

LONDON CITY COUNCIL MEETING, 2023-07-25

ADDITIONAL SUBMISSION BY BECK HEIRS

RE. 8.2 12TH REPORT OF THE PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

(4.3) 39 Carfrae Street - Application Pursuant to Heritage Easement Agreement

There have been a lot of submissions on this issue to CACP, PEC and Council from the applicants, the Becks and others. This submission seeks to provide clarity on how we believe Council members should vote, based on the evidence provided, along with brief rationales. For detailed reasoning, please refer to our other submissions on this matter.

WE SUPPORT

a) motion to direct staff to work with the applicant to resolve outstanding concerns with Schedule “C” and Schedule “D” of the Heritage Easement Agreement and bring back an update within 6 months on the status. It being noted that staff are directed to suspend enforcement measures on the existing fireplace matters until further direction from Council on the Heritage Easement Agreement.

Rationale

This is effectively a moratorium to allow staff, Council, PEC and CACP to obtain a more comprehensive understanding of the issues. We believe this is beneficial.

We are concerned that the applicants have not demonstrated willingness to work with staff on matters concerning the Heritage Easement Agreement.

WE URGE VOTING AGAINST

b) that the heritage alteration application to install asphalt shingles or an alternate composite material for the roof replacement of the property located at 39 Carfrae Street BE APPROVED.

Rationale

This is contrary to the well-reasoned recommendation from staff that the application **BE REFUSED**. As per the PEC meeting, staff estimate that they recommend approval for about 90% of applications, so the refusal recommendation should carry significant weight.

Further, in our view the applicants have submitted no valid evidence to counter staff’s recommendation. Many claims are made, but all are significantly flawed, as we have outlined in our other submissions.

Refusal of this heritage alteration permit is not a complete refusal of any permit nor does it force the use of specific roofing; it only requires the applicants to work with the City on a permit for a suitable roof replacement material, something that is in keeping with what is specified in the Heritage Easement Agreement. Such collaboration is consistent with the first part of the motion.