



## MEMORANDUM



**TO:** Heritage Markham Committee

**FROM:** Evan Manning, Senior Heritage Planner

**DATE:** May 14, 2025

**SUBJECT:** **Minor Heritage Permit Application**  
10 Washington Street, Markham Village  
Unauthorized Application of Stone Veneer

**FILE:** Pending

---

**Property/Building Description:** One-and-a-half storey detached former dwelling constructed c.1893 as per municipal records

**Use:** Commercial

**Heritage Status:** 10 Washington Street is designated under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* as part of the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District (the “MVHCD” or the “District”).

### **Application/Proposal**

- A property management company (the “Agent”) retained by the Owner of 10 Washington Street (the “Subject Property”) will be submitting a Minor Heritage Permit application seeking after-the-fact authorization to install pre-cast stone veneer on the south elevation of the heritage dwelling. Refer to Appendix ‘B’ for before and after images.
- As per a conversation with By-law Enforcement, the Agent stated that installation of the stone veneer is intended to stabilize the heritage building’s south elevation and prevent deterioration of the existing brick masonry.

### **Policy Context**

#### *Ontario Heritage Act*

- As per Section 42(4) of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (the “Act”), Council (or its delegate) must approve a heritage permit, with or without conditions, 90 days from the date the municipality serves notice to the applicant of receipt of the submission. While Staff can approve a Heritage Permit (both minor and major) via delegated authority, only Council can refuse a permit.
- Heritage Section staff (“Staff”) have been informed by the Agent that submission of a Minor Heritage Permit application is in process. At the time of writing, the application has not yet been circulated to Staff.

- As Council may not sit in either July or August, Staff are bringing this matter forward for Heritage Markham consideration prior to application circulation to ensure Council is able to render a decision (if necessary) prior to any summer recess, and before expiration of the 90-day decision deadline. Staff anticipate that Council will consider the application at its meeting on June 24.
- Section 69 of the Act - Offences and Restoration Costs
  - 69 (1) Subject to subsection (2), every person who,
    - (a) knowingly, furnishes false information in any application under this Act or in any statement, report or return required to be furnished under this Act or the regulations;
    - (b) fails to comply with any order, direction or other requirement made under this Act; or
    - (c) contravenes this Act or the regulations,
 and every director or officer of a corporation who knowingly concurs in such furnishing of false information, failure or contravention is guilty of an offence and on conviction is liable to a fine of not more than \$50,000 or to imprisonment for a term of not more than one year, or to both. R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18, s. 69 (1).
- Corporations
  - (2) Where a corporation is convicted of an offence under subsection (1), the maximum penalty that may be imposed upon the corporation is \$250,000 and not as provided therein. R.S.O. 1990, c. O.18, s. 69 (2).

#### *MVHCD Plan*

- The Subject Property is categorized as a Type 'A' property. As described in Section 3.2 ('Building Classification') of the MVHCD Plan, Type 'A' properties possess the following characteristics within the District:

*[They are] of major importance to the Heritage District.*

*They have historical and architectural value.*

*They are the buildings that give the main heritage character to the district.*

- Section 3.3 of the MVHCD Plan ('Policies: Type A Buildings') contains the following policy direction relevant to this application: *"Original materials should be conserved. Where renewal is required, materials and methods shall be used that match the original materials and approximate the same methods used traditionally."*
- Section 4.3.2 of the MVHCD Plan ('Common Elements: Exterior Finish') contains the following guideline relevant to this application: *"The external finish of "A" and "B" type buildings should be conserved in the original form. Additions or modifications to these buildings, or any new structures should be complementary in terms of materials and type of finish to the existing heritage structure or to other historic buildings on the street."*

#### **Staff Comment**

- Based on the above-referenced direction from the MVHCD Plan, Staff do not support the application of the stone veneer. Further, it is the position of Staff that the

application of a veneer is likely not required to stabilize the existing brick masonry and request further information from the Agent as to the condition of the heritage building's south elevation.

- If a Heritage Permit application is not submitted and/or the applicant chooses not to remove the material, charges can be laid pursuant to section 69 of the Ontario Heritage Act.

### **Suggested Recommendation for Heritage Markham**

THAT Heritage Markham objects from a heritage perspective to the installation of stone veneer at 10 Washington Street and recommends that the Minor Heritage Permit application be refused;

AND THAT the unauthorised alteration be reversed, and the underlying brick masonry be repaired/restored.

---

#### **ATTACHMENTS:**

Appendix 'A'	Property Map
Appendix 'B'	Before and After Images of the Subject Property

File Path: Q:\Development\Heritage\PROPERTY\WASHNGTN\10\HM Memos & Extracts

**Appendix 'A'**  
*Property Map*



Property map showing the location of the Subject Property outlined in blue (Source: City of Markham)

## Appendix 'B'

### *Before and After Images of the Subject Property*



South elevation of 10 Washington Street c. 2020 showing the original brick masonry [above] and after the recent application of the pre-cast stone veneer [below] (Source: Google/City of Markham)