

Thank you for this information. Yes, we would like this to appear on the public, published Planning Environment Committee Agenda and we do authorize this.

**Please add the following to the above-mentioned communique, which we also authorize for inclusion in the Agenda:**

The request by Tuckey's was to demolish these heritage buildings. A heritage district is also affected by the *appearance* of the outside. There should have been a request to change the front of 138 from an ordinary village house to a scarlet-orange monstrosity before they did it. However, as of today, July 17, I see that Tuckey's has gone ahead without permission and put up cladding on its own to join 136A to 138 and as well cladding the part of 138 that juts into the street. 138 is now two storeys high of scarlet eyesore that the light hits differently than it hits the rest of Tuckey's lining Wortley Road, and so the two garish colours do not seem to match. The whole long frontage of Tuckey's, virtually half a block long, now, starting at the main corner of the main street of this heritage village, looks as if it has been parachuted in from a strip mall. To go ahead with changes of this ugly a nature before requesting planning permission seems meant to present a "finished" product before the planning meeting can make its decision about demolition, and is cynically premature, to say the least.

Regarding the request before the board to demolish both 136A and the house immediately to the south of the previous (now already changed) border of Tuckeys, there is a further question that must be determined. My husband, who has considerable experience with old houses, has inspected the clearly visible cladding on the north and south side of the house numbered 138. He believes it (and the cladding likely now hidden by steel or aluminum orange and bricks under 136 and 136A) is likely to be asbestos lined tiling. If this is the case, demolishing it without special protections would be poisonous to the construction workers, all the people walking the street, neighbours, and any animals in the area. If it turns out that the two properties under consideration for demolishing are indeed clad in asbestos tiling, then an inspection should be made also of the area underneath the current facade of the previous Tuckey's Hardware at #136 to determine if its original walls (that I was told are still there, only covered up by what we see from the street; I was told this by the former owner of the Westland building who died at a very advanced age only recently, and who made the heritage of the area his project and business for many years.)

If the inside of 136 is original, as he said, and if it is *like* its neighbour, then both may be polluting their interiors with potential carcinogens. The asbestos would have to be removed then from the whole corner all the way from the parking lot on Craig to the end of 138, including what should be thought of as #136 despite its unpermitted changes to its length that now seems to include #138 already. It will be virtually impossible to remove asbestos without taking down the brick and steel/aluminum cladding already on #136. This provides an excellent opportunity for the WHOLE of Tuckey's, whatever size Council determines that it can be, to be redesigned on the outside in a way that fits in with our heritage village. Certainly just demolishing 136A and 138 is too quick and invasive, if asbestos is concerned. The greatest care must be taken to remove each layer one at a time under protective plastic, by experts in the field.

Thank you for your attention to these real and potential problems.

Welwyn Wilton Katz and Greg Yarrow  
108 Askin Street, London, ON N6C 1E6

---