



Report to: Development Services Committee

Meeting Date: May 10, 2022

SUBJECT: Recommendation Report, Cultural Heritage Resource Strategy, North District Employment Lands (MiX), Ward 2
PREPARED BY: Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning, Ext. 2080

RECOMMENDATION:

- 1) That the report entitled “Recommendation Report, Cultural Heritage Resource Strategy, North District Employment Lands (MiX), Ward 2”, dated May 10, 2022, be received;
- 2) That the study entitled “Cultural Heritage Resource Strategy - City of Markham North District Employment Lands (MiX)” prepared by MacNaughton Hermesen Britton Clarkson Planning Limited (MHBC) in association with George Robb Architect and urbanMetrics be endorsed in principle to guide staff in addressing cultural heritage resources in the North District Employment Lands;
- 3) That staff be directed to initiate an Official Plan Amendment to address the suggested changes to the Official Plan’s cultural heritage policies related to the MiX area;
- 4) That Staff be authorized and directed to do all things necessary to give effect to this resolution.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Markham has embarked on long-range planning for the most recent urban expansion lands within the northern area of the City. A portion of this area has been identified for employment lands, and is known as the Markham Innovation Exchange (MiX) District. The area is currently rural in nature and contains a number of identified cultural heritage resources, some designated under the Ontario Heritage Act and some listed on the City’s municipal heritage register. The City indicated the need for guidance related to cultural heritage resource conservation as this area moves forward towards redevelopment.

Markham retained the consultant team of MHBC Planning, George Robb Architect and urbanMetrics to assist in the development of an overall strategy as it relates to the cultural heritage resources within this area. The strategy developed by the project team reviewed the concept planned for the MiX lands, examined various options for the cultural heritage resources, and provided recommendations that both balance conservation of the identified resources with the inclusion of the lands within a planned prestige employment area (Appendix “E”). Based on the recommendations prepared by the project team, the main potential outcomes for the group of properties are:

1. Retention of the heritage resources within the employment lands, with the resources either maintaining existing uses or being adaptively re-used.

2. Removal of the heritage resources, which would see the relocation of all or some of the buildings to either other locations within the employment lands, other locations within the City (such as the Markham Heritage Estates), or demolition of the buildings.

The assessment completed by the study team confirms that the properties identified by the City have cultural heritage value, and has identified strategies to address their future conservation as this area is redeveloped.

The study suggested a policy change to provide greater flexibility when engaging heritage resources. A proposed Official Plan Amendment would establish a policy framework for the MiX area, which would prioritize adaptive re-use or relocation of buildings rather than retention of single-family dwellings for residential uses within a business park. Also buildings would not have to be under threat of loss to consider relocation.

The study also provides guidance on vacant and occupied heritage properties as well as proper mothballing techniques for vacant properties.

An overview of the study findings and recommendations was presented to Development Services Committee in February (Appendix 'C'). The study was then referred to Heritage Markham Committee for comment (Appendix 'D'). This report recommends that the Study be endorsed in principle to guide staff in addressing cultural heritage resources in the North District Employment Lands. It is also recommended that staff be directed to initiate an Official Plan Amendment to address the suggested changes to the Official Plan's cultural heritage policies related to the MiX area.

PURPOSE:

The purpose of the report is to obtain Council endorsement in principle of the consultant's study and recommendations on the development of a strategy to address cultural heritage resources in the North District Employment Lands.

BACKGROUND:

Cultural heritage resources are located in the North District's Employment Lands

As part of the City's Future Urban Area work in northern Markham, a specific component of the North Planning District has been designated for employment uses. Currently this area is rural in nature comprised primarily of farm properties, a number of which possess buildings of cultural heritage value or interest.

The City has recently announced this area as part of the Markham Innovation Exchange or the MiX. This would be a distinctive innovation district utilizing one of the largest undeveloped opportunities for greenfield employment lands in the Greater Toronto Area. A campus-style environment is envisioned where entrepreneurs, innovators and start-ups can collaborate and grow their business.

The issue of how to address properties of cultural heritage value or interest on the North District Employment Lands was first raised during capital budget discussions regarding potential maintenance expenditures for a City owned property. Members of the Budget Committee indicated at the time that a strategy for the cultural heritage resources within the Employment Lands should be explored. Also, during discussions concerning the acquisition of a property in this area by the City, Council directed staff to consider the issue of heritage buildings situated on employment lands as part of an

independent third party study to be undertaken and to report back to Council with further recommendations.

It was felt that when considering how best to handle a cultural heritage resource, corporate wide objectives should be considered in addition to heritage conservation objectives. Although there are policies in the Markham Official Plan indicating that it is the policy of Council that significant cultural heritage resources should be incorporated into new development either in their original use or an adaptive re-use, the feasibility of this approach was questioned when dealing with these type of employment lands.

The City undertook a study to develop a strategy

Consultants were retained to consider how best to address the existing properties of cultural heritage value or interest within the defined study boundary by providing options, guidance and a strategy. The study area is the Employment Area in the North District Planning District generally bounded by Woodbine Avenue, Elgin Mills Road, Warden Avenue and the Markham/Whitchurch-Stouffville municipal boundary to the north (see Appendix 'A').

Originally there were 9 properties of cultural heritage value or interest that were within the study area boundaries (two additional adjacent properties were added which brought the total to 11 properties). Six of the properties are in private ownership, four are owned by the City of Markham and one is owned by the Region of York. The Region of York property was addressed prior to the study initiation and was removed from the scope of work.

MHBC Consultants was retained as the lead consultant in association with George Robb Architects for architecture and urbanMetrics for economics. Staff from Planning, Real Property and Sustainability and Asset Management comprised the internal staff advisory committee.

An overview of the study findings was presented to Development Services Committee in February

The consultants presented their findings to Development Services Committee on February 7, 2022. The Committee provided extensive comments (see Appendix 'C') and referred the matter to the Heritage Markham Committee to obtain feedback on the recommended strategy prior to returning to Development Services Committee for further consideration.

Heritage Markham Committee reviewed the proposed strategy

The consultant presented their findings to the Heritage Markham Committee on February 9, 2022 (See Appendix 'D' for the Extract). The Committee received the information and offered the following commentary:

- Support for the consultant's suggestions regarding the protection of the vacant cultural heritage resources;
- Suggested 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;
- Support for a modified Official Plan policy hierarchy for the cultural heritage resources within the MiX lands as follows:
 - 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.

- Support for the concept of clustering heritage resources in a dedicated area within the MiX lands.

OPTIONS/ DISCUSSION:

The goal of the study was to balance heritage conservation objectives with the development of an efficient and effective prestige employment area

Markham has embarked on long-range planning for the most recent urban expansion lands within the northern area of the City. A portion of this area has been identified for employment lands, and will be known as the Markham Innovation Exchange (MiX). The area is currently rural in nature and contains a number of identified cultural heritage resources, some designated under the Ontario Heritage Act and some listed on the City's municipal heritage register.

The City identified a need for further guidance related to cultural heritage resource conservation as this area moves forward towards redevelopment. The strategy developed by the project team reviewed the concept proposed for the MiX lands, examined various options for the cultural heritage resources, and provided recommendations that both balance conservation of the identified resources with the inclusion of the lands within a planned employment area.

The main study tasks undertaken included: field work and assessment of heritage properties; the extent of the heritage significance (buildings only or landscapes); the location of the resources as to their impact on development potential; the structure size and conditions of the buildings and whether it was moveable; economic analysis through case studies and an exploration of the impacts on land value and development potential.

The identified properties were found to possess cultural heritage value

In summary, the study found that the identified properties have cultural heritage value. The value is primarily in the buildings, but also some landscape features. Opportunities exist to conserve cultural heritage value through MiX development, however, a more flexible policy framework is required. A series of case studies were examined illustrating successful adaptive re-use of heritage resources for non-residential purposes, including: restaurants, bars, retail stores, spas, boutique hotels, cultural centres, daycares, private schools, professional offices, social/fraternal clubs, and museums, among others. Some resources necessitated relocation to ensure viability, but others were conserved in place. In most cases, large-scale industrial development can co-exist with heritage resources and it was reported that the presence of heritage properties often contributed to aesthetic value and identity.

The study also examined financial and property implications

Sub-consultant urbanMetrics was requested to determine the potential impact of cultural heritage resources on the realization of the MiX District; review the implications of retaining the resources with a variety of conservation approaches; and explore the impacts on the area's future land value. urbanMetrics undertook case study research of cultural heritage resources across the GTHA that have been retained and successfully integrated into emerging employment land developments.

According to the study, the balancing act of conserving cultural heritage resources within high-priority employment areas is not unique to the City of Markham. Many municipalities across the GTHA have been faced with similar scenarios, yielding a range of conservation approaches, financial implications, municipal interventions, and partnership outcomes. urbanMetrics consulted with

municipal heritage planners from across the GTHA to identify examples of cultural heritage resources that have been successfully integrated into employment areas.

This component of the study examined the planning context of the MiX lands, conservation approaches, financial impacts, municipal interventions and impact on development potential. The resulting key takeaways and recommendations are as follows:

- It is imperative that the Future Employment Area is carefully planned to ensure its employment potential is not detrimentally impacted. To attract industrial users, the development process needs to enable large, developable parcels that can maximize industrial footprints and accommodate appropriate truck circulation and access.
- The cultural heritage resources need to be situated in locations that do not hinder development, and/or create irregular development parcels with limited access points. If the resource is situated in the centre of the property, it is recommended that it be relocated and restored at a corner lot, with the subject building ideally oriented towards the street. If the resource is already located at the street, it should be reviewed on a case-by-case basis to understand if the current configuration allows for sufficient access points to the remaining property, or if it would be financially beneficial for the property owner to relocate it to the corner lot and open up more access points and development area.
- Relocating cultural heritage resources towards the street is beneficial as it improves the building's street visibility, which increases the likelihood of attracting a commercial tenant. While restoration and relocation might be expensive for the property owner, this approach gives owners a potentially revenue-generating tenant that will serve the future employment land users.
- When conserving a heritage building with the intent of adaptive reuse, property owners must ensure they are publicly accessible and located on a large lot so that it can be flexible to the requirements and needs of a future tenant.
- Heritage properties bring value and local identity, and we do not believe the cultural heritage resources will detrimentally impact land value in the Future Employment Area. The available parcels are large and regular shaped, which can accommodate a range of small to large industrial uses. Any obstacles related to the cultural heritage resources in the area could be mostly resolved through relocations.
- A potential conflict could occur between Prestige Office uses and the cultural heritage resources. Both should be situated on corner lots with prominent street visibility. However, this could be accommodated by repurposing and integrating the resource into contemporary office space, instead of commercial space.
- If the City prefers that the resources are relocated and/or tightly clustered together, there will be significant costs required by the property owners, which might not be financially feasible for them. If the City is interested in clustering and relocating the resources, there might be benefit in acquiring the properties and alleviating some of these costs from the property owners to achieve the City's broader corporate objectives.

Study recommendations attempt to balance heritage conservation needs with the future use of the lands for employment purposes.

The study suggests that the main potential outcomes for the group of heritage properties are:

1. Retention of the heritage resources within the employment lands, with the resources being adaptively re-used. It is most desirable from a land use compatibility perspective that the long-term intent is not to have residential uses within a business park. This option also retains the historic context of the properties, while also recognizing their value and ability to transition to land uses more compatible within a business park area.
2. Removal of the heritage resources, which would see the relocation of all or some of the buildings to either other locations within the employment lands or other locations within the City (such as Markham Heritage Estates, or similar type of site.)

Proposed Official Plan amendment

The study also suggests that given residential uses are not appropriate for the MiX area, that a Special Policy Area within the Markham Official Plan be implemented for the MiX employment area. The Special Policy Area would prioritize the adaptive re-use or relocation of cultural heritage resources within heritage properties over retaining them in situ. In addition, the policy should not require the properties to be 'at risk' as a reason to re-locate the buildings.

The study suggests the following hierarchy as a framework:

- retention of the resource on its original site and adaptively re-use the building for a non-residential use where possible and feasible;
- relocate the resource to a sympathetic site elsewhere within Markham (staff would interpret this to include relocation within the immediate development site or the MiX District).

A draft Official Plan Amendment is included as an appendix to the study document. Heritage Markham Committee and staff have suggested that prior to relocation elsewhere in Markham, consideration of relocation to another site within the MiX should be explored as part of the hierarchy.

Encouraging the re-location of heritage buildings is only a reasonable policy approach if the buildings have a suitable location to be relocated to. The existing Markham Heritage Estates has limited potential within the existing subdivision. Therefore, according to the study, it would be prudent for the City to investigate expanding the current Markham Heritage Estates, or finding another location that would be suitable for this type of use. Heritage Markham Committee has suggested the concept of clustering heritage resources in a dedicated area within the MiX lands could also be considered.

Property specific recommendations for occupied and vacant sites

The study includes recommendations for occupied and vacant properties. For occupied properties, it is recommended to retain the existing building(s) in the existing location on the property, and utilize them for the existing purposes for the foreseeable future. Existing building clusters should ideally remain intact, as well as the area immediately surrounding them. On the larger properties, the balance of the lands can continue to be used for agricultural or other compatible rural uses for the foreseeable future. In the longer-term as the employment uses continue to develop in the area, it may be appropriate to consider adaptive re-use of the existing buildings for purposes that would compliment the overall business park use for the MiX District (e.g. restaurant or office use), or possibly relocate the building(s) per the recommended Official Plan policy revisions.

For vacant properties, the buildings can either be refurbished / adaptively reused at this time, or be brought into a secure state and remain until such time as a use is determined or relocation can occur. It is recommended the City work with the property owners / internal staff as applicable to ensure strategies to appropriately 'mothball' the properties are implemented.

Proper “mothballing” of vacant resources

According to the study, since a future use for some of the buildings is not yet known and it is conceivable they could remain vacant for some time, measures are required to ensure the buildings remain in a stable condition. Cultural heritage conservation best practices recommend ‘mothballing’ be undertaken in such circumstances. Mothballing refers to the temporary closing up of a building or structure to protect it from the weather as well as to secure it from vandalism. Guidance on appropriate mothballing is provided in the study. Markham’s property standards by-law and Keep Markham Beautiful By-law can also be used by By-law Enforcement staff.

The study also suggests that Markham staff develop a work program and checklist following the general recommendations related to mothballing for the vacant City-owned properties. Some of this work has been undertaken through the preparation of condition assessment reports on behalf of the City, which have identified immediate and future needs for the vacant City-owned properties. This information will form the basis for future development of a mothball plan related to each property. It is important the City of Markham direct funding to these properties to ensure the future conservation and protection of City investment. Until such time as a mothball plan has been developed, it is recommended City staff ensure the properties are visited monthly by staff to ensure the buildings are secure.

Staff Recommendations

It is recommended that the “Cultural Heritage Resource Strategy - City of Markham North District Employment Lands (MiX)” study be endorsed in principle to guide staff in addressing cultural heritage resources in the North District Employment Lands. It is also recommended that staff be directed to proceed with an Official Plan Amendment to address the suggested changes to the Official Plan cultural heritage policies related to the MiX area.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Not applicable.

HUMAN RESOURCES CONSIDERATIONS

Not applicable.

ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIC PRIORITIES:

The protection of cultural heritage resource is a component of Growth Management. This helps achieve a quality community by ensuring that the City of Markham’s cultural heritage resources remain part of the fabric of the City, strengthening the sense of community.

The report aligns with the strategic focus area of Growth Management as it provides direction on a strategy for cultural heritage resources in the North Districts’ MiX area.

BUSINESS UNITS CONSULTED AND AFFECTED:

Business units consulted included: Planning, Heritage Section, Real Property and Asset Management as well as the Heritage Markham Committee.

RECOMMENDED BY:

Biju Karumanchery, RPP, MCIP
Director, Planning and Urban Design

Arvin Prasad, MPA, RPP, MCIP,
Commissioner of Development Services

ATTACHMENTS:

- Appendix 'A' – Location of Cultural Heritage Resources in the Study Area
- Appendix 'B' – List of Cultural Heritage Resources in the Study Area
- Appendix 'C' – Minutes from February 7, 2022 Development Services Committee Meeting
- Appendix 'D' – Heritage Markham Extract, February 9, 2022
- Appendix 'E' – Cultural Heritage Resource Strategy, North District Employment Lands (MiX)

Appendix 'A' – Location of Cultural Heritage Resources in the Study Area



Source: MHBC

See Appendix 'B' for corresponding address, ownership, heritage status and illustration

Appendix 'B' – List of Cultural Heritage Resources in the Study Area

Property information			
Ref#	Address / photo	Heritage Status	Ownership
#1	2780 19th Avenue (Alfred Read Farmhouse – c.1855) 	Listed	City of Markham
#2	3010 19th Avenue (SS #7 – c.1902) 	Designated Part IV (2004-215)	Private (Catholic Diocese)
#3	3270 19th Avenue (Doner House – c.1881) 	Listed	Private (Flikas)
#4	3490 19th Avenue (Gormley Widman House and Barn – c.1855 / c.1902) 	Listed	Private (Wideview Farms – Friedman)
#5	3565 19th Avenue (Lewis-Jarvis House and Barn – c.1870/c.1900) 	Listed	City of Markham

#6	11251 Woodbine Avenue (Hopper House – c.1855) 	Listed	Private (Glendower Properties)
#7	11242 Warden Avenue (Summerfeldt-McKay House – c.1835/c.1875) 	Listed	City of Markham
#8	11172 Warden Avenue (Clayton School [55#12] – 1874) 	Designated Part IV (187-82)	Private (Azizi)
#9	11091 Warden Avenue (John G. Mustard farmhouse – c.1845) 	Listed	City of Markham
#10	3450 Elgin Mills Road East (Hilts-Ford House – c.1850/1875) 	Listed	Private (Romandale Farms)

Source: MHBC

APPENDIX ‘C’ - Minutes from February 7, 2022 Development Services Committee Meeting**STRATEGY TO ADDRESS CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCES IN THE NORTH DISTRICT EMPLOYMENT LANDS (10.0)**

Arvin Prasad, Commissioner of Development Services, introduced the item.

Regan Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning, advised that the purpose of the presentation is to provide Council with the results of a study exploring options on how to address the existing cultural heritage resources located in the North District employment lands (MiX). The study took both the City’s corporate and cultural heritage objectives into consideration. The next step will be to consult with the Heritage Markham Committee on the conclusions of the study and the proposed direction. The study lead consultants, Dan Currie and Nick Bogaert, MHBC Planning, Urban Design & Landscape Architecture, provided a presentation entitled “City of Markham, Culture Heritage Resources Strategy – North District Employment Lands (MiX)”. They noted that the study also explored the economic impact of retaining cultural resources in employment lands through the work of their sub-consultant urbanMetrics led by land economist. The consultants indicated that the ten properties had cultural heritage value, that they were not necessarily a detriment to the end use of the land from a development and economic perspective and that the policy affecting heritage resources in this area needed to be more flexible to allow adaptive re-use and if necessary, relocation without having to demonstrate the resource was under threat of loss.

Committee discussed the following relative to the consultant’s presentation:

- The location and condition of the cultural heritage resources located within the MiX;
- Designating a specific area within the MiX for the possible re-location of the cultural heritage resources located on the lands;
- The possibility of creating a second Heritage Estates subdivision and other relocation opportunities in the City;
- The background and qualifications of the researchers and consultants that conducted the study;
- Developers frequently wishing to re-locate heritage houses outside of their development site;
- The City’s success with integrating cultural heritage resources into developments;
- Situations when a cultural heritage resource has been deemed threatened and has been moved to Heritage Estates in the past (i.e. for construction of the Highway 407, or the development of a big box retail complex);
- The diminishing interest in acquiring a heritage house to restore and possibly relocate, likely due to the cost of relocation and acquiring a lot;

- Legislative changes that provided the City with more tools to successfully protect cultural heritage resources in-situ;
- How creating a more flexible policy for culture heritage resources located in the MiX that prioritizes adaptable uses and relocation can lead to better outcomes than the City's existing policy, which priorities retaining the cultural heritage resource in its original use and site;
- Whether all of the City's heritage conservation policies need to be more flexible;
- The need to assess the current condition of the 10 cultural heritage resources located within MiX to ensure they are protected and that no further damage to the resources occurs (By-law Enforcement);
- The need for an agreement between the City and the owner of the cultural heritage resource to provide financial assistance to a person willing to relocate and restore the resource elsewhere;
- The need to evaluate on a case by case basis whether the cultural heritage resources located in the MiX need to be relocated;
- The need to do more to protect accessory buildings possessing cultural heritage value, such as barns;
- The importance of educating the public in regards to the history of the cultural heritage resource that is being retained and restored (i.e. including a plaque);
- The effectiveness of restoring only a portion of the a cultural heritage resource and incorporating it into a building;
- Recognized that many of the business typically found in a residential or commercial area that could utilize a cultural heritage resource would also be needed in an employment district (i.e. daycare, offices and restaurants).

Mr. Currie and Mr. Hutcheson provided clarification to inquiries from the Committee.

The Committee requested that successful examples of cultural heritage resources being restored and used for adaptive purposes in employment districts be provided to the Heritage Markham Committee when presenting this item to the committee.

Moved by Mayor Frank Scarpitti

Seconded by Regional Councillor Jack Heath

1. That the presentation by MHBC on the "Strategy to Address Cultural Heritage Resources in the North District Employment Lands", be received; and,
2. That the matter be referred to the Heritage Markham Committee to obtain feedback on the recommended strategy.

Carried

Appendix 'D'**HERITAGE MARKHAM
EXTRACT**

Date: February 9, 2022

To: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

EXTRACT CONTAINING ITEM # 4.1 OF THE SECOND HERITAGE MARKHAM
COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON FEBRUARY 9, 2022

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