



Heritage Markham Committee Minutes

Meeting Number: 10
November 11, 2020, 7:15 PM
Electronic Meeting

Members	Councillor Keith Irish Councillor Karen Rea Councillor Reid McAlpine Graham Dewar Paul Tiefenbach	Evelin Ellison Ken Davis Doug Denby Shan Goel Anthony Farr Lake Trevelyan
Regrets	Jason McCauley, and David Nesbitt	
Staff	Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner	Grace Lombardi, Acting Election & Committee Coordinator Laura Gold, Council/Committee Coordinator

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

Anthony Farr declared a disclosure of pecuniary interest on agenda item No. 6.1 Demolition Permit Application for 32 Colborne Street, as he lives next door to the property.

3. PART ONE - ADMINISTRATION

3.1 APPROVAL OF AGENDA (16.11)

Lake Trevelyan added an item under new business regarding the City's process for making decisions on heritage matters.

Recommendation:

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

Carried

3.2 MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 14, 2020 HERITAGE MARKHAM COMMITTEE MEETING (16.11)

Recommendation:

That the minutes of the Heritage Markham Committee meeting held October 14, 2020 be received and adopted.

Carried

4. PART TWO – DEPUTATIONS

There were no deputations.

5. PART THREE – CONSENT

5.1 HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATIONS

DELEGATED APPROVAL

HERITAGE PERMITS APPROVED BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF

16 PETER STREET, MV

14 CHURCH STREET, MV

36 CHURCH STREET, MV (16.11)

FILE NUMBERS:

- HE 20 129850
- HE 20 129853
- HE 20 130740
- HE 20 130742

Extracts:

R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

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 APPLICATION

DELEGATED APPROVAL

PERMITS APPROVED BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF

10720 VICTORIA SQUARE BOULEVARD

177 MAIN STREET UNIONVILLE

FILE NUMBERS:

- NH 19 131975
- AL 20 110839

Extracts:

R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

Recommendation:

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

Carried

5.3 TREE PERMITS

DELEGATED APPROVAL

TREE REMOVAL PERMITS

131 MAIN STREET UNIONVILLE

FILE NUMBER:

TREE 20 130422

Extracts:

R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham receive the information on the tree removal permit approved by Heritage Section staff under the delegated approval process.

Carried

5.4 INFORMATION

UNIONVILLE SUB-COMMITTEE OF HERITAGE MARKHAM STREETSCAPE FURNITURE – MAIN STREET UNIONVILLE UNIONVILLE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Extracts: R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham Committee receive the Meeting Notes/Recommendation from the Unionville Patio/Streetscape Furniture Sub-Committee as information.

Carried

5.5 COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT

COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT VARIANCE APPLICATION SECOND RESIDENTIAL UNIT 298 MAIN STREET UNIONVILLE

FILE NUMBER:

A/021/20

Extracts:

R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

J. Leung, Secretary, Committee of Adjustment, Planning & Urban Design

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham has no comment from a heritage perspective on the requested variances at 298 Main Street Unionville to permit:

- an accessory dwelling unit in the existing house, whereas the only a single detached dwelling is permitted; and,
- a minimum parking space of 2.6m x 5.63m in a private garage, whereas a minimum of 2.6m x 5.8m is required; and,

That final review of the variance application A/021/20 be delegated to Heritage Section staff.

Carried

5.6 HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATIONS

INTRODUCTION OF TEMPORARY MUSKOKA CHAIRS IN PUBLIC SPACES

UNIONVILLE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT 146, 185 AND 216 MAIN STREET

Extracts:

R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning,

David Plant, Senior Manager, Operations

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham has no objection to the Heritage Permit application in support of the installation of Muskoka style chairs (12 in total) at the three identified public realm locations within the Unionville Heritage Conservation District on a temporary basis (Nov 2020 – March 2021).

Carried

5.7 PLAN OF CONDOMINIUM

HART HAUS CONDOMINIUMS - STIVER LANE INC. 208 MAIN STREET, UNIONVILLE

FILE NUMBER:

20 128605

Extracts:

R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning and S. Bordone, Senior Planner

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham Committee has no comment from a heritage perspective on the condominium application (Hart Haus Condominiums) at 208 Main Street, Unionville; and,

That the new address (208 Main Street Unionville) be added to the Markham Register of Property of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest.

Carried

5.8 INFORMATION

LOCAL PLANNING APPEAL TRIBUNAL (LPAT) DECISION 105 AND 107 MAIN STREET UNIONVILLE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Extracts:

R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham Committee receive as information.

Carried

6. PART FOUR - REGULAR

6.1 DEMOLITION PERMIT APPLICATION

REMOVAL OF FIRE DAMAGED STRUCTURE

32 COLBORNE STREET

THORNHILL HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT

FILE NUMBER:

DP 20 129726

Extracts:

R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner presented the staff memorandum and supporting material for the Demolition Permit Application for 32 Colborne Street, located in the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District. The permit is being requested due to fire damage to the structure.

Staff anticipated that a heritage application for the reconstruction of the house will be submitted to the Committee on a future date.

Committee provided the following feedback on the Demolition Permit Application:

- Recognized there is a lot of structural damage to the property, and that it needs to be demolished for health and safety reasons;
- Requested that the hedges, and the trees behind the house be protected when demolishing, and rebuilding the house.

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the demolition of the existing fire damaged dwelling to the first level floor system at 32 Colborne Street; and,

That the design of any future dwelling to be constructed upon the existing foundation comply with the policies and guidelines for new dwellings contained in the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District Plan; and,

That the trees and the hedge at 32 Colborne Street be protected when demolishing, and re-constructing the house.

Carried

6.2 SITE PLAN CONTROL APPLICATION

PROPOSED REMODELLING AND ADDITION TO AN EXISTING NON-HERITAGE DETACHED DWELLING

40 ROUGE STREET

MARKHAM VILLAGE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT

FILE NUMBER:

SPC 20 127950

Extracts:

R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

J. Mott, Technician, Planning & Urban Design

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning presented the staff memorandum and supporting material regarding a Site Plan Control Application for the proposed remodeling and addition to an existing non-heritage detached dwelling, built in 1954, on 40 Rouge Street in the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District.

Staff had no objection to the Site Plan Control Application subject to the revisions to the windows and doors of the proposed east elevation to make them more reflective of typical historic windows and doors found in historic Markham Village

The Committee Members provided the following feedback on the remodeling and addition of 40 Rouge Street:

- A streetscape would have been useful;
- Suggested making the house 1 ½ story versus 2 story to be more compatible with the surrounding homes;
- Suggested that the addition may require a side setback variance;
- Satisfied with the size of the home being proposed;
- Requested that the scale of drawings be clearly included in future agenda packages.

Staff advised that that in accordance with the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District Plan, a 1-2 storey home is considered complimentary to the surrounding area, and that the Applicant will be required to bring forward a Committee of Adjustment Application to the Heritage Markham Committee if the addition requires a side setback variance.

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham has no objection to the demolition of the existing dwelling (above the foundation); and,

That Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the proposed alterations and additions dated September 16, 2020 to the existing dwelling at 40 Rouge Street, subject to revisions to the windows and doors of the proposed east elevation to make them more reflective of typical historic windows and doors found in historic Markham Village; and,

That final review of the Site Plan application and any other development application required to permit the proposed alterations and additions be delegated to Heritage Section staff; and further,

That the applicant enter into a Site Plan Agreement with the City containing the standard conditions regarding windows, materials, colours, etc.

Carried

6.3 OFFICIAL PLAN AND ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT APPLICATIONS

SPRINGHILL HOMES INC.

RETENTION OF FRANCIS PIKE HOUSE IN A HIGH RISE DEVELOPMENT

7170 HIGHWAY 7

FILE NUMBER:

PLAN 20 119576

Extracts:

R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Stephen Corr, Senior Planner, East

Regan Hutcheson, Senior Manager of Heritage Planning presented the attached memorandum and supporting material for the retention of the Francis Pike House in a high-rise development. The developer is proposing to restore the heritage house on its original site, incorporate it into the high-rise development, and use it as a daycare.

Staff suggested that Heritage Markham have no comment from a heritage perspective on the Official Plan and zoning by-law amendments, but noted the buildings' original orientation would be reversed and, no longer be facing Highway 7.

Committee provided the following feedback on the proposal for the retention of the Francis Pike House in a high-rise development:

- Suggested it may be more appropriate to locate the house on a corner of the development parcel or closer to Arthur Bonner Street;
- Some Members were against the Heritage House being located between two high-rise buildings, and others felt it was a unique way of featuring it in the development;
- Committee felt that the heritage resource would be maintained by the Condominium Corporation if it remained in the proposed location;
- Suggested the house should be put in a location where it is more compatible with the surrounding area;
- Noted it may be difficult to access the heritage house in its proposed location if it is being used as a daycare.

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham Committee has no comment from a heritage perspective on the Official Plan and zoning by-law amendments (File Plan 20 119576); and,

That the following constructive comments are provided from a heritage perspective for consideration in response to the conceptual site plan regarding the placement and use of the Francis Pike House:

- Positive Features – all components of the heritage building are proposed to be retained (veranda, main building and rear addition; the building remains on its original development lands; its new location is adjacent to the park space (enhanced visibility) and the lower 3 storey portions of the development; and a use is proposed (day care centre). The heritage building would be a central feature.
- Negative Features – the orientation of the building is reversed (now north facing) and there does not appear to be a drop off or road access to the day care centre use. Views from Hwy 7 would be of the rear addition. **In its proposed location, the building would be lost relative to any public presence. If this overall development plan stays more or less the same, Heritage Markham suggests that the house be moved closer to Arthur Bonner Avenue.**

- Other – if through re-design, the heritage building is required to move to another location, a corner lot on either side street could be explored with appropriate land for child drop off/parking.

And that Heritage Markham Committee be forwarded the future Site Plan Control Application which should contain an exterior restoration plan and landscape plan for the Francis Pike House.

Carried

7. PART SIX - NEW BUSINESS

Lake Trevelyan expressed concern that heritage decisions at the City seem to be subjective rather than objective, suggesting that a framework for making decisions on heritage matters may be required.

Staff advised that the Unionville Heritage Conservation District Plan was created to provide an objective framework for making decisions on heritage matters in the Unionville area. The plan was created to ensure consistency in the City's heritage decision-making and remove subjectivity. It includes guidelines for the types of heritage matters that would traditionally come before the Heritage Markham Committee. The plan won planning awards for its new approach for heritage district plans and for providing a comprehensive and illustrative framework for making heritage decisions, but staff noted that there is always room for improvement. Council direction and approval is required prior to making any changes to the plan.

Councillor Reid McAlpine, and Lake Trevelyan will discuss this matter with the Unionville Villagers Association prior to making any recommendations to this committee.

The concept of creating a Sub-Committee to review the Heritage District Plans was mentioned. Staff noted that staff will soon begin the process of updating the Markham Village Conservation District Plan, which is Markham's oldest plan.

Lake Trevelyan requested a copy of the Unionville Heritage Conservation District Plan.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The Heritage Markham Committee adjourned at 8:34 PM.