



# Heritage Markham Committee Minutes

**Meeting Number: 5**  
**May 11, 2022, 7:00 PM**  
**Electronic Meeting**

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

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

Councillor Reid McAlpine, Chair, convened the meeting at 7:01 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

There were no disclosures of pecuniary interest.

## 3. PART ONE - ADMINISTRATION

### 3.1 APPROVAL OF AGENDA (16.11)

#### A. Addendum Agenda

Staff requested that item 5.2 - 11 Eliza Street, Thornhill, New Front Yard Fence with Brick Piers - be moved from the Consent Agenda to the Regular Agenda as item 6.5.

## B. New Business from Committee Members

Staff noted that several written submissions had been submitted, regarding items 4.1 and 6.1 which were circulated to the Committee prior to the meeting.

### Recommendation:

That the May 11, 2022 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved, as amended.

**Carried**

## **3.2 MINUTES OF THE APRIL 13, 2022 HERITAGE MARKHAM COMMITTEE MEETING (16.11)**

### Recommendation:

That the minutes of the Heritage Markham Committee meeting held on April 13, 2022 be received and adopted.

**Carried**

## **4. PART TWO - DEPUTATIONS**

### **4.1 DEMOLITION PERMIT**

#### **APPLICATION TO DEMOLISH A PROPERTY LISTED ON THE MARKHAM REGISTER OF PROPERTY OF CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST 7951 YONGE ST, THORNHILL (16.11)**

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Heritage Planner

Evan Manning, Heritage Planner, addressed the committee and summarized the memorandum, noting that the property was adjacent to the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District, and was listed on the Markham Register of Property of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest. Mr. Manning advised that the former dwelling, now in commercial use, was fairly intact with modifications including the replacement of doors and windows and the reconfiguration of the original ground floor window along the west elevation. Otherwise the form of the building

was intact. He noted that the building was screened from Yonge Street with mature trees.

Mr. Manning indicated that Staff evaluated the property under Ontario Regulation 9/06, noting that the evaluation framework was established by the Province in order to ensure consistency among municipalities when assessing a property's potential cultural heritage value. It was the opinion of Staff that the building has modest design and historical value, but significant contextual value as per Ontario Regulation 9/06. He advised that the property was also evaluated using the City's Heritage Resources Evaluation System, and it was the opinion of Staff that the property straddled the Group 2 and Group 3 classifications.

Jeffrey Streisfield, a representative of the applicant, indicated that the property lacks strong reasoning for designation under Ontario Heritage Act, as the property did not constitute a significant cultural heritage resource. Mr. Streisfield noted that the building is located within a highly altered landscape, being surrounded by apartment buildings to the east. Mr. Streisfield requested that the Committee recognize that the property is proximate to the future Royal Orchard subway station, and should be removed to allow for residential intensification of the site.

A deputation was made by Valerie Burke recommending the support of the recommendation that finds the house to be a significant cultural heritage resource which should be conserved through designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. She noted that it was an Edwardian Classical building, and is historically significant for its association with the Heintzman House. Ms. Burke commented that Thornhill has lost many heritage buildings along Yonge Street and that the remaining ones should be conserved to preserve the heritage character of the area.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Inquired of Ms. Burke which significant cultural heritage resources were lost on Yonge Street, and whether they were lost prior to the establishment of the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District in 1986.
  - Ms. Burke advised that many were lost in the 1960's but that the area could not afford to lose more cultural heritage resources. She noted that the home could be incorporated into future development plans for the property.
- Inquired of Ms. Burke why the property was not put forward for designation while Ms. Burke was on the Heritage Markham Committee.

- Ms. Burke stated that some properties get overlooked until brought to the Committee's attention.
- Asked Mr. Streisfield what the total area of the property was, and how far north and south the property extended from the house.
  - Mr. Streisfield advised that the property was approximately 2,200 square meters, and the boundaries were as outlined in yellow on the image provided in the appendix of the Staff report.
- Inquired as to the Applicant's intention for property, as intensification alone did not warrant demolition of the house, and inquired whether incorporation of the house into a future development scheme was possible.
  - Mr. Streisfield stated that intensification was planned to provide needed housing, including affordable housing, given the proximity to the future subway station. He advised that the house should not be conserved as it wasn't a significant heritage resource, and that consideration could be given to salvaging some of the existing material, such as brick, for incorporation into a future development.
- Commented that the written deputation from Diane Berwick makes a strong case for the significance of the house and property, and that Heritage Markham has a long history of working with applicants to incorporate cultural heritage resources into new developments with an outcome that was beneficial for both parties.
  - Mr. Streisfield reiterated that the house should not be incorporated into future plans or the site because it is not a significant heritage resource, and should not be designated under the Ontario Heritage Act. He stated that the need to provide new housing and affordable housing was more important than this particular building, and that a decision to conserve the building was a matter for Council to consider.
- Inquired why the building could not be incorporated into the future plans for the property.
  - Mr. Streisfield advised adaptive re-use of the existing building was challenging.
- Inquired whether the Applicant would consider relocating the building within the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District, as mentioned in Ms. Berwick's written deputation.

- Mr. Streisfield indicated that the owner may consider this option. He commented that he did not see the significance of the building in Ms. Berwick's letter and reiterated that the property is not located within the District. Mr. Streisfield did not share Ms. Berwick's perspective that the building is a gateway to the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District.

A deputation was made by Barry Nelson, as a representative of the Thornhill Historical Society (THS). He advised that the THS considers the building to be in excellent condition and contributes to the village-like character of Yonge Street in Thornhill. He stated that the significance of the property is found in its historical connection to the Frances family and the Heintzman House. Mr. Nelson recommended accepting the recommendation that the house is a significant cultural heritage resource and should be conserved. Mr. Nelson commented that he had respect for the applicant, as they have a long history of looking after buildings along Yonge Street, and commended the applicant for maintaining the buildings in good condition.

Mr. Streisfield disputed the comment that the building contributes to the village-like character of Thornhill as there are apartment buildings next to it and the subway may soon come through the area.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Commented that Mr. Streisfield's use of the word "significant" was overemphasized and stated that it was up to the Committee to determine if the building was a significant heritage resource.
- Commented on the discomfort with discussing demolition without considering the use of the building in a different context elsewhere on the property, and without knowing the future plans for the property.
- Clarified with Mr. Streisfield that the property was approximately 0.25 acres in size, and suggested that the value of the property will be higher without the existing building.
- Indicated support for retaining the building on-site.
- Questioned the definition of significant by someone who had an interest in removing the building, noting that properties with less significance and in poorer condition have been conserved elsewhere.
- Inquired why Staff was not clearly in opposition to demolition of the building.
  - Staff commented that there were multiple viewpoints as to the cultural heritage value of the property and that staff values hearing the advice and

input of Heritage Markham. Staff indicated that the building contained some design and historical value as described in Ontario Regulation 9/06, but that it was the position of Staff that it was the value was not significant. Staff clarified that the purpose of the memo was to encourage discussion, rather than present a conclusion as to whether the existing building should be conserved.

- Commented that the village-like character of Thornhill was enhanced by the existing building, and it helps tell the story of Yonge Street development.
- Commented that Heritage Markham's role is to reflect on the building from a heritage perspective and not to evaluate affordable housing.
- Commented that the building can still have cultural historical value despite the property not being within the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District, and having not been previously considered for designation under the Ontario Heritage Act.
- Commented that the quantity and age of the trees on the property gives it significance.
- Commented that the significance of the building was greater than that of the location, and inquired as to the likelihood of the owner permitting relocation.
  - Mr. Streisfield indicated that the applicant was prepared to work with Heritage Markham or others to have the building relocated off-site.
- Inquired about the Committee's options for delaying demolition in an effort to find an alternate option.
  - Staff advised the Committee that the building was Listed rather than designated, and that the Ontario Heritage Act requires Council to make a decision within 60 days following receipt of the intention to demolish as to whether to designate the property. There is no provision in the Act to extend the timeframe for listed properties facing demolition whereas there is this opportunity for designated properties. Committee was also advised that staff had to be cognizant of the timing of future Council meetings to address the 60 day timeframe.
- Inquired whether the demolition permit would have to be withdrawn to extend the time available to discuss potential alternatives.
  - Staff advised that this would allow for negotiations to occur beyond the aforementioned timeframe

- Commented that heritage buildings have been incorporated into several developments within Markham, and stated that conservation need not conflict with intensification of the property.
- In response to Mr. Streisfield's comment that the City and Metrolinx were aware of the plans for the property, the Committee inquired why the proposed use of the land was not presented to the Committee at the meeting.

After further discussion, Mr. Streisfield agreed on behalf of the applicant to withdraw the demolition application and to work with City Staff and Councillor Irish over the next 30 days to discuss alternative options for the building.

Recommendation:

**THAT Heritage Markham receive the written submissions by Diane Berwick and Valerie Burke and the deputations by Barry Nelson on behalf of the Thornhill Historical Society, and Valerie Burke.**

**Carried**

## **5. PART THREE - CONSENT**

### **5.1 HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATIONS**

**DELEGATED APPROVAL BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF  
23 VICTORIA AVENUE, (UHCD), 210 MAIN STREET (UHCD), 6041  
HIGHWAY 7 EAST (MVHCD), 7667 14<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE (PART IV), 5  
GEORGE STREET (MVHCD) (16.11)**

**FILE NUMBER:**

HE 22 118204

HE 22 117006

HE 22 117012

HE 22 118205

HE 22 117013 & 118486

**Extracts:**

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

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 HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATION**

### **STOREFRONT AWNING**

#### **193 MAIN STREET, UNIONVILLE (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER:

HE 22 118659

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Heritage Planner

#### Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection to the proposed retractable awning for 193 Main Street Unionville and final review of the application be delegated to Heritage Section Staff.

**Carried**

## **5.3 APPROVAL OF BUILDING PERMIT**

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

#### **10761 VICTORIA SQUARE, 5990 16<sup>th</sup> AVE (MVHCD) (16.11)**

FILE NUMBERS:

AL 22 111657

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 OFFICIAL PLAN AND ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENTS**

### **10 ROYAL ORCHARD BLVD AND 8051 YONGE STREET, MARKHAM (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER:

PLAN 19 137814

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

R. Cefaratti, Senior Planner, West District

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning addressed the Committee and noted that the property was not within the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District but was considered adjacent (i.e. within 60m) as defined within the 2014 Official Plan. He noted that the existing one-storey commercial plaza is proposed to be removed and replaced by a mixed-use development. Mr. Hutcheson advised that the immediate built form context consisted primarily of high-rise residential properties to the north and south with some mid and lower rise residential further to the east. There are also a number of cultural heritage resources and low-rise developments near the subject property along the west side of Yonge Street in the Vaughan portion of the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District. Mr. Hutcheson also discussed streetscape improvements that Staff would like to see occur as part of any future development.

A deputation was made by Valerie Burke, recommending that the applicant incorporate a streetscape compatible with the heritage character of the area, that a heritage plaque be installed, and that public art be incorporated that reflects Thornhill's heritage. Ms. Burke requested her written comments be shared with City of Vaughan staff.

A deputation was made by Barry Nelson on behalf of the Thornhill Historical Society, commenting that there were 50,000 residents on the Markham side of Thornhill and 60,000 residents on the Vaughan side, and that Ms. Burke's recommendations reflect the feelings of the Thornhill community as a whole.

In response to a comment from the Committee, Staff clarified that the driveway of 8051 Yonge Street, Markham does not abut or share the driveway with 7951 Yonge Street.

Recommendations:

**THAT Heritage Markham receive the written submission by Valerie Burke and the deputations by Valerie Burke, and Barry Nelson, on behalf of the Thornhill Historical Society;**

THAT Heritage Markham Committee has reviewed applications submitted for Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment at 10 Royal Orchard Blvd and 8051 Yonge Street due to the properties being adjacent to the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District boundary which includes this part of the Yonge Street public right-of-way, and has no comment on the applications;

THAT Heritage Markham Committee recommends that Markham Planning staff obtain input from the Heritage Vaughan Committee on these applications;

AND THAT Heritage Markham Committee recommends the matter of appropriate streetscape treatment for the Yonge Street right-of-way be addressed in consultation with the Heritage Markham Committee as part of a future Site Plan Control application.

**Carried**

## **6.2 COMMERCIAL FACADE IMPROVEMENT GRANT PROGRAM**

### **REVIEW OF 2022 GRANT APPLICATIONS**

#### **136, 154, 159, 166, AND 182 MAIN STREET UNIONVILLE AND 40-44 MAIN STREET NORTH MARKHAM VILLAGE AND 9899 MARKHAM ROAD (16.11)**

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

Note: This item was discussed after item 6.5.

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning addressed the Committee and summarized the manner in which Staff came to determine the distribution of funds. He noted that the process was quite involved and took into account applications received from property owners who had not applied for the grant in the past, and whether the application was for heritage features of the buildings.

#### **Recommendations:**

THAT Heritage Markham supports a matching grant of up to \$4,759.38 for the proposed re-conditioning the historic wooden windows at 136 Main St. Unionville subject to the applicant obtaining a Heritage permit for the proposed work;

THAT Heritage Markham supports a matching grant of up to \$1,154.23 for the painting of 154 Main St. Unionville in historic colours subject to the applicant obtaining a Heritage Permit for the proposed work;

THAT Heritage Markham supports a matching grant of up to \$1,575.94 for the repair of the cornice above the storefront and the replacement of the existing storefront windows with historically authentic windows at 159 Main Street Unionville subject to the applicant obtaining a Building/Heritage permit for the proposed work;

THAT Heritage Markham supports a matching grant of up to \$8,755.22 for the installation of historically appropriate windows on the south east and north facades of 166 Main Street Unionville subject to the applicant obtaining a Heritage Permit for the proposed work and entering into a heritage conservation easement agreement with the City for any grant exceeding \$5,000.00;

THAT Heritage Markham supports a matching grant of up to \$8,755.22 for the installation of historically appropriate windows at 9899 Markham Road;

THAT Heritage Markham does not support a grant for painting at 182 Main Street Unionville because the painting is only necessary due to the applicant recently painting the building without approval in an inappropriate blue colour, and because the proposed colour scheme does not represent historic or authentic colours;

THAT Heritage Markham does not support a grant for painting the trims, windows and doors at 40-44 Main Street North in Markham Village, because it is not considered to be a substantive improvement, and not based on historically researched or historically appropriate colours;

AND THAT a Façade Easement Agreement be obtained for any property that is not currently subject to one for grant amounts exceeding \$5,000.00.

**Carried**

### **6.3 DESIGNATED HERITAGE PROPERTY GRANT PROGRAM**

#### **REVIEW OF 2022 GRANT APPLICATIONS**

**1 MILLBROOK GATE, 16 GEORGE STREET, 28 CHURCH STREET, 309 MAIN STREET NORTH, 15 BEWELL DRIVE, 33 DICKSON HILL ROAD, 26 COLBORNE STREET, 8 ALEXANDER HUNTER PLACE, AND 23 VICTORIA AVENUE (16.11)**

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning addressed the Committee and summarized the criteria Staff used to determine the most appropriate distribution of funds. He noted that the program was coming to the end of its 3 year cycle and that it assists property owners in restoration work up to a maximum of \$5,000 involving 50/50 cost sharing with the property owner.

Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham supports the funding of the following eight grant applications at a total cost of \$30,000.00 subject to the amounts and conditions noted on the individual summary sheets:

- 16 George Street, Markham Village,
- 28 Church Street, Markham Village,
- 309 Main Street North, Markham Village,
- 15 Bewell Drive, Box Grove,
- 33 Dickson Hill Road, Dickson Hill,
- 26 Colborne Street, Thornhill,
- 8 Alexander Hunter Place, Markham Heritage Estates,
- 23 Victoria Avenue, Unionville;

THAT Heritage Markham does not support the grant application for 1 Millbrook Gate;

AND THAT Heritage Markham recommends that Council consider extending the Designated Heritage Property Grant Program for another three years (2023-2025).

**Carried**

#### **6.4 ONTARIO HERITAGE CONFERENCE - JUNE 16-18, 2022, BROCKVILLE (16.11)**

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning addressed the Committee and noted that the Ontario Heritage Conference will be held in person this year in Brockville from June 16-18, 2022. He noted that in the past, Heritage Markham members that attended had their costs such as accommodation, registration fees,

and travel taken care of as they were attending to bring back knowledge to the Committee. The Heritage Markham budget for training/workshops/conferences is \$2,000. Mr. Hutcheson inquired if any Committee members were interested in attending this year. One member noted that it would be beneficial to have members attend as the City of Markham is considering hosting the conference in future.

Councillors Karen Rea and Reid McAlpine, as well as Neil Chakraborty expressed interest and indicated that they would attend, if possible.

Recommendations:

**THAT Heritage Markham supports the attendance of Councillor Karen Rea, Councillor Reid McAlpine, and Neil Chakraborty at the 2022 Ontario Heritage Conference, and the payment of incurred related expenses yet to be determined, to a maximum of \$2,000 total;**

AND THAT the information on the Ontario Heritage Conference be received as information.

**Carried**

## **6.5 HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATION**

### **NEW FRONT YARD FENCE AND DRIVEWAY GATE WITH BRICK PIERS**

**11 ELIZA STREET, THORNHILL (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER:

HE 22 118487

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Heritage Planner

Note: This item was discussed after item 6.1.

Evan Manning, Heritage Planner, addressed the Committee and commented that the item was moved from the Consent agenda to Regular agenda, as the applicant proposed to amend their Heritage Permit application to include a driveway gate.

Mr. Manning noted that the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District Plan provides direction that gates are prohibited, however the homeowner is requesting consideration for privacy and security purposes. He further noted that despite the

policies and guidelines of the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District Plan concerning driveway gates, approval had been granted for other properties in the District (e.g. a wooden picket fence gate at 146 John Street).

Mr. Manning noted that the light post is an existing feature.

The Applicant and property owner, Vladimir Demine, addressed the Committee and stated that he was seeking privacy and security for his grandchildren. He noted that pedestrians often walked through his yard mistaking it for a path to Pomona Mills Park, and he wished to prevent further trespassing through his property.

Mr. Demine commented on the various styles of fence considered, and that their decision to use a low metal fence was to match the character of their house.

A deputation was made by Barry Nelson on behalf of the Thornhill Historical Society. Mr. Nelson advised that there were many different examples of wooden fences along Colborne Street and Marie Court, and shared the historical use of wooden gates as primarily being used to restrict animal access. Mr. Nelson noted that a metal gate was installed at 149 John Street which was approved by the Development Services Committee, but it was not supported by Heritage Markham.

A deputation was made by Evelin Ellison recommending the use of a wooden picket fence and that the lantern features proposed for the brick piers not be supported, or if supported that it be modest in scale.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Inquired why the applicant chose metal over wood.
  - The applicant advised that wood would be more economical but it did not match the style of their house.
- Requested additional information on the cedar hedge and additional bushes mentioned by the applicant, and their location relative to the proposed fence.
  - The applicant advised that the existing cedar hedge was not healthy and their intention was to remove it and plant a proper hedge that better suited the fencing.
- Expressed support for the brick piers, black metal gate and lighting.
- Inquired whether the applicant considered installing a fence at the back of the property to prevent people from cutting through.

- The significant depth of the applicant's property was mentioned, and that people were often far onto the property before realizing they were trespassing.
- Expressed concern regarding the brick piers affecting the root system of the trees and requested the location of the brick piers and gate in relation to the property line.
  - The applicant advised that the property limits would have to be investigated, but the gate and piers were anticipated to be installed in line with the green hedge, and behind the light post that was pre-existing. The applicant confirmed he would not encroach on City-owned property.
- Clarified that the metal gate would be painted black.

Evelin Ellison commented that a visual of the proposed gate would be helpful in making a decision.

Recommendations:

**THAT Heritage Markham receive the deputations by Barry Nelson on behalf of the Thornhill Historical Society, and Evelin Ellison;**

**AND THAT Heritage Markham supports the proposed black metal fencing, brick piers with lighting and black metal driveway gate, and recommends approval of the heritage permit application.**

**Carried**

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

The following projects were commented on.

### **a) Doors Open Markham 2022**

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning, addressed the committee and advised that the Doors Open Markham 2022 Committee has been given approval by the City of Markham for the event to take place in-person this year, under current pandemic circumstances. The event is usually held in September. It was noted that Councillor Reid McAlpine is on the Doors Open Markham 2022 Committee.

### **d) Unionville Heritage Centre Secondary Plan**

Councillor Reid McAlpine inquired if there was any development on this project. Staff commented that there was no time allocated for this project at the moment.

**8. PART SIX - NEW BUSINESS**

A Committee member requested clarification on Mr. Jeffrey Streisfield's comments that the Committee's comments did not matter as council would make the decision. The Chair commented that Heritage Markham is an advisory committee that makes recommendations to City staff and Council, but does not have the authority to approve or deny applications.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

The Heritage Markham Committee adjourned at 9:22 p.m.