



# Heritage Markham Committee Minutes

**Meeting Number: 11**  
**November 9, 2022, 7:00 PM**  
**Electronic Meeting**

Members	Councillor Keith Irish	Lake Trevelyan
	Councillor Reid McAlpine, Chair	Paul Tiefenbach
	Councillor Karen Rea	David Wilson, Vice Chair
	Neil Chakraborty	Elizabeth Wimmer
	Ken Davis	
	Shan Goel	
	Victor Huang	
	Nathan Proctor	
Regrets		
Staff	Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning	Rajeeth Arulanantham, Assistant to Council/Committee
	Evan Manning, Senior Heritage Planner	Laura Gold, Council/Committee Coordinator
	Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner	

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

Councillor Reid McAlpine, Chair, convened the meeting at 7:03 PM by asking for any disclosures of interest with respect to items on the agenda.

## 2. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

Victor Huang declared a disclosure of pecuniary interest for the following item due to his involvement with project:

*6.1 ZONING BYLAW AMENDMENT, OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT,  
 PLAN OF SUBDIVISION*

*PROPOSED TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT  
347 MAIN STREET NORTH (16.11)*

**3. PART ONE - ADMINISTRATION**

**3.1 APPROVAL OF AGENDA (16.11)**

- A. Addendum Agenda
- B. New Business from Committee Members

Recommendation:

That the November 9, 2022 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved.

**Carried**

**3.2 MINUTES OF THE OCTOBER 12, 2022 HERITAGE MARKHAM COMMITTEE MEETING (16.11)**

Recommendation:

That the minutes of the Heritage Markham Committee meeting held on October 12, 2022 be received and adopted.

**Carried**

**4. PART TWO - DEPUTATIONS**

**4.1 ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT, OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT**

**PROPOSED NEW MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT**

**160, 162, 166, 170, 174, 182 AND 186 MAIN STREET UNIONVILLE (16.11)**

FILE NUMBERS:

PLAN 22 253770

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner, advised that Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications have been received for a mixed-use development located behind the commercial properties that front the west side of Main Street, Unionville. The proposal is bisected by a publicly-owned laneway extending westwards from Main Street.

David Johnston, David Johnston Architect Ltd, provided a presentation on the proposed mixed use development. He also noted that they hope to coordinate construction with the redevelopment plans for the Main Street streetscape project.

Chris Uchiyama, LHC, Heritage Planning and Archaeological Consulting Firm, presented a brief overview of the Heritage Impact Assessment submitted for the proposed mixed-use development. She noted from her perspective that the massing had been varied, the height was appropriate, the mansard roof approach included articulation, the barn relocation was supported and that conservation plans should be prepared to address any physical impacts to existing buildings and ensure their protection.

The Committee discussed the following issues as they relate to the proposed development:

#### Rental Units

A Member inquired if there will be rental units in the proposed mixed-use development.

Mr. Johnston explained that the rental units will be included in the proposed rear additions to the existing building fronting Main Street.

#### Underground Parking Garage

The Committee questioned if the proposed development will have enough residential, commercial, and visitors parking.

Marshall Smith, KLM Planning Partners Inc., advised that the Applicant is still working with City Staff on the parking requirements for the proposed development, but explained that the commercial parking is to be looked at as a whole rather than for each retail unit. This rationale is being used as visitors to Main Street will typically go to several retail establishments rather than to one when visiting the area. Mr. Smith clarified that all residential parking will be for the occupants, and that visitors can park in public parking located in the area. It was noted that 10 commercial parking spaces were being proposed and no parking allocated for rental units.

Mr. Johnston advised that there will be one level of underground parking, which will be connected to different parts of the proposed development via staircases. Mr. Johnston noted there is currently 70 parking spaces being contemplated within the underground garage.

The Committee suggested that the Applicant should not rely on public parking for visitor parking, as there is limited public parking on or around Main Street.

### Waste Management

The Committee inquired how waste removal will be addressed, and if the waste collection truck will be able to collect the waste from the underground parking garage without having to reverse down the publicly-owned laneway.

Mr. Johnston advised that waste will be kept in the basement of the proposed development, and brought up and placed outside on waste collection days, noting that the waste for commercial and residential units will be collected on a different days. Mr. Johnston explained that this waste management model is used by a number of the condominiums located on Highway 7 in Markham Centre. Mr. Johnston clarified that there will either be a tri-sorter for the separation of waste, recycling and organic matter, or residents will be required to bring and separate their waste in the basement.

Mr. Smith advised that the proposed development will include a T-turnaround, which will permit for waste collection trucks to turnaround safely with only having to reverse slightly down the laneway.

Mr. Johnston explained that the underground parking garage will have a shallow ceiling due to the high water table, potentially impacting the feasibility of below-grade waste collection.

It was suggested that the Applicant may wish to explore acquiring the laneway from the City to make waste collection easier, and to introduce the connectivity of the underground parking garage with the south property.

### Interior Walkway and Soft Landscaping

A Member suggested that the interior walkway would be an ideal location for an art-walk, as it may draw people to the area and reduce the visual clutter on Main Street. The Member also suggested there should be more soft-landscaping.

Mr. Johnston advised that the proposed development will include mostly hardscaping with minimal grass. Mr. Johnston anticipated that the area will be heavily used. He noted that the desired north-south walkway would be internal to the site and not along the west property boundary.

### Buffer between the School and the Mixed Development

The Committee questioned whether there will be a buffer between the school and the proposed development and whether it could include soft landscaping. It also questioned the set back from school's property, and if there is an easement on the property. It was noted that it appeared that all existing trees were to be removed from the site.

Mr. Johnston advised that the plan is to plant larger trees on the school's side of the property line, and smaller trees on opposite side. Mr. Johnston confirmed that they propose to work with the York Region Public School Board on this matter. Mr. Johnston clarified that there will be a 2 metre set-back from the school's property line, and that the only easement on the property was for hydro. He confirmed that all on-site trees were to be removed and that a number of them were considered low-caliber.

The Committee requested that the western setback of the Hart House Condominiums and the proposed development be compared.

#### Emergency Services Access

The Committee questioned how emergency services will be able to access the proposed development, especially the north building.

Mr. Johnston advised that the proposed development will be fully equipped with sprinklers, and that all building code and fire requirements will be met. Emergency vehicles will be able to access the proposed development through the laneway or from Main Street.

Mr. Smith noted that the sprinkler system will also include Siamese connections, which provides a means for firefighters to connect hose lines to supplement the sprinklers water supply. Furthermore, the fire fighters will have access to a rapid key box, which provides access to all units.

#### Condominium Corporation

A Member questioned how the condominium corporation would work for this development proposal.

#### Vision Plan – Pattern Book

The Committee expressed concern that the proposed development does not reflect the style and massing as depicted in the Pattern Book approved by the City in 2018.

Mr. Johnston advised the deviation from the Pattern Book is the result of the book being created to take into consideration the development of single lots, rather than multiple lots, and the challenges of adhering to the Pattern Book while ensuring the proposal is economically viable. Mr. Johnston noted that the Pattern Book also does not consider the relationship between proposed and existing new residential construction on Main Street.

Harshal Dave, owner advised that the original development proposal prepared for this property did not comply with the Pattern Book, and that David Johnston was

hired to create a new proposal that more closely reflects the guidance provided in the Pattern Book.

#### Mansard Roof

The Committee supported the staff recommendation with respect to the proposed use of a mansard roof, suggesting that finessing the roof slightly to include more of a pitch would create more of a Unionville village-like feel.

#### Existing Barn

It was noted that this matter needs to be addressed, and if relocated, an appropriate local site needs to be found. Previous discussions included the Stiver Mill property, owned by the City.

#### Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham recommends that that applicant work with Heritage Section staff to explore opportunities to further refine the proposed massing and height components of the buildings to be more reflective of the guidance provided in the Unionville Pattern Book;

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection to the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendment components seeking permission for residential uses within the new buildings at the rear of the existing Main Street properties;

AND THAT Heritage Markham recommends that the Barn Structure be retained and incorporated into the development, **or be relocated** to another local site preferably within the Unionville village area.

**Carried**

## **4.2 PROPOSED CHANGES TO PROVINCE OF ONTARIO LEGISLATION**

### **BILL 23 - MORE HOMES BUILT FASTER ACT, 2022, IMPACT ON MARKHAM'S HERITAGE PLANNING PROGRAM**

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

D. Wedderburn, Manager, Policy

Regan Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning, presented the heritage implications of proposed provincial legislation, *Bill 23 – More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022*. Mr. Hutcheson advised that according to the Government of Ontario, the Act is intended to modify, and streamline municipal planning to increase the supply of housing in Ontario, including affordable housing. Mr. Hutcheson noted that staff's two major concerns regarding the proposed

legislation include: 1) prohibiting the use of Site Plan Control for housing under 10 units (which would impact how Markham addresses low-rise residential development approval in heritage conservation districts); and 2) that heritage properties added to the City's Heritage Registry need to be designated within two years of being placed on the list, and once removed cannot be added back to the list for another 5 years.

The following deputation were made on the proposed new provincial legislation:

1. Barry Nelson advised that Bill 23 addresses exclusionary zoning by requiring more units on residential parcels, which provides some incentive for rental unit construction thereby increasing the supply of affordable housing, but noted that it also has many limitations. Mr. Nelson suggest that Bill 23 will fail to meet its objectives for the following reasons: 1) it focuses on high-rise development, which will drive up the cost of land and increase developer profits; 2) it focuses on placing rental properties on expensive environmentally sensitive land, including culturally sensitive areas such as Heritage Districts, which will make building affordable housing more challenging; and 3) it will create less livable communities. Mr. Nelson advised that the City needs to continue to put pressure on the Province. Mr. Nelson thanked staff for preparing a comprehensive analysis of the proposed legislation so quickly.
  
2. Adam Birrell, President, Thornhill Historical Society (formally known as the Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill - SPOHT), thanked staff for their response to the proposed provincial legislation, and generally supported their response, noting that the clear intent of the changes appeared to be to make heritage protection more difficult. He noted the following: 1) expressed concern regarding the vagueness of Section 41 (Heritage Districts) of the proposed legislation, noting the danger of what could occur due to the lack of detail, as municipalities need to maintain the ability to designate heritage districts; 2) suggested adding "listed property" as well as designated under the staff comment on Section 41 (1.2)- Proposed changes to Site Plan Approval- Number of Units.
  
2. Evelin Ellison suggested that staff recommend that heritage landscapes also be protected under the proposed legislation.

Mr. Hutcheson noted that staff did not make any recommendations regarding heritage landscaping, as this is not specifically addressed in the proposed legislation, and that landscape elements can be protected through Part IV and V

designation. He further noted that HCD's are considered cultural heritage landscapes.

The Committee briefly discussed the proposed legislation, and suggested that staff's recommendation to consider a heritage permitting system if site plan control to address heritage matters is eliminated, be communicated to Council, but withheld from the communication sent to the Province.

Mr. Hutcheson clarified that most other municipalities in Ontario already use a heritage permitting system to address heritage matters. However, Markham has combined the Site Plan Control and the Heritage Permit tools to achieve superior results. The Committee suggested possibly expressing the efficiencies that have been found through Markham's use of Site Plan Control in Staff's response to the Province.

The Committee encouraged all Members and deputants to submit their individual comments to the Province.

Recommendations:

**THAT the deputations by Barry Nelson, Adam Birell, (Thornhill Historical Society), and Evelin Ellison be received.**

THAT Heritage Markham Committee receive the information on the Bill 23 - More Homes Built Faster Act, 2022 and the impact on Markham's Heritage Planning Program;

AND THAT Heritage Markham supports the comments and recommendations in the summary chart (Attachment A) and recommends to Council that these be forwarded to the Government of Ontario.

**Carried**

**5. PART THREE - CONSENT**

**5.1 HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATION**

**DELEGATED APPROVAL BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF  
190 MAIN STREET NORTH (MVHCD), 280 MAIN STREET NORTH  
(MVHCD), 7 WASHINGTON STREET (MVHCD) (16.11)**

FILE NUMBERS:

HE 22 262358

HE 22 261765

HE 22 261766

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 PERMIT APPLICATION**

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

**329 MAIN ST. N. (MVHCD), 10346 MCCOWAN RD., 157 MAIN ST. (UHCD), 10761 VICTORIA SQUARE BLVD., 4592 HWY 7E. UNIONVILLE (16.11)**

FILE NUMBERS:

HP 22 255378

HP 21 143904

AL 22 260191

AL 22 111657

AL 22 112161

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 SITE PLAN CONTROL APPLICATION**

**ALTERATIONS TO A PART-IV DESIGNATED PROPERTY  
9392 KENNEDY ROAD (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER:

22 251336 SPC

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Senior Heritage Planner

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection to the design of the proposed three-storey addition to 9392 Kennedy Road and that further review of the Site Plan Control application, and any other development application required to approve the proposed development, be delegated to Heritage Section staff.

**Carried**

#### **5.4 COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT VARIANCE APPLICATION**

##### **COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT APPLICATION FOR INCREASED RESTAURANT GFA**

**5990 16<sup>th</sup> AVENUE (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER:

A/043/22

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Senior Heritage Planner

A Member requested that the Applicant be required to obtain both a sign and heritage permit as a condition of the approval of the application for increased restaurant GFA at 5990 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham has no comment on the Minor Variance application (A/043/22) for 5990 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue from a heritage perspective; and,

**THAT Heritage Markham recommends that obtaining a sign/heritage permit be included as condition of the application's approval for increased restaurant GFA at 5990 16<sup>th</sup> Avenue.**

**Carried**

#### **5.5 SITE PLAN CONTROL APPLICATION**

**PROPOSED TWO-LANE DRIVEWAY  
245 RENFREW DRIVE, BUTTONVILLE (16.11)**

FILE NUMBERS:

SPC 22 249377

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Senior Heritage Planner

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham has no comment from a heritage perspective on the Site Plan Control application for 245 Renfrew Drive.

**Carried**

**5.6 HERITAGE MARKHAM NOMINEES - AWARDS**

**ONTARIO VOLUNTEER SERVICE AWARDS - 2023  
ONTARIO HONOURS AND AWARDS SECRETARIAT (16.11)**

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham receive the information on the Ontario Volunteer Service Awards as information.

**Carried**

**5.7 COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT VARIANCE APPLICATION**

***COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT APPLICATION FOR PROPOSED  
SECOND STOREY ADDITION AND EXPANSION OF THE FRONT PORCH  
9 MARIE COURT, THORNHILL (16.11)***

FILE NUMBERS:

PLAN 22 258197 MNV

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Senior Heritage Planner

J. Kim, Senior Planner, West District

RECOMMENDATION:

THAT Heritage Markham has no comment from a heritage perspective on the Minor Variance application for 9 Marie Court.

**Carried**

**6. PART FOUR - REGULAR**

**6.1 ZONING BYLAW AMENDMENT, OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT, PLAN OF SUBDIVISION**

**PROPOSED TOWNHOUSE DEVELOPMENT  
347 MAIN STREET NORTH (16.11)**

FILE NUMBERS:

PLAN 19 123553

PLAN 21 140439

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

Victor Huang did not participate in the discussion on this item, as he indicated at the start of the meeting that he had pecuniary interest due to his involvement with the project.

Peter Wokral, Senior, Heritage Planner, advised that Official Plan, Zoning By-Law Amendment, and Draft Plan of Subdivision applications have been submitted for 347 Main Street North to facilitate a proposed double row of townhouses.

A member of the Committee expressed concern that the lot was too small to accommodate fourteen townhouses, suggesting that the density should be similar to recently approved nearby townhouse developments such as 10-20 Fincham Avenue. It was also suggested that Applicant consider building a series of fourplexes rather than townhouses on the lot.

Jack Wong, Malone Given and Parsons, representing the applicant, advised that the development proposal addresses staff's technical comments, and that the number of townhouses has been reduced twice, once from 19-15 units, and now from 15-14 units. He noted that there is no maximum density for the property in the Official Plan, but that the proposed density was generally in line with other recent townhouse projects in the Markham Village area.

Karen and Dean Kearns expressed concern that the proposed development would increase traffic on Deer Park Lane, when traffic and speeding are already an issue on the street. Particular concern was expressed regarding the safety of children on the street due to traffic volume. Concern was also expressed regarding the parking supply.

Recommendations:

**THAT Heritage Markham does not support the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications for 347 Main St. N., or the associated Draft Plan of Subdivision application as submitted;**

**AND THAT Heritage Markham encourages the Applicant to work with City Staff on a new proposal.**

**Carried**

## **6.2 REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK**

### **ONTARIO REGULATION 9/06 EVALUATION 26 LANGSTAFF ROAD EAST (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER:

N/A

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Senior Heritage Planner

Evan Manning, Senior Heritage Planner, advised that this item involves the evaluation of 26 Langstaff Road East under Ontario Regulation 9/06 for potential designation under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. A summary of the staff findings was presented, including the conclusion that the property did not appear to meet the criteria as outlined in Ontario Regulation 9/06, and that the property was not considered by staff to be a significant cultural heritage resource.

The following deputations were made regarding the evaluation of 26 Langstaff Road East as a cultural heritage resource:

Valerie Burke spoke in support of designating the property under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, as the church is one of two properties remaining in this area, and that the property could be integrated into future development proposals for the area.

Barry Nelson strongly supported Part IV designation for the church, as it is one of the last remaining buildings in the area associated with the Langstaff community.

Mr. Nelson noted that there will be 80,000 people living in this area and that it needs to be created as a livable place, and that incorporating heritage resources into developments supports place-making and spurs economic growth.

The Clerk noted that a written submission had been received from Diane Berwick in support of retention and heritage protection.

Regan Hutcheson advised that if the Committee recommends designation of the property, staff will need to get a legal interpretation as to whether the City can undertake that action. It is his understanding that provincially-owned properties may be exempt from Part IV designation. Further, if designation is to be recommended, he encouraged the Committee to include the designation criteria it thinks the property meets in any recommendation.

The Committee suggested that staff should clarify if the City can designate the property.

Recommendation:

**THAT the written submission by Diane Berwick on the evaluation of 26 Langstaff Road East, Thornhill, as a cultural asset, be received; and**

**THAT the depositions by Valerie Burke, and Barry Nelson on the evaluation of 26 Langstaff Road East, Thornhill, as a cultural asset, be received; and**

**THAT Heritage Markham considers 26 Langstaff Road East to be a significant cultural heritage resource, and recommends designation of the property under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act.*, as it meets the following criteria under Regulation 9/06:**

**The property has historical value or associative value because it:**

- i. has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community, and**
- ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture.**

**and;**

**The property has contextual value because it:**

- a. is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of the area**
- b. is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or**
- c. is a landmark**

**Carried**

### 6.3 DEMOLITION PERMIT

#### **INTENTION TO DEMOLISH A PART-V DESIGNATED PROPERTY 83 JOHN STREET, THORNHILL HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER:

N/A

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Senior Heritage Planner

Evan Manning, Senior Heritage Planner, advised that the City has received notice of the owner's intention to demolish the existing one-storey dwelling located at 83 John Street and replace it with a new two-storey dwelling. The property is designated under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. Staff are in support of the removal as they feel the dwelling is not a significant component of the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District as it is not directly linked to the community's origins as a mid to late 19<sup>th</sup> century mill village.

The following deputations were made on the demolition notice:

1. Tony Farr advised that he previously served on the Heritage Markham Committee and regretted the Committee's previous decision permitting the demolition of 85 John Street which was similar in design, scale and vintage with 83 John Street. Mr. Farr felt that demolishing the house would have a negative impact on the Thornhill HCD as it will be replaced with a modern structure, will not be sympathetic in scale with the District, and because the dwelling is associated with the provision of housing for returning Second World War veterans as provided through the *Veteran's Land Act*. Mr. Farr noted that the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District Plan also encourages improvements to Class "C" dwellings rather than their removal. Mr. Farr suggested that modest character of the house reflects the historical context of the area. Mr. Farr supported the decision that the Heritage Markham Committee made at its June 8, 2022 meeting, which recommended the conservation of the house, and the construction of a compatible addition.

2. Valerie Burke spoke in opposition to removal of the dwelling and in support of its conservation as the dwelling is connected to the *Land Veterans' Act*, and represents a tangible reminder of the sacrifices made by veterans.

3. Adam Birrell, President, Thornhill Historical Society (formally known as the Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill - SPOHT), spoke in opposition

to the removal of the dwelling and in support of its conservation as it one of the last remaining veteran's houses. He also noted that its modest design is in keeping with the historic character of dwellings in the District.

The Committee encouraged staff to meet with the Applicant to discuss their intentions, and how they can meet Heritage Markham's expectations. Staff advised that they reached out to the Applicant and it was made clear that they have no interest in conserving the house.

Recommendation:

**THAT the deputations by Tony Farr, Valerie Burke, and Adam Birrell, (Thornhill Historical Society), regarding the notice of the owner's intent to demolish the existing one-storey dwelling located at 83 John Street, be received; and,**

**THAT the written submission by Valerie Burke, and Diane Berwick, regarding the notice of the owner's intent to demolish the existing one-storey dwelling located at 83 John Street, be received; and**

**THAT Heritage Markham objects to the application to demolish the dwelling located at 86 John Street for the following reasons:**

- 1) its connections to *Veterans' Land Act*;**
- 2) its modest character reflects the historical context of the area;**
- 3) the Thornhill Conservation District Plan encourages improvements to "Class C" dwellings rather than their demolition; and**
- 4) the replacement of the dwelling with a more modern structure weakens the heritage character of the area.**

**Carried**

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

There was no updates on studies or projects affecting heritage resources.

**8. PART SIX - NEW BUSINESS**

The Committee asked the Clerk to look into the possibility of holding a hybrid meeting or an in person meeting (if all Members are comfortable attending in person) for the December Heritage Markham meeting to permit for a holiday gathering to be held after the meeting.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

The Heritage Markham Committee adjourned at 10:10 PM.