



# Heritage Markham Committee Minutes

**Meeting Number: 7**  
**July 14, 2021, 7:00 PM**  
**Electronic Meeting**

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

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

Councillor Reid McAlpine, Chair, convened the meeting at 7:03 PM by asking for any disclosures of interest with respect to items on the agenda.

## 2. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

There were no disclosure of pecuniary interest.

## 3. PART ONE - ADMINISTRATION

### 3.1 APPROVAL OF AGENDA (16.11)

A. Addendum Agenda

There was no addendum agenda.

B. New Business from Committee Members

Doug Denby requested that consent item 5.1 be discussed after item 6.2.

Recommendation:

That the July 14, 2021 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved, as amended

**Carried**

A. New Business from Committee Members

There was no new business from Committee Members.

**3.2 MINUTES OF THE JUNE 9, 2021 HERITAGE MARKHAM COMMITTEE MEETING (16.11)**

David Wilson advised that the conflict of interest he declared at the June 9, 2021, meeting in regards to 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 was due to him knowing the designer rather than the applicant. Mr. Wilson requested that this be corrected on pages 2 and 12 of the June 9, 2021 Heritage Markham Committee Minutes.

Recommendation:

That the minutes of the Heritage Markham Committee meeting held on June 9, 2021 be received and adopted, as amended.

**Carried**

**3.3 DEATH OF FORMER HERITAGE MARKHAM MEMBER MARION MATTHIAS (16.11)**

Extracts:

R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Committee recognized Marian Matthias's contribution to the protection of the preservation of Markham's cultural heritage resources and agreed to extend a letter of condolence to her family.

Evelin Ellison made a deputation recognizing Ms. Matthias's contribution to the preservation of cultural heritage resources in Thornhill and throughout Markham.

**Recommendation:**

THAT the Heritage Markham Committee extends its condolences to the family of Marion Matthias and expresses its appreciation for her extensive past accomplishments in assisting in the protection and preservation of Markham's cultural heritage resources, especially her work in historic Thornhill.

**Carried**

**4. PART TWO - DEPUTATIONS**

**4.1 HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATION**

**146 JOHN STREET, THORNHILL  
MODEL TRAIN DIORAMA (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER: 21 125806 HE

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning  
J. Rahim, By-Law Enforcement  
T. Wilkinson, By-law Enforcement  
C. Storto, City Solicitor

Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner, addressed the Committee and provided a summary of the staff memorandum. Mr. Wokral advised that the applicant is seeking a heritage permit in support of a model train diorama on his property (primarily front and side yard), and that the consideration of the feature needs to be made through a heritage lens. Staff have no objection to the heritage permit, as the feature can generally not be seen from the public view. .

Weesh Pacheco and Ivy Hong, owners of the property advised that they are seeking approval from the Committee for a heritage permit to allow for a model train diorama on their property. The train has been shared with the community for the last few years and was designed to reflect the time period of the historic Thornhill Heritage District. They contended that the train display is not a business and that it has been installed to provide members of the community with something to enjoy during the pandemic. They confirmed that the train diorama

has been removed from City property and that no admission fee has, or is being charged to see the train, They also indicated that a member of the public has tagged the train on Google as a historic attraction.

The following deputations were made regarding the heritage permit application for the train diorama located at 146 John Street:

Homeria Shahsavand expressed concern that the train diorama is causing a lot of disruption to the community and that too many pedestrians are being permitted on the property to view the diorama. Concern was also expressed that the diorama has increased traffic in the area, that the diorama is a distraction to pedestrians and drivers, and that the homeowner has a donation box and a cotton candy machine on his property.

Mr. Heidari expressed concern that the train diorama is being promoted as an attraction and that it is a business for the homeowner. Mr. Heidari was also concerned that his family's privacy was being impacted by the train diorama, and that his family was being threatened online for contacting the authorities regarding the diorama. Further concern was expressed about perceived lack of conformance with landscape guidelines in the Thornhill HCD Plan.

Allison Duncan advised that she did not think that the homeowner's yard was a suitable location for the train diorama, as the house is located on the corner of a busy intersection, and traffic increases when the train diorama is running.

Barry Nelson spoke in regards to how the train diorama has played a therapeutic role for many residents in the community during the pandemic. Mr. Pacheco was also invited to showcase his train diorama on City-TV's Breakfast Television, and his yard is being recognized for its horticultural display. Mr. Nelson noted that thousands of cars drive on John Street every day, and that he did not think the train diorama has led to an increase in traffic volume.

Zhia Heidari expressed concern regarding the location of the train diorama, suggesting it should be placed in a more suitable location.

Shima Heidari expressed concern regarding the location of the train diorama, did not feel it had heritage significance and questioned if the train is permitted without a heritage permit.

The Committee provided the following feedback on the train diorama located at 146 John Street:

- Noted that the train was creating issues in the neighbourhood, but did not feel that the train diorama negatively impacted the cultural heritage value of the property, or the overall historic character of the district;

- Noted that the train diorama does not appear to be a permanent structure, as it has been reconfigured several times by the owner since receiving complaints and likened the distraction it creates to that of a talented gymnast practicing on a private trampoline visible from the public realm;
- Suggested cyberbullying is a matter for York Region Police and should not be considered from a heritage perspective;
- Expressed concern that the City's By-Law Enforcement Officers may be less inclined to enforce the permitted uses of the property if the Heritage Markham indicates support of the heritage permit application and it is approved;
- Questioned why they have a cotton candy machine on their property.

The Committee recommended and voted to defer the item to the next meeting in order to obtain feedback from the City's Legal and By-law Enforcement departments before making a recommendation on the matter.

**Recommendation:**

**THAT the deputations by Homeria Shahsavand, Mr. Heidari , Allision Duncan, Barry Nelson, Zhia Heidari and Shima Heidari regarding agenda item No. 4.1 – Heritage Permit Application, 146 John Street, Thornhill Model Train Diorama, be received**

**That the written submissions by David Mather, Homeria Shahsavand, and Zhia Heidari regarding agenda item No. 4.1 – Heritage Permit Application, 146 John Street, Thornhill Model Train Diorama, be received.**

**THAT Heritage Markham defer Item No. 4.3 - Heritage Permit Application, 146 John Street, Thornhill Model Train Diorama; and,**

**AND THAT Heritage Markham Councillor Liaisons and Heritage staff meet with City's Legal and By-law Enforcement staff to obtain feedback on the matter.**

**Carried**

## **5. PART THREE – CONSENT**

### **5.1 HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATION**

**DELEGATED APPROVAL BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF  
7 VICTORIA AVENUE (UHCD)  
137A MAIN STREET (UHCD)  
29 JAMES WALKER COURT (MVHCD) (16.11)**

**FILE NUMBERS:**

HE 21 125318

HE 21 126821

HE 21 126979

Extracts:

R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Note: this agenda item was dealt with after item 6.2 on the agenda.

Doug Denby expressed concern that his address is frequently confused with the Unionville Recycling Depot's address and requested that staff and/or members Council attend to this matter.

Mr. Denby also requested that the agenda be corrected to reflect that 137A Main Street Unionville (the Unionville Recycling Depot) is applying for a heritage permit applicant rather than 137 Main Street Unionville, which is the address of his personal residence.

**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****DELEGATED APPROVAL BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF****45 JOHN STREET (THCD)****20 GEORGE STREET (MVHCD)****11091 WARDEN AVENUE****26 COLBORNE STREET (THCD)****205 MAIN STREET UNIONVILLE (UHCD)****48 CHURCH STREET (MVHCD)****7892 MCCOWAN ROAD****101 TOWN CENTRE BLVD****4440 HWY 7 E (UHCD) (16.11)****FILE NUMBERS:**

HP 20 120853

HP 21 120528

HP 21 120240

HP 21 122273  
 SP 21 122155  
 HP 20 134744  
 NH 20 126281  
 AL 21 114687  
 AL 21 122059

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**

### **5.3 OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT**

#### **10 RUGGLES AVENUE CHANGE TO LAND USE DESIGNATION (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER:  
 20 132805

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning  
 M. Rokos, Senior Planner

Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner, addressed the Committee and provided a summary of the staff memorandum. Mr. Wokral advised that the applicant is applying for an Official Plan Amendment to permit for a change to the land use designation from “Environmental Protection Area Valleylands” to “Parks and Open Space” at 10 Ruggles Avenue to facilitate an enclosure of a portion of the Pomona Mills Creek. Staff do not have a comment on this application, as it does not directly impact the Munshaw House, the cultural heritage resource located on the site.

Valerie Burke expressed concern that the Pomona Mills Creek was being proposed to be covered at 10 Ruggles Avenue when the original vision for the Langstaff Community was to restore and naturalize the creek. Ms. Burke noted that City needs to do everything possible to protect the creek’s eco-system, and was concerned the covering of the creek could impact the Munshaw House.

Barry Nelson, representing the Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill (SPOHT), expressed concern regarding the impact the covering of the creek will have on the valleylands, noting that the original vision for the Langstaff Community was to restore the creek. Mr. Nelson also expressed concern that 13,000 artifacts were found close to the subject lands and that he was not aware of any archeological study regarding the cultural heritage significance of the site.

Evelin Ellison suggested that the Committee pass a resolution recognizing the importance of protecting both the natural and cultural heritage resources on the site. Ms. Ellison advised that most of the cultural heritage resources in the Langstaff Community were demolished slowly overtime by neglect.

The Committee requested that a copy of the heritage minutes where the vision for this Langstaff Community was discussed be circulated to the Committee by email for information purposes.

Committee provided the following feedback relative to the staff memorandum:

- Noted that residents would not have access to the creek if it were to remain open, as a retaining wall will be required to be built on both sides of the creek as it needs to be brought up to the grading of Highway 407. Metrolinx requirements were also noted as posing a challenge to keeping the creek exposed;
- Questioned if an archeological study of the lands is required.

Mr. Wokral advised that archaeological assessments are required as part of any proposed large development application for lands occupied by a historic waterway, but that this application is being processed by the West Planning District Team and that Heritage Staff has not had access to any relevant archaeological study.

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham has no comment from a heritage perspective on the application for Official Plan Amendment (20 132805) as it does not impact the Munshaw House (10 Ruggles Avenue), a protected built heritage resource.

**Carried**

**Recommendation**

**THAT the deputations by Valerie Burke, and Barry Nelson regarding agenda item 5.3 – 10 Ruggles Avenue, Change to Land Use Designation, be received.**



**THAT the written submission by Valerie Burke, and Adam Birrell, Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill (SPOHT,) regarding agenda item 5.3 – 10 Ruggles Avenue, Change to Land Use Designation, be received.**

**AND THAT the Heritage Markham Committee express concern regarding the impact the covering of the Pomona Mills Creek at 10 Ruggles Avenue will have on the natural heritage resources in the area.**

**Carried**

#### **5.4 OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT**

##### **REVISION TO LEGAL DESCRIPTION OF HERITAGE DESIGNATION BY-LAW 4-95**

**45 STOLLERY POND CRESCENT (FORMERLY 4075 MAJOR  
MACKENZIE DRIVE**

**ANGUS GLEN VILLAGE LTD. / MAJOR MACKENZIE DRIVE EAST  
(YR25) (16.11)**

##### Extracts:

R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

##### Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection to amending By-law 4-95 to revise the legal description in Schedule A to reflect its current legal description which will exclude the lands to be conveyed to the Region of York for transportation purposes.

**Carried**

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

##### **6.1 ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT**

**APPLICATION TO PERMIT A SECONDARY SCHOOL  
9286 KENNEDY ROAD  
GEORGE HUNTER HOUSE (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER:

PLAN 21 107046

Extracts:

R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

R. Cefaratti, Senior Planner

Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner, addressed the Committee and provided a summary of the staff memorandum. The applicant is requesting a Zoning By-Law Amendment to permit a five storey private secondary school at 9286 Kennedy Road. The applicant is proposing to relocate the George Hunter House in the same general area and orientation, incorporating it by partially enclosing it within a glass curtain wall structure of the proposed high school, so that it can be used as a student lounge. The cultural heritage asset is currently vacant, but the owner has made an effort to protect the asset from further damage.

Areez Remtulla, representing the applicant advised that York Region has requested that the George Hunter House be moved so that it is further away from the road.

The Committee provided the following feedback relative to the staff memorandum:

- Questioned why the heritage home is being enclosed in glass;
- Noted other modern buildings have incorporated heritage homes into the building in a similar fashion, for example the Bank of Canada building in downtown Toronto;
- Supported the restoration of the house, as it is currently in very poor condition;
- Satisfied with the work the applicant has been doing to protect the heritage home;
- Requested the applicant provide detailed 3D renderings of the proposal;
- Suggested making the heritage culture resource more prominent so that is not overshadowed by the proposed secondary school.

Mr. Remtulla advised that the house is being partially enclosed with a glass curtain wall to mesh and contrast the modern building with the cultural heritage resource. Mr. Remtulla agreed to present more renderings of the proposed development when the site plan application is submitted and reviewed by the Committee.

Mr. Wokral confirmed that the site plan application for this development proposal will come back to the Committee for its feedback and that more detail will be provided at this next stage in the planning process.

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham Committee has no comment from a heritage perspective on the proposed Zoning By-law amendment to facilitate a 5 storey Secondary School building at 9286 Kennedy Road;

THAT Heritage Markham supports retaining and relocating the George Hunter House in the same general location and orientation fronting Kenney Road;

THAT Heritage Markham supports the proposed concept of partially enclosing the George Hunter House behind a glass curtain wall structure provided the structural integrity of the Hunter House is maintained and the alteration is designed to be reversible;

AND THAT the applicant prepare a more thorough restoration plan for the George Hunter House which includes the retention of the existing south facing box bay window, replication of historic verandas, gable end chimneys and other missing architectural details

**Carried**

## **6.2 HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATION**

### **HERITAGE EASEMENT AGREEMENT**

#### **REAR YARD SPORTS PAD**

#### **233 MAIN STREET, UNIONVILLE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER: Pending

#### Extracts:

R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

J. Rahim, By-law Enforcement

C. Storto, City Solicitor

Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner, addressed the Committee and provided a summary of the staff memorandum. The owner of 233 Main Street Unionville is seeking a heritage permit for a rear yard sports pad, and cabana. Municipal approval of these works is required as per the Heritage Easement Agreement. Some of the work has already been undertaken on the property without any approvals. Trees were cut down without permission, and the concrete sports pad has already been built. The owner is now seeking permission for the completed and proposed work.

Peter Wokral clarified that the owner has discussed covering the sports pad with a building in the future, but has not submitted a development application or building permit in this regard at this time.

Committee discussed the following relative to the staff memorandum:

- Questioned if the property was for sale;
- Discussed whether the homeowner was planning to use the arena for private or commercial purposes, noting that a hockey school business is registered to the subject lands;
- Expressed concern that the owner cut down the trees and put in a concrete pad without a heritage permit or City approval;
- Expressed concern that a large portion of the lawn will be hard surfaces if the arena and cabana are permitted to be built on the subject lands and that this could cause drainage issues;
- Expressed concern that the sports pad is as incompatible with the heritage character of Unionville as is rear yard paved parking. The Committee was unsure why the sports pad is being supported by Heritage section staff while the paved parking at another heritage property on Main Street was ordered removed at the request of City staff;
- Suggested that new trees should be planted on the property;
- Noted that the arena would not be visible from the street view, but that it would be visible from approximately 10 surrounding backyards.

#### Recommendation

**THAT the Heritage Markham Committee does not support the heritage permit for the rear yard sports pad and the small cabana structure;**

AND THAT the Committee recommends that the replanting of trees on the property is preferable to the payment of cash-in-lieu in order to enhance the heritage conservation district's tree canopy;

AND THAT Heritage Markham does not support the introduction of a rear yard building to enclose the rink/sports pad as it would be out of character with typical rear yard accessory buildings found in the City's heritage conservation districts.

**Carried**

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

No update was provided on the studies/projects affecting heritage resources.

**8. PART SIX - NEW BUSINESS**

There was no new business.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

The Heritage Markham Committee adjourned at 9:37 pm.