



Heritage Markham Committee Minutes

Meeting Number: 10
October 13, 2021, 7:00 PM
Electronic Meeting

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

Councillor Keith Irish, Chair, convened the meeting at 7:03 PM. He noted that the meeting was being held electronically due to the Covid-19 pandemic and informed the attendees that the meeting is being recorded. The Chair asked for any disclosures of interest with respect to items on the agenda.

2. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

There were no disclosures 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

There was no new business.

Mr Hutcheson indicated that the Heritage Markham member who wanted to discuss agenda item 8.1 was not in attendance and that this item should be deferred.

Recommendation:

That the October 13, 2021 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved, with the deferral of item 8.1.

Carried

3.2 MINUTES OF THE SEPTEMBER 8, 2021 HERITAGE MARKHAM COMMITTEE MEETING (16.11)

Recommendation:

That the minutes of the Heritage Markham Committee meeting held on September 8, 2021 be received and adopted.

Carried

4. PART TWO - DEPUTATIONS

4.1 PLAN OF SUBDIVISION AND ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT

10379 AND 10411 KENNEDY ROAD

MINOTAR HOLDINGS INC AND HAL-VAN 5.5 INVESTMENTS LTD.

FILE NUMBERS:

PLAN 20 133038

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Daniel Brutto, Senior Planner, North District

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning addressed the Committee and provided a summary of the staff memorandum. He noted that the heritage buildings were being incorporated into the design of the subdivision in a residential use with the buildings being kept together for cultural significance and

that the proposal includes moving the south building closer to Kennedy Road for prominence and visibility. He commented on the grading issues faced by buildings along Kennedy Road and the need for new foundations for both buildings.

Rachel Redshaw of MHBC, representing the applicant, advised that both houses would be retained and used as residences. The orientation to Kennedy Road would be maintained, as well as the relationship between the two houses with the proposed garage at the rear. The new semi-detached dwellings proposed to the south are setback to maintain the sight line of the heritage homes from Kennedy Road, and to be 2-storey dwellings with traditional architectural elements. Ms. Redshaw stated that a Conservation Plan was part of the strategy and that proper relocation and rehabilitation of the dwellings and landscaping, and commemoration would be undertaken.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Commented that the proposed proximity of the heritage homes to each other seems close and queried whether a variance would be required for the setback.
- Commented that the chicane in the road could be moved south of the heritage dwellings to allow for a larger front yard for the south heritage building.
- Commented that the north heritage building could be moved slightly further north to create more space between the homes.
- Inquired whether the south heritage building could be moved further into the lot to allow for a larger front yard.
- Inquired whether additions could be put on the houses and if additions were planned.
- Commented that the north heritage building had a long drive lane that impacted backyard amenity space.
- Inquired when the 2-year occupancy requirement timeline would commence.
- Commented that the significant spacing between heritage dwellings is part of what makes them distinct from others.
- Inquired about the number of garages each townhouse to the south of the heritage buildings would have and a preference for adjacent driveway to create more green space next to the south heritage house..
- Commented that consideration should be given to minimizing asphalt.
- Inquired whether any trees would be lost due to grading around the lot.
- Inquired whether front porches would be installed when the heritage homes were restored and commented that the front yard setback and placement of the heritage homes on the lots would require consideration, if so.

- Commented that the height of modern 2-storey buildings may be taller than those of the 19th century and expressed concern that the proposed semi detached dwellings immediately to the south of the heritage homes may overwhelm the heritage houses in size and bulk, even with the setback.
- Inquired about placing a large single detached dwelling on the lot south of the heritage homes, rather than the proposed semi-detached homes.

Clay Leibel, the Applicant, provided the following responses:

- The proposed dwellings immediately to the south of the heritage homes are semi-detached homes with a single garage each.
- One tree is expected to be removed as part of the grading of the lot.
- The dwelling originally at 10411 Kennedy Road would have a veranda reinstated as part of the restoration.
- Architectural elements can be used to reduce the appearance of massing, and will be part of the development design.
- Landscaping will be part of the Restoration Plan.
- A large home may be difficult to sell in an area with mixed residential including town homes, and having a large single home immediately next to the heritage homes may dwarf the heritage homes compared to semi-detached homes.
- The heritage homes will have their own zoning and specific setbacks, which will be determined through the plan of subdivision and zoning by-law amendment.
- Consideration will be given to moving the chicane in front of the south heritage home slightly south. The original intention was to give an elevated landscape to the heritage homes and create greater prominence.
- An addition on the south heritage home is a possibility; the north home does not necessitate one.
- The driveway length in the drawing for the north heritage house is exaggerated to show the access point but in reality there should be space in the rear yard for backyard amenity.
- Noted that the north heritage resource is currently occupied and the south heritage resource is being used by him, and neither is at risk of short term collapse.

Staff provided the following comments:

- Commented that the 2-year occupancy standards timeline would commence when the plan of subdivision is registered.

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham Committee recommends that the revised concept plan reviewed on October 13, 2021 that places the two historic Sommerfeldt Houses together on larger lots facing onto Kennedy Road is supported from a heritage perspective;

That the City's standard heritage requirements as originally noted in the March 10, 2021 staff memorandum to Heritage Markham and included below, be conditions of draft approval for the plan of subdivision and/or included in the Subdivision Agreement;

- Retention of the heritage resources on an identified lot/block;
- Protection of each heritage resource by keeping it occupied or properly boarded to prevent vandalism and deterioration including:
 - securing and protecting the building from damage through the requirements outlined in the City of Markham's Property Standards By-law (Part III – Heritage Buildings), and the Keep Markham Beautiful (Maintenance) By-law including Section 8 – Vacant Heritage Property;
 - when vacant, erecting a "No-trespassing" sign in a visible location on the property indicating that the Heritage Building is to be preserved onsite and should not be vandalized and/or scavenged; and
 - installing a 8 ft high fence around the perimeter of the house to protect the dwelling until the completion of construction in the vicinity or the commencement of long-term occupancy of the dwelling as confirmed by City (Heritage Section) staff.
- Securing a Heritage Easement Agreement for each building;
- Provision of a legal survey of each Heritage Building to facilitate the registration of the designation by-law and Heritage Easement Agreement on the created/proposed lot;
- Provision of a \$250,000 Letter of Credit for each building to ensure the preservation and restoration of the existing heritage building and the implementation of all heritage requirements;
- Execution of a Site Plan Agreement with the City for the heritage building including detailed elevations outlining the proposed restoration/conservation plan prepared by a qualified architect with demonstrated experience in heritage restoration projects;
- Implementation of the exterior restoration of the heritage building and ensure basic standards of occupancy within two years ;

- Provision of a marketing plan to promote the features and availability of the heritage house;
- Commemoration of the heritage house through the acquisition and installation of a Markham Remembered interpretive plaque

That consideration be given to utilizing historic family names from this area for park and street names in the subdivision;

And that the owner address identified maintenance issues immediately to eliminate further damage to the buildings, including:

10379 Kennedy Road:

- Repair water damage between second floor bathroom and kitchen;
- Repair of original windows to ensure adequate closure;
- Repair of roof of main house
- Removal of overgrown vegetation around the house.
- Proper boarding when the house becomes vacant.

10411 Kennedy Road:

- Repair water damage in roof framing, particular to the north-east corner of the main building;
- Repair of original windows to ensure adequate closure and repair or replace, if necessary, broken or missing window panes;
- Repair front entryway (including door frame and door) where there is water damage (i.e. decaying wood),
- Repair of roof of main house
- Repair or replace spalling/ broken brick and repoint where necessary;
- Removal of overgrown vegetation around the house
- Proper boarding when the house becomes vacant.

and if necessary By-law Enforcement be requested to become involved.

Carried

5. PART THREE - CONSENT

5.1 HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATIONS

**DELEGATED APPROVAL BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF
12 WISMER PLACE (MARKHAM HERITAGE ESTATES) (16.11)**

FILE NUMBERS:

HE 21 137172

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Recommendation:

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

Carried

5.2 BUILDING AND SIGN PERMITS

**DELEGATED APPROVAL BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF
53 JOHN STREET (THCD)
6031 HYW 7 E. (MVCD)
1 PETER STREET (MVHCD) (16.11)**

FILE NUMBERS:

HP 21 131992

NH 21 137655

HP 21 137681

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

6. PART FOUR - REGULAR

6.1 SITE PLAN CONTROL APPLICATION

121 JOHN STREET, THORHILL PROPOSED SIDE ADDITION TO A HERITAGE BUILDING (16.11)

FILE NUMBERS:

- 21 131872

Extracts:

R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Heritage Planner

Evan Manning, Heritage Planner, addressed the Committee and provided a summary of the staff memorandum, noting that the property was a Class C. He advised that a site plan application is pending, and no variances are proposed. Mr. Manning commented on the use of partial glazing for the walkway and wood siding to match the existing home and reference the 70's design of the original house. He noted that the design does not require any tree removal and that the sculpted design of the connecting structure and additional measures were planned to mitigate damage to the root structure of the nearby tree.

The following deputations were made regarding the proposed side addition to a heritage building at 121 John Street. Thornhill:

- Valerie Burke expressed concerns regarding the application, both verbally and in a written submission noting that the glass in the connecting space being a risk to birds, and requested that the motion include that the applicant comply with the City of Markham's bird friendly guidelines. Ms. Burke expressed concern regarding the height of the proposed addition and that the necessary care would not be taken to protect the tree.
- Barry Nelson, on behalf of the Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill (SPOHT), provided a letter as well as a deputation, expressing general support for the addition, with a few areas of concern. Mr. Nelson indicated that the connecting space appears to be usable living space and should be included in the square footage calculation, and would appreciate confirmation that the height of the proposed addition complies with the Thornhill Conservation District Plan policies. He also requested clarification if Staff considered the new construction to be an addition or ancillary building, and requested that the window treatment for the connecting room comply with the City of Markham's bird friendly guidelines.
- Evelin Ellison stated that the existing building was almost considered heritage as it is nearly 70 years old and that a streetscape drawing was important to

show the relationship to the neighbouring houses. She noted that the exception previously made for the metal roof was a result of the metal roof being hidden from street view, and did not support it for this property.

Francis Lapointe, an architect representing the applicant, provided the following comments:

- Noted that the void space referred to by SPOHT is included in the addition.
- Stated that various structural options were considered for the addition but found the barn-like style to be most in keeping with the neighbourhood.
- Noted the new construction is technically an addition to the house, but could visually appear to be similar to an ancillary building on the property.
- Advised that the Google Streetview indicated that the eastern house was slightly taller than the proposed addition.
- Advised that the shape of the link, with a series of mullions, and wood fins were designed to deter birds from travelling towards the windows, and expressed awareness of the bird friendly guidelines and willingness to further review the strategy to prevent bird strikes.
- Noted that window blinds would be installed.
- Stated that the metal roof was a long lasting product and consistent with heritage use (barns, outbuildings).

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Expressed bird-related concerns with the window and panel sizes
- Asked Staff whether the proposed metal roof is permitted, if it is an addition.
- Expressed concern about making an exception for the 600 square foot addition, and a preference for the addition to be reduced in height.
- Expressed appreciation for architecture being planned that is complementary to the neighbourhood.
- Queried the Staff regarding the requirement for a streetscape drawing.

Francis Lapointe, representing the applicant, advised that the windows were less than 2 sq m in size..

Staff provided the following comments:

- Staff stated that the structure was an addition that took the form of a barn-like structure, which Staff believes allows for flexibility in the roofing material used.
- Advised that the streetscape drawing was challenging to prepare as measurements of the neighbouring properties were required to complete it, which requires cooperation from the neighbours, and therefore it is only

requested when there is concern that there will be a negative impact to the neighbours due to the height of the proposed structure. Staff stated that the height of the addition was below the bylaw maximum, and that the steep gable was the reason for the height, and therefore in this case was not determined to be necessary.

Recommendation:

THAT the deputations and written submissions by Valerie Burke, Evelin Ellison, and Barry Nelson on behalf of SPOHT regarding agenda item 6.1 – 121 John Street, proposed side addition to a heritage building, be received;

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the proposed addition at 121 John 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 should the design be generally consistent with the conceptual drawings appended to this memo.

Carried

6.2 COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT MINOR VARIANCE

PROPOSED TWO-STOREY REAR ADDITION TO AN EXISTING TWO-STOREY DWELLING

336 MAIN STREET NORTH (MVHCD) (16.11)

FILE NUMBER:

A/057/21

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Heritage Planner

Note: the deputation by Elizabeth Brown on behalf of the Markham Village & Sherwood Conservation Residents Association, took place before the discussion of item 4.1 on the agenda.

Evan Manning, Heritage Planner, addressed the Committee and provided a summary of the staff memorandum. Mr. Manning advised that the architect reduced the height of the addition to achieve a complementary relationship with the existing building and reduced the size of window openings. He commented

that the variances being sought pertained to considerations such as building depth and front yard setback rather than building height or lot coverage, and that despite the as-of-right permission for height, the applicant lowered the addition to improve the relationship with the heritage building. He further noted that the new height of the addition created an eave line that generally corresponds to the eave line of the heritage building. Further, he noted that a transom was introduced along the east elevation of the addition in order to better reflect the height of the existing door opening.

The following deputations were made regarding the proposed two-storey rear addition to an existing two-storey dwelling at 336 Main Street North, MVHCD:

- Elizabeth Brown, on behalf of the Markham Village & Sherwood Conservation Residents Association, noted that the entire volume of the addition was 2-storeys with no relief to massing on the second floor with architectural features. The massing and scale of the proposed addition would make the house larger than the neighbouring homes. She noted that the neighbour to the north had a garage addition, but the massing was different, and that the neighbour to the south had a 1-story addition. Ms. Brown noted that trees were proposed to be removed to allow for the relocation of the driveway, and that there would no longer be mature vegetation; 6 existing trees would be removed because of the addition. She expressed a preference for the second floor to be substantially smaller and requested that efforts be made to reduce the massing and save the trees.
- Susan Ilott advised that the size of building was not in keeping with the neighbourhood, which is mostly bungalows or 1.5 storey dwellings. She expressed concern regarding the removal of trees and potential for the home to be used for purposes other than a single-family home.
- Donna Wigmore stated that 8 feet was not a minor variance. She expressed that a 10-foot landscape separation should be required for houses that abut Peter Street and Elizabeth Street. Ms. Wigmore advised that the proposed addition with the existing dwelling is too large for the lot and the lack of landscaping could pose an issue with the water runoff issues existing in Mount Joy. She advised that the proposed windows are not balanced, and the design is incongruent to the original design of the home, and that the original front veranda should be restored (as illustrated on an archival photo that was available). Ms. Wigmore noted the existing dwelling may have additional historical significance as it was previously owned by Alexander Hunter who was a prominent individual, and is also a pre-confederation dwelling. She advised that the integrated garage was not in keeping with the requirements other neighbouring owners were previously required to abide by and that the

garage was not inconspicuous. She also requested that the classification of the existing dwelling to be changed to a class A.

- Marilyn Tufford, owner of the neighbouring property, provided historic photos of the home to show its long-standing presence and original design. She stressed the importance of maintaining the heritage character of the area (i.e. scale), and that the revisions to the drawing since the last review were minor and did not include any changes to the exterior to integrate heritage architectural features. Ms. Tufford advised that the change to the driveway setback will create problems for neighbouring vehicles exiting their driveways, and that the large structure will impact water drainage. She objected to the proposed removal of vegetation and asked that further revisions be made to bring the house in line with neighbouring dwellings. A written submission is being provided. Ms. Tufford also referenced the design of the two verandas visible in the historic photo and questioned why they were not proposed to be reinstated.
- Jane Cotterill, owner of two properties across the street, stated that the proposal does not have heritage features and the size is overwhelming for the Markham Village area. She does not support the style of garage or removal of the trees and believes further revision is required to the design.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Commented that the proposed addition will increase the size of the dwelling approximately 4-fold and was not in line with the size of the dwellings on the street.
- Expressed concern that an existing tree is proposed to be removed to accommodate a new driveway leading to a 2-car garage integrated in the building, and that the context of the existing heritage home would be lost with the proposed garage design.
- Inquired whether the basement could be accessed from within the home rather than via a separate door at the back of the house, and whether there were future plans to convert the basement into an apartment.
- Commented that the addition appears oversized for the heritage home and noted that the side porch could not be reinstated if the current design plans were approved.
- Commented that a detached garage at the rear is preferred and inset of the second story walls
- Commented that further design revision should take into account the feedback from the deputants, including the loss of the side porch, detached garage, and efforts to save some of the trees.

- Requested that further discussion be deferred and further review be delegated to the Architectural Review Sub-committee.
- Requested that Staff ensure the driveway width complies with the driveway curb cut by-law.
- Inquired about tree preservation and commented that the trees should be reviewed with Urban Design staff and determine whether any are sensitive to development.
- Inquired as to whether staff were aware of the historic photos provided by Ms. Tufford, and requested information about a proposed restoration scope.
- Commented that an attempt should be made to save the trees outside of the building envelope, noting that the current proposal did not include plans for plantings.
- Commented that the design could include more heritage features and that a garage separate from the dwelling is preferred.

The applicant's representative, Rock Kim, noted that the plans included access to the basement from inside the house as well. He stated that the plan is for a single-dwelling, and noted that his client requested a back side entrance to the basement and the design style accommodates the low ceiling height since the existing house exterior cannot be altered.

Staff provided the following comments:

- Noted that the existing driveway was shared between the two properties, and the applicant wants to create a separate driveway that is no longer shared.
- Advised that once the site plan application stage is reached, restoration requirements will be reviewed, including the reinstatement of the front veranda, as per the original design.
- Stated that the arborist report is submitted as part of site plan application.
- Advised that the current variance application is a review of the building envelope and that a review of any archival materials would be part of future review, and that the applicant would be required to reinstate as much of the original house design as possible as a condition of approval.

Recommendation:

THAT the deputations and written submissions by Elizabeth Brown, Susan Ilott, Donna Wigmore, Marilyn Tufford, and Jane Cotterill regarding agenda item 6.2 – 336 Main Street North, MVHCD, proposed two-storey rear addition to an existing two-storey dwelling, be received;

AND THAT Heritage Markham defer further discussion and design review to the Architectural Review Sub-committee.

Carried

6.3 HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATION

4450 HIGHWAY 7 EAST, UNIONVILLE EXTERIOR PAINTING (16.11)

FILE NUMBERS:

- HE 21 140321

Extracts:

R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Heritage Planner

Evan Manning, Heritage Planner, addressed the Committee and provided a summary of the staff memorandum. He noted that the application was for the unit on the west side of the commercial complex, and that the tenant had painted the exterior brick a pink tone that is not an approved heritage colour. Normally, brick buildings are not painted. The tenant stated they were unaware of the requirement for a Heritage Permit or the need for consultation with heritage staff. Mr. Manning noted that other applicants in the Unionville Heritage Conservation District had been required to remove the paint from brick exteriors when the colour did not conform with guidelines in the Unionville Heritage Conservation District Plan.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Commented that the building was located within the Unionville Heritage Conservation District but was not of historical significance.
- Commented that heritage guidelines for paint colour should be followed if painting of the surface is permitted.
- Expressed support for returning the brick to its original colour.
- Noted that enforcement of the existing regulations was required to maintain the aesthetic of the heritage conservation areas.

Staff noted that the tenant had also changed the exterior sign without applying for a sign permit and that by-law enforcement would be informed to ensure compliance.

Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham does not support the painting of the original brick and recommends that approval of the heritage permit application be denied, and the paint be removed from the brick surface.

Carried

8. PART SIX - NEW BUSINESS

8.1 POLICY/GUIDELINES - UNIONVILLE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT PLAN

SELECTION AND APPROVAL OF PAINT COLOURS

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Discussion regarding Item 8.1, Policy / Guidelines – Unionville Heritage Conservation District Plan, is deferred until the next meeting.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The Heritage Markham Committee adjourned at 9:14 p.m.