



Heritage Markham Committee Minutes

Meeting Number: 1
January 12, 2022, 7:00 PM
Electronic Meeting

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

Councillor Keith Irish, Chair, convened the meeting at 7:01 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

- Heritage Permit Application - 182 Main Street, Unionville

2. New Business from Committee Members

A deputation was made by Barry Nelson, representing *The Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill*, regarding the Agenda. Mr. Nelson noted the items he wished to provide comment on in the meeting and requested that deputations be received at the time the item is considered.

Recommendation:

THAT the deputation by Barry Nelson, on behalf of *The Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill* regarding the Agenda, be received;

THAT the Addendum Agenda item be accepted;

AND THAT the January 12, 2022 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved, as amended.

Carried

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

A deputation was made by Barry Nelson, representing *The Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill*, regarding the minutes. He commented that any clerks identified as being in attendance should be available for communication during the meeting, and advised that at the December 8, 2021 meeting, deputations could not be made for an item before it was voted on. Mr. Nelson provided a link to the Heritage Tool Kit from the former Ministry of Culture (now called the Ministry of Heritage, Sport, Tourism and Culture Industries) and requested that it be distributed to the Committee members. He also provided comment on when the chair should vote on items before the committee.

Recommendation:

THAT the deputation by Barry Nelson, on behalf of *The Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill*, be received;

AND THAT the minutes of the Heritage Markham Committee meeting held on December 8, 2021 be received and adopted.

Carried

3.3 END OF TERM FOR COMMITTEE MEMBER DOUG DENBY (16.11)

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning addressed the Committee and provided a summary of the staff memorandum.

A deputation was made by Barry Nelson, representing *The Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill*, acknowledging Mr. Denby's passion for the preservation of Markham's heritage resources, his respectfulness towards the Staff and delegates, and his actions as an active representative of his community.

Recommendation:

THAT the deputation by Barry Nelson, on behalf of *The Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill*, be received;

AND THAT Heritage Markham thanks Doug Denby for his commitment and service to the Heritage Markham Committee, and recognizes his contribution in helping to protect and preserve the heritage resources in Markham.

Carried

3.4 INFORMATION

HERITAGE MARKHAM COMMITTEE 2021 YEAR END SUMMARY AND STATISTICS (16.11)

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning addressed the Committee and provided a summary of the staff memorandum, noting that the summary was based on the number of Agenda items for the previous year and did not necessarily reflect the total number of applications received by the City. Mr. Hutcheson noted that there was a significant increase in requests from commercial property owners for financial assistance, and the number of site plan applications had returned to pre-pandemic levels. He also reported that the Committee experienced one of the largest turnovers of committee members in 2021. Mr. Hutcheson expressed appreciation to the volunteers for their time, and noted with the exception of one meeting absence, that the three Councillors on the Committee attended all the meetings.

A deputation was made by Barry Nelson, representing *The Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill*. He commented on the contributions Heritage Markham made through its role as an advisory body. Mr. Nelson expressed interest in the financial contribution to the reserve fund related to demolitions and other matters, and how the funds were spent.

The Committee thanked the staff and acknowledged their hard work, noting that in addition to the time spent preparing the agendas, numerous phone calls and emails were answered on a regular basis that were not captured in the summary.

Recommendation:

THAT the deputation by Barry Nelson, on behalf of *The Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill* be received;

AND THAT Heritage Markham Committee receive the information on Heritage Markham Committee 2021 Year End Summary and Statistics, as information.

Carried

3.5 HERITAGE MARKHAM ELECTION AND APPOINTMENTS - 2022

- 1. Election of Chair and Vice-Chair**
- 2. Sub-Committees of Heritage Markham**
- 3. Heritage Markham Representative- Other Committees (16.11)**

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning addressed the Committee and provided a summary of each sub-committee's function. Mr. Hutcheson also administered the election of Chair and Vice Chair.

A motion was made and seconded to nominate Councillor Keith Irish as Chair of the Heritage Markham Committee for 2022. Councillor Keith Irish thanked the members for their support, but declined the nomination.

A motion was made and seconded to nominate Councillor Reid McAlpine as Chair of the Heritage Markham Committee for 2022. Councillor McAlpine was not present at the meeting, however he had expressed in advance of the meeting that, if nominated, he would accept the nomination. As there were no further nominations, Councillor Reid McAlpine was acclaimed as Chair of the Heritage Markham Committee for 2022.

A motion was made and seconded to nominate David Wilson as Vice- Chair of the Heritage Markham Committee for 2022. Mr. Wilson accepted the nomination. As there were no further nominations, David Wilson was acclaimed as Vice Chair.

Given the absence of the newly elected Chair, Mr. Wilson as Vice Chair took over for the remainder of the meeting. He requested members to volunteer for the various sub-committees and other committees which require a Heritage Markham representative.

A deputation was originally requested by Barry Nelson, representing *The Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill*. He noted that he had no further comment following the election/appointment of Committee member positions.

Note: David Wilson, Vice Chair, assumed the role of Chair for the remainder of the meeting, as Councillor Reid McAlpine was absent.

Recommendations:

THAT **Councillor Reid McAlpine** is the Chair and **David Wilson** is the Vice Chair of the Heritage Markham Committee for 2022 effective immediately;

THAT the following members comprise the Architectural Review Sub-Committee - **Ken Davis, Victor Huang, Elizabeth Wimmer, Nathan Proctor, and Karen Rea**, effective January 13, 2022;

THAT the following members comprise the Heritage Building Evaluation Sub-Committee - **Paul Teifenbach, Shan Goel, Ken Davis, and Karen Rea**, effective January 13, 2022;

THAT **Neil Chakraborty** is the Heritage Markham representatives on the Doors Open Committee effective January 13, 2022;

THAT **Elizabeth Wimmer** is the Heritage Markham representative on the Historic Unionville Community Vision Committee effective January 13, 2022.

Carried

4. PART TWO - DEPUTATIONS

5. PART THREE - CONSENT

5.1 HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATIONS

DELEGATED APPROVAL BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF
3 EJ LENNOX WAY (UHCD)
1 STATION STREET (MVHCD) (16.11)

FILE NUMBERS:

HE 21 146741

HE 21 147552

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

E. Manning, Heritage Planner

The following feedback was provided regarding 1 Station Street, MVHCD.

- The Committee noted that the property had several deficiencies that required rectification and inquired whether the approval of the Heritage Permit Application could be conditional on having the deficiencies resolved.
 - Staff commented that standard practice was to keep infractions separate and work with by-law enforcement to address the outstanding issues.
- The Committee commented that the proposed fence will be sited where a shed is currently located, and requested that it be noted that the fence cannot be installed until the shed is moved.
 - Staff noted that by-law enforcement will be advising the applicant that a heritage permit or depending on its actual size, a building permit, will be required for the relocated shed. The owner had previously advised staff that they were willing to move the shed to the rear yard.
- The Committee inquired whether the property was a corner lot and where the side yard fence would extend to.
 - Staff advised that the lot was not a typical corner lot shape and that by-law enforcement would determine whether the fence complied with the City's fence by-law. Staff were primarily concerned with the fence as it pertains to policies and guidelines as contained in the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District Plan.
- The Committee inquired as to whether the fence was secured into the side of the house and whether it would obscure any architectural features.
 - Staff advised that the plan shows the fence in the same plane and noted that the house was previously determined not to be of heritage significance.

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 PERMITS

DELEGATED APPROVAL BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF

7750 BAYVIEW AVE.

4400 HWY 7 E. (UHCD)

11 PETER ST. (MVHCD)

6 FONTHILL BLVD. (UHCD)(16.11)

FILE NUMBERS:

DP 21 139559

SP 21 140491

HP 21 145961

HP 21 138518

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

A deputation was made by Barry Nelson, representing *The Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill*, regarding 7750 Bayview Avenue. He noted that the term "demolition" was not used in the Agenda and recommended that it be included in future agendas to highlight the matter and encourage discussion. Staff noted that for future reference, the pre-fix letters 'DP' refers to Demolition Permit.

Recommendation:

THAT the deputation by Barry Nelson, on behalf of *The Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill*, be received;

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

Carried

5.3 COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT VARIANCE

**PROPOSED ENCLOSING OF AN EXISTING ROOF-TOP DECK
7703 KENNEDY ROAD (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER:

A/026/21

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, noting that the property was listed but not designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The proposal to enclose the rear rooftop deck on the modern portion of the building triggered the variance request for 9 parking spots where 14 are required by the zoning by-law.

The following comments were made regarding 7703 Kennedy Road:

- The Committee inquired whether there were any plans to improve the aesthetic of the exposed concrete block on the north wall of the addition.
 - Staff advised that the existing concrete block wall was a building code requirement related to fire concerns and that improvements to the wall were not requested.
- The Committee inquired whether the house should be designated.
 - Staff advised that designation was considered in 2014 as part of a Heritage Markham recommendation, noting that there were complexities to the application. The existing owners did not wish to designate the property; therefore the City negotiated with the owner to have restoration work undertaken and existing improper installations repaired (as per the direction of the Development Services Committee). The owner entered into a development agreement with the City requiring them to provide notice of their intention to sell the property so that the City could initiate designation of the property prior to listing the property for sale.

Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham has no comment from a heritage perspective regarding the Committee of Adjustment application A/026/21 requesting 9 parking spaces whereas 14 are required, noting that Heritage Markham previously supported a 2013 Variance permitting 9 parking spaces whereas 13 were required;

AND THAT review of the future building permit to enclose the existing roof-top deck based on the drawings dated November 20, 2020 be delegated to Heritage Section staff.

Carried

6. PART FOUR - REGULAR

6.1 HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATIONS

DRIVEWAY GATE INSTALLATION 146 JOHN STREET, THORNHILL (16.11)

FILE NUMBER:
HE 21 146960

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 identified as Class 'C' within the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District Plan (THCD Plan). He advised that the driveway gate appearance would mimic the existing picket fence on the property and that the primary function is to prevent the applicant's young children from accessing John Street. Mr. Manning noted that the gate installation was reversible and sympathetic in design to the character of the existing dwelling. He noted that the installation will not have an adverse impact on the cultural heritage value of the property as it is reversible. Further, it was noted that although policies and guidelines within the THCD Plan discourage the gating of driveways, the appropriateness of their installation should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

The following feedback was provided regarding the driveway gate installation at 146 John Street, Thornhill:

- The Committee commented that the proposed gate was attractive, extended the street line, and reduced the impact of the driveway.
- The Committee also commented that there was an existing metal gate/swing arm on the property, and queried its function.

The following deputations were made regarding the driveway gate installation at 146 John Street, Thornhill:

- Homeira Shahsavand, owner of a neighbouring property, presented photographs of the property at 146 John Street, taken in the last month. Ms. Shahsavand expressed appreciation for the measures taken to keep the community safe, but wanted to ensure the purpose of the gate is for safety and not to showcase the neighbour's train and decorations. She requested explicit details of the permitted functions of the gate indicating that it is used only for the community's safety and privacy.
- Barry Nelson, representing *The Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill*, commented that a previous Heritage Section staff member, George Duncan, once noted that the restriction on driveway gates within the THCD Plan was to prevent the feel of a gated community.

The applicant and homeowner of 146 John Street, Ivy Hong, provided the following responses to questions from the Committee.

- The decorations on the existing fence were for the holiday season, and were temporary in nature.
- The rendering provided to Staff for inclusion in the Agenda was a Google image with the proposed fence added using Photoshop.
- There is no metal on the proposed gate.
- The existing metal gate will remain on the applicant's property, and provide a route for the model train to cross the driveway and enter the garage.
- The aforementioned metal gate will not be attached to the proposed driveway gate.

The Committee noted that the train and associated infrastructure was not a matter for Heritage Markham to address, and that focus should be on the impact of the driveway gate from a heritage perspective.

Recommendation:

THAT the deputations by Homeira Shahsavand and Barry Nelson, and comments from Ivy Hong, be received;

THAT notwithstanding existing policy and guidelines in the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District Plan, Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the proposed driveway gate, and that the heritage permit application be approved.

Carried

6.2 HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATIONS

PATIO / STREETSCAPE FURNITURE

146 MAIN STREET, UNIONVILLE

181 MAIN STREET, UNIONVILLE

216 MAIN STREET, UNIONVILLE (16.11)

FILE NUMBERS:

HE 21 147839

HE 21 147838

HE 21 147840

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 the three locations for the proposed patio furniture. Mr. Manning advised that the Unionville Patio/Streetscape Furniture Sub-Committee had convened on October 22, 2020 and the feedback from the meeting was presented to Operation Staff who took it under consideration when selecting the preferred furniture.

The Committee commented that the local Councillor supported the furniture selected.

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the proposed bistro-style street furniture as selected by Operations staff, and that the Heritage Permit application be approved.

Carried

8. PART SIX - NEW BUSINESS

8.1 HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATION

EXTERIOR PAINTING

182 MAIN STREET, UNIONVILLE (16.11)

FILE NUMBER:

HE 22 109505

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, presenting photos of the current colour of the building, as well as the approved colour used in 2016. Mr. Manning advised that the applicant has painted the entire building in a single colour of blue, and that the colour was not chosen from the existing approved heritage colours. He noted that Heritage Staff would not have approved the current colour, preferring a more muted colour palette, and that the applicant had not consulted Heritage Section staff prior to painting the building.

The following feedback was provided regarding the exterior painting of 182 Main Street, Unionville:

- The Committee advised that the Heritage Colours Sub-Committee should provide input on this matter, which will be taken into consideration.
- The Committee inquired whether ownership of the building had changed.
 - Staff could not comment on the ownership but advised that the tenancy had changed.
- Staff commented that they would not have supported the building being painted one colour.

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham does not support the selected exterior paint colour and recommends that approval of the heritage permit application be denied.

AND THAT Heritage Markham recommends that the applicant work with Heritage Section staff on a suitable replacement colour, and that approval of that paint colour be addressed via delegated authority.

Carried

9. ADJOURNMENT

The Heritage Markham Committee adjourned at 8:40 p.m.