



Heritage Markham Committee Minutes

Meeting Number: 12
December 8, 2021, 7:30 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
Regrets	Paul Tiefenbach David Wilson	Elizabeth Wimmer
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 7:32 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)

1. Addendum Agenda
2. New Business from Committee Members

Recommendation:

That the December 8, 2021 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved.

Carried

3.2 MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 10, 2021 HERITAGE MARKHAM COMMITTEE MEETING (16.11)

Recommendation:

That the minutes of the Heritage Markham Committee meeting held on November 10, 2021 be received and adopted.

Carried

4. PART TWO - DEPUTATIONS

5. PART THREE - CONSENT

5.1 BUILDING AND SIGN PERMITS

**DELEGATED APPROVAL BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF
218 MAIN STREET (UHCD))
10346 MCCOWAN ROAD
397-399 ROYAL ORCHARD BLVD.
33 COLBORNE STREET (THCD)
1 PETER STREET (MVHCD)(16.11)**

FILE NUMBERS:

SP 21 133627

HP 21 143904

NH 21 127431

HP 21 132369

HP 21 137681

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Councillor Reid McAlpine requested that the agenda be corrected to reflect that 218 Main Street (UHCD) had applied for a sign permit application rather than 28 Main Street (UHCD).

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 APPLICATIONS

DELEGATED APPROVAL BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF 16 PETER STREET (MVHCD)(16.11)

FILE NUMBER:
HE 21 136030

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

6. PART FOUR - REGULAR

6.1 COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT VARIANCE

PROPOSED NEW SINGLE DETACHED DWELLING ON ADJACENT LANDS TO A CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE 23 IDA STREET, THORNHILL (16.11)

FILE NUMBER:
A/158/21

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. Mr. Manning advised that the property was not located in the THCD, but rather adjacent to the District, as defined in the Official Plan (2014), as the northern edge of the subject property is located within the 60 metre buffer zone. At its closest point, the subject property is approximately 50 meters from the southern boundary of the THCD at 179 John

Street. Mr. Manning noted that the applicant had requested variances for the height and maximum building depth.

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning noted that written correspondence was received from *The Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill* which indicated that they did not support the delegation of applications involving properties on adjacent lands to cultural heritage resources to Heritage Staff.

A motion was made to separate voting and discussion of the two recommendations made by Heritage Staff.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Karen Rea submitted a written correspondence to the Committee advising that there were negative implications when applications were not brought before Heritage Markham for comment and reached the Committee of Adjustment.
- Expressed a preference to have all applications involving properties on adjacent lands to cultural heritage resources brought before the Heritage Markham Committee.
- Noted that removing the requirement for the Committee to consider all applications involving properties located on adjacent lands to cultural heritage resources may allow some applications to be overlooked to the detriment of adjacent heritage properties.

The following deputations were made regarding the proposed new single detached dwelling on adjacent lands to a cultural heritage resource at 23 Ida Street, Thornhill:

- Evelin Ellison advised that having the plans for all four elevations would provide better context for the proposed dwelling. She also noted that by having applications brought before the Heritage Markham Committee involving properties on adjacent lands to cultural heritage resources provides an opportunity to discuss applications that could affect the HCDs.
- Barry Nelson on behalf of *The Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill* noted their understanding for Staff recommendations, but felt it was necessary that future applications regarding properties on adjacent lands to cultural heritage resources be brought before the Heritage Markham Committee as decisions by the Committee of Adjustment had been influenced in the past by input from Heritage Markham. He noted that applications that did not go through Heritage Markham and were subsequently approved by the Committee of Adjustment were not compatible in scale with THCD. He noted that the protocol was put in place for good reason and inquired as to the

original reason for the policy. He also commented how the decision would set a precedent for future applications.

Staff provided the following comments:

- The 60 meter buffer was included in the 2014 Official Plan to ensure development abutting or adjacent to municipally-recognized heritage properties did not have an adverse impact on nearby heritage resources.
- The 2014 Official Plan reflected provincial heritage policies.
- The proposed revision to the handling of applications involving properties on adjacent lands to cultural heritage resources was put forward for consideration as Staff was requested to improve efficiencies (related to the time it takes to prepare the report for a Heritage Markham agenda and the time it takes at the Heritage Markham meeting itself), where possible.

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham has no comment from a heritage perspective on the variance application A/158/21 for 23 Ida Street.

Carried

Recommendation:

THAT the deputations by Evelin Ellison and Barry Nelson and the written submission by The Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill regarding agenda item 6.1 – 23 Ida Street, be received.

Carried

Recommendation:

THAT the decision as to what applications involving properties on *adjacent lands* to *cultural heritage resources* need to be reviewed by Heritage Markham be limited to those on lands either abutting or separated by a municipally-owned right-of-way from municipally-recognized heritage resources.

Lost

6.2 INFORMATION

BUILDING PERMIT APPLICATION EBENEZER UNITED CHURCH

**EMERGENCY STABILIZATION REPAIRS
5000 STEELES AVENUE EAST (16.11)**

FILE NUMBERS:

N/A

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. Mr. Manning provided the location and context of the property, noting that it was not part of a Heritage Conservation District (HCD), and was instead individually-recognized as a Part IV property.

Mr. Manning advised that ERA Architects Inc., a heritage consultant, assessed the building envelope and observed damage to the masonry at the top of tower due to lack of maintenance and from water damage. He noted that the masonry was beginning to bow and could fail with the freeze-thaw cycle, thereby posing a life safety issue. As such, Staff were working to expedite approval of the work. The heritage consultant intended to document the tower prior to deconstruction to allow for proper reconstruction in the spring. A plywood cover for the church would be used as an interim protection measure, and the tower would be reconstructed in the Spring in accordance with measured drawings produced by ERA prior to disassembly of the damaged masonry.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Proposed a friendly amendment to the recommendation, to replace “has no objection” with “supports the plan”
- Inquired whether any materials from the existing tower would be reused in the reconstruction.
- Doug Denby noted that he had the same style of brick available for the church to use, if desired.

Staff provided the following comments:

- It is common practice to salvage brick from the original structure, where possible.
- New materials would have the colour and profile specified to match the original material being reused.

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham receive as information the proposed work plan for the Ebenezer United Church as detailed in the heritage memo prepared by ERA, and **supports the plan** from a heritage perspective.

Carried

6.3 DEMOLITION PERMIT APPLICATION

PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF THE PINGLE-BROWN HOUSE 4638 MAJOR MACKENZIE DRIVE EAST (16.11)

FILE NUMBER:

DP 21 192804

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. Mr. Wokral noted that the issue was brought before the Heritage Markham Committee for discussion in September 2021. He further noted that Staff had conducted a site visit to the Pingle Brown House, and it was the consensus of Staff that the structure lacked sufficient cultural heritage value to merit conservation. The Committee previously noted that they had no objection to the removal of the house provided that it was carefully documented during demolition, and select items salvaged (if feasible). Mr. Wokral wished to inform the Committee that the formal demolition permit had been submitted, and to obtain comment from the committee under the current conditions.

Chris Uchiyama, a consultant on behalf of the applicant, was at the meeting to answer questions from the Committee.

The following deputations were made regarding the proposed demolition of the Pingle-Brown House at 4638 Major Mackenzie Drive East:

- Evelin Ellison noted that the City of Markham website mentioned the significance of the Pingle-Brown House and the Agenda did not include sufficient historical information. Mrs. Ellison expressed her desire for the house to be preserved and integrated into the subdivision given its historical association with the Berczy Settlers.
- Barry Nelson stated that other heritage homes were conserved and incorporated into subdivisions, and believes the house to possess significant cultural heritage value.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Councillor Rea commented that a member of the public had contacted her indicating that the house belonged to their family for generations and though the land was sold to developers, they were unhappy the house was being demolished.
- Noted that the Committee had previously attempted to protect the Pringle-Brown House, and were advised that after careful consideration, the decision was made to support demolition..

Staff provided the following comments:

- The Pingle cemetery will be respected and incorporated into the proposed subdivision.
- The Pingle-Brown House is proposed to be sensitively demolished to permit the documentation of the construction techniques, and to salvage historical components.
- The intention of informing the Committee at this meeting was to apprise them that the demolition permit had been submitted, and that the development scheme had already been approved by the Development Services Committee and Council.

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection to the demolition of Pingle-Brown House provided that the owner ensures that the building is carefully deconstructed during the demolition process to discover the evolution of the structure and provides documentation of the mid-19th century construction techniques to the City, and permits that salvage of historic building components.

Carried

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

7.1 REVIEW OF INFILL CONSTRUCTION (RESIDENTIAL) IN MARKHAM'S HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICTS (16.11)

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning provided a review of residential infill construction which had occurred in the City's heritage conservation districts

(HCDs)s, and provided comments on projects that were considered successful, and others that provided a learning opportunity for improvement.

Mr. Hutcheson noted that infill construction was assessed for compatibility with the heritage character of the District, to complement the area's aesthetic and historical scale of development, as well as appropriate setbacks, materiality and colour. Details such as recessed attached garages, detached garages to the rear and the use of traditional materials was encouraged.

Mr. Hutcheson presented several examples in each HCD noting positive outcomes and missed opportunities. He noted that efforts made to work with the applicant to maintain lower roof lines and divide the roofscape provided more character within the context of the HCD.

Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner, commented on the importance of small details such as selection of material to improve the outcomes of project.

Mr. Wokral further stated that the use of stucco should be qualified in the future regarding its appropriate use and location. He also noted that the transition between new infill and the neighbouring smaller buildings is something to keep in mind.

Mr. Hutcheson concluded that a significant number of infill development occurred in Markham over the last 30 years, and noted that the presentation served as a guide for developing better and more appropriate infill in the future.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Expressed appreciation for Heritage Staff's efforts on the presentation as well as interest in seeing the differences between infill development in the different HCDs.
- Inquired how the amount of input or opposition by the community impacted the applications.

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham Committee receive the staff presentation on "Infill Construction (Residential) in Markham's Heritage Conservation Districts".

Carried

8. PART SIX - NEW BUSINESS

8.1 CONSISTENCY BETWEEN APPROVALS AND CONSTRUCTION

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Commented that measures should be in place to ensure that what is approved for the HCDs is what gets built.
- Commented that the building inspector should notice and report inconsistencies between the plan and construction.
- Expressed concern regarding future applications and incongruency between the approved plans and actual construction as the number of applications that do not comply could multiply if not careful.

Staff provided the following comments:

- Advised that several measures are in place to ensure construction as per approved drawings, including a letter of credit for each application. The review of applications by Staff at the building permit stage to ensure the permit set reflects the approved work as detailed in the approved site plan drawings is another measure to ensure compliance.
- Noted that improper development could be prosecuted under the Ontario Heritage Act.
- Commented that one recent application that involved the rebuilding of a home due to fire damage did not comply with the Building Permit plans which had indicated that the external materials should be approved through the heritage permit process. The owner and builder did not comply and submit a heritage permit application. Staff noted that rebuilding of this fire damaged home did not require the application to go through site plan approval (as the owner was to rebuild the exact same house), and stated that this was an opportunity for learning.
- Advised that building inspectors ensured compliance with the Ontario Building Code and safety requirements, rather than compliance with aesthetic considerations as approved by Staff through site plan control.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The Heritage Markham Committee adjourned at 9:17 p.m.