



# Heritage Markham Committee Minutes

**Meeting Number: 4**  
**April 13, 2022, 7:30 PM**  
**Electronic Meeting**

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

---

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

Councillor Reid McAlpine, Chair, convened the meeting at 7:31 PM. He noted that the meeting is being held electronically due to ongoing concerns around public health 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

The Chair, Councillor Reid McAlpine, disclosed an interest with respect to item 6.3, 27 Victoria Avenue, UHCD, by nature of being the owner of the property.

## 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.

Recommendation:

That the April 13, 2022 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved.

**Carried**

**3.2 MINUTES OF THE MARCH 9, 2022 HERITAGE MARKHAM COMMITTEE MEETING (16.11)**

Recommendation:

That the minutes of the Heritage Markham Committee meeting held on March 9, 2022 be received and adopted.

**Carried**

**3.3 CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE CITY CLERK, USE OF CORPORATE RESOURCES FOR ELECTION PURPOSES POLICY**

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning addressed the Committee and advised that the memorandum was information for the Committee members to be aware of related to the use of City resources during an election period.

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham Committee receive the correspondence from the City Clerk on “Use of Corporate Resources for Election Purposes Policy” as information.

**Carried**

**4. PART TWO - DEPUTATIONS**

There were no deputations.

**5. PART THREE - CONSENT**

**5.1 HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATION**

**DELEGATED APPROVAL BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF**

**354 MAIN STREET NORTH, (MVHCD), 18 JOHN STREET (THCD), 139A MAIN STREET (UHCD), 1 KALVINSTER DRIVE (Part IV), 12 GEORGE STREET (MVHCD) (16.11)**

**FILE NUMBERS:**

HE 21 136034

HE 22 110935

HE 22 111596

HE 22 115724

HE 22 115916

**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**

**5.2 REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK, DESIGNATION BY-LAW AMENDMENTS**

**60 MAPLE PARKWAY (FORMERLY 4438 FOURTEENTH AVENUE), 15 HERITAGE CORNERS LANE (FORMERLY 9251 HIGHWAY 48 NORTH), 99 THOROUGHbred WAY (FORMERLY 9804 MCCOWAN ROAD), 43 CASTLEVIEW CRESCENT (FORMERLY 10077 WOODBINE AVENUE), 8 GREEN HOLLOW COURT (FORMERLY 9516 NINTH AVENUE), 20 MACKENZIE'S STAND AVENUE (FORMERLY 8083 WARDEN AVENUE), 8 WISMER PLACE (FORMERLY 10391 WOODBINE AVENUE), 9899 MARKHAM ROAD (FORMERLY 9899 HIGHWAY 48), 628 WILFRED MURISON AVENUE (FORMERLY 9486 MCCOWAN ROAD), 7 BEWELL DRIVE (FORMERLY 7447 NINTH LINE) (16.11)**

**Extracts:**

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Heritage Planner

Staff advised that the address for 8 Green Hollow Court should be revised to reflect 9516 Ninth Avenue, and not 9652 Ninth Avenue as published in the agenda.

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the proposed amended by-laws for the following properties:

60 Maple Parkway (formerly 4438 Fourteenth Avenue)  
 15 Heritage Corners Lane (formerly 9251 Highway 48 North)  
 99 Thoroughbred Way (formerly 9804 McCowan Road)  
 43 Castlevue Crescent (formerly 10077 Woodbine Avenue)  
 8 Green Hollow Court (formerly 9516 Ninth Avenue)  
 20 Mackenzie's Stand Avenue (formerly 8083 Warden Avenue)  
 8 Wismer Place (formerly 10391 Woodbine Avenue)  
 9899 Markham Road (formerly 9899 Highway 48)  
 628 Wilfred Murison Avenue (formerly 9486 McCowan Road)  
 7 Bewell Drive (formerly 7447 Ninth Line)

**Carried**

### **5.3 PERMIT APPLICATIONS**

#### **DELEGATED APPROVAL OF BUILDING PERMITS BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF**

**3990 14TH AVE., 4355 HWY 7. 7E. (UHCD) (16.11)**

**FILE NUMBERS:**

AL 21 142998

AL 22 112077

**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**

## **6. PART FOUR - REGULAR**

## 6.1 REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK

### **PROPOSED RELOCATION OF HERITAGE DWELLING TO MARKHAM HERITAGE ESTATES PROPOSED RELOCATION OF THE JOHN KOCH HOUSE TO 14 HERITAGE CORNERS LANE, MARKHAM HERITAGE ESTATES 10062 HIGHWAY 48, MARKHAM (16.11)**

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner, addressed the committee and summarized the memorandum, noting that the Applicant was previously allotted 14 Heritage Corners Lane, Markham Heritage Estates, for the relocation of the Reverend Jenkins House. Due to building condition complications and other legal issues, with the Reverend Jenkins House, the Applicant was given the opportunity to seek other possible candidate heritage buildings that could be relocated to the property. The John Koch House was selected by the Applicant and is supported by Staff given: a) its historical significance, b) the absence of future development plans on its current property, and: c) the deteriorating condition of the vacant dwelling.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Commented that it was unfortunate that less than 10% of the Reverend Jenkins House could actually be salvaged.
  - Staff noted that the contractor initially indicated that 80% of the house could be salvaged but that was found not to be the case.
- Requested an update on the Reverend Jenkins House at the committee's next meeting.
  - Staff noted that the Reverend Jenkins House was currently part of a litigation, and the Heritage Markham Committee would be provided an update in the future as it may be improper to provide comment on the matter at this time.

#### Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham considers the John Koch Farmhouse located at 10062 Highway 48 to meet the eligibility criteria for relocation to Markham Heritage Estates;

THAT Heritage Markham supports the relocation and restoration of the John Koch Farmhouse to 14 Heritage Corners Lane in light of the situation regarding the Reverend Jenkins House;

THAT Heritage Markham supports the designation of the property containing the relocated John Koch Farmhouse at Markham Heritage Estates pursuant to Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act and obtaining a Heritage Easement Agreement with the City to further protect the cultural heritage resource at its new location;

AND THAT the site plan application and any development application required to relocate and restore the John Koch Farmhouse in Markham Heritage Estates be referred to Heritage Section staff, provided that it is moved intact as it exists at 10062 Highway 48, and there are no proposed additions or significant alterations.

**Carried**

## **6.2 SITE PLAN CONTROL APPLICATION**

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

#### **FILE NUMBERS:**

SPC 21 140484

SPC 21 142835

#### **Extracts:**

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner, addressed the Committee and commented that revisions had been made to the designs following the presentation at the February 9, 2022 Heritage Markham meeting.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Details on specific elevations were requested.
  - Staff provided clarification on the elevations and advised that the roof-top patio was removed from the design of 52 Nelson Street as it overlooked the neighbouring property, however the rooftop patio on the current 50 Nelson Street design only overlooked the Applicant's own property. As such, Staff did not request its removal.

#### **Recommendations:**

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection to the general design of the proposed new dwelling at 50 Nelson St. from a heritage perspective and delegates final review of any required development application to Heritage Section Staff subject to the implementation of the following revisions:

- That stucco be limited to the north elevation so that it is not visible from the public realm;
- That the proposed ledge rock foundation treatment be revised to a reflect traditional stonework in terms of coursing, dimensions and stone type;
- That the hipped roof be replaced with east and west facing gables;
- That the proposed metal roof be a standing seam metal roof or other historically appropriate sheet type of metal;
- That the windows of the street facing façade be single or double hung in operation;
- That the proposed window opening surrounds be replaced by window details reflective of historic brick homes of Markham Village;
- That the porch details be more reflective of historic Markham porches and verandas;
- That all windows and railings comply with the City's Bird Friendly Guidelines

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection to the general design of the proposed new dwelling at 52 Nelson St. from a heritage perspective, and delegates final review of any required development application to Heritage Section Staff, subject to the implementation of the following revisions:

- That stucco be limited to the north elevation so that it is not visible from the public realm;
- That the proposed ledge rock foundation treatment be revised to a reflect traditional stonework in terms of coursing, dimensions and stone type;
- That the hipped roof be revised to have east and west facing gables;
- That the window facing the street be single or double hung in operation and the proposed stucco window surrounds be replaced with detailing replicating historic Markham brick work and window treatments;
- That the front porch details be more reflective of historic Markham porches and verandas.

- That all windows and glass railings comply with the City of Markham Bird Friendly Guidelines.

**Carried**

### **6.3 SITE PLAN CONTROL APPLICATION**

#### **PROPOSED ADDITION TO AN EXISTING HERITAGE DWELLING 27 VICTORIA AVE., UNIONVILLE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DWELLING (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER:  
SPC 22 111838

Extracts to:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

The Chair, Councillor Reid McAlpine, disclosed a pecuniary interest with respect to item 6.3, 27 Victoria Avenue, UHCD, by nature of being the owner of the property. He vacated the position of Chair and excused himself from the meeting for the discussion and voting of this item.

In accordance with the Committee's Terms of Reference, as the Chair and Vice Chair were not present, Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning, presided over the selection of an Acting Chair. Councillor Keith Irish nominated Elizabeth Wimmer as Acting Chair, which she accepted. As there was no opposition, Elizabeth Wimmer assumed the role of Acting Chair for item 6.3.

Councillor Keith Irish and Councillor Karen Rea recused themselves from the discussion and abstained from voting on this item, due to their relationship as friends and colleagues of Councillor Reid McAlpine, but did not leave the meeting.

Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner, addressed the Committee and provided a summary of the Staff comments and recommendations from the memorandum.

Andrew McAlpine, the Applicant's representative and architect of the project, was present. He addressed the Committee and provided a few comments:

- Regarding the Staff comment to reduce the roof height of the addition, Andrew McAlpine noted that the design intent was to retain the visual simplicity of the dwelling and that lowering the roof height would require an adjustment to some of the window heights. Mr. McAlpine commented that the trees on the property limited the visibility of the extension from the roadway,



with minimal impact as viewed from Victoria Avenue, and noted that the heritage house continued to be the visual focus of the property.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Acknowledged that typically the Committee preferred the height of the addition to be lower than the heritage house, but noted that lowering the roof line to mitigate its visual impact from the street was not necessary due to the limited visibility of the addition from the most significant view of the house from Victoria Avenue:
- Expressed understanding for the Applicant's desire for the floor heights to be consistent with newer homes, as it could affect the value of the house.
- Questioned the concern by staff with the upper balcony railings.
  - Andrew McAlpine commented that the heritage design was for railings to be 3 feet high or less, but current Ontario Building Code required that railings be nearly 4 feet high, causing it to be more obvious that the balcony was not part of the original building.
  - Staff commented that there was an example in Markham Heritage Estates where a balcony with OBC compliant railings was installed and was frequently commented on negatively by visitors. Staff also noted that the new railing height and spacing impacted the homeowners use of the balcony when seated as the view would be limited.
- Inquired whether the balcony (as revised) was decorative or functional:
  - The applicant's representative advised that the door to the balcony would be operational and allow one or two persons to step out onto the balcony, but the space was fairly restricted.
- Inquired whether the roof pitch could be maintained if the roof height was lowered:
  - The applicant's representative advised it was a possibility, but believed the current roof pitch complemented the heritage house better.
- Inquired about the room heights in the addition.
  - The applicant's representative advised that the first and second floor were just under 9 feet high.
- Inquired whether dormers were considered to maintain some of the ceiling height.

- The applicant's representative advised that sketches were done, but the addition of dormers did not suit the house design, and did not improve the look of the house.

Staff noted that if a Committee member abstains from voting, the member's vote is considered in the negative.

Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the proposed demolition of the existing one storey rear addition at 27 Victoria Avenue;

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection to the general form, massing, materials and architectural details of the proposed two storey rear addition from a heritage perspective subject to the revisions identified below;

- ~~THAT the height of the proposed two storey addition be reduced by a minimum of 2 ft. to make the addition more in scale with the existing heritage dwelling and that the volumes of the proposed second floor rooms be contained within the roof structure;~~
- THAT notwithstanding the policies contained in the Unionville Heritage Conservation District Plan regarding skylights, Heritage Markham has no objection to the proposed skylight on the east facing slope of the rear tail of the heritage portion of the house provided it is flat in profile and of a glazing that closely matches the colour of the roof;
- THAT Heritage Markham does not support the proposed new veranda and balcony on the west side of the rear tail of the heritage portion of the house, but would support a smaller balcony within the existing veranda roof utilizing the existing turned porch posts;

AND THAT final review of the site plan application be referred to Heritage Section staff, provided that the revisions recommended by the Committee are incorporated into the proposal.

**Carried**

#### **6.4 FORTHCOMING HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATION**

##### **EXTERIOR PAINTING AND STOREFRONT MODIFICATIONS 182 MAIN STREET, UNIONVILLE (16.11)**

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Heritage Planner

Elizabeth Wimmer vacated the seat of Acting Chair. Councillor Reid McAlpine returned to the meeting and resumed the role of Chair.

Evan Manning, Heritage Planner, addressed the Committee and provided a summary of the memorandum, noting that the applicant was proposing to repaint the majority of the building exterior in a gray/beige similar to the colour approved by Heritage Section staff in 2016, and would paint the storefront in a similar shade of blue to the existing for branding purposes. The Applicant expressed willingness to work with staff to find a suitable blue colour.

The Committee members provided the following feedback:

- Inquired whether there was a limitation on the size of proposed signage as seen in the rendering submitted by the applicant, and whether the proposed sign conformed to the sign bylaw.
  - Staff advised that focus had been on the colour rather than the sign size but that conformance with the sign by-law would be required.
  - Staff commented that where “Décor Gallery” appeared on the rendering was considered the sign band and that the permitted letter area was determined by a percentage of total area as described in the sign bylaw.
- Inquired whether the Committee could provide further comment on the selected shade of blue.
- Suggested a smaller area of blue, with a return of more traditional colour to the door and frame and windows.
  - Staff commented that the previous iteration of the store front, from the previous occupant, was more traditional with the decorative elements and frontage being in a different colour from the rest of the building.
- Commented that the proposed colouring was tasteful, provided that the blue was more muted, and that it may not be necessary for the entire frontage to be blue to highlight the architectural features of the face.
- Informed fellow members that the applicant’s particular use of the store was expected to be temporary as it was related to the condominium proposed to the rear of the property.

Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham does not support the exterior paint colour proposed for the storefront component of the building and recommends that the applicant work with Heritage Section staff and the relevant Heritage Markham sub-committee on a suitable replacement colour, and that approval of that paint colour be addressed via delegated authority;

AND THAT Heritage Markham does not support the awning covering the transom window and recommends the front door include glazing to conform to the historical configuration of nineteenth century storefronts (as opposed to a solid door treatment)

**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 8:39 p.m.