



Heritage Markham Committee Minutes

Meeting Number: 9
September 14, 2022, 7:00 PM
Electronic Meeting

Members	Councillor Keith Irish Shan Goel Councillor Reid McAlpine, Chair Nathan Proctor	Paul Tiefenbach David Wilson Elizabeth Wimmer Neil Chakraborty
Regrets	Ken Davis Victor Huang	Lake Trevelyan Councillor Karen Rea
Staff	Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning Evan Manning, Senior Heritage Planner	Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner Hristina Giantsopoulos, Committee Secretary Rehan Suleman, Speakers List

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Heritage Markham Committee meeting convened at 7:06 PM with Councillor Reid McAlpine presiding as chair.

2. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

There were none disclosed.

3. PART ONE - ADMINISTRATION

3.1 APPROVAL OF AGENDA (16.11)

A. Addendum Agenda

B. New Business from Committee Members

Recommendation

That the September 14, 2022 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved.

Carried

3.2 MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 23, 2022 HERITAGE MARKHAM COMMITTEE MEETING (16.11)

It was noted that Councillor McAlpine chaired the August 23, 2022 Heritage Markham Committee meeting and that the minutes should be updated accordingly.

Recommendation:

That the minutes of the Heritage Markham Committee meeting held on August 23, 2022 be received and adopted as amended.

Carried

4. PART TWO - DEPUTATIONS

4.1 REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK

26 LANGSTAFF ROAD EAST, THORNHILL

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Senior Heritage Planner

Evan Manning, Senior Heritage Planner, introduced the item and noted that this property is not part of an immediate development proposal and is listed on the City of Markham's Register of Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest.

Joan Crosbie, of Timmins Martelle Heritage Consultants (TMHC), addressed the Committee to advise that the purpose of the presentation is to seek input from the Heritage Markham Committee as part of continued community consultation prior to finalizing their findings regarding the property's cultural heritage value. She presented information in relation to a provincial cultural heritage evaluation report (CHER) for 26 Langstaff Road E. that outlined the property location, size, history of tenancy and ownership, ~~the location~~, and current heritage status. It was noted that the building has been vacant since 2014 and has openings in the roof, water in the basement, partial ceiling collapse and peeling paint. Ms. Crosbie noted that the current project is to reassess the cultural heritage value and interest of the property that is being led by Infrastructure Ontario. At this time, the condition of the building is poor and based on their analysis, the property doesn't meet the Ontario Heritage Act's O.Reg. 10/06 – "Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest of Provincial Significance".

Barry Nelson, addressed the Committee in support of preserving this heritage resource as a physical remnant of the former Langstaff community and to retain the opportunity for its incorporation into future development.

Valerie Burke, addressed the Committee in support of the preservation of the former community structure given its Group 2 evaluation rating by the Heritage Markham Committee a few years ago, and that the building should be incorporated into any future development project. She also expressed concern regarding the lack of maintenance and stewardship by the Province.

Abby Flower, Cultural Heritage Manager, Infrastructure Ontario (IO) advised that the building is not in great shape and that IO has limited resources to address the many buildings in its portfolio. She indicated that she will come back to the Committee with any information as to whether protective measures can be taken to stabilize the property as part of a future maintenance cycle.

The Committee discussed the following:

- The overall condition of the building;
- Whether there are any plans for a highway on-ramp at this location that may impact the property or any current development plans for the property;
- Inquiries into how the building has deteriorated to the state that it is in without any remediation on part of the Province;
- The type of permission required from local authorities for any demolition of the property and who is the ultimate decision-maker;
- The type of influence the City and Heritage Markham may have over Provincially-owned properties such as designation; and further,
- That there is interest in maintaining the building while TMHC's evaluation is finalized, and in advance of a future redevelopment of the property.

Ms. Flower advised that ultimately it would be a provincial decision to demolish the building and that if the property were to be evaluated as having heritage value, a Heritage Impact Assessment would be required along with heritage stakeholder input.

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham receive the deputation from TMHC regarding the preliminary findings of their CHER for 26 Langstaff Road East; and

That the Committee respectfully request Infrastructure Ontario to take immediate steps to prevent further deterioration of the building; and,

That the Committee begin the process of evaluating the property for potential designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act; and,

That the correspondence from the Thornhill Historical Society and the deputations from Barry Nelson and Valerie Burke be received.

Carried

4.2 SITE PLAN CONTROL

ADJACENT TO A MUNICIPALLY- RECOGNIZED HERITAGE RESOURCE

PROPOSED HIGH RISE DEVELOPMENT

5, 9, 11, & 25 LANGSTAFF ROAD EAST, THORNHILL (16.11)

File Number:

22 247842 SPC

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Senior Heritage Planner

The Committee consented that item 5.7 be moved forward after item 4.1 (Deputation - 26 Langstaff Road East).

Evan Manning, Senior Heritage Planner, addressed the Committee to provide an overview of the Site Plan Control application for 5, 9, 11, & 25 Langstaff Road East for two high-rise towers adjacent to a municipally-recognized heritage resource (26 Langstaff Road East). The proposed development is comprised of 1,132 residential units.

The Committee discussed the impact of the project on the surrounding area including its impact on the local creek, and parking issues associated with the large number of new residents.

Barry Nelson requested to speak in relation to the creek. The Chair advised that the discussion should focus on any impact of the development on the adjacent heritage resource. He noted that only discussions on the matter at hand would be permitted.

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham has no comment from a heritage perspective on the Site Plan Control application for 5, 9, 11, & 25 Langstaff Road East;

Carried

That item 5.7 be moved out of the Consent section and placed after item 4.1 in the Regular Reports section of the agenda.

Carried

5. PART THREE - CONSENT

5.1 HERITAGE PERMIT

**DELEGATED APPROVAL BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF
5990 16TH AVENUE (MVHCD), 24-26 FRANKLIN STREET (MVHCD)
(16.11)**

File Numbers:

HE 22 256161

HE 22 257611

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 HERITAGE PERMIT

**DELEGATED APPROVAL BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF
157 MAIN STREET (UHCD) (16.11)**

File Numbers:

HE 22 256161

HE 22 257611

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Senior Heritage Planner

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham receive the information on the heritage permit for 157 Main Street, Unionville approved by Heritage Section staff under the delegated approval process.

Carried

5.3 BUILDING PERMIT

DELEGATED APPROVAL OF BUILDING PERMITS BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF

19 ROUGE STREET (MVHCD), 50 GEORGE STREET (MVHCD), 109 JOHN STREET (THCD), 139 MAIN STREET (UHCD) (16.11)

File Numbers:

HP 22 246666

HP 22 120973

HP 17 159713

NH 22 255868

HP 22 246666

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

5.4 DEMOLITION PERMIT

**PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF A REAR YARD ACCESSORY BUILDING
45 JERMAN STREET, MARKHAM VILLAGE HERITAGE
CONSERVATION DISTRICT (16.11)**

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the demolition of the historic, one-storey, frame accessory building at 45 Jerman Street subject to the applicant advertising the structure for salvage or relocation for 2 weeks in the local newspaper;

Carried

5.5 SITE PLAN CONTROL

FAÇADE MODIFICATIONS

4340 HIGHWAY 7 EAST, UNIONVILLE (16.11)

File Number:

SPC 22 244216

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Senior Heritage Planner

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to proposed modifications as shown in the Site Plan Control application for 4340 Highway 7 East.

Carried

5.6 COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT VARIANCE

ADJACENT TO THE MARKHAM VILLAGE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT PROPOSED NEW DETACHED DWELLING

14 WALES AVENUE, MARKHAM VILLAGE (16.11)

File Number:
MNV 22 256482 (A/163/22)

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

Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham has no comment from a heritage perspective on the Variance application and proposed new detached dwelling at 14 Wales Avenue;

THAT any future development application on the property be delegated to Heritage Section Staff;

AND THAT 14 Wales Avenue be removed from the Markham Register of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest at the earliest opportunity.

Carried

5.8 SITE PLAN CONTROL

ADJACENT TO THORNHILL HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT PROPOSED NEW COMMERCIAL BUILDING 7545 YONGE STREET (16.11)

File Number:
SPC 22 245693

Extracts:
R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Valerie Burke, Thornhill Historical Society, addressed the Committee and suggested that there be consideration for design improvements with respect to the new commercial building to ensure better compatibility with the adjacent Thornhill Heritage Conservation District (THCD).

The Committee discussed inclusion of landscape buffer of three meters adjacent to the THCD.

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham Committee has reviewed the application submitted for 7545 Yonge Street due to the property 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 application other than to encourage a robust landscape treatment along the Yonge Street frontage **and that it is preferably at a minimum of 3 metres.**

That the written communication from Thornhill Historical Society and the deputation by Valerie Burke be received.

Carried

6. PART FOUR - REGULAR

6.1 COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT VARIANCE

PROPOSED COACH HOUSE

339 MAIN STREET NORTH, MARKHAM VILLAGE (16.11)

File Number:

A/146/22

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Senior Heritage Planner

Evan Manning, Senior Heritage Planner, addressed the Committee concerning the application, specifically the applicant's proposal to remove the existing garage, keep the driveway in its current location, and permit the construction of a coach house at the rear of the property. He advised that Staff are in support of this proposal and will work with the applicant to reduce the amount of paving in the front yard.

Mr. Russ Gregory, expressed concern with the Committee's comments in relation to the driveway orientation.

The Committee requested further clarification on the orientation of the driveway and inquired about the existing tree locations. Staff confirmed that the proposed driveway reflects the current driveway location, and that no trees are proposed to be removed.

Moved by David Wilson

Seconded by Councillor Keith Irish

Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the demolition of the existing detached garage at 339 Main Street North;

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the requested variances to permit the proposed *coach house*;

AND THAT 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 to ensure conformance to the MVHCD Plan.

Carried

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

7.1 SPECIAL PROJECTS

UNIONVILLE MAIN STREET STREETScape - DETAILED DESIGN STAGE (16.11)

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

A. Cachola, Senior Manager, Infrastructure and Capital Projects

N. Azmy, Senior Capital Works Engineer

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning, addressed the Committee and provided information on the streetscape design for Unionville Main Street and provided visual examples of the materials that are being considered for the surface areas of the reconstruction project (sidewalk, boulevard and roadway).

The proposal includes:

- Roadway – Unilock- Town Hall 3 Colour Blend (Old Oak, Burnt Clay and Burgundy Red) a rough surface paver with larger spacing between pavers.
- Sidewalk and Edges- Unilock
 - Sidewalk – Senzo Cream or Revela Savannah – a smooth surface paver
 - Edges – Promenade 4x12 Opal Blend or Promenade 4x12 Sandstone
- Parking Space Area on Boulevard – Unilock – select one of the Town Hall Colours (Old Oak, Burnt Clay or Burgundy Red) a rough surface paver with larger spacing between pavers.

Mr. Hutcheson advised that Council has approved the use of concrete pavers on a concrete base and is seeking input from the Committee on the proposed colour treatment and size of pavers from a heritage perspective.

It was noted that AODA requirements are under review to ensure compliance, notably to ensure that there are no issues for people with visual impairments.

Individual committee members made the following comments in relation to the paver options and colours proposed:

- Colour of Pavers
 - A member indicated that the use of three colours of pavers in the road way was not appropriate from a heritage perspective and suggested that only one colour be used;
 - A member noted that the brick colour will fade quickly after installation;
 - No member indicated any opposition to the colours presented.
- Sidewalk and Boulevard Treatment
 - A member noted a preference for concrete sidewalks;
 - A member indicated that City engineers should be relied upon for their expertise and input on sidewalk materials;
 - A member suggested that perhaps there should not be any colour difference between the sidewalk paver and the boulevard paver (but it was noted that this could impact where vehicles park and may invade the pedestrian travel area). Further, impact on accessibility issues (such as sight impairment) and not knowing where the pedestrian travel area is located was raised as a concern;
 - A member indicated a preference for boulevard pavers to be brick size (more traditional in appearance);
- Maintenance and Noise
 - A member noted the potential additional maintenance of these materials over time;
 - A member raised the issue of rough pavers creating louder roadway noise and the potential impact on adjacent buildings;
 - The issue of the wider grout space between the roadway pavers was discussed as a potential safety issue (primarily when the street is closed to traffic and used by pedestrians) and whether a smoother paver face with less grout space would be better.
- General

- A member suggested that design elements along the street (such as trees, street furniture, lamp posts, etc) are usually more significant in the planning of streetscapes as opposed to surface materials.

Mr. Hutcheson advised that the decisions on paver use and placement have already been made and approved by Council and that this presentation was to obtain preliminary feedback from the Committee on the colour selection and size of pavers from a heritage perspective and to ensure they were complementary to the Unionville Heritage Conservation District.

Overall, the Committee did not appear to be opposed to the colour palette from a heritage perspective, but individual members expressed their opinions of paver size, roughness of the paver surface, spacing between pavers and whether fewer paver colours should be used.

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham Committee receive the update on the Unionville Main Street Streetscape Project – Detailed Design regarding paver selection, colour and placement

Carried

8. PART SIX - NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

9. ADJOURNMENT

That the Heritage Markham Committee meeting adjourn at 9:23 PM.

Carried