

**From:** wes@weskinghorn.com <wes@weskinghorn.com>

**Sent:** Thursday, July 13, 2023 11:40 PM

**To:** PEC <pec@london.ca>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] For the July 17 PEC Agenda - Regarding 39 Carfrae Street

**Importance:** High

To the Chair and Members of the PEC,

Thank you for considering these thoughts on the current matter before you of the Carfrae cottage (39 Carfrae Street).

First, I would like to say that we at the ACO are aware that ownership of a heritage building does, of course, come with responsibilities. We must always consider the realities of modern living, environmental concerns and changing material costs as part of that discussion. We are by no means ideologues and feel that City Staff has historically done a good job of balancing all of this in their recommendations. This appears to be the case here as well.

What seems to be lost at times when stories appear in the press on these matters is that when purchasing a home with a designation, the owner is aware of this designation and the requirements of it before the purchase. There should be no surprises when, in essence, the legal agreement that they signed is later enforced. The purchase of any home is in essence a contract and comes with various responsibilities - be they as part of a condo development, within a suburban neighbourhood, or yes - a home with heritage designation.

This designation is in fact part of the value of that purchase - the pride and pleasure of owning a home with important heritage value. When we choose to purchase one, we of course take on the responsibility to maintain that home in a way that carries that value on to future owners, and to the City at large. All of this is laid out at the time of purchase as part of the house deed (which the Heritage Easement Agreement is attached to).

Here, City Staff are simply recommending that the heritage alteration permit to replace the roof with asphalt shingles be refused because wood shingles are one of the heritage attributes delineated in the Heritage Easement Agreement. This is a legal agreement (in essence a form of contract) between City and homeowner. It seems logical that this agreement, tied to the purchase, should be upheld.

As we understand it, City Staff have suggested that other options be explored here with the homeowner, and we applaud that. We hope that considering all this the City will uphold its own agreement, support the City Staff recommendation, and let this play out.

Sincerely,

*Wes Kinghorn, PhD*

*President, ACO London Region Branch*