will contribute to the conservation of this part of Rosedale.

I also previously stated that Heritage Conservation Districts are intended to conserve the heritage attributes of the communities on which they are based. However, they are not intended to prevent changes. Rather, they are intended to *manage* change. In this instance, it is important to review the proposal on the basis of whether the proposed changes create a negative impact on the overall quality of the HCD. In my view, the proposal does not create a negative impact; it meets the intent of the Provincial Policy Statement in terms of intensification of built-up areas; and it satisfies the intent of the South Rosedale Heritage Conservation District by providing a managed solution to change within the context of the policies of the HCD.

In looking at the comments by the City, I make the following comments:

- The three subject properties, constructed from 1944 to 1954, represent an aesthetic of their own time and place for the period of their construction, they do not match the remaining character of South Rosedale. Their replacement with a well-designed structure that references heritage attributes within a current design forms a part of the evolution of this part of the community.
- 5 Dale Avenue is described as having been constructed for a former mayor of Toronto and incorporates design elements typical of mid-century bungalows including a prominent garage facing Dale Avenue. I must note that virtually every bungalow built in Toronto in the mid-fifties incorporates such features and, given the presence of literally thousands of houses of this vintage in the City, such features do not create a rare or unique design which would trigger any form of heritage importance. The comment that a

prominent garage facing Dale Avenue is one of these features is extremely odd given the prohibition in the Heritage Conservation District of just such features as a reaction to their poor street presence. No matter who may have lived here, does this outweigh the paucity of other criteria that would produce viable reasons for the retention of this building?

- 7 Dale is described as a custom-designed bungalow designed by an award-winning architect of the time. The building itself is hidden from view and therefore generates no contribution to the character of the HCD. Philosophically, should new high-end design work of our own time and place be excluded on the basis that a building designed by an earlier architect is too important to lose? The design of the new structure is by a current award-winning architect. Surely the test should be “does the proposed development respect the character of the street and add to it?”

Reference is made to the owner, the president of a glass and plastics firm, as conveying heritage importance. I do not see this individual as significant but, if so, this argument could then be used as one which could sterilize the potential re-development of hundreds of undesignated properties across the City. The enumeration of the design features are simply a compendium of the typical features of the genre. The design is simply a typical architectural response to the fashion of the time in which it was created, in my opinion.

- Virtually nothing of importance is described of 9 Dale Avenue to justify heritage importance.

The context of the street along Dale Ave. is mentioned with no reference to the variety of buildings on the south side which have been present for over 40 years. Internationally, a 40 year time frame establishes the age which initiates an evaluation of heritage sites (including Federal Government properties). The apartment buildings on Dale (which are also “C” buildings) are referenced but not incorporated into a consideration of the existing character of the street. In my view, the proposed development will reinforce the already set character of the street and respond to the scale, massing and materials of its context.

While the policy framework is discussed in the following sections, the test of significance of these buildings within the context of the HCD has not, in my opinion, been met with the City’s evaluation. Given that the buildings are virtually hidden from the street, their only contribution appears to be in the landscaped area between the buildings and street. Negotiation with the City in terms of a more vigorous landscaped area as a buffer may be reasonable in this context. However, my original opinions supporting the application have not changed.

Sincerely,  
Goldsmith Borgal & Company Ltd. Architects

  
Christopher Borgal CAA FRAIC CAHP  
President