



Heritage Markham Committee Minutes

Meeting Number: 2
February 9, 2022, 7:00 PM
Electronic Meeting

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

Reid McAlpine, 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 provided the methods of submitting a deputation in advance of the meeting and advised attendees that while the meeting was in session, deputation requests for items on the agenda should be made by sending a message to the Speakers List with the deputant's full name and the agenda item number to be addressed. He indicated that each deputant would have five minutes to speak on an item.

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

The Committee commented that the heading for item 5.2 “Building or Sign Permits” should more clearly indicate that demolitions and other matters were addressed as part of this item, and requested that the Staff revise the heading to “Permits” for future agendas.

Staff noted that as previously mentioned during January’s Heritage Markham meeting, demolition permits are denoted by “DP” and are clearly identified in the staff memo listing all permits. In the interest of clarity, Staff noted that future agendas will include the heading “Permits” as per comments provided by the Committee.

B. New Business from Committee Members

There was no new business identified.

Recommendation

That the February 9, 2022 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved.

Carried

3.2 MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 12, 2022 HERITAGE MARKHAM COMMITTEE MEETING (16.11)

A deputation was made by Barry Nelson, on behalf of the Thornhill Historical Society, expressing concern with respect to Item 3.5 “Heritage Markham Election and Appointments – 2022”. Mr. Nelson noted that the minutes did not reflect that the Chair scheduled the deputations to occur after the election of the Committee Chair and Vice Chair took place. He requested that the election item in the minutes be revised to accurately reflect the sequence of events from the January Heritage Markham meeting, and suggested that his deputation may have changed the outcome.

The Chair commented that discussion on re-opening the election would be better addressed in a different forum.

The Chair called for a motion to revise the minutes.

Recommendation

THAT the minutes for Item 3.5 Heritage Markham Election and Appointments - 2022 be revised to reflect that the deputant was invited to speak following the conclusion of the election;

AND THAT the minutes of the Heritage Markham Committee meeting held on January 12, 2022 be received and adopted, as amended.

Carried

Note: a second motion related to the above matter was called after agenda item 4.1 was discussed.

Recommendation

THAT the deputation by Barry Nelson, on behalf of the Thornhill Historical Society be received.

Carried

4. PART TWO - DEPUTATIONS

4.1 PRESENTATION

STRATEGY FOR CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE PROPERTIES IN NORTH DISTRICT EMPLOYMENT AREA PRESENTATION BY CONSULTANTS - MHBC (16.11)

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning introduced Dan Currie and Nick Bogaert of MHBC to the Committee and advised that they will present their findings and recommendations regarding the cultural heritage resource properties in the North District employment area, referred to as the MiX. Mr. Hutcheson noted that this matter had been before the Development Services Committee on February 7, 2022 for information purposes and that Staff will include the recommendations from Heritage Markham in their report to be provided to the Development Services Committee in April 2022.

Dan Currie advised that the study area generally involved the lands east of Woodbine Avenue, west of Warden Avenue, north of Elgin Mills and south of 19th Avenue, further referred to as the MiX. He further summarized the objectives of the study.

Nick Bogaert identified the 10 cultural heritage resources in the study area, their heritage status (i.e. listed or designated), general condition and state of occupancy, as well as ownership. Mr. Bogaert reviewed the goals of the study, the Heritage Resource Policy, main tasks undertaken, findings, conclusions, and recommendations. He noted that all the cultural heritage resources were found to have cultural heritage value, affirming their inclusion on the City of Markham's Register of Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest.

Mr. Currie recommended applying a special or modified policy hierarchy for the cultural heritage resources in the MiX use area:

- Prioritize adaptive reuse and relocation.
- Remove the requirement for a resource being under threat before considering relocation.

The consultants also provided recommendations for ensuring both occupied and vacant properties were properly conserved as development was likely several years in the future. They noted that following receipt of comments and direction from Heritage Markham, the study would be brought forward to Council for endorsement and future implementation.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Expressed appreciation for the presentation.
- Commented that many of the cultural heritage resources were not located in the centre of planning areas, but along the edges of roadways and greenways, and may not significantly affect the development potential of the study area thereby allowing for in-situ retention.
- Commented that adaptive re-use was supported and that the City has been successful in the past integrating cultural heritage resources in employment lands.
- Commented that the policy hierarchy concerning conservation of heritage resources should remain consistent with the Official Plan, and should not change specifically for the MiX.
- Questioned whether providing an exemption from the policy hierarchy would weaken people's resolve to maintain heritage resources in other parts of the City in the future – would this policy be precedent setting.
- Provided the example that heritage resources were retained in-situ along 14th Avenue and were integrated into development sites.

- Questioned what warranted treating the MiX area so differently than other parts of the City:
 - Dan Currie responded that the MiX would include a range of employment uses, including large lot manufacturing distribution, creating unique grounds for a special policy
- Inquired when the report would be going back to Council for endorsement.
 - Staff advised that the feedback from Heritage Markham would be incorporated into the Staff report to be presented to Development Services Committee in April.
- Commented that a person willing to relocate a heritage resource from this area assumes a large financial burden whereas the seller benefits financially as any heritage responsibilities are removed. A policy should be created that requires (perhaps as a condition of support for relocation) the property owner/developer to share the restoration/relocation costs for heritage properties.
- Inquired how occupied homes would be treated when the developer approaches them to sell.
 - Staff commented that the City could not force the sale or reuse of occupied properties. Existing owners may have an opportunity to join with other land owners to create larger development parcels. Further, Staff noted that the use of the home will have to be determined once the existing owners have sold the property.
 - Currie commented that properly maintaining the vacant buildings would allow for adaptive reuse in future.
- Indicated a preference for the policy hierarchy for the cultural heritage resources to be:
 - Adaptive re-use in situ, if possible;
 - Relocation on the property; and
 - Relocation to another area
- Recommended that MHBC revise the recommendation to clearly indicate that a set of criteria must be met to consider requests to relocate the cultural heritage resource.
 - Mr Currie indicated that the absence of the ‘threat of loss’ criteria allows flexibility in the planning framework both on and off site. He also

suggested that some of the criteria may still be considered to justify a relocation request.

- Proposed that owners of the cultural heritage resources be permitted to move the resource to a specific part of the land within the MiX, provided there is agreement among the owners and purchasers.
- Discussed adaptively re-used privately owned buildings near Buttonville including Buttonville School House.
 - Staff clarified that the Buttonville School House was converted by the York Region Board of Education, but noted that the ownership of the land versus building were unknown.

A deputation was made by Evelin Ellison recommending that the Architectural Review Subcommittee evaluate the listed properties as well as their current condition, and determine whether any can be designated, emphasizing the importance of conserving heritage resources.

Recommendations:

THAT the deputation by Evelin Ellison be received;

That Heritage Markham Committee receive the updated presentation from the MHBC consultant team on the ‘Strategy to Address Cultural Heritage Resources in the North District Employment Lands’, as information.

AND THAT Heritage Markham has the following comments:

- **Heritage Markham endorses the consultant report by MHBC regarding the protection of the vacant cultural heritage resources;**
- **Heritage Markham supports the concept of a cost-sharing policy between the existing land owner and a purchaser for the restoration of cultural heritage resources, especially if relocation is proposed;**
- **Heritage Markham supports the following policy hierarchy for the cultural heritage resources within the MiX lands:**
 - **Adaptive re-use of the heritage resource in situ;**
 - **Relocation of the heritage resource within the MiX, once established criteria is met;**
 - **Relocation to another area, once established criteria is met.**
- **Heritage Markham supports the concept of clustering heritage resources in a dedicated area within the MiX lands.**

Carried

5. PART THREE - CONSENT

5.1 HERITAGE PERMIT

**NEW FRONT YARD FENCE AND FRONT PORCH RAILING
293 MAIN STREET NORTH, MARKHAM VILLAGE (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER:

HE 22 109737

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Heritage Planner

Recommendation

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

Carried

5.2 HERITAGE PERMITS

**DELEGATED APPROVAL BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF
141 MAIN STREET (UHCD),
21 FRED VARLEY DRIVE (UHCD) (16.11)**

FILE NUMBERS:

HE 22 110656,

HE 22 110317

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

E. Manning, Heritage Planner

Recommendation

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

Carried

5.3 BUILDING OR SIGN PERMITS

DELEGATED APPROVAL OF BUILDING PERMITS BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF

**4031 16TH AVE.,
48 MAIN ST. N. (MVHCD),
7689 YONGE ST. (THCD) (16.11)**

FILE NAMES:

HP 21 144449,
AL 21 146266,
SP 21 146167

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning
P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

Recommendation

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

Carried

5.4 SITE PLAN CONTROL

PROPOSED ACCESSORY BUILDING FOR INDOOR POOL 11584 HIGHWAY 48, MARKHAM (16.11)

FILE NUMBER:

SPC 21 141009

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Recommendation

THAT Heritage Markham has no comment from a heritage perspective on the site plan application for the proposed accessory building at 11584 Hwy. 48 and that final review of the application be delegated to Heritage Section staff.

Carried

5.5 COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT VARIANCE APPLICATION

PROPOSED NEW SINGLE DETACHED DWELLING ON ADJACENT LANDS TO A CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE 29 FRED VARLEY DRIVE, UNIONVILLE (16.11)

FILE NUMBER:

A/201/21

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Heritage Planner

Recommendation

THAT Heritage Markham has no comment from a heritage perspective on the variance application (A/201/21) for 29 Fred Varley Drive.

Carried

5.6 COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT VARIANCE APPLICATION

PROPOSED NEW SINGLE-DETACHED DWELLING ON ADJACENT LANDS TO A CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCE 18 FOREST PARK CRESCENT (16.11)

FILE NUMBER:

A/184/21

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Heritage Planner

Recommendation

THAT Heritage Markham has no comment from a heritage perspective on the variance application (A/184/21) for 18 Forest Park Crescent.

Carried

5.7 INFORMATION

**PROCLAMATION OF HERITAGE WEEK 2022
FLAG RAISING AT CIVIC CENTRE (16.11)**

Extracts:

R.Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham receive as information.

Carried

6. PART FOUR - REGULAR

6.1 SITE PLAN CONTROL

**PROPOSED NEW DETACHED DWELLINGS
50 & 52 NELSON STREET, MARKHAM VILLAGE HERITAGE
CONSERVATION DISTRICT (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER:

SPC 21 140 & SPC 21 142835

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. He noted that there were modern aspects to the interior of the proposed dwelling at 50 Nelson Street, such as the 16 foot garage height, that seemed incongruent with the attempt to introduce a traditional facade on the dwelling. Mr. Wokral recommended that the applicant continue working with staff to ensure that the proposed dwelling more accurately reflects the heritage character of the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District (MVHCD). It was suggested that the applicant may wish to consider a building typology that is more reflective of a mill or heritage industrial structure given this area of Markham Village was previously occupied by a number of mills.

Mr. Wokral commented that the form for the proposed dwelling at 52 Nelson Street could better reflect the area's historic character, and recommended that the proposed roof deck be deleted or relocated to minimize impact on the neighbouring dwelling.

The applicant's representatives, Fariha Prowise and Reagan Jing were present at the meeting to answer questions from the Committee.

The Committee requested the reasoning for Staff's proposal to have only one of the two proposed structures resemble a mill:

- Wokral commented that the mill buildings that previously existed in the area shared many commonalities with the proposed residential architecture, with bold, simple forms, and that permitting this style of architecture could be a suitable alternative. He noted that it was a new concept that could be considered appropriate given the remoteness of the subject property, lack of surrounding heritage buildings, and the vanished historic 19th century industrial uses of the area.

The Committee inquired whether semi-detached dwellings were considered.

- Staff commented that detached dwellings were intended from the outset;
- Reagan Jing commented that the lots were severed prior to the owner purchasing the properties, therefore the expectation was to develop two detached dwellings.

The Committee expressed concern that neighbouring homes may dispute the historic mill or industrial building concept, and were curious as to the architectural character of adjacent homes. The issue of whether new infill in this area needed to be of a heritage design was also raised:

- Wokral commented that the neighbouring homes were modern in style and would likely be replaced with new buildings given that they are identified as Type 'C' buildings.
- Hutcheson commented that for new infill, Staff are striving to maintain consistency concerning scale, massing and materials within the MVHCD.

Mr. Jing commented that the roof terrace location could be changed and that modifications had already been made to achieve the front elevation required by Heritage Markham, however, the applicant will continue to revise the design based on comments from tonight's meeting. Mr. Jing noted that other buildings with a similar design to the proposed dwelling were approved by the City and inquired why their design was not supportable.

Recommendations

THAT the design of the proposed dwelling at 50 Nelson Street be revised with the assistance of Heritage Section staff to better reconcile the floor plan with the exterior, and **be permitted as an option to** reflect the materials and building

traditions of Markham Township historic mills and other historic industrial buildings, to be brought back to Heritage Markham for further review;

AND THAT the design of the proposed dwelling at 52 Nelson Street be revised with the assistance of Heritage Section staff to delete the proposed roof top terrace and better reflect the materials and building traditions of historic Markham buildings, and brought back to Heritage Markham for further review.

Carried

6.2 OFFICIAL PLAN AND ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT APPLICATION

PROPOSED HIGH-DENSITY MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION OF ON-SITE, HERITAGE BUILDING 288-300 JOHN STREET, THORNHILL JOHN WELSH HOUSE/THORNLEA (16.11)

FILE NUMBER:
20 130784 PLAN

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, stating that this was the Applicant's second OPA/ZBA submission and that revisions had been made to the proposal based on comments from City staff. Mr. Manning noted that the proposal had not yet reached the Site Plan Control stage. Mr. Manning noted that the proposed buildings generally tapered in height as they approached the heritage building (John Welsh House), and were composed of a podium and tower combination.

In addition to a written submission, a deputation was made by Barry Nelson on behalf of the Thornhill Historical Society. He noted their mission statement, and commented that in the past they had observed that development projects upon completion often differed from the material submitted to the City as part of the approvals process.

Mr. Nelson also provided the following comments:

- The infill buildings should be respectful of in-force policy concerning building height;

- The proposed development remained conceptual, and Heritage Markham typically provides comments on tree preservation, landscaping, and other matters that have yet to be resolved;
- Supported the Staff recommendation to enter into a Heritage Easement Agreement and Restoration Plan for the on-site heritage resource;
- Expressed appreciation for the 45 degree angular plane relative to the retained heritage building;
- Questioned whether the proposed development suited the character of the larger area (i.e scale and design of the adjacent Old Thornhill Village townhouse development);
- Commented on the potential to link the development site with adjacent natural areas.

A deputation and written submission were made by Valerie Burke, and she provided the following comments:

- Supported the recommendation to enter into a Heritage Easement Agreement and Restoration Plan for the retained heritage building;
- Requested that Heritage Markham review the forthcoming Site Plan Control application to address finer details such as soft landscaping, tree preservation, lighting standard design, and relationship of the proposed patio to the heritage building);
- Requested that the new buildings incorporate classic design elements to complement the architectural style of the Welsh House and the Old Thornhill Village townhouses adjacent to the development site.

A deputation was made by Evelin Ellison on behalf of Ward 1 South Thornhill Residents Inc. and Willowbrook Residents Association. Ms. Ellison provided a summary of ownership/tenancy of the John Welsh House and provided the following comments:

- Inquired whether there is a heritage easement in place for the heritage building as it was municipally-owned at one time and supported the staff recommendation for a Heritage Easement Agreement;
- Noted the importance of the heritage building as a central part of Thornhill and requested lower heights of the surrounding buildings to respect the scale of the heritage building.

- Requested that a comprehensive plan be made to ensure there is adequate open space retained around the heritage building;
- Encouraged the addition of soft landscaping behind the heritage building to visually mitigate the impact of the proposed additional density;
- Requested that Heritage Markham review the project again in the future when more details are available.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Generally supportive of the proposed development, and recommended creating a ‘main street feel’ ..
- Indicated support for the park as it enhances the views of the heritage building ;
- Requested more detailed drawings regarding the spaces immediately around the heritage building and that Heritage Markham review the forthcoming Site Plan Control application;
- Requested clarification on whether the heritage building would be moved and adjacent building height.
 - Staff advised that the heritage building is proposed to be conserved in-situ, and noted that the area to the west would remain as-is while the area to the east of the heritage building would be redeveloped into a park.
 - Staff noted the proposed buildings generally tapered in height as they approached the heritage building, and there was a fair distance between the heritage building and the podiums of the adjacent proposed buildings.
- Commented that the architecture of the proposed development eclipsed the heritage building.
- Expressed interest in reviewing landscape drawings when they are submitted by the applicant.

Recommendations

THAT the deputations and written submissions from Barry Nelson, on behalf of the Thornhill Historical Society, and Valerie Burke, and the deputation by Evelin Ellison on behalf of Ward 1 South Thornhill Residents Inc. and Willowbrook Residents Association, be received;

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the proposed redevelopment of the subject site as outlined in the OPA/ZBA applications;

THAT final review of any forthcoming site plan control application, and any other development application required to approve the proposed development, be **brought back** to Heritage **Markham for review**;

THAT heritage approval conditions associated with a future site plan control application include the entering into a Heritage Easement Agreement to ensure the long-term conservation of the heritage building, an interpretation component to make legible the history of the property, and a restoration plan to return the heritage building to a more historically-accurate condition;

AND THAT Heritage Section staff coordinate with Planning and Urban Design Staff as well as the Parks Department to ensure the prominence of the heritage building when designing and programming of the new public park.

Carried

6.3 ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT

ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT APPLICATION TO PERMIT FUTURE SEVERANCE AND NEW INFILL DWELLING 36 WASHINGTON STREET (MVHCD) (16.11)

FILE NUMBER:
PLAN 21 127477

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. He noted that a Zoning By-law amendment application has been received to change the current C2 zoning, and to permit severance of the property for residential uses.

The applicant, Shane Gregory, was present to answer questions from the Committee.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Generally supported the concept;

- Expressed concern that the deck would become an enclosed third storey in future;
- Requested clarification if there would be a second suite on each property;
- Expressed concern with the lack of soft landscaping at the back of the houses;
- Inquired how the trees were rated at the property line, and between the houses that were proposed for removal while commenting that the application should not be supported if the trees were determined to be significant.
 - Gregory advised that an arborist report was not yet available but would be submitted to Staff for review. He noted that the trees located in the proposed driveway were planned for removal as well as three trees bordering the neighbour to the south.

Staff provided the following comments:

- Mr. Wokral noted that the current zoning (C2) permitted for the existing building to be converted to an office or other commercial use, for which a parking lot could be approved that could also impact on-site trees.
- Mr. Hutcheson noted the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment and development standards being requested were in support of the current concept before the committee and if there were concerns with the concept, the committee should not support the proposed development standards at this time.

Mr. Gregory agreed to secure the information requested by the Committee to allow further discussion at a subsequent meeting.

Recommendations

THAT Heritage Markham supports the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment for 36 Washington Street to delete the existing permitted commercial uses and only permit detached dwellings from a heritage perspective;

AND THAT the issue of tree removal/conservation and the matter of development standards to be included in the zoning by-law amendment return to Heritage Markham Committee at the March meeting, or when appropriate, to allow further discussion.

Carried

6.4 COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT VARIANCE APPLICATION

**PROPOSED TWO-STOREY SEMI-DETACHED DWELLING WITH
DETACHED GARAGE
33 WASHINGTON STREET (MVHCD) (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER:

A/004/22

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Heritage Planner

Evan Manning, Heritage Planner, addressed the Committee and summarized the memorandum, expressing staff's concerns with the site plan as currently composed as it would require removal of two mature trees.

The applicant, Shane Gregory, was present to answer questions from the Committee.

Mr. Gregory commented that he did not wish to see the tree on the south lot line removed and was willing to work with staff for a reduction in GFA or to cantilever the structure so as to not affect its root system. Mr. Gregory noted that the variance matter was time sensitive in order to meet an upcoming scheduled Committee of Adjustment meeting. He advised that strategically planted trees may adequately address removal of the tree along Jerman Street as it was in poor condition per the Arborist report.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Inquired whether the applicant considered orienting the development to have one dwelling fronting Washington Street and the other fronting Jerman Street:
 - Gregory responded that it was considered, but Jerman Street (west side) was primarily existing garages and dilapidated rear yards. He noted a lot depth issue for setbacks for parking and that it would remove amenity space.
- Commented that the Jerman Street streetscape could be improved with more houses fronting on it;
- Requested the City review and provide comment on the submitted Tree Preservation Plan and whether the City would support the removal of the tree on municipal property;
- Commented that the applicant consider moving the garage closer to Jerman Street with a patio on the side:

- Gregory advised that moving the driveway would shift the dividing line of the properties;
- Gregory expressed willingness to consider plantings on either side of the driveway to prevent future paving.
- Inquired whether shifting the proposed dwelling a meter to the south would reduce impact on the tree fronting Jerman Street:
 - Gregory advised that the tree has already been sculpted to accommodate power lines, and a southward shift would still require removal of the tree.
- Commented that sculpted trees can be healthy and live for a long time;
- Requested that the applicant review the properties at 35 and 37 Washington Street for consideration when revising the site plan.

Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham opposes the proposed variances from a heritage perspective to permit a new semi-detached dwelling with a shared detached garage, and requests that City Staff work with the applicant on a revised development concept.

Carried

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

There were no updates.

8. PART SIX - NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The Heritage Markham Committee adjourned at 10:02 p.m.