



# Cultural Heritage Resource Strategy – North District Employment Lands (MiX)

May 10, 2022  
Development Services Committee




## Background

- Long-range planning underway for future urban area lands in north Markham.
- MiX lands include a number of identified cultural heritage resources.
- Direction required related to heritage resource conservation.
- Consultant team retained to undertake work.





# Study Area





## Cultural Heritage Resources

2780 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue

(Alfred Read Farmhouse – c.1855)



3010 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue

(SS #7 – c.1902)



3270 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue

(Doner House – c.1881)



3490 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue

(Gormley Widman House and Barn –  
c.1855 / c.1902)



11242 Warden Avenue

(Summerfeldt-McKay House –  
c.1835/c.1875)



3565 19<sup>th</sup> Avenue

(Lewis-Jarvis House and Barn –  
c.1870/c.1900)



11251 Woodbine Avenue

(Hopper House – c.1855)



11172 Warden Avenue

(Clayton School [SS#12] – 1874)



11091 Warden Avenue

(John G. Mustard farmhouse – c.1845)



3450 Elgin Mills Road East

(Hilts-Ford House – c.1850/1875)





## Study Goals

- Develop strategy for identified cultural heritage resources within MiX lands.
- Basis: potential conflict between
  - Goal of conserving cultural heritage resources
  - Goal of efficient and effective prestige employment area



## Current Heritage Policy

- Official Plan hierarchy for built heritage resources (4.5.3):
  - Retain in original location with original use
  - Retain in original location and adaptively re-use
  - Relocate within area of development
  - Relocate to a sympathetic site within Markham.
- Demonstration of threat of loss required for relocation offsite



## Key Study Tasks

- Main tasks undertaken:
- **Field work and assessment of properties.**
  - Extent of heritage significance: buildings only or buildings and landscape?
  - Location: impact on development potential?
  - Structure size and condition – moveable?
- **Economic Analysis**
  - Case-study research: impacts on land value and development potential



## Heritage Resources - Significance

- Identified properties have cultural heritage value.
  - Primarily in buildings /some landscape features.
  - Opportunities exist to conserve cultural heritage value through MiX development.
- A more flexible policy framework is required







## Case Studies

- A number of successful adaptive re-use cases
- Uses: restaurants, bars, retail stores, spas, boutique hotels, cultural centres, daycares, private schools, professional offices, social/fraternal clubs, and museums, among others.
- Relocation versus In-situ
- Co-existence is possible
- Value and identity.



## Financial/Real Property Implications

- Key findings:
  - large and regular shaped parcels to allow for range of uses and movement.
  - Resources should be in locations that don't hinder development or create irregular parcels with limited access.
  - If relocating, locations near the street are beneficial.
  - Publically-accessible and on large lot so that maximum flexibility.



## Financial/ Real Property Implications

- Land values not significantly impacted by presence of heritage resources.
- Potential conflicts can be avoided by integrating heritage resources into office space instead of commercial (both require high visibility).
- Significant costs if relocating buildings to cluster together. City could assist in alleviating costs if corporate objective to retain / cluster resources



## Study Recommendations

- Create an Area-specific OPA for MiX lands:
  - Modify policy hierarchy to prioritize adaptive reuse / relocation
  - “Being under serious threat” not required
- For occupied and vacant properties.
  - Occupied properties: retain buildings and landscape; consider adaptive re-use or relocation in future.
  - Vacant properties: secure buildings and ensure proper ‘mothball’
- Develop a work program re: mothballing for City owned properties, obtain funding to protect City investment.



## Review to Date

- **Development Services Committee** – input and referral to Heritage Markham (Feb 7<sup>th</sup>)
- **Heritage Markham Committee** – input and recommendation:
  - Need for ongoing protection/ maintenance
  - Consider Cost Sharing if relocation is proposed
  - Modified OP policy revision
    - Adaptive reuse in-situ
    - Relocation within the MiX
    - Relocation within City
  - Support concept of clustering in MiX lands



## Recommendation

- Endorse in Principle the study to guide staff in addressing cultural heritage resources in the North District Employment Lands;
- Initiate an Official Plan Amendment to address the suggested changes to the Official Plan's cultural heritage policies related to the MiX area