



# Heritage Markham Committee Minutes

**Meeting Number 6**  
**June 9, 2021, 7:00 PM**  
**Electronic Meeting**

|         |                                             |                               |
|---------|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Members | Councillor Keith Irish, Chair               | David Nesbitt                 |
|         | Ken Davis, Vice Chair                       | Nathan Proctor                |
|         | Councillor Reid McAlpine                    | Paul Tiefenbach               |
|         | Councillor Karen Rea                        | Lake Trevelyan                |
|         | Doug Denby                                  | David Wilson                  |
|         | Shan Goel                                   | Elizabeth Wimmer              |
|         | Victor Huang                                |                               |
|         |                                             |                               |
| Staff   | Evan Manning, Senior Heritage Planner       | Laura Gold, Council/Committee |
|         | Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning | Coordinator                   |
|         | Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner       | Mary-Jane Courchesne, Acting  |
|         |                                             | Council/Committee Coordinator |

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

Councillor Keith Irish, Chair, convened the meeting at 7:08 PM by asking for any disclosures of interest with respect to items on the agenda.

## 2. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

Councillor Reid McAlpine declared a conflict on Item No. 4.1 – Official Plan and Zoning Amendments, 134, 136, 140, 144, and 152 Main Street North; 12 Wilson Street, Residential Retirement Development with Commercial, Smartcentres and Revera Inc. (2697996 Ontario Inc.), as his good friend works for Smartcentres.

David Wilson declared a conflict of interest on Item No. 5.4 - Site Plan Control and Committee of Adjustment Variance Application, 36 Washington Street, Markham Village

Heritage Conservation District, Proposed 2 Storey Rear Addition to an Existing Heritage Dwelling, as he knows the property owner.

David Wilson declared a conflict of interest on Item No. 6.3 – Notice of Demolition 32 Joseph Street, as he plays hockey with the applicant.

### **3. PART ONE - ADMINISTRATION**

#### **3.1 APPROVAL OF AGENDA (16.11)**

Committee approved the following amendments to the agenda:

- Agenda Item 6.4 - Revision to the Legal Description of Heritage Designation By-Law 2008-90, 5933 Fourteenth Avenue, ZA 16 130764, SU 16 130764, SPC 20 110863, was added to the agenda at the request of Staff;
- Agenda Item No. 6.3 – Heritage Permit Application, 233 Main Street, Unionville, Rear Yard Sports Pad, was deferred at the owner's request to a future Heritage Markham Committee meeting.

Recommendation:

That the June 9, 2021 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved, as amended.

**Carried**

#### **3.2 MINUTES OF THE MAY 12, 2021 HERITAGE MARKHAM COMMITTEE MEETING (16.11)**

Recommendation:

That the minutes of the Heritage Markham Committee meeting held on May 12, 2021 be received and adopted.

**Carried**

### **4. PART TWO - DEPUTATIONS**

#### **4.1 OFFICIAL PLAN AND ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENTS**

**134, 136, 140, 144 AND 152 MAIN STREET NORTH;**

**12 WILSON STREET**

**RESIDENTIAL RETIREMENT DEVELOPMENT WITH COMMERCIAL, SMARTCENTRES AND REVERA INC. (2637996 ONTARIO INC) (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER: PLAN 20 136386

Extracts:

R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

Councillor Reid McAlpine declared a conflict on Item No. 4.1 – Official Plan and Zoning Amendments, 134, 136, 140, 144, and 152 Main Street North; 12 Wilson Street, Residential Retirement Development with Commercial, Smartcentres and Revera Inc. (2697996 Ontario Inc.), as his good friend works for Smartcentres.

Regan Hutcheson provided a presentation on the development application for Official Plan and Zoning By-Law Amendments on the subject properties which are in support of a residential retirement development with commercial uses, and identified issues that were of concern from a heritage perspective.

Kate Cooper, Bousfields Inc., provided a presentation on the development proposal on behalf of the applicant noting her team had previously attended two community information meetings and the Statutory Public meeting.

The following deputations were made on the development proposal:

**Jason Ng**

- Suggested the development proposal provides an opportunity to enhance the main street area;
- Expressed concern regarding the height, massing and design of the development proposal, including the relationship with the three storey townhouses located to the north of the development site;
- Suggested that a mixed use residential condominium would be more suitable for this location, as the residents would support the local businesses;
- Suggested the number of street facing stores and restaurants be increased.

**Phil Rowley**

- Expressed concern that the development proposal will overshadow the surrounding homes and cultural heritage resources;
- Expressed concern regarding the height, density and massing of the development proposal;
- Expressed concern that the development proposal does not fit the character of the area, including the proposed architectural treatment, and that run-off from the construction will pollute Robinson Creek;
- Expressed concern regarding his loss of privacy;
- Suggested the proposal needs to be redesigned to be in harmony with Markham Village;

- Suggested if the proposal proceeds there should be measures put in place to protect Robinson Creek, and that the construction should only be permitted during certain times;

#### **Karl Van Kessel**

- Expressed concern regarding the height, massing and design of the development proposal;
- Expressed concern that the proposed development does not fit the character of the area and that it overshadows the surrounding neighbourhood ;
- Expressed concern that that it does not comply with the City's Zoning By-Laws or Official Plan, and was not in support of a large institutional use;
- Suggested there should be more green space and sunlight for the residents of the senior's home to enjoy;
- Lacks both public and private vibrant spaces;
- .

#### **Philip Ling**

- Suggested that the scale of the development would destroy the heritage character of the area, and that the renderings are not reflective of a heritage district.
- Suggested that approving the development proposal would be unfair to those who have worked so hard to preserve and protect the heritage in the area;
- Expressed concern regarding the front set-back;
- Noted that he would support any new develop in compliance with the City's Official Plan and Zoning By-Laws for the Markham Village Heritage District.

#### **Janet Whitley**

- Suggested that proposed development was not a positive change for Markham Village;
- Expressed concern regarding the design and massing of the proposal;
- Suggest that a proposal that will attract residents and visitors to shop on Main Street Markham and that complies with the City's Official Plan and Zoning By-Laws would be more suitable for this location;
- Hoped that the Henry Wilson House (right now Main's Mansion) would be the focus of the frontage of the proposed development;
- A lack of parking for commercial patrons;
- Suggested the developer should go back to the drawing board.

### **Dean Kemper**

- Lives in a heritage home on Water Street adjacent to the backend of the development;
- Would welcome a development proposal that respects the character of the area and the City Official Plan and Zoning By-Laws for this area;
- Expressed the greatest concern in regards to the size, height, scale and massing of the development proposal;
- Expressed concern that if the development proposal is approved it will lead to further degradation of the neighbourhood and the demise of the heritage village;
- Expressed concern that the development proposal will impact their sunlight and privacy;
- Asked the Heritage Markham Committee to not support the development proposal.

### **Leslie Kimberley-Kemper**

- Expressed concern that that the development proposal does not comply with the City's Zoning By-Laws or Official Plan;
- Expressed concern regarding the height, density, massing, and set-back of the development proposal;
- Expressed concern that there is a lack of green space for the residents of the proposed senior's home to enjoy;
- Suggested the development proposal needs to be revised.

### **Arthur Strader**

- Expressed concern that building another seniors home would impact both the vibrancy, and the employment opportunities on Main Street Markham, especially for students and residents with less formal education;
- Expressed concern that proposed development will impact the social scene on Main Street Markham, such as the Markham Music Festival;
- Suggested restoring the existing plaza and making it vibrant again.

### **Shelagh De Savoye**

- Expressed concern that the proposed development does not fit the character of the area, and that it will generate more traffic;
- Suggested that a retirement home will not attract new retail or restaurants;

- Spoke about the importance of attracting stores and restaurants to open on Main Street Markham.

### **Art Strader**

- Expressed concern that the proposed development does not respect the character of the area, the architecture is not aesthetically appropriate, and it does not comply with the City's Official Plan or Zoning By-Laws for Markham Village;
- Suggested that proposed development will end the shopping district on Main Street Markham at Wilson Street;
- Noted that Main Street Markham should remain a place where people socialize and gather. This will negatively impact the vitality of the street;
- Asked the Heritage Markham Committee to deny the development proposal.

### **Evelin Ellison**

- Suggested that some of the density be removed and replaced with green space for the residents of proposed development to enjoy;
- Supported the staff recommendation.

Committee provided the following feedback on the proposed development:

- Expressed concern regarding the height, massing, density, and scale of the proposed development;
- Concern regarding the architectural design treatment;
- Suggested that Main Street Markham should be preserved for all generations to enjoy, including the younger generations;
- Suggested the proposal does not fit the character of the area and it is not respectful to the local heritage district;
- Concerned that the seniors living in the building will not have enough sunlight, especially related to the courtyard outdoor space;
- Suggested the development should include a laneway in the back to provide for service access and to permit for a larger set-back from the adjacent homes;
- Noted that appearance and height of the backend of the development proposal needs to be considered due to the grading on Water Street
- Suggested stepping back the eastern and western façade and pulling the balconies into the development;
- Suggested using low profile rooftop units to reduce the height of the penthouse features;
- Suggested there should be more articulation on the façade.

Councillor Karen Rea thanked the residents for their feedback and for attending the meeting.

Ms. Cooper showed the committee where the outdoor amenity space is being proposed to be located on the site plan primarily within the rear courtyard, and noted that there will also be a lot of indoor amenity space. Ms. Cooper also advised that the applicant will be reviewing the shadow study, and will be considering comments from staff and residents as they consider potential modifications to the project..

Recommendation:

THAT the deputations by Jason Ng, Phil Rowley, Karl Van Kessel, Philip Ling, Janet Whitley, Dean Kemper, Leslie Kimberley-Kemper, Arthur Strader, Shelagh De Savoye, Art Strader, and Evelin Ellison, regarding the Official Plan and Zoning Amendments, 134, 136, 140, 144, and 152 Main Street North; 12 Wilson Street, Residential Retirement Development with Commercial, SmartCentres and Revera Inc. (2697996 Ontario Inc.), be received.

THAT the written submission from Janet Whitely, Tanya Holme, Diane Berwick, Elizabeth Brown, and Donna Wigmore regarding the Official Plan and Zoning Amendments, 134, 136, 140, 144, and 152 Main Street North; 12 Wilson Street, Residential Retirement Development with Commercial, SmartCentres and Revera Inc. (2697996 Ontario Inc.), be received.

THAT Heritage Markham Committee has the following comments from a heritage perspective on the proposal for the redevelopment of the Markham Village Lanes complex:

- No objection to the demolition of the Markham Village Lanes building;
- Objection to the proposed replication of 12 Wilson Street (Charles and Maria Carlton House), but no objection to the removal of the additions constructed in the 1990s;
- Support the retention of the five cultural heritage resources on Main Street North and their further protection through heritage easement agreements;
- Support obtaining a conservation/restoration plan as part of a future site plan control application to address the restoration requirements associated with each cultural heritage resource;
- Consider convenient and visible at-grade parking to support and ensure the success of the proposed commercial uses within the retained cultural heritage resources;

- For the new development:
  - Revisit the proposed height of the development. A maximum height of four storeys is preferred with transitions to two-three storeys to better complement the heights of lower scale residential properties adjacent to the development is recommended.
  - Explore opportunities to further reduce the massing of the structure by breaking up the facades and the overall building mass into elements that better reflect the scale and massing of adjacent building forms.
  - Generally support the current design approach (modern complementary) which works well for backdrop buildings (behind the Main Street heritage buildings) but explore other related approaches to ensure side and rear facades are more in character with their surroundings.
  - Consider the use of a window design that is more traditional in appearance and revise the design to have integrated balconies as opposed to projecting balconies
  - Appropriate use of traditional materials including limiting stone to a foundation treatment rather than an exterior wall cladding.
  - **Increase the commercial, retail or restaurant space at the front of the development proposal on Main Street Markham.**
  - **In corporate more green space into the development proposal for the future residents of the seniors home.**

**Carried**

## **5. PART THREE - CONSENT**

### **5.1 BUILDING OR SIGN PERMIT APPLICATIONS**

#### **DELEGATED APPROVAL BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF**

**128 MAIN STREET (UHCD)**

**205 MAIN STREET (UHCD)**

**28 WALES AVENUE (MVHCD) (16.11)**

FILE NUMBERS:

- PE 21 126153

- AL 21 117141
- PE 21 118590

Extracts:

R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Recommendation:

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

**Carried**

## **5.2 HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATION**

### **DELEGATED APPROVAL BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF 280 MAIN STREET NORTH (MVHCD) (16.11)**

FILE NUMBERS:

- HE 21 122071

Extracts:

R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Recommendation:

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

**Carried**

## **5.3 COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT VARIANCE APPLICATION**

### **4 MARIE COURT, THORNHILL PROPOSED NEW DWELLING (16.11)**

File Number: A/050/21

Extracts:

R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Heritage Planner

J. Leung, Committee of Adjustment

Hailey Miller, Planner 1

Evan Manning, Heritage Planner, provided a summary of the Committee of Adjustment Variance Application for 4 Marie Court, Thornhill for a proposed new dwelling. Mr. Manning advised that the property is not a municipally-recognized heritage resource, but it is located adjacent to the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District.

The following deputations were made regarding the Committee of Adjustment Variance Application for 4 Marie Court:

Anthony Farr advised that he would not support the variances, as bringing the house forward 7 feet, and increasing the height by 4 feet will make the house more visible from John Street.

Barry Nelson, representing the Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill (SPOHT), spoke in opposition of increasing the height and positioning the new house further forward due to its proximity to the heritage district.

Robert Armstrong spoke in opposition to increasing the height and reducing the front yard setback.

Olana Alcock spoke in opposition to the variances, as they may make the house visible from John Street, the core of the Thornhill Conservation Heritage District. Ms. Alcock also expressed concern that there would be less grass in the front yard, which could impact flooding in the area.

Alison Chong spoke in opposition to the variances, as they may make the house visible from John Street. Ms. Chong suggested the houses should be built in compliance with the City's Official Plan and Zoning By-laws.

Evelin Ellison advised that she did not think the house was suitable for the area, and expressed concern regarding the impact the house will have on flooding in the area.

Committee provided the following feedback on the application:

- Expressed concerned that the mature trees will be injured by the new house and inquired if an arborist report will be required;
- Expressed concern in regards to the amount of hard surfaces;
- Inquired if circular driveways are permitted in Markham;
- Did not have an objection to the new house being built in this location;
- Expressed concern regarding the variances.

Ali Shakeri, architect, representing the applicant advised that the new house was designed to have a flat roof to reduce the height of the house, and that more than half of the front yard will be soft surfaces and that the mature trees will be maintained. A front yard set-back variance is being requested, as the house cannot be positioned further back in the property due to its proximity to the Don River

watershed and restrictions put in place by the Toronto and Region and Conservation Authority. He also noted that the site of the proposed new house is also not within the heritage district.

Regan Hutcheson agreed to look into whether an arborist report is required for the trees in the front, and noted that Heritage Staff's comments were specifically focussed on whether the variances in support of the new house would negatively impact the heritage conservation district or specific heritage attributes.. Mr. Hutcheson advised that circular driveways are not permitted in heritage districts, but that the proposed new house is not located within the heritage district, and would be subject to the City's Driveway By-law.

Elizabeth Wimmer advised that circular driveways are permitted in Markham, but that certain criteria must be met for this type of driveway to be permitted.

Recommendation:

That the deputations from Anthony Farr, Barry Nelson, Robert Armstrong, Olana Alcock, Alison Chong, and Evelin Ellison, regarding the Committee of Adjustment Variance Application, 4 Marie Court Thornhill, Proposed New dwelling, be received.

That the Communications from Diane Berwick, Helen Azgin, Linda Nicol, Valerie Burke, and Anthony Farr, regarding the Committee of Adjustment Variance Application, 4 Marie Court Thornhill, Proposed New Dwelling, be received.

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the requested variances to permit a new detached residential dwelling at 4 Marie Court.

**Carried**

#### **5.4 SITE PLAN CONTROL AND COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT VARIANCE APPLICATION**

##### **36 WASHINGTON STREET MARKHAM VILLAGE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT PROPOSED 2 STOREY REAR ADDITION TO AN EXISTING HERITAGE DWELLING (16.11)**

**FILE NUMBERS:**

- SPC 21 120140
- A/078/21

Extracts:

R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

J. Leung, Committee of Adjustment

David Wilson declared a conflict of interest on Item No. 5.4 - Site Plan Control and Committee of Adjustment Variance Application, 36 Washington Street, Markham Village Heritage Conservation District, Proposed 2 Storey Rear Addition to an Existing Heritage Dwelling, as he knows the property owner.

Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner, presented the staff memorandum on the applications for variances and Site Plan Control.

Barry Nelson provided a deputation on the historical significance of kitchen tails, and suggested that they should be celebrated in these type of homes.

Mr. Wokral agreed that kitchen tails can be historically significant, but explained they often have structural problems due to substandard construction compared to the rest of the house, and that they are often located where it is most practical to construct additions to existing houses..

Committee inquired why two kitchens are being proposed for the dwelling.

Russ Gregory advised that the drawings include two kitchens, as the applicant is also in the process of applying to re-zone the property from commercial to a residential use, which would include a ground level second suite.

Recommendations:

THAT the deputation by Barry Nelson regarding the Site Plan Control and Committee of Adjustment Variance Application, 36 Washington Street, Markham Village Heritage Conservation District, Proposed 2 Storey Rear Addition to an Existing Heritage Dwelling, be received.

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the demolition of the one storey heritage kitchen tail of the existing dwelling;

THAT Heritage Markham supports the proposed re-opening of the front veranda, the design of the proposed two-storey rear addition and the requested variance to expand a legal non-conforming use from a heritage perspective;

THAT Heritage Markham delegates final review of the variance application to Heritage Section staff;

THAT Heritage Markham delegates final review of the site plan application to Heritage Section staff provided that:

- That the existing later cladding of the heritage portion of the dwelling is to be removed to reveal and restore the original underlying wooden cladding;
- That the elevations be revised to reflect the retention of all the existing original historic wooden windows on the south, east and north elevations;
- That the bump-out for the proposed gas fireplace shown on the south wall of the heritage portion of the house be deleted;
- That the designer provide veranda details reflective of local historic verandas of the same period of the house;

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

**Carried**

## **5.5 COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT VARIANCE APPLICATION**

### **11 PAVILLION STREET**

#### **UNIONVILLE**

#### **PROPOSED NEW ACCESSORY BUILDING AND UNCOVERED PORCH (16.11)**

#### **FILE NUMBER:**

**A/074/21**

#### Extracts:

R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Heritage Planner

J. Leung, Committee of Adjustment

#### Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the requested variances to permit a new accessory building and uncovered porch at 11 Pavillion Street.

AND THAT final review of the forthcoming site plan control application and any other development application required to approve the proposed development be delegated to Heritage Section staff.

**Carried**

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

### **6.1 NOTICE OF INTENTION TO DEMOLISH**

**ALEXANDER MCPHERSON HOUSE  
31 VICTORY AVE  
MILLIKEN COMMUNITY (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER: DP 120197

Extracts:

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

Peter Workal provided an overview of the staff memorandum and material. Staff do not support the proposed demolition of the McPherson House. Staff recommend that the house be incorporated and restored as a dwelling within the townhouse development. Staff is in the process of working with the applicant to withdraw the demolition request.

Committee supported staff's recommendation.

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham does not support the proposed demolition of the McPherson House and recommends that it be appropriately incorporated as a dwelling within the proposed townhouse development.

**Carried**

### **6.2 NOTICE OF INTENTION TO DEMOLISH**

**32 JOSEPH STREET  
MARKHAM VILLAGE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER: N/A

Extracts:

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

David Wilson declared a conflict on interest on Item No. 6.3 – Notice of Demolition 32 Joseph Street, as he plays hockey with the applicant.

Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner, presented the staff memorandum on the request to demolish 32 Joseph Street. Staff noted that consideration of the demolition of the house should be based on its overall contribution to the heritage character in the district, and should not be based on the merits of the design of the proposed new house. Mr. Wokral advised that a decision on the demolition is necessary, as this is the third time the application has been brought forward to the Committee, and the matter is to be considered by the Development Services Committee prior to the summer recess.

After discussion, the Committee decided not to support the demolition request due to it being classified under the Heritage Conservation District Plan, as a B-Type building.

Gregory Russ, representing the applicant, expressed his disappointment in the Committee's decision, and advised that he would be challenging the decision at Council.

Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham in accordance with the policies contained in the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District Plan regarding the demolition of Type 'B' buildings does not support the demolition of the existing detached dwelling at 32 Joseph Street because it is relatively significant in contributing to the overall heritage character of the district and encourages the owner to design a compatible addition, but has no objection to the demolition of the existing detached garage;

AND THAT the future updating of the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District Plan provide greater clarity regarding the demolition of non-heritage complementary buildings to provide greater certainty to the potential purchasers of these properties.

**Carried**

### **6.3 HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATION**

#### **233 MAIN STREET, UNIONVILLE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT REAR YARD SPORTS PAD (16.11)**

**FILE NUMBERS:**

- PENDING

Extracts:

R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

J. Rahim, By-Law Enforcement

C. Storto, City Solicitor

This item was deferred to a future Heritage Markham Committee meeting at the request of the property owner

6.4 **REVISION TO LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF HERITAGE DESIGNATION  
BY-LAW 2008-190  
5933 FOURTEENTH AVENUE  
ZA 16 130764, SU 16 130764, SPC 20 110863 (16.11)**

Extracts:

R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Heritage Planner

Evan Manning, Heritage Planner, presented the staff memorandum on the Revision to the Legal Description of By-Law 2008-190.

Committee briefly discussed the narrow and irregularly shaped parcel of land along Fourteenth Avenue being conveyed to the Region for transportation purposes and whether this had any impact on the cultural heritage resource.

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection to amending Schedule A of By-law 2008-190 to exclude the portion of land conveyed to the Region of York for transportation purposes.

**Carried**

**8. PART SIX - NEW BUSINESS**

Committee briefly discussed how to evaluate the value of houses/properties identified in heritage conservation districts classified as “Type B” buildings or non heritage buildings which are considered to be complementary to neighbouring heritage buildings in terms of their scale, form, massing and material, and which may support and help define the heritage character of the district.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

The Heritage Markham Committee adjourned at 10:25 PM.