



# Heritage Markham Committee Minutes

**Meeting Number: 3**  
**March 11, 2020, 7:15 PM**  
**Canada Room**

|         |   |   |
|---------|---|---|
| Members | Graham Dewar<br>Doug Denby<br>Evelin Ellison<br>Anthony Farr<br>Shan Goel             | Councillor Keith Irish<br>Councillor Reid McAlpine<br>Jason McCauley<br>Councillor Karen Rea<br>Paul Tiefenbach |
| Regrets | Ken Davis   | David Nesbitt   |
| Staff   | George Duncan, Senior Heritage Planner<br>Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning | Victoria Hamilton, Committee Secretary (PT)   |

---

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

Graham Dewar, Chair, convened the meeting at 7:21 PM by asking for any disclosures of interest with respect to items on the agenda.

The Chair introduced new Heritage Markham Committee member, Jason McCauley, and welcomed him.

Jason briefly introduced himself to the Committee.

## 2. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

There were no disclosures of interest.

## 3. PART ONE - ADMINISTRATION

### 3.1 APPROVAL OF AGENDA (16.11)

A. Addendum Agenda

B. New Business

- 4592 Highway 7, Unionville, Review of Property Status

Recommendation:

That the March 11, 2020 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved, as amended.

**Carried**

**3.2 MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 12, 2020 HERITAGE MARKHAM COMMITTEE MEETING (16.11)**

Recommendation:

That the minutes of the Heritage Markham Committee meeting held on February 12, 2020 be received and adopted, as presented.

**Carried**

**4. PART TWO - DEPUTATIONS**

**4.1 REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK**

**12 WILSON STREET, MARKHAM VILLAGE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT  
STATUS OF BUILDING FROM A CULTURAL HERITAGE PERSPECTIVE (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Regan Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning, informed the Committee that further discussion had taken place with the Applicant since this item was added to the agenda, and that the Applicant had requested to defer discussion regarding this matter until the April meeting to allow time for further research.

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham accept the deferral of discussion regarding the building at 12 Wilson Street until the April meeting.

**Carried**

**5. PART THREE - CONSENT**

**5.1 HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATIONS**

**185 MAIN STREET, UNIONVILLE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT**

**10 PETER STREET, MARKHAM VILLAGE HERITAGE  
CONSERVATION DISTRICT  
4160 19TH AVENUE, ALMIRA COMMUNITY - INDIVIDUALLY  
DESIGNATED**

**DELEGATED APPROVALS: HERITAGE PERMITS (16.11)**

FILE NUMBERS:

- HE 20 109326
- HE 20 109112
- HE 20 109142

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Recommendation:

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

**Carried**

**5.2 BUILDING OR SIGN PERMIT APPLICATIONS**

**7895 YONGE STREET, THORNHILL HERITAGE CONSERVATION  
DISTRICT**

**272 MAIN STREET NORTH, MARKHAM VILLAGE HERITAGE  
CONSERVATION DISTRICT**

**DELEGATED APPROVALS: SIGN PERMITS (16.11)**

FILE NUMBERS:

- 20 107732 SP
- 20 109485 HP

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Recommendation:

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

**Carried**

**5.3 SITE PLAN CONTROL APPLICATION**

**45 JOHN STREET, THORNHILL HERITAGE CONSERVATION  
DISTRICT**

**NEW SINGLE DETACHED DWELLING – SECOND REVISED  
ELEVATIONS (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER: SPC 19 142354

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning  
 F. Hemon-Morneau, Project Planner

There was discussion regarding the windows on the east and west side elevations and whether they should follow the same pattern as on the front of the dwelling.

A Committee member expressed concern that the east elevation windows would be visible from the street. Another member commented that the existing setbacks on the side elevations should be kept in mind.

R. Hutcheson displayed the Site Plan presented at the February 2020 meeting, which showed the setbacks and how the dwelling compared to the neighbouring buildings.

A Committee member asked if staff could request the applicant to consider modifying the side window glazing to match the new front window treatment.

In response to a Committee member, staff confirmed that the back windows would be bird friendly.

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham supports the use of casement windows in the design shown in the second revised design for the proposed new dwelling at 45 John Street based on its Arts and Crafts style inspiration.

**Carried**

## **6. PART FOUR - REGULAR**

### **6.1 REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK**

**11 PRINCESS STREET, MARKHAM VILLAGE HERITAGE  
 CONSERVATION DISTRICT  
 METAL SHINGLE ROOFING FOR NEW DWELLING (16.11)  
 FILE NUMBER: SPC 19 122591**

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning  
 G. Duncan, Senior Heritage Planner

George Duncan, Senior Heritage Planner, addressed the Committee and summarized the details outlined in the memo. He noted that there were no other heritage buildings on the street and that mostly custom homes with neo traditional designs were being built. He stated that a sample of the granular-coated metal

shingle had not been provided for the meeting, but product brochures were available to show the Committee.

A Committee member mentioned that the property had a number of pine trees and that the sap from the pine trees often decreased the lifespan of asphalt shingles. He stated that the granular-coated metal shingles were used in Muskoka as an alternative, and did not look like metal shingles when viewed from the ground.

Councillor K. Rea proposed an amendment to the staff recommendation; that Heritage Markham supports the proposed granular-coated metal shingle cladding, as a test case, provided that a sample of the material is submitted to staff for review and final determination.

Another Committee member noted that two houses in Thornhill had metal shingles that stood out as metal shingles, and requested that staff carefully scrutinize the material.

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham supports the substitution of granular-coated metal shingle cladding “DECRA Shingle XD” for the approved asphalt-shingle cladding for the new dwelling at 11 Princess Street in an appropriate heritage colour as determined by staff, as a test case, provided that the applicant first submits a sample of the material for staff review and approval.

**Carried**

## **6.2 DEMOLITION PERMIT APPLICATION**

### **10225 KENNEDY ROAD - INDIVIDUALLY DESIGNATED PROPERTY REMOVAL OF NON-HERITAGE ADDITIONS HOMER WILSON FARMHOUSE (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER: 19 102709 DP

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning  
C. Bird, Director, Building Standards

George Duncan, Senior Heritage Planner, addressed the Committee and summarized the details outlined in the memo. He reviewed the layout of the exterior and the materials used. G. Duncan noted that the elements proposed for demolition did not contribute to the heritage value and features of the building, were not identified as heritage attributes in the Designation By-Law, and were also a fire and safety concern.

There was discussion as to how a feature was determined to be of heritage value. G. Duncan advised that it was on a case by case basis, but that consideration was given to aspects such as the date of construction, the feature that was added, and the quality of the design and construction. In this case, the additions were not considered to add to the heritage value.

A Committee member stressed the importance of receiving a commitment from the Applicant to begin work expeditiously.

Councillor K. Rea requested an amendment to the staff recommendation; that the Applicant submit a plan to board up and secure all openings prior to the issuance of a demolition permit.

In response to a query, staff advised that the Committee would have an opportunity to review the restoration plan prior to any construction, and at that time, it would be determined if a south side porch was suitable.

In response to a query, staff advised that the addition was likely built post-World War 2.

A Committee member expressed concern that original parts of the porch may have been covered over, and recommended including a caveat to protect any heritage features that became apparent during demolition.

Staff clarified that the additions proposed for demolition were not designated as heritage. The north and west porches were protected as heritage features, but not the south porch.

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham has no objection to the demolition of the identified portions of the designated Homer Wilson Farmhouse that do not contribute to the heritage value, subject to the following conditions:

- That the non-heritage portions of the building be carefully removed with manual demolition of selected area adjoining the heritage building, to ensure no accidental damage by machine operations occurs; and,
- That a plan or description of how all openings (windows, doors, etc.) in the heritage building are to be secured once the non-heritage portions of the building are removed be provided to the satisfaction of the Manager of Heritage Planning prior to the issuance of a demolition permit; and further,

- That any issues with openings, roofing, rain gutters/downspouts, soffits and fascia be repaired to ensure that the heritage building remains in stable condition until its future restoration.

**Carried**

### **6.3 BUILDING EVALUATION**

#### **33 DICKSON HILL ROAD, DICKSON HILL BUILDING EVALUATION AND CLASSIFICATION OF THE JOSEPH PIPHER HOUSE AND ACCESSORY BUILDING (16.11)**

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning  
P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

Regan Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning, addressed the Committee and summarized the details outlined in the memo. The property was classified as Group 1 (of major significance and importance, worthy of designation).

A Committee member inquired if the house could be moved from its current location. G. Dewar, as a member of the Building Evaluation Sub-Committee that reviewed the property, advised that the building was made of fieldstone and would be very difficult to move. He noted that the Committee would review the Site Plan before any future development.

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham supports the classification of the historic buildings at 33 Dickson Hill Road as evaluated by the Building Evaluation Sub-Committee of Heritage Markham, in support of the proposed designation of the property.

**Carried**

### **6.4 REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK**

#### **2 ALEXANDER HUNTER PLACE, MARKHAM HERITAGE ESTATES PROPOSED REVISION TO DESIGN OF APPROVED ADDITION (16.11) FILE NUMBER: SC 17 167062**

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning  
P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

Regan Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning, addressed the Committee and noted that the Applicant had received Site Plan approval and a building permit, however wished to modify some features from the approved drawings.

In response to a query regarding the french doors and rear elevation, staff advised that the property was located within Markham Heritage Estates, and therefore a higher standard of historical authenticity was expected. The property was also a corner lot, so visibility was high.

Regarding the widening of the addition, staff advised that there was a ground floor plate maximum in Markham Heritage Estates, and that a bylaw variance application would be required if the square footage was greater. Staff noted that variances had been secured by other Markham Heritage Estate homes.

There was discussion regarding the timing of the construction, and the Committee's preference for the work to begin as soon as possible. Staff advised that the current Site Plan agreement required the commencement of work within one year of approval. Options to expedite the initiation and completion of the construction were discussed. Staff advised that a letter of credit would be obtained that was tied into the completion of the work.

A Committee member commented that the mortgage discount should not begin until after the house was inhabited.

There was discussion regarding the proportions of the proposed dwelling, and it was noted that the design was already approved.

The Committee proposed an amendment to the recommendation; that staff consider discussing options with legal counsel to have the Applicant initiate the work in a timely manner.

Graham Dewar departed the meeting at 8:33 p.m.

By consent of the Committee, Keith Irish assumed the role of Chair for the remainder of the meeting.

Recommendation:

1. That Heritage Markham would have no objection from a heritage perspective to a site plan application to widen the proposed rear addition by 2 feet, as shown in the drawing date stamped March 4, 2020 provided that the following revisions are made to the drawings:

- That the relationship between the house and grade in the drawings originally approved be maintained so that there is no requirement to

provide veranda railings in compliance with the Ontario Building Code;

- That the basement windows be revised to historically authentic three paned windows;
- That the entrance off the side veranda be revised to a door with a transom only and not the entrance illustrated with a single sidelight;
- That the French door illustrated on the rear addition be revised to a more historically authentic door to the satisfaction of Heritage Section staff;
- That the decorative details of the veranda be identical to the front and side veranda details of the house located at 141 Main Street Unionville which is closely related in its architectural style; and,

2. That Heritage Markham has no objection to any variance to the By-law required to permit the proposed 2 ft. widening of the addition as illustrated in the drawing date stamped March 4, 2020; and,

3. That final review of any development application in order to approve the revised addition as illustrated in the drawings date stamped March 4, 2020 be delegated to the City, (Heritage Section) staff; and,

4. That the applicant enter into a Site Plan agreement containing the standard conditions regarding materials, colours, windows etc.; and further,

5. That staff consider consulting with legal counsel to find a way to have the Applicant initiate the work in a timely manner, including the concept of a letter of credit to ensure the project is initiated.

**Carried**

## **7. PART FIVE - STUDIES/PROJECTS AFFECTING HERITAGE RESOURCES - UPDATES**

### **7.1 STUDIES/PROJECTS**

#### **HERITAGE EDUCATION**

#### **MAKE 'SAVE AND RE-USE' THE NORM – ALIGNING HERITAGE PRESERVATION WITH PROVINCIAL PRIORITIES (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Regan Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning, reviewed a presentation created by the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario.

The Committee requested that staff forward a copy of the presentation to all Committee members and that the same presentation, if possible, be given to Markham Council, as well as York Region Council. Staff would confirm with the ACO if the presentation could be shared.

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham Committee receive for information; and,

That the presentation be made available to Markham Council and York Region Council.

**Carried**

**8. PART SIX - NEW BUSINESS**

**8.1 REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK**

**4592 HIGHWAY 7, UNIONVILLE  
REVIEW OF PROPERTY STATUS (16.11)**

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning, addressed the Committee and advised that the property was not on the Markham Register of Property of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, either as a listed property or designated property. Staff has had enquiries as to the status of the property.

Staff asked the Committee for feedback on the situation and the property's unprotected status. R. Hutcheson noted that the Markham Official Plan did indicate that there may be properties of cultural heritage interest that were not yet identified or designated, or included in the Register, but may still be worthy of conservation and inclusion in the Register.

A Committee member noted that the location of the building was problematic as it was out of context with its surroundings. Committee enquired as to how many houses of this style remained in Markham. Staff indicated that further research would have to be undertaken, but the house appeared to date from the 1910-20 period of construction.

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham supports the investigation and evaluation of the historical nature of the property by Heritage staff.

**Carried**

**8.2 DESCRIPTION CORRECTION**

**YORK REGION WEBSITE  
ANNSWELL COURT FOUNDATION DESCRIPTION (16.11)**

A Committee member advised that on the York Region website, the location of the Annswell Court Foundation was listed as Vaughan, however, it should read Thornhill or Markham.

The Committee requested that staff contact York Region to have this corrected.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

The Heritage Markham Committee meeting adjourned at 9:05 PM.