



Heritage Markham Committee Minutes

Meeting Number: 11
November 10, 2021, 7:00 PM
Electronic Meeting

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

Councillor Keith Irish, Chair, convened the meeting at 7:02 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

Staff noted an addendum agenda item that had been emailed to members -60
Main Street North Unit 3, MVHCD, Committee of Adjustment Variance
Application

B. New Business from Committee Members

182 Main Street, Unionville, Paint Colour

Recommendation:

That the November 10, 2021 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved,
as amended.

Carried

**3.2 MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 13, 2021 HERITAGE MARKHAM
COMMITTEE MEETING (16.11)**

Recommendation:

That the minutes of the Heritage Markham Committee meeting held on October
13, 2021 be received and adopted.

Carried

**3.3 NEW MEMBER - THORNHILL HERITAGE MARKHAM COMMITTEE
(16.11)**

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning requested that the agenda be
corrected to reflect that David Wilson is a Unionville Representative and Nathan
Proctor is a Markham Village Representative.

Regan Hutcheson welcomed Neil Chakraborty to the Heritage Committee.

Neil Chakraborty introduced himself as a Thornhill Representative, having lived
in the area for 10 years, and expressed excitement in joining the Heritage
Markham Committee.

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham Committee welcomes Neil Chakraborty to the
committee.

Carried

3.4 END OF TERM FOR COMMITTEE MEMBER DAVID NESBITT (16.11)

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning addressed the Committee and noted the various committees that David Nesbitt participated in, expressing his appreciation for David Nesbitt's expertise and participation in site visits over his ten years as a dedicated Heritage Markham Committee member.

Councillor Karen Rea expressed appreciation for the insight and wisdom that David Nesbitt shared on projects, and for his invaluable contributions to the Heritage Markham Committee.

Councillor Reid McAlpine extended his thanks to David Nesbitt for his countless contributions.

Doug Denby stated that David Nesbitt contributed significantly to the Committee and that he was impressed with Mr. Nesbitt's positions during discussions.

Councillor Keith Irish recalled David Nesbitt's time as Chair of the Heritage Markham Committee and the efficient way he ran the meetings and was able to conclude items in a positive way.

David Nesbitt thanked the members of Heritage Markham, the Heritage Staff and Clerk Staff, expressing his appreciation for his time on the Heritage Markham Committee, and that he also benefitted through learning while on the Committee. Mr. Nesbitt welcomed Neil Chakraborty to the Committee and expressed his interest in continuing to contribute to the Heritage Markham Committee in some form.

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham acknowledges and appreciates the 10 years of commitment and dedicated service provided by David Nesbitt to the Heritage Markham Committee, and recognizes his outstanding contribution and effort in protecting and preserving the heritage resources in Markham.

Carried

4. PART TWO - DEPUTATIONS

4.1 REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK

**ALECTRA ZERO EMISSION VEHICLE INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT
210 MAIN STREET, UNIONVILLE, AND 6041 HIGHWAY 7, MARKHAM
VILLAGE (16.11)**

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

J. Reid, Community Engagement Assistant, Sustainability and Asset Management

R. Yu, Project Manager, Sustainability and Asset Management

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning addressed the Committee and advised that the representatives from Alectra were present to propose signage for the zero emission vehicle charging stations planned for installation in Markham Village and Unionville, and to obtain the Committee's feedback from a heritage perspective.

Averyl Dsouza, a representative from Alectra who is project co-ordinator for this endeavour, advised that the proposed electric vehicle charging stations are part of a federal initiative and that two of the sites selected in the City of Markham are sites in heritage conservation districts. Alectra is requesting feedback on the proposed signage.

Amanda Powers, a representative from Alectra who is a marketing manager, presented a sign/infrastructure rendering proposed for Crosby CC, noting that the bollards protecting the electric vehicle chargers would likely be yellow instead of blue as pictured. As well, the two parking spots for the electric vehicle chargers would be moved one space to the right so that a uniform background colour would be present.

Ms. Powers provided the following comments, noting that the proposed design is a best-case scenario for Alectra, and that feedback was welcome:

- The Ontario regulation requires that parking signage be present indicating electric vehicles only.
- The chargers will be installed at the centre of the two parking spots, with bollards on either side for protection.
- Signs mounted to the building wall are proposed that span the width of the parking spaces.
- The asphalt on the ground is to be painted Alectra's green colour and the curb is to be painted blue.

Ms. Powers noted that two electric vehicle charging stations at Markham Village Community Centre (MVCC) will have a different setup, as the two parking spaces

are facing each other rather than next to each other. The proposed signage is to be free-standing on an adjacent green buffer.

The Committee members provided the following feedback:

- Inquired whether the wall mounted sign at Crosby CC would be illuminated, and the material of the sign.
- Commented that the signs should comply with the Heritage Conservation District Plan approved colours.
- Inquired about the location of the electric vehicle chargers at MVCC.
- Inquired about the location of the signage at MVCC.
- Expressed concern over the size of the signage, commenting that signs at Crosby CC should be smaller.
- Commented that the electric vehicle charging stations at the Markham Civic Centre have minimal signage and people do not have difficulty finding them.
- Commented that a review should be done of how the signs comply with the Heritage by-laws.
- Commented that there are ways to increase visibility other than signage.
- Commented that black iron bollards would be preferred to match with other bollards in the Heritage Districts.
- Commented that the chargers would be better suited in locations that shared the context of being fuel or transportation related, such as the Historic Unionville Village Train Station CC on Station Lane.
- Commented that the Station CC was less busy and the location would be less intrusive.
- Inquired whether the charging station type has been selected, and whether there's an option to place a housing over the chargers to blend better with the heritage district.
- Expressed concern that permitting a company to use their corporate colours in the Heritage Districts will set a precedent and may result in residents requesting to use similar colours in future.
- Commented that though location is important, people will visit charging stations within a reasonable distance since charging is required.

- Commented that electric vehicle charging stations at the Historic Unionville Train Station CC would be very visible in the heritage district and expressed a preference for the chargers to be installed at Crosby CC.
- Suggested altering the shape of the signs to be more in line with historical shapes for signs, and not to embellish the bollards as they would draw more attention.
- Commented that the electric vehicles should receive prime parking spaces to encourage the use of electric vehicles.
- Inquired whether the purpose of the signage was to identify the electric vehicle charging area or Alectra's service.
- Commented that other electric vehicle signs in the City had small signs for the sponsors and expressed a preference for the signage to be similar in size to accessibility parking signs.
- Suggested modifying the colours used on the sign as the Alectra brand colour is too modern for the heritage districts.
- Commented that Alectra is covering the infrastructure cost but the City of Markham taxpayers are paying for the real estate.
- Noted that the charging stations will primarily be used by visitors to the community, as residents would mostly charge their vehicles at home.

Janet Reid, Community Engagement Assistant, Sustainability and Asset Management, provided the following comments:

- The electric vehicle chargers at MVCC are proposed for installation on the east side of the community centre, north of the recycling depot.
- The two electric vehicle parking spots are nose-to-nose.
- The proposal is for the charging stations to be mounted on the grass covered area, so as to not interfere with operations and snow removal.
- The locations were chosen by Alectra, with the understanding that revenue is required from the charging stations as Alectra is investing the capital and is providing the chargers at no cost to the City of Markham.

The Alectra representatives provided the following responses:

- The proposed signs for Crosby CC will be static, not back lit, made of weather resistant material such as aluminum, with a steel frame.

- The proposed signs for Markham Village CC will be free-standing, and 6 to 8 feet wide.
- The supplier of the electric vehicle charging station is Flo, and the dual pedestal charger is to be used.
- Funding for the project requires the installation be completed by the end of the calendar year and customization of the charger is not possible within the time restriction.
- The company's branding on the signs partially serves to indicate Alectra's participation in the electric vehicle charging setting.
- They cannot alter the company's branding colours, but efforts will be made to mute them where possible.

Staff provided the following comments:

- Recommended a reduction in size of the sign, to approximately half of the current proposal.
- Recommended a simple or basic shape.

Recommendations:

THAT the presentation from Alectra officials on the Zero Emission Vehicle Infrastructure Project and the proposed infrastructure proposals for two properties within the Markham Village and Unionville Heritage Conservation Districts, be received as information; and

THAT Heritage Markham Committee provides the following feedback from a heritage perspective:

- **Recommends a reduction in the size of the signage, with one sign per parking spot;**
- **Recommends that Alectra representatives work with Heritage Staff to mute the colours.**

Carried

5. PART THREE - CONSENT

5.1 HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATIONS

DELEGATED APPROVAL BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF
248 MAIN STREET NORTH (MVHCD)
202 MAIN STREET (UHCD) (16.11)

FILE NUMBERS:

HE 21 142621

HE 21 142772

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Councillor Karen Rea inquired whether the landscape pavers at 248 Main Street North are just the for the walkway, or more of the front yard.

Evan Manning, Heritage Planner, advised that the proposed application is for the installation of concrete pavers, with no intention to alter the amount of hardscaping.

Recommendation:

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

Carried

5.2 BUILDING AND SIGN PERMITS

DELEGATED APPROVAL BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF
1 PETER STREET (MVHCD)
11 PETER STREET (MVHCD)
20 WATER STREET (MVHCD) (16.11)

FILE NUMBERS:

HP 21 137681

PE 21 138766

AL 21 135294

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 DESIGNATION OF PROPERTY

DESIGNATION UNDER PART IV OF THE ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT 4592 HIGHWAY 7 EAST (16.11)

FILE NUMBERS:

A/057/21

SPC 20 107969

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Heritage Planner

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham receive the draft Statement of Significance for the Bewell Bungalow as information.

Carried

6. PART FOUR - REGULAR

6.1 COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT 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

Evan Manning, Heritage Planner, expressed appreciation to the Architectural Sub-Committee for their time reviewing the proposal. Mr. Manning noted that revisions were made to the proposed dwelling, including removal of the integrated garage, maintaining the existing driveway and rear garage, and reducing the width of the house by 8 feet. The proposed windows are also arranged to be complementary to the configuration of the existing house. A front veranda is proposed based on archival material and the existing spruce tree, previously

proposed to be removed to accommodate the addition, is now proposed to be retained.

Marilyn Tufford, owner of the neighbouring property, expressed her support for retention of the garage and a desire to ensure it will not be converted to a coach house in future. Ms. Tufford had no concern regarding the shared driveway and thanked the Architectural Sub-Committee for their efforts. Ms. Tufford commented that the home was still large, and drainage remained a concern, but was hopeful the Committee of Adjustment would consider the scale of the house within the neighbourhood. Ms. Tufford requested to remain apprised of further developments.

Heritage Section staff noted that if significant changes occurred in the design of the addition during the review of the site plan application, the matter would return to Heritage Markham Committee.

Recommendations:

THAT the deputation by Marilyn Tufford regarding agenda item 6.1 – 336 Main Street North, MVHCD, proposed two-storey rear addition to an existing two-storey dwelling, be received;

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the requested variances to permit a new two-storey rear addition subject to:

- The applicant submitting revised drawings to the Committee of Adjustment that generally align with the comments provided by the Architectural Review Subcommittee on October 26, 2021;

AND THAT final review of the submitted site plan control application, and any other development application required to approve the proposed development, be delegated to Heritage Section staff should the design remain generally consistent with the revised drawings.

Carried

6.2 COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT VARIANCE

**PROPOSED NEW SINGLE DETACHED DWELLING ON ADJACENT LANDS TO A CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE
60 PETER STREET, MARKHAM (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER:

A/160/21

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner, addressed the Committee and provided a summary of the staff memorandum involving a property outside of the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District, but within 60m of the district boundary.

The Committee members provided the following feedback:

- Expressed concern that the proposed windows do not comply with the bird friendly guidelines and that the proposed dwelling is 1,000 square feet more than permitted.
- Commented that all homes on Peter Street should be part of the heritage district.
- Expressed concern delegating review of all applications involving properties on adjacent lands to cultural heritage resources to Heritage Staff, as responsibility should not fall on them for determining what is significant.
- Suggested including the discussion of buffer zones or gradients between adjacent lands to cultural heritage resources and the heritage districts in a future meeting.

Staff provided the following comments:

- The District Plan regulates the cultural heritage resources and noted that there are limited regulations on adjacent lands.
- A large number of homes on Peter Street (north of David Street outside of the Heritage District) are new infill houses.

Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham has no comment from a heritage perspective on the variance application A/160/21 for 60 Peter Street;

AND THAT discussion regarding regulations pertaining to the review of properties on *adjacent lands to cultural heritage resources* be deferred to a future meeting at the discretion of Heritage Staff.

Carried

8. PART SIX - NEW BUSINESS

8.1 POLICY / GUIDELINES - UNIONVILLE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT PLAN

SELECTION AND APPROVAL OF PAINT COLOURS (16.11)

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Note: this agenda item was discussed after item 8.2 on the agenda.

Lake Trevelyan commented that several residents were displeased that 105 Main Street, Unionville was permitted to be painted in a shade of blue that the residents did not believe is a heritage colour. Mr. Trevelyan suggested that a more specific guideline on the range of permitted colours be established.

The Committee members provided the following feedback:

- Recommended refining the colour palate permitted for specific heritage communities, possibly reviewed by an independent person, and considered for context and combination of colours.
- Commented that the Benjamin Moore heritage colours mirror the heritage of the United States and may not all be applicable to the Markham Heritage Districts.
- Suggested that further guidance be provided to reduce the colour palate for the Markham Heritage Districts, with the allowance for some variation.
- Commented that further discussion regarding paint colours was warranted but should be undertaken with additional consideration at a future meeting.
- Proposed forming a sub-committee to review and reduce the palette of permitted colours for the Markham Heritage Districts.
- Inquired whether colour approval took place during site plan review.

Staff provided the following comments:

- The colour was approved through a heritage permit, from the Benjamin Moore heritage colour palette.
- Minor changes were made, but were reviewed by Staff and permitted as the colours were from the approved Benjamin Moore heritage colours.
- Several buildings in the City's heritage conservation districts have been approved to be painted blue.

- Through the site plan approval process, the colour are usually identified.
- Most of the painting applications are from owners of existing heritage buildings that want to improve the aesthetic.
- Consideration is given to the style and age of the building when reviewing colours, as certain colours would not suit the type of building.
- The heritage permit refers to the approved paint colour.

Recommendation:

THAT the information provided by staff on heritage paint colours and the approval process for 105 Main St Unionville be received.

Carried

8.2 COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT VARIANCE APPLICATION

60 MAIN STREET NORTH UNIT 3, MARKHAM VILLAGE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT (16.11)

FILE NUMBER:

A/054/20

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

Secretary-Treasurer, Committee of Adjustment

Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner, addressed the Committee and provided a summary of the staff memorandum. Mr. Wokral commented that the establishment is considered place of amusement, which is not permitted by the applicable C2 zoning designation.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Inquired whether permitting a change of use would open up opportunities for other non-permitted establishments in future based on precedent, that may not suit the heritage district.
- Inquired why the establishment was considered a place of amusement rather than restaurant since beverages are sold.

Staff provided the following comments:

- Heritage Markham is providing a recommendation to the Committee of Adjustment, and whether the establishment has a negative impact from a heritage perspective.
- The zoning section has determined that the primary function of the establishment is a place of amusement with beverage sales as an ancillary function;
- Heritage Section staff has no objection to the Committee of Adjustment approving the requested use from a heritage perspective, as it is similar to other uses permitted by the Zoning By-law, and recommends that Heritage Markham provide no comment on the application.

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham has no comment from a heritage perspective on the variance application A/54/20 for 60 Main Street North

8.3 182 MAIN STREET, RE-PAINTING

Councillor Reid McAlpine inquired whether the paint colour at 182 Main Street, Unionville Heritage Conservation District was approved, including the trim.

Staff provided the following comments:

- Heritage Staff did not receive any application from 182 Main Street, and therefore no painting was approved.
- Heritage Staff has informed enforcement staff of the concern. By-law Enforcement will notify the owner that a permit is required, and once received, the application would likely be brought before the Heritage Markham Committee.
- Clarification is required on whether the previous trim was approved, as this colour appears to have been used for the entire building.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The Heritage Markham Committee adjourned at 9:29 p.m.