



Heritage Markham Committee Minutes

Meeting Number: 6
June 8, 2022, 7:00 PM
Electronic Meeting

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

Councillor Reid McAlpine, Chair, convened the meeting at 7:02. 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

Councillor Reid McAlpine, Chair, disclosed an interest with respect to: Item # 6.3 (3 Victoria Lane, Unionville Heritage Conservation District), and Item # 6.4 (25 Victoria Avenue, Unionville Heritage Conservation District), by nature of being the immediate neighbour of both properties and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

3. PART ONE - ADMINISTRATION

3.1 APPROVAL OF AGENDA (16.11)

A. Addendum Agenda

Request for Feedback
139 Main Street Unionville, The Unionville Planing Mill
Proposed Alteration of Existing Roof to Accommodate Air-Conditioning
Unit

It was agreed to add this to the agenda as item 6.6

Recommendation:

That the June 8, 2022, Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved, as amended.

Carried

3.2 MINUTES OF THE MAY 11, 2022 HERITAGE MARKHAM COMMITTEE MEETING (16.11)

Recommendation:

That the minutes of the Heritage Markham Committee meeting held on May 11, 2022, be received and adopted.

Carried

4. PART TWO - DEPUTATIONS

There were no deputations.

5. PART THREE - CONSENT

5.1 HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATIONS

**DELEGATED APPROVAL BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF
7 WASHINGTON AVENUE (MVHCD), 16 VICTORIA AVE (UHCD) (16.11)**

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Senior 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 BUILDING OR SIGN PERMIT APPLICATIONS

DELEGATED APPROVAL BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF

166 MAIN ST. (UHCD), 1 PETER ST. (MVHCD), 26 COLBORNE ST. (THCD), 32 COLBORNE ST. (THCD), 306 MAIN ST. (UHCD), 120 MAIN ST. N. (MVHCD) (16.11)

FILE NUMBERS:

AL 22 116635

HP 21 137681

HP 22 116545

HP 21 147828

HP 22109157

SP 22 118923

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**5.3 CONSENT (SEVERANCE) APPLICATION****COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT - PROPOSED LOT CREATION**

**36 WASHINGTON STREET, MARKHAM VILLAGE HERITAGE
CONSERVATION DISTRICT (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER:

CSNT 20 129414

B/018/22

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

Secretary-Treasurer, Committee of Adjustment

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham receive the information of the severance application for 36 Washington Street; and

THAT Heritage Markham recommends that a Heritage Easement Agreement be secured as a condition of severance approval from the Committee of Adjustment.

Carried

6. PART FOUR - REGULAR

6.1 COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT VARIANCE APPLICATION & SITE PLAN CONTROL APPLICATION

PROPOSED TWO-STOREY DWELLING WITH INTEGRATED GARAGE 83 JOHN STREET, THORNHILL HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT (16.11)

FILE NUMBERS:

A/046/22

22 113689 SPC

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Senior Heritage Planner

Evan Manning, Senior Heritage Planner addressed the Committee and summarized the concurrent Minor Variance and Site Plan Control Applications for a proposed two-storey dwelling with integrated garage at 83 John Street in the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District (THCD). The two variances being sought for the property are (1) building depth of 18.9 m, whereas the by-law permits a maximum of 16.8 m; and (2) a floor area ratio of 41.8 percent, whereas the by-law permits a maximum floor area ratio of 33 percent.

The current dwelling was constructed in 1946 and was adjacent to a similar property at 85 John Street. Both 83 and 85 John Street properties were associated with the Veteran's Land Act and the provision of land for returning WW2 veterans. In 2015, SPOHT opposed the demolition of the dwelling at 85 John Street. SPOHT was concerned that there are only a few remaining homes associated with Veteran's Land Act in Thornhill, and that these will all be eventually demolished.

Staff opinion is that the existing dwelling is not considered to be a significant cultural heritage resource as described within the Heritage District Plan. Staff noted that a similar dwelling (85 John Street) was permitted to be demolished in 2017. Staff concur with the subject property's 'C' rating within the THCD Plan, and are of the opinion that its removal will not have an adverse impact on the cultural heritage

value of the District (which is the protection of 19th and early 20th century buildings associated with the original mill village).

Mr. Barry Nelson, on behalf of the Thornhill Historical Society, addressed the Committee on Veterans Land Agreement homes that provided financial assistance for land acquisition for returning veterans. Mr. Nelson asked the Committee to preserve this asset and requested the Committee to encourage the applicant to add to the existing structure. Mr. Nelson requested that Heritage Markham consider this structure on its own merits in relation to Veteran Land Agreement houses.

Ms. Valerie Burke, addressed the Committee in support of retaining the existing dwelling at 83 John Street. She stated that the structure has a very special connection to the Veterans Land Agreement of 1942 and this 76-year-old building should be preserved because of its emerging cultural heritage and its tangible reminder of the sacrifices the veterans paid to protect the freedoms we enjoy today. She was of the opinion that if this building were demolished, another “thread in the tapestry would be removed”.

Responding to questions from the Chair, Mr. Manning explained the difference between Class B and Class C buildings. He further advised that the existing dwelling is categorized as a Class C building possessing the following qualities:

- buildings/properties primarily constructed post-1939
- buildings/properties that are sympathetic to the District by virtue of their scale or design qualities;
- buildings/properties not sympathetic to historic character of the District.

Regan Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning explained the process and community consultation that staff took to review the update to the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District Plan in 2007, especially related to the classification of buildings. He further advised that Heritage Markham Committee may recommend and Council may decide to preserve the existing dwelling at 83 John Street if they believe it has sufficient cultural heritage value on its own and not related to the District..

Given that the community at large did not wish to preserve buildings of a vintage similar to 83 John Street when the District plan was reviewed in 2007, Heritage staff remain of the opinion that there is no reason to object to the proposed demolition of the existing dwelling.

Responding to questions from the Committee, Mr. Victor Guitberg, architect for the applicant, advised that the applicant’s intention is to build a new house on the subject property. Responding to a question whether the applicant would be willing to

consider building an addition to the existing structure, Mr. Guitberg advised that the applicant would not be willing to do so.

Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham does not support the demolition of the existing one-storey single detached dwelling at 83 John Street, Thornhill Heritage Conservation District;

THAT staff be requested to work with the owner/applicant to pursue options of preserving the existing one-storey single detached dwelling at 83 John Street; and

THAT the written submissions and verbal depositions from Mr. Barry Nelson, Thornhill Historical Society, and Ms. Valerie Burke, be received.

Carried

6.2 SITE PLAN CONTROL APPLICATION

PROPOSED TWO CAR GARAGE AND REINSTATEMENT OF FRONT VERANDA

25 COLBORNE STREET, THORNHILL HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT (16.11)

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Senior Heritage Planner

Evan Manning, Senior Heritage Planner addressed the Committee and reviewed the proposal for a two-car garage with breezeway and reinstatement of the front veranda at 25 Colborne Street in the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District. The house, c1851, is identified as a Class A building within the District Plan and has an existing one-car garage that was constructed in 1951. The applicant is proposing to remove the existing garage and replace it with an attached two-car garage similar in design to the current one. The homeowners and their architect, Mr. Bradley Dunn, were available for questions from the Committee.

The Senior Heritage Planner advised that Heritage Section staff will work with the applicant to ensure that the proposed works will be complementary to the heritage character of the property, and noted that the drawings submitted by the applicant show a promising relationship to heritage fabric. Staff will also work with the applicant to ensure there is no damage to mature on-site trees, and if any trees need to be removed, the item will be brought back to the Heritage Markham Committee for consideration.

Mr. Barry Nelson, on behalf of the Thornhill Historical Society, addressed the Committee in support of the application, however, he indicated that some heritage features may not comply with the Ontario Building Code (ie. the possible need for the introduction of a railing on the reinstated front veranda).

Ms. Valerie Burke addressed the Committee in support of the application and thanked the applicants for proposing to restore the historic house to its former glory. Ms. Burke advised that the previous owner had restored the front entrance which had been missing for many years.

Responding to questions from the Committee with respect to the Building Code requirements for railings, Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning advised that a railing is required if the floor deck of the porch is 24 inches or more above grade. He further advised that staff will work with the applicant to help ensure that a railing is not required, and if one is, that staff will report back to the Heritage Markham Committee.

There was no further discussion, comments and/or questions from the Committee.

Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the proposed attached two-car garage and the reinstatement of the veranda (subject to its design replicating the historic veranda seen in archival photographs);

THAT final review of the forthcoming Site Plan Control application, and any other development application required to approve the proposed development, be delegated to Heritage Section staff provided that the design is generally consistent with the conceptual drawings appended to this memo; and

THAT the written submissions and verbal deputations from Mr. Barry Nelson, Thornhill Historical Society and Valerie and David Burke, be received.

Carried

6.3 SITE PLAN CONTROL APPLICATION

PROPOSED ADDITION TO AN EXISTING NON-HERITAGE DWELLING 3 VICTORIA LANE, UNIONVILLE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT (16.11)

FILE NUMBER:
SPC 22 117576

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

Councillor Reid McAlpine, Chair, disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 6.3 (3 Victoria Lane, Unionville Heritage Conservation District), by nature of being a neighbouring property owner, and did not take part in the discussion of, or vote on the applications.

David Wilson assumed the Chair for this item.

Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner, addressed the Committee and summarized the site plan control application for the proposed addition to an existing non-heritage dwelling at 3 Victoria Lane in the Unionville Heritage Conservation District.

The existing dwelling on the property is a 1½ storey modern infill house. The applicant proposes to construct a detached garage and a one storey addition to the existing dwelling while converting the existing attached garage into new living space. Staff is satisfied that the design of the proposed addition complies with the policies and guidelines contained in the Unionville Heritage Conservation Plan as it applies to additions to non-heritage buildings, is architecturally compatible with the existing dwelling, and has no negative impacts to the historic character of the District. The existing driveway is to be removed and replaced with grass and the garage doors are to be removed and replaced with windows. The new garage is to be recessed behind the front elevation of the existing dwelling.

Responding to questions from the Committee, Mr. Shane Gregory, the applicant's design representative, advised that the intent is to remove the existing paved driveway and cover that area with sod and new vegetation, which will also provide a buffer between the neighbouring properties. There is to be no parking on the grass, and all parking will be within the proposed new two car garage and driveway.

Responding to further questions from the Committee, Mr. Shane Gregory advised that there is no intention of having two separate dwellings on the property. He further advised that the applicant is aware that if an additional dwelling is desired in the future, they will need to apply to the Committee of Adjustment to legalize it as a secondary suite. He further advised that since the property is abutting lands are owned by Metrolinx, the owners need to enter into a restrictive agreement with them. The Committee recommended that the existing parking pad be completely removed.

There being no further comments and/or questions from the Committee, the following motion was made with an amendment.

Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection to the design of the proposed addition to the existing dwelling at 3 Victoria Lane;

THAT the applicant remove the existing parking pad on the property;

THAT Heritage Markham delegates final review of the Site Plan Application and any other development application necessary to approve the proposed addition to the City (Heritage Section) staff; and

THAT the applicant enter into a Site Plan Agreement with the City containing standard conditions regarding materials, colours, windows etc.to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Urban Design or their designate.

Carried

6.4 SITE PLAN CONTROL APPLICATION & VARIANCE APPLICATION

PROPOSED REAR ADDITION TO AN EXISTING HERITAGE DWELLING 25 VICTORIA AVE, UNIONVILLE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT (16.11)

FILE NUMBER:

SPC 116892

A/06/22

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

Councillor Reid McAlpine, Chair disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 6.4 (25 Victoria Avenue, Unionville Heritage Conservation District), by nature of being the neighbour, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

David Wilson assumed the Chair for this item.

Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner, addressed the Committee and summarized the Site Plan Control and Minor Variance applications for the proposed rear addition to an existing heritage dwelling at 25 Victoria Avenue.

The property is currently occupied by a heritage dwelling constructed in the 1890s. An existing 1-storey tail that was most likely a summer kitchen woodshed is proposed to be removed in order to construct a two-storey addition at the rear. A full width verandah is also proposed, along with some restoration of the heritage house. The variances being applied for are:

1. a front yard setback of 5 feet 2 inches to the front covered porch, whereas the By-law requires 25 feet;
2. a maximum lot coverage of 34.5 percent, whereas the By-law permits a maximum lot coverage of 33.3 percent;
3. a rear concrete deck without cellar below to project 3.66 metres, whereas the By-law permits a maximum projection of 3.0 metres; and
4. window openings at an elevation of 174.7 metres, whereas the bylaw requires an elevation of 174.8 metres.

The Senior Heritage Planner advised the Committee that Staff have evaluated the proposal against the policies and guidelines of the District Plan and have no objections to the variances being sought as they either reflect an existing historic condition, are minor in nature, or have no impact from a heritage perspective.

Staff, however, recommends that the architectural form of the proposed addition be revised to better reflect the form and simple massing of the existing heritage house. Staff do not support the proposed alteration to the existing front veranda which appears to be an original or early heritage feature based on archival photographs. The proposed addition would appear to negatively impact a large Norway Maple tree located on the property boundary to the east, and the proposed detached garage requires the removal of trees located at the rear of the property. Staff recommends that the submitted drawings be annotated to identify heritage features to be retained and new materials, and that elevation drawings for the garage be submitted. Staff also recommends that the underlying historic siding of the heritage house be restored, and that two-over-two single hung windows be installed in the heritage portion of the house. Staff suggested that this application return to Heritage Markham for further review after the applicant has considered Staff's recommendations.

Heritage Markham expressed concerns about tree preservation on the property and will review this aspect of the proposal when it comes back to the Committee for future consideration.

Mr. Russ Gregory, the applicant's design representative, advised that a tree preservation plan has been submitted. There are two trees on the owner's property that reportedly are not in good health and are proposed to be removed, however, the owner has every intention to preserve significant trees. He further advised that the plans have been designed considering the neighbouring properties.

Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham does not support the proposed front veranda and recommends that the existing historic front porch be retained in its current form;

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection to the requested variances from a heritage perspective;

THAT the proposed addition be revised to better reflect the architectural form and simple massing of the existing heritage dwelling;

THAT the drawings be annotated to identify materials, heritage features to be retained and new materials, and garage drawings be submitted;

THAT the underlying historic siding of the heritage dwelling be revealed and restored, and that any modern replacement window be replaced with new historically authentic windows;

THAT the large Norway Maple tree located on the property to the east be preserved; through the design of the proposed addition;

AND THAT the submission be revised and return to Heritage Markham Committee for review.

Carried

6.5 REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK

UPDATE ON OPTIONS FOR EXISTING BUILDING 7951 YONGE STREET (16.11)

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Senior Heritage Planner

Councillor Reid McAlpine resumed the Chair for the rest of the meeting.

This matter was considered at the May Heritage Markham Committee meeting, and Councillor Keith Irish agreed to meet with the applicant or their representative and review what options might be available to preserve the building on site or by potentially moving it to another appropriate site.

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning advised that after the May 11 Heritage Markham Committee meeting the applicant withdrew their application to demolish the existing building at 7951 Yonge Street.

Councillor Keith Irish advised that the applicant had previously applied for a demolition permit in order to make way for a proposed future development. There is currently no application before the City, nor have they participated in any formal pre-consultation with Planning staff, however, he was made aware of a concept plan that was submitted by the applicant or the owner's agent to the Province, proposing a

twenty-six storey mixed-use high-rise building consisting of approximately 170 units, including 120 parking spaces with 96 located in 2 levels of underground parking and the remainder being located at-grade. He also noted this property would be adjacent to a potential Royal Orchard subway station.

As background to this item, Councillor Irish expressed concerns about recommendations concerning cultural heritage resources which were included in the recent housing affordability task force and whether they might be introduced in the future. He also noted that although Heritage Markham has not made a decision on the matter, it appeared that the committee would prefer to deny this request for a demolition permit, and retain the existing building on the property at 7951 Yonge Street.

Councillor Irish advised that since the last Heritage Markham Committee meeting, he has worked with the City's Manager, Real Property and the Senior Manager of Revenue and Property Taxes, and has a list of city-owned vacant properties, with the exclusion of parkland property in Ward 1. He further advised that he is continuing to have discussions with the owner's agent regarding the opportunity and cost of moving the building. It is his opinion that it is in the best interest of the current property owner to see the building preserved through relocation, and he hopes to have a better idea of that possibility, and will provide an update to the Heritage Markham Committee at its meeting in July.

Responding to questions from the Committee about a possible MZO application from the owner, Councillor Irish advised that the response he received from Planning Staff is that the owner is exploring all options.

Responding to a further question from the Committee, Councillor Irish advised that there do not appear to be any government programs that would provide assistance in a private matter like this. In his opinion, it is in the best interest of the developer to assume the costs and move the home to an alternate site in the local community.

Mr. Barry Nelson, speaking on behalf of the Thornhill Historical Society, addressed the Committee and expressed his concerns that this matter was not referred to the Architectural Review Sub-committee for future discussions when it was considered at the last Heritage Markham meeting. He also noted that this heritage resource functions as a gateway to the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District.

Councillor Irish indicated that negotiations will continue and it would appear that demolition will not be pursued in the short term.

Recommendations:

THAT the update from Councillor Irish on discussions with the owner concerning options for the cultural heritage resource, be received;

THAT Councillor Irish provide a further update to Heritage Markham at its meeting on July 13, 2022; and

THAT the verbal deputation by Barry Nelson, Thornhill Historical Society, be received.

Carried

6.6 REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK

PROPOSED ALTERATION OF EXISTING ROOF TO ACCOMMODATE AIR-CONDITIONING UNIT 139 MAIN STREET UNIONVILLE, THE UNIONVILLE PLANING MILL (16.11)

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner, addressed the Committee and summarized the request for feedback with respect to the proposed alterations to accommodate a rooftop air-conditioning unit at 139 Main Street, Unionville – the Planing Mill located at the corner of Main Street and Victoria Avenue. This is a prominent commercial building constructed to replace the original planing mill which burned down and was designed to reflect the distinct forms of the 19th century industrial buildings also seen on the Stiver Mill complex.

The owner of the property proposes to remove a portion of the existing monitor roof to accommodate a new roof-top air conditioning unit. It was noted that unlike most residential buildings, the design of industrial buildings must by necessity often reflect the practical requirements of the functions and equipment contained within, rendering aesthetic concerns secondary. A good example of this architectural form in the Unionville context is the appearance of the historic Stiver Mill Complex which reflects the former industrial processes and use of the building. One character defining aspect of this building and the Planing Mill is the use of a gabled monitor roof.

During proposed repairs of the existing air-conditioning unit, it was noted that the existing roof structure did not meet the required clearances as stipulated by the manufacturer, which could lead to a fire, and that the existing roof structure prevented the effective exhaust of dangerous carbon monoxide gas expelled by the unit when in operation. As a result, the current equipment can no longer be utilized. . The proposed new roof top air-conditioning unit requires a minimum clearance of 10

feet above the unit to both prevent fires and permit the escape of carbon monoxide, and that is why the applicant proposes to simply remove the existing monitor roof over the air-conditioning unit to meet the required standards for operation.

The applicant provided elevation drawings illustrating the existing roof, what it would look like with a portion of the roof removed, and what a new raised roof meeting the required clearances of the proposed air conditioning unit would look like. Although it would be preferable to retain the roof as it exists, this is not possible due to the requirements of the air-conditioning equipment. Staff are of the opinion that the impact of the proposed removal of a small section of the existing roof is preferable to a new monitor type roof meeting the clearance requirements, but raised quite high above the unit. Therefore, staff recommends the option of removing the necessary section of the roof as proposed, or building a skeletal structure to mimic the form of the existing roof, provided it still complies with the required clearances of the new air-conditioning unit. A similar approach was used on the roof of the Village Grocer building on 16th Avenue.

The Committee discussed various options of replacing the existing roof with a new roof that would meet the required clearance of the proposed air-conditioning unit.

Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham supports a skeletal structure containing the form of the existing monitor roof, provided this meets the operating requirements of the specified air-conditioning unit; and

THAT final review of the building permit required to permit either option be delegated to Heritage Section staff.

Carried

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

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning advised the Committee of an upcoming statutory public meeting at 7:00 p.m. on June 27th to consider a City-initiated Temporary Use By-law which will temporarily permit the expansion of existing and new outdoor patios associated with restaurant and brewery uses and outdoor sales and display areas associated with existing permitted retail and personal service shops. The proposal would apply to the Heritage area of Unionville and Markham Main Street.

Councillor Reid McAlpine advised the Committee of an upcoming Public Information meeting on June 23rd with respect to the revitalization plans for the Main Street Unionville commercial streetscape.

8. PART SIX - NEW BUSINESS

There were no items of new business.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The Heritage Markham Committee adjourned at 9:15 p.m.