

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Michael Smith**

Date: Tue, Oct 8, 2024 at 10:14 AM

Subject: Re: My 32 River St. Sutton Property

To: Tolek Makarewicz <tmakarewicz@georgina.ca>

Hi again, Tolek

Very many thanks for the meeting last week. Here are my detailed comments that should be raised at tomorrow's council meeting in regards to my historical property called Maplehurst.

1. I bought the 32 River St property in 2010, in part because of its historical and heritage value. As a published author, I plan on writing a history of Maplehurst at some point in the future (PM William Lyon McKenzie King was personal friends with the Holborns, and stayed here frequently in the 1920s and 30s). And so, in principle, I am not against my home being designated a heritage property.
2. The exterior of my manor or regency house is brick, not stucco. The report incorrectly states it is a stucco house.
3. My current property insurer, Desjardins, has told me in no uncertain terms that they will not insure my property if it becomes a designated heritage property. In other words, I would need to find another insurer, and it would almost certainly be more expensive.
4. I have already spent considerable sums improving my house - the kitchen was renovated in 2012, a new separate three car garage was built in 2014 (which I plan to connect house to in future), I transitioned to natural gas from oil in 2018/2019 (this was very expensive as I had to pay Enbridge to extend the gas line down the street to reach my property) and I completely gutted and renovated the bathroom upstairs in 2020/21.
5. The gorgeous wrap-around veranda with columns that is visible to the road is the most precious aspect of the property. But it is not resting on a sturdy foundation, and needs to be reinforced with property footings, not the makeshift blocks it is currently standing on. This will cost me about \$100,000 to correct given the size of the job. I definitely plan on doing this, but cannot afford at present.
6. The non visible side of the house facing the river has been altered a number of times over the decades. I wish to replace this rotting structure with a sunroom addition, all in complete harmony with the regency style of the house.
7. At the back of the house, there is this one room addition that was built in the 1980s by the looks of it (not brick), but it is not in a good state of repair (the siding is starting to peel away). It has no heritage value whatsoever, so my plan is to replace it with a larger structure that seamlessly connects the house to the garage, but this time all in brick to match the rest of the house. Again, the roof lines would match that of the house and garage, and be fully completed in the regency style in total congruence with the historical environment of the property.

Given all this, and given that I agree with its Priority 1 listing, but given the very considerable expenses involved, I do however respectfully ask that there be given a **very generous transition period to official heritage designation.**

With all kind regards,
Michael