



MEMORANDUM

TO: Heritage Markham Committee

FROM: Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

DATE: July 13, 2022

SUBJECT: Proposed Addition to an Existing Heritage Dwelling
27 Victoria Ave., Unionville Heritage Conservation District
Variance Application A/070/22

Property/Building Description: Vernacular 1 ½ storey frame dwelling, c. 1871 with a modern one storey addition

Use: Residence

Heritage Status: Designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act and identified as a Type 'A' building or buildings that define the heritage character of the district.

Application/Proposal

- The owners of the property have submitted a Site Plan Control application (SPC 22 111838) to the City proposing to demolish the existing rear one storey modern addition in order to construct a new two storey, rear addition that would create an additional 118.1m² (1,271 ft²) of floor area;
- As part of the review of the site plan application, two variances representing existing site conditions were identified, that the owner has applied to the Committee of Adjustment to bring into compliance with the Zoning By-law;
- The variances being applied for are to permit:
 - An existing west side yard setback of the heritage dwelling of 5'-8" whereas the By-law requires a minimum side yard setback of 6'-0".
 - One parking space, whereas the By-law requires two parking spaces.

Background

- Heritage Markham reviewed the associated site plan application for the proposed two storey rear addition on April 13, 2022 not being aware of the need for any variances;
- The Committee indicated that they had no objection to the general form, massing, materials and architectural details of the proposed rear addition from a heritage perspective and delegated final review of the application to Heritage Section Staff (See attached Heritage Markham Extract from April 13, 2022).

Staff Comment

- Heritage Staff has no objection to the requested variances as they reflect existing site conditions, and there is no proposed change of use for the property from a detached dwelling. As illustrated in the photograph in Attachment 2, the driveway area can accommodate more than one car, but can only provide one space that complies with parking space size requirements in the Zoning By-law. Accordingly, Staff has written a report to the Committee of Adjustment in support of the variances being approved for the hearing scheduled for July 13, 2022;
- However, one of the conditions recommended to be attached to any approval of the application is that the variances be supported by Heritage Markham;
- Therefore, Heritage Staff recommends that Heritage Markham have no objection to the requested variances from a heritage perspective.

Suggested Recommendation for Heritage Markham

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection to the requested variances to permit an existing west side yard setback of 5'-8" and to permit one parking space at 27 Victoria Avenue from a heritage perspective.

Attachments:

1. Location Map
2. Photographs of the Existing Heritage House and Driveway
3. Proposed Site Plan for the Two Storey Rear Addition
4. Heritage Markham Extract of April 13, 2022

Attachment 1

27 Victoria Avenue, Unionville Heritage Conservation District



Attachment 2

27 Victoria Avenue, Unionville Heritage Conservation District

Front



East Side - driveway area



Attachment 4

HERITAGE MARKHAM EXTRACT

Date: April 13, 2022

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

EXTRACT CONTAINING ITEM # 6.3 OF THE FOURTH HERITAGE MARKHAM
COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON APRIL 13, 2022

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

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 domers 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