



Reply to the Attention of: Mary Flynn-Guglietti
Direct Line: 416.865.7256
Email Address: mary.flynn@mcmillan.ca
Our File No.: 308415
Date: July 4, 2024

COURIER & EMAIL (city.clerk@mississauga.ca)

City Clerk's Office
The Corporation of the City of Mississauga
300 City Centre Drive, 2nd Floor
Mississauga, ON L5B 3C1

Attention: City Clerk, Diana Rusnov

Dear Ms. Rusnov:

Re: Notice of Objection to the Notice of Intention to Pass a By-law to Designate 1 Godfrey's Lane to be of Cultural Heritage Value and Interest under Part IV, Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. O. 18, as amended.
Address: 1 Godfrey's Lane
Owner: Catherine and John Scott Bagby

We are the solicitors retained on behalf of Catherine and John Scott Bagby (the "**Clients**"), owners of the lands municipally known as 1 Godfrey's Lane (the "**Subject Site**"), in the City of Mississauga (the "**City**"). Our Clients are in receipt of a Notice of Intention to pass a By-law to Designate the Subject Site's lands and premises to be of cultural heritage value and interest pursuant to Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Kindly accept this letter as our Clients' formal Notice of Objection to the designation.

The following are the reasons for our Client's objection to the designation.

We have had an opportunity to review the undated Heritage Evaluation Report (the "**Report**") prepared by the staff of the City of Mississauga and wish to comment specifically regarding the reference to the Subject Site.

1. At paragraph 1 of page 7 of the Report it states that the main residence at 1 Godfrey's Lane "displays minimal architectural embellishment and, as such, does not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit."

2. At paragraph 3 on page 7 it states that the Subject Site does not demonstrate a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.
3. At paragraph 6 on page 7 it states that the City of Mississauga records indicate that the architect Murray Brown designed 1 Godfrey's Lane and that this was not "one of his more notable works, being of a conventional bungalow design".
4. At paragraph 9 on page 7 it states that the Subject Site "is not considered locally to be a landmark".
5. At paragraph 9 on page 14 it states that "the property at 1 Godfrey's Lane has minimal architectural and historical merit.

It is important to note that the residential house on the Subject Site has been significantly altered from the original structure. The current first and second floors are 5 times larger than the original structure. The original stone-faced front porch or screened porch was renovated to a sunroom with glass in approximately 1950 and was again renovated in 1998. As well the entire front of the house presents very differently from the original structure due to significant renovations in 1950 and 2010 and no longer resembles the original structure.

It is clear in reviewing the Report that the main consideration for designation as outlined on page 9 is the location of the property's rural-style laneway access, orientation facing Lake Ontario and shed dormers. It is important to note that a number of structural repairs were necessary during the 2010 renovations. Once the ceilings were exposed it was clear that the original build did not include dormers and it is assumed that the dormers were added during the 1950 renovations.

The Report also speaks to the mix of credit valley stone and stucco however, it is important to note that much of the credit valley stone placement was a result of the 1950 and 2010 renovations and does not date to the original structure. Also, the 2010 renovations revealed that the main center chimney is all brick construction, except for the exposed roof portion. The addition of the credit valley stone to the exposed roof portion would have been an appropriate repair to the weathered brick in the 1950's.

We respectfully submit that the existing home, as a result of significant renovations, no longer is a true representation of Toronto's "cottage country" summer homes once common along the Mississauga lakeshore. The existing home does not display a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit and has minimal architectural and historical merit as noted in the Report. Further and as noted in the Report, it is not one of the architect's notable works and is not considered to be a landmark. It is, therefore, inappropriate to designate the Subject Site of cultural heritage value and interest.

We therefore request that we be notified of the date the proposed designating by-law will be presented to Council and, also, ask that I be listed as a deputation on this item.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Mary Flynn-Guglietti". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Mary Flynn-Guglietti*
*A Professional Corporation

CC: Catherine and John Scott Bagby