

Heritage Markham Committee Meeting
City of Markham
May 8, 2019
Canada Room, Markham Civic Centre

Members

Graham Dewar, Chair
Maria Cerone
Ken Davis
Evelin Ellison
Anthony Farr
David Nesbitt
Jennifer Peters-Morales
Councillor Karen Rea

Regrets

Councillor Keith Irish
Councillor Reid McAlpine
Zuzana Zila
Regan Hutcheson, Manager,
Heritage Planning

Staff

George Duncan, Senior Heritage Planner
Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner
Victoria Hamilton, Committee Secretary (PT)

Graham Dewar, Chair, convened the meeting at 7:15 PM by asking for any disclosures of interest with respect to items on the agenda.

David Nesbitt disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 4 (15 Union Street, Unionville), by nature of being the neighbour, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

Part One - Administration

1. Approval of Agenda (16.11)

- A) Addendum Agenda
- B) New Business from Committee Members

Recommendation:

That the May 8, 2019 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved.

CARRIED

**2. Minutes of the April 10, 2019
Heritage Markham Committee Meeting (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

[Minutes](#)

Recommendation:

That the minutes of the Heritage Markham Committee meeting held on April 10, 2019 be received and adopted.

CARRIED

**3. Heritage Permit Applications,
197 Main Street, Unionville Heritage Conservation District,
216 Main Street, Unionville Heritage Conservation District,
Proposed Ground Signs for McKay Art Centre
and Varley Art Gallery (16.11)**

File Numbers: HE 19 118632

HE 19 118363

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning
N. O'Laoghaire, Manager, Art Gallery
G. Duncan, Senior Heritage Planner

[Memorandum](#)

George Duncan, Senior Heritage Planner, addressed the Committee and summarized the details outlined in the memo. He reminded the Committee that the Unionville Heritage Conservation District Plan did not include any policy or guidance for public facility signage.

The applicant, Ms. Niamh O'Laoghaire, Manager of the Varley Art Gallery, was in attendance and presented the proposed signage for the Varley Art Gallery and McKay Art

Centre. A ground sign for the Varley Art Gallery was previously presented in August 2018 to Heritage Markham and revisions were made based on the recommendations from the Committee.

In response to an inquiry, Staff advised that both the Varley Art Gallery and McKay Art Centre were owned by the City of Markham.

There was discussion regarding the standard sign silhouette design adopted for heritage properties such as parks, and whether that should apply to this signage. Staff advised that the referred to signage was typical for parks and street signs but not for public/civic buildings. Staff noted that over-standardization of signage could cause the heritage districts to appear overly commercialized, and that the design of the McKay Art Centre signage suited the quaint heritage character of the house, and the design of the Varley Art Gallery sign suited the post-modern architecture of the building.

Ms. O’Laoghaire presented the revised locations and placement planned for both signs, and provided reasoning for the specified locations. She noted that the composition of the Varley Art Gallery sign would be wood with wooden posts or high density foam made to appear like wood. The background of the sign would be purple with the logo portion of the sign cut out and the full name of the premises written in white lettering below.

The Committee inquired if the colour scheme was final. Ms. O’Laoghaire advised that purple and white were the current colours of the Varley Art Gallery logo, and the sign colours were chosen to reflect the current branding.

Ms. O’Laoghaire advised that the revised McKay Art Centre sign would allow artists to advertise their exhibitions and sales, and allow a hanging sign to be placed below the stationary sign during events. Ms. O’Laoghaire advised that the proposed sign was in the same sight line as other signs on the street, such as the Starbucks.

The Committee inquired about lighting for the signs. Ms. O’Laoghaire advised that there would not be lighting specifically for the signs; the existing street lighting would illuminate the signs.

There was discussion regarding the revised location of the sign at 197 Main Street inhibiting the view of the heritage building for photographs. Ms. O’Laoghaire stated that the sign could not be rotated in its current location due to a low lying wall present adjacent to the sign, so it would have to be moved forward and rotated. A Committee member stated that the new location placed the sign by the footpath entrance to the building which was a better location for directing patrons than the current sign. Another Committee member noted that the proposed rotation of the sign would decrease the profile of the sign when viewed from across the street for photographs.

The Committee proposed an amendment to the Staff recommendation – that Heritage Markham supports the new ground sign for the McKay Art Centre, without any objection to the proposed location.

Councillor K. Rea requested that Ms. O’Laoghaire ensure that the Ward Councillor, Reid McAlpine was aware of the proposed signage and locations and obtain his feedback on the matter.

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham supports the revised design for the proposed ground sign at the Varley Art Gallery; and,

That Heritage Markham supports the new ground sign for the McKay Art Centre.

CARRIED

- 4. Heritage Permit Applications,
27 Victoria Avenue, Unionville,
15 Union Street, Unionville,
19 Parkway Avenue, Markham Village,
24 Church Street, Markham Village,
48 Church Street, Markham Village,
48 Church Street, Markham Village,
Delegated Approvals: Heritage Permits (16.11)**

File Numbers: HE 19 117033

HE 19 117323

HE 19 117182

HE 19 117708

HE 19 117710

HE 19 118069

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

[Memorandum](#)

David Nesbitt disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 4 (15 Union Street, Unionville), by nature of being the neighbour, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham receive the information on heritage permits approved by Heritage Section staff under the delegated approval process.

CARRIED

5. **Building and Sign Permit Applications,
328 Main Street North, Markham Village,
175 Main Street North, Markham Village,
106 Main Street North, Markham Village,
11 Heritage Corners Lane Markham Heritage Estates,
Delegated Approvals: Building and Sign Permits (16.11)**

File Numbers: 19 116080 PP

19 117673 SP

19 115659 SP

17 176810 HP

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

[Memorandum](#)

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham receive the information on building and sign permits approved by Heritage Section staff under the delegated approval process.

CARRIED

6. **Committee of Adjustment Variance Application,
1 Beech Street North, Markham Village Heritage Conservation District,
Proposed Basement Second Suite (16.11)**

File Numbers: A/35/19

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

J. Leung, Committee of Adjustment

[Memorandum](#)

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the application seeking approval and legalization of the existing basement second suite located at 1 Beech Street in Markham Village.

CARRIED

**7. Heritage Permit Application,
Pomona Mills Park & Toogood Pond Park,
Proposed Shinrin Yoku Interpretive and Directional Signage (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning
T. Lewinberg, Public Realm Coordinator

Memorandum

A member of the Committee requested that this item be moved to the regular agenda.

The applicant, Tanya Lewinberg, Public Realm Coordinator, was in attendance and presented the proposed interpretive and directional signage for Pomona and Toogood Pond Parks, highlighting their function as forest therapy guides and significance in featuring work done by the City to promote nature and the benefits of being in a park.

The Committee inquired why the proposed signage was not brought to Heritage Markham for review prior to this meeting. The applicant advised that she was not aware of the need to consult with Heritage Markham for park signage, and that production of the signs was expedited as the signs were funded through a grant.

There was discussion regarding the number of signs and whether they could be reduced. The applicant noted that five (5) of the signs were maps, three (3) were wayfinding, and only five (5) were invitation to view different aspects of the surrounding nature. The location of the signs were discussed, and it was noted that modifications could not be made to the signs as they were already produced and powder coated.

There was discussion as to whether the local Councillors, Reid McAlpine and Keith Irish, were aware of the signs. The applicant advised that Councillor Irish was aware and supportive of the signs. Councillor Rea recommended that Councillors McAlpine and Irish be consulted regarding the signage, to allow review and discussion with the necessary parties prior to the installation of the signs.

The Committee proposed an amendment to the Staff recommendation – that Heritage Markham supports the Staff recommendation, provided that Councillors McAlpine and Irish are consulted prior to the installation of the signs.

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the approval of the Heritage Permits for the proposed Shinrin-Yoku interpretive and directional signage as they do not negatively impact the heritage character of the either the Thornhill or Unionville Heritage Conservation Districts, **provided that Councillor Reid McAlpine and Councillor Keith Irish are consulted prior to the installation of the signs.**

CARRIED

8. Correspondence (16.11)

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

[Correspondence](#)

Recommendation:

That the following correspondence be received as information:

- a) Markham Historical Society: Remember Markham Newsletter, Spring 2019.
(Staff has full copy)
- b) Ontario Historical Society: OHS Bulletin, April 2019. (Staff has full copy)

CARRIED

**9. Demolition Permit Application,
14 Wales Avenue, Listed on the Register of Property of Cultural Heritage
Value or Interest, Mount Joy Community,
Request for Demolition (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning
G. Duncan, Project Planner

Memorandum

George Duncan, Senior Heritage Planner, addressed the Committee and summarized the details outlined in the memo. He noted that the property was not located in a heritage conservation district, but was on the *Markham Register of Property of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest*. G. Duncan noted that the property would not be subject to a Site Plan Control Application, but would require a demolition permit and building permit.

The applicant's representative, Russ Gregory, was in attendance and advised the Committee that designs had not yet been made for a proposed dwelling as he did not wish to move forward with any details until an opinion concerning demolition was received from Heritage Markham. He noted that he may also assist with the design for 15 Wales Avenue, which was also owned by the applicant.

The Committee advised that, in keeping with their approach to Group 2 rated buildings, demolition of the property could not be supported without any details on the proposed development. The Committee noted their support for a compatible addition, which the applicant's representative has achieved in the past on other local projects, to maintain the character of the street.

Staff advised that the Committee must decide whether to recommend the demolition of the building or that it be designated under the Ontario Heritage Act within 60 days, or have the applicant agree to an extension to allow time to return the Heritage Markham with a design for a replacement dwelling that would suit the neighbourhood context.

The Committee inquired if the applicant would be willing to defer the demolition application for 30 days to permit time for the applicant to work with Staff to find a feasible design with respect to the building. The applicant's representative agreed.

The Committee proposed an amendment to the Staff recommendation – that Heritage Markham recommends that a decision be deferred until the applicant's representative has had an opportunity to work with Staff in an attempt to find an agreeable resolution regarding the design for the proposed new dwelling.

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham defer a recommendation on demolition until the applicant's representative has had an opportunity to work with Staff to find an agreeable resolution regarding the design for the proposed new dwelling.

CARRIED

**10. Zoning By-law Application,
Plan of Subdivision.
3575 Elgin Mills Road East, Berczy Glen,
Barn Complex (16.11)**

File Numbers: ZA 18 235522

SU 18 235522

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning
D. Brutto, Project Planner

Memorandum

George Duncan, Senior Heritage Planner, addressed the Committee and summarized the details outlined in the memo. He read aloud a letter received from the Frisby family, the previous owners of the property, and noted that Staff had recently taken quality pictures of the barn, which was standard practice for heritage buildings that were scheduled for demolition.

The applicant's representative, Vincent J. Santamaura from the Architectural Firm SRN Architects Inc., was in attendance.

The Committee inquired if V. Santamaura knew where the Frisby family intended to build their new residence with the salvaged lumber from the barn. Mr. Santamaura advised that he did not.

The Committee inquired about options for obtaining financial security to ensure the lumber from the barn was used to build a new residence. Staff advised that in the past, financial security was not held for accessory buildings and that the honour system was used.

The Committee noted their discontentment that the barn was not being preserved and integrated into the future development application.

Councillor Rea proposed an alternate use of the barn where it would be repaired and maintained by Unionville Little Theatre. The applicant's representative indicated that the current subdivision proposal had a very rigid street pattern, which would have to be altered if the barn remained in place.

There was discussion regarding the owner's right to remove the structure, stated in the letter from the Frisby family. It was noted that the condition stated was part of the purchase and sale agreement, a private commitment that did not supersede the City's requirement for approval prior to demolition.

There was discussion on how to preserve barns in good condition and prevent them from being demolished in the future. The Committee noted that all reasonable steps should be taken to preserve and find alternate purposes for the barns. Staff noted that it was a complex problem because in order to preserve the building, it needed to be able to function with an alternate use, however barns were large structures that would require significant alteration to function as modern structures for commercial or residential use,

and they were large which made them difficult to integrate into new development plans. Staff noted that lot values in the City of Markham were currently very high and losing the use of an area as large as a barn would likely be difficult for developers to support.

There was discussion regarding having a subcommittee meeting to review options for the future as similar situations would arise again.

The Committee proposed an amendment to the Staff recommendation – that Heritage Markham recommends Staff to investigate potential options for obtaining financial security to ensure the salvaged lumber from the barn is reused by the Frisby family in the construction of a new residence.

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham receive the staff memo concerning the barn complex and other outbuildings at 3575 Elgin Mills Road East and supports the proposed salvaging of lumber by the Frisby family for a future new residence; **and**

That Heritage Markham recommends Staff investigate options for the City to obtain a financial security to ensure the salvaged lumber from the barn is reused by the Frisby family in the construction of a new residence.

CARRIED

- 11. Demolition Permit Application,
11251 Woodbine Avenue, Markham North Planning District,
David Hopper House (16.11)**
File Numbers: 19 115460 DP
Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning
G. Duncan, Project Planner
-

Memorandum

George Duncan, Senior Heritage Planner, addressed the Committee and summarized the details outlined in the memo. He noted that the building was unique as it had a side kitchen wing rather than the more typical rear facing one. He outlined the 60 day limit for addressing the demolition request if Heritage Markham wished to support the designation of the building. G. Duncan noted that in the past, other abandoned, derelict buildings had been moved to Markham Heritage Estates, however this building was made of stone and the foundation was an integral part of the structure. He advised that the building could be relocated, but at significant cost.

The applicant's representative, Vincent J. Santamaura from the Architectural Firm SRN Architects Inc., was in attendance and advised the Committee that the owner had the property for 10 years, and prior to that time the floors had been removed. He noted that the owner had received an order to comply from the City, stating that the building was close to being condemned. V. Santamaura presented pictures showing the current state of the building.

The Committee stated that the building did not have any major cracks or faults in the stonework and that the unique feature of having both stone and brick as part of the structure was historically worth preserving. The Committee expressed their disappointment that the building was neglected by the owner and allowed to fall into decay, and noted that other buildings with similar states of vandalism and damage have been restored. The Committee further expressed disappointment with the assessment made by the Architect in the report and the inconsistencies present between the heritage assessment and structural assessment.

The Committee was not in support of permitting demolition due to the state of the building being caused by neglect and lack of maintenance by the owner, and supported the designation of the building under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham **does not support the demolition of the David Hopper House at 11251 Woodbine Avenue and recommends the designation of the building pursuant to the Ontario Heritage Act; and**

That Heritage Markham recommends the restoration of the building on-site and in a timely manner, and that immediate action be taken to prevent further deterioration of the building.

CARRIED

Adjournment

The Heritage Markham Committee meeting adjourned at 9:21 PM.

CARRIED