



# Heritage Markham Committee Minutes

**Meeting Number: 2**  
**February 8, 2023, 7:00 PM**  
**Electronic Meeting**

Members	Councillor Karen Rea, Chair Lake Trevelyan, Vice-Chair Councillor Keith Irish Councillor Reid McAlpine Ken Davis Victor Huang Nathan Proctor	Paul Tiefenbach David Wilson Elizabeth Wimmer David Butterworth Tejinder Sidhu Ron Blake
Staff	Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning Evan Manning, Senior Heritage Planner	Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner II Erica Alligood, Election & Committee Coordinator

---

## 1. CALL TO ORDER

Councillor Karen Rea, Chair, convened the meeting at 7:06 PM by asking for any disclosures of interest with respect to items on the agenda.

## 2. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

Ken Davis declared a pecuniary interest on the following item due to residing immediately next door to the subject property and his friendship with the owner of the subject property:

### 5.1 Heritage Permit Application

Delegated Approval by Heritage Section Staff

24 David Gohn Circle (Markham Heritage Estates) (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 February 8, 2023 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved.

**Carried**

**3.2 MINUTES OF THE JANUARY 11, 2023 HERITAGE MARKHAM COMMITTEE MEETING (16.11)**

Recommendation:

That the minutes of the Heritage Markham Committee meeting held on January 11, 2023 be received and adopted.

**Carried**

**3.3 NEW MEMBERS**

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage, introduced three new members of Heritage Markham which were appointed by Council: Ron Blake, David Butterworth, and Tejinder Sidhu. Mr. Hutcheson advised that Paul Tiefenbach was reappointed to the Committee. Mr. Hutcheson invited the new members to briefly introduce themselves.

Ron Blake introduced himself and advised that he has been a resident of Thornhill for over 25 years. Mr. Blake also advised that he worked in the Planning Department of the City of Markham for 22 years prior to his retirement, and encountered many different types of applications, including many that involved heritage resources. Mr. Blake expressed his enthusiasm for participating in the Heritage Markham Committee.

Tejinder Sidhu introduced herself as a resident of Markham and advised that she works as a Development Planner for the City of Brampton. Ms. Sidhu expressed her excitement for bringing her professional experience and her experiences as a Markham resident to the Heritage Markham Committee.

David Butterworth introduced himself and advised that he worked for a large architecture firm before moving into the development industry. Mr. Butterworth

also detailed his work as a historic building consultant and expressed his excitement to bring his professional experience to the Committee and for working with the Members of the Committee.

Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham Committee welcomes Ron Blake, Tejinder Sidhu and David Butterworth to the committee;

AND THAT Heritage Markham thanks Shan Goel and Neil Chakraborty for their past service in the conservation of Markham's cultural heritage resources.

**Carried**

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

##### **4.1 SITE PLAN CONTROL**

##### **PROPOSED RESTORATION OF HISTORIC CLUBHOUSE AND NEW ADDITION**

##### **7859 YONGE ST. THORNHILL HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER:

SPC 22 266567

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner II

Peter Wokral, Senior Planner II, provided a presentation regarding a proposed restoration scope and addition to the historic Toronto Ladies Golf Club clubhouse. Mr. Wokral briefly explained the proposal, including the plan to demolish the existing addition to the original clubhouse, which was constructed in 1990. Mr. Wokral introduced Heather Dubbeldam of Dubbeldam Architecture and Design, the project architects, to provide a presentation detailing the proposal. Heather Dubbeldam also thanked the Committee for the opportunity to present, and for the feedback that Staff have provided thus far. She provided an overview of the proposed addition and its design features.

Sharon Vattay, Heritage Specialist, GBCA Architects, provided the historical context for the property and explained how the heritage elements and overall character of the building would be conserved. Ms. Vattay advised that a comprehensive condition assessment has been completed to determine the necessary repairs or upgrades. Ms. Vattay highlighted the planned repair of the

west facade which involves the removal of an all-season awning, restoring it to its original appearance.

Mr. Wokral provided Heritage Section staff recommendations and noted that staff had encouraged the applicant to introduce multi-pane glazing in order to risk the reduce of bird strikes and to be more in keeping with the architectural detailing of the heritage building.

Evelin Ellison provided a deputation on behalf of the Thornhill Historic Society. Ms. Ellison highlighted her concerns that the new addition was contemporary in design. Ms. Ellison also expressed her concerns regarding bird-safety and recommended multi-pane windows.

Brian Fischer, Ward One (South) Residents Inc., provided a deputation highlighting concerns that the current design detracts from the heritage building and noted a preference for a design that was less contemporary, similar to the conservatory which is attached to the Heintzman House. Mr. Fischer also noted his belief that the windows in the proposed addition should be multi-pane due to bird-safety considerations.

The Applicant clarified that the windows meet the City's Bird Friendly guidelines and that a pattern will also be applied to the windows to ensure that they are visible to birds.

The Committee members provided the following feedback:

- Inquired as to the original front of the heritage building on the subject property. The Applicant clarified that the west elevation (facing Yonge Street) was the original front while the building was a residence, but that when the Golf Club assumed ownership two years later, the east elevation was used as the main entrance. Mr. Wokral confirmed that the original facade will be visible once the awning is removed, but confirmed that both sides will contain entrances.
- Discussed the contrast between the proposed addition and the heritage building, with some members noting their preference for a further contrast between the new and old, and others expressing appreciation for the way the simplicity of the addition accentuates the heritage character of the existing building. The Applicant confirmed that they were pursuing a design which complemented the heritage character of the existing building without attempting to mimic it.

- Agreed that the multi-pane windows may not fit into the design of the addition and agreed that Heritage Markham should not stipulate the window design given that bird friendly measures would be incorporated.
- Inquired about the dining area moving to the addition and the screening of rooftop equipment from sightlines. The Applicant advised that the kitchen is not being relocated and that the small electric units are not visible from the parking lot due to the screening and the height of the roof.

The Committee consented to the removal of the fourth recommendation which requests the incorporation of multi-pane windows into the design.

Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the proposed demolition of the 1990's addition to the historic clubhouse;

THAT Heritage Markham supports the proposed restoration of the exterior of the historic clubhouse and removal of the existing fabric awning;

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the siting, materials, form and massing of the proposed addition to the historic clubhouse;

AND THAT final review of the site plan application and any other development application required to permit the proposed addition be delegated to the City, (Heritage Section) staff.

**Carried**

THAT the written submissions from the following individuals be received:

- Adam Birrell, President, Thornhill Historical Society
- Diane Berwick
- Joan Honsberger
- Valerie Burke;

AND THAT the deputations from Evelin Ellison and Brian Fischer be received.

**Carried**

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

### **5.1 HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATION**

**DELEGATED APPROVAL BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF  
24 DAVID GOHN CIRCLE (MARKHAM HERITAGE ESTATES) (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER:

HE 22 265867

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Senior Heritage Planner

Ken Davis refrained from voting due to his conflict which he disclosed.

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham receive the information on the heritage permit approved by Heritage Section staff under the delegated approval process.

**Carried**

**5.2 BUILDING PERMIT**

**DELEGATED APPROVAL BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF  
7861 YONGE ST. (THCD), 14 GEORGE ST. (MVHCD) (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER:

AL 20 135131

HP 22 265819

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 COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT**

**VARIANCE APPLICATION IN SUPPORT OF A PROPOSED NEW  
DWELLING**

**27 CHURCH STREET, MARKHAM VILLAGE (16.11)**

**FILE NUMBER:**

MNV 22 266998

A/262/22

**Extracts:**

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner II

Peter Wokral, Senior Planner II, advised that this item concerns a minor variance application for 27 Church Street to enable the construction of a new dwelling. Mr. Wokral advised that Heritage Section staff expect a Major Heritage Permit application to be submitted in the future. Mr. Wokral also advised that the proposed dwelling meets the required sideyard set-backs prescribed by the By-law and is designed to be in accordance with the existing context, mirroring the building depths, front and rear yard setbacks of the adjacent dwellings, but noted that the net-floor ratio exceeds what is currently permitted under the zoning by-law.

Jacque Gardiner, a neighbour, provided a deputation advising of concerns about drainage issues in the neighbourhood. She acknowledged that she has not yet reviewed the current plan, but noted that if this new dwelling is at a higher grade than the other homes in the neighbourhood, other homes may experience drainage onto their properties.

The Committee members discussed whether or not the net floor exceedance was a heritage issue, as there was a consensus that the application is generally acceptable from a heritage perspective. The Committee agreed that the design of the proposed dwelling is in keeping with the heritage character of the area.

The Committee debated altering the resolution with regards to net floor area and discussed ways to revise the motion to indicate that the Committee did not have an opinion on the net floor variance which will be reviewed by the Committee of Adjustment.

**Recommendations:**

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

- a porch with stairs to encroach 24.4 inches, whereas the By-law permits 18 inches
- a rear yard setback of 23.6 feet, whereas the By-law requires a minimum of 25 feet

- a maximum building depth of 17.68m, whereas the By-law permits a maximum of 16.8m.

**THAT Heritage Markham has no opinion from a heritage perspective and offers no support or objection to the requested variance for a maximum net floor area ratio of 54.90 percent, whereas the By-law allows a maximum floor area ratio of 45 percent**

AND THAT Heritage Markham delegates the Committee's review of the Major Heritage Permit application for the proposed new dwelling at 27 Church Street to Heritage Staff staff, provided that there are no significant deviations from the attached proposed site plan and elevations.

**Carried**

**THAT the deputation from Jacquie Gardiner be received.**

**Carried**

## **6.2 HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATION**

### **FRONT YARD LANDSCAPE ALTERATIONS 145 JOHN STREET, THORNHILL HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT (16.11)**

FILE NUMBER:

HE 23 110708

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Senior Heritage Planner

Evan Manning, Senior Heritage Planner, provided a brief introduction to this item, reminding members that it was deferred from January's Heritage Markham meeting to allow the Applicant to confirm if alterations complied with By-law 2016-20, which was in question at the previous meeting. Mr. Manning advised that the by-law requires that 40% of the front-yard must contain softscaping given the applicant's driveway width and lot frontage. Mr. Manning confirmed that Heritage Section Staff do not object to the paving of the driveway but object to the extent of paving in the formerly sodded front-yard. Mr. Manning advised that front yard alterations must conform to the requirements of the aforementioned by-law as well as direction in the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District Plan. In response to safety concerns noted by the Applicant at the previous meeting, Mr.

Manning confirmed that Staff would be willing to work with the Applicant on a hammerhead driveway configuration to allow safe exit from the driveway onto John Street.

Councillor Karen Rea, Chair, confirmed that she would allow deputants who spoke to this application at the January Heritage meeting to speak again, asking them to ensure that they remain within the five-minute speaking limit.

Homeira Shahsavand, Applicant, provided a brief presentation highlighting the reasons for the front-yard paving, including safety concerns, lawn drainage issues, and additional play area for her children. Ms. Shahsavand also confirmed her understanding of the importance of greenspace in the neighbourhood.

Russol Heydari, Applicant, provided an update regarding the soft landscaping on the property. Mr. Heydari advised that a By-law Officer came to the subject property earlier in the week and confirmed that there were no by-law infractions as a result of the front-yard alterations. Mr. Heydari echoed the reasons for the front-yard alterations which were previously described by Ms. Shahsavand.

Zhila Heidari, Deputant and John Street resident, expressed her support for the front-yard alterations, noting that they were an improvement to the property. Ms. Heidari noted the high volume of traffic in front of the subject property as a result of its proximity to the intersection of John Street and Henderson Avenue. Ms. Heidari noted that the front yard was previously very muddy which was improved by the paving. Ms. Heidari also stated that the Applicant planted trees on the property and used high quality materials.

Massoud Mashadi, Deputant, expressed support for the application, noting that the front yard has improved in appearance. Mr. Mashadi also expressed concern regarding the volume of traffic along John Street and expressed support due to the safety concerns described by the Applicant.

David Jordan, Deputant and neighbour to the Applicant, expressed his support for the application and noted his disagreement with the Staff recommendations. Mr. Jordan briefly explained his reasons for support, which were also provided at the January 11th Heritage Markham Committee meeting. Mr. Jordan shared images of other homes in the area with substantial front-yard paving to emphasize his belief that the extent of the paving is not uncommon within the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District.

Barry Nelson, Deputant, requested to speak. It was confirmed that he did not make a deputation on this application at the January Heritage Committee meeting. Mr. Nelson urged the Committee to listen to the Applicant with empathy and noted that home use is vastly different post-pandemic. Mr. Nelson noted his

agreement with the safety concerns expressed by the Applicant and advised that he has personally been on the property and has seen the issues first-hand. Mr. Nelson noted that as a previous member of the Heritage Markham Committee, he is an advocate of heritage conservation, but expressed that he does not believe this property is a true heritage structure.

The Committee members provided the following feedback:

- Emphasized the importance of removing safety from the discussion as the hammerhead driveway configuration would resolve safety concerns and is permitted within the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District Plan.
- Indicated the importance of adhering to policy in the District Plan as it will become more difficult for Committee and Council to maintain the integrity of the Plan if it is not upheld in a majority of circumstances.
- Agreed that the arguments in support of the application (i.e. recreation and safety) are outside of the purview of the Heritage Markham Committee, which has the responsibility to examine the issue through the lens of the District Plan, regardless of the heritage character of the home itself.
- Noted that although some questioned the heritage value of the subject property, reiterated that it is within a heritage conservation district and thus is governed by the policies of the District Plan.

**THAT Item 6.2 be tabled prior to Item 6.1 as several Deputants joined the meeting to discuss Item 6.2**

**Carried**

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham does not support the front yard landscape alterations and gate posts and recommends that the Minor Heritage Permit Application seeking approval of the unauthorized alterations be denied, and that the interlock pavers be removed from the former sodded areas.

**AND THAT written submissions from the following individuals be received:**

- **Shakiba & Massood Mashadi**
- **Bernie Reddick**
- **Neila Bergman**
- **Walter & Allison Duncan**

- **David Jordan**
- **Hossein & Zhila Heidari**
- **Gail Carson**
- **Nancy Kostelac;**

**AND FURTHER THAT the deputations from the following individuals be received:**

- **Homeira Shamsavand**
- **Russol Heydari**
- **Zhila Heidari**
- **David Jordan**
- **Barry Nelson.**

**Carried**

### **6.3 DEMOLITION PERMIT**

#### **PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF THE CLAYTON SCHOOLHOUSE 11172 WARDEN AVENUE(16.11)**

**FILE NUMBER:**

DP 23 110974

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner II

Peter Wokral, Senior Planner II, provided an update regarding the Clayton School House which was partially destroyed by a fire. Mr. Wokral advised that the fire caused extensive damage to the wooden components of the building, but confirmed that the outer, multi-wythe brick walls and foundation of the historic schoolhouse remain intact. Mr. Wokral advised that two engineering reports indicated that the brick walls appear to be stable and recommended bracing the walls prior to removing debris to investigate the condition of the remaining foundation. Mr. Wokral advised that the insurance company for the property has obtained a third engineer who has recommended demolition of the schoolhouse, which only Council can approve. Mr. Wokral noted that Heritage Section would

like to see the exterior walls retained, in order to restore the building, and do not support demolition, based on the information available.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Expressed concerns about the brick being exposed to the elements for an extended period of time. Staff confirmed that this is a concern, and why time is of the essence to expedite the installation of temporary wooden supports to resist lateral pressure exerted by the surrounding soil on the foundation. Mr. Wokral also noted that, some buildings constructed in the 19<sup>th</sup> century were designed anticipating fires, so that they could be rebuilt using the surviving masonry walls.
- Inquired as to the value of the insurance policy on the property as concerns were raised that it may not cover the restoration cost of the schoolhouse. Staff advised that they do not know the insured value of the building but noted that it was not insured as a heritage building.
- Inquired as to the Owner's preference for demolition or restoration of the schoolhouse. Staff advised that they believe the Owner would prefer to build a new building on the site.
- Discussed adding a clause to the recommendation requesting the Owner to protect the schoolhouse from any further degradation as additional bracing was recommended by the engineer to prevent further damage to the schoolhouse while the issue is under review by Committee and Council.

The Committee consented to add a recommendation that the Owner take immediate steps to prevent any further degradation of the property.

Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham does not support any demolition permit proposing to demolish the remaining solid brick walls of the Clayton Schoolhouse at 11172 Warden Ave.;

**THAT Heritage Markham requests the Owner takes immediate and appropriate steps to prevent further deterioration of the existing facade of the Clayton Schoolhouse from the elements and provides proper stabilization of the remaining structure.**

AND THAT Heritage Markham has no objection to the demolition of what remains of the modern two storey rear addition or the deck located on the north side of the schoolhouse.

Carried

#### 6.4 COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT - MINOR VARIANCE APPLICATION

##### PROPOSED TWO-STOREY DETACHED DWELLING 7 FREDERICTON ROAD, MARKHAM VILLAGE (16.11)

FILE NUMBER:

A/124/22

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Senior Heritage Planner

Evan Manning, Senior Planner, advised that this type of application would typically come to Committee as a consent item, however, Heritage Section Staff wanted to highlight the second recommendation which delegates review of future Minor Variance applications on lands *adjacent* to cultural heritage resources to Heritage Section staff provided that the local Councillor is in support of the proposed variance(s).

The Heritage Markham Committee noted no objections to the delegation as recommended, but consented to slightly alter the first Staff recommendation to indicate "no support or objection" rather than "no comment"

Recommendations:

**THAT Heritage Markham offers no support or objection from a heritage perspective on the Minor Variance application for 7 Fredericton Road;**

AND THAT Heritage Markham delegates review of future Minor Variance applications on lands considered *adjacent* to *cultural heritage resources* to Heritage Section staff provided that the Ward Councillor has no objection to the proposal from a heritage perspective.

Carried

#### 6.5 ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT AND OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENT APPLICATIONS

##### PROPOSED HIGH-RISE MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT 7128, 7170 & 7186 HIGHWAY 7 (16.11)

FILE NUMBER:

20 119576 PLAN

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Senior Heritage Planner

S. Corr, Senior Planner II

Evan Manning, Senior Planner, advised that this item involves concurrent Official Plan and Zoning By-Law amendment applications originally submitted in 2020. Mr. Manning advised that the subject lands contain a heritage building as well as two mid-century dwellings. Mr. Manning confirmed that Staff do not object to the removal of the two mid-century buildings and advised that Heritage Section Staff is currently focused on the proposed relocation of the heritage home within the subject lands. Mr. Manning indicated that the heritage home was originally proposed to be located between the two high-rise towers planned for the site, however, in response to feedback from Staff and Heritage Markham, the heritage home has been relocated adjacent to a public park within the revised development scheme. Mr. Manning noted that Heritage Section staff believe the new proposed location of the heritage building is an improvement from it previously proposed location given the increase in visibility from the public realm.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Inquired about the desired uses of the existing heritage building and its functionality, as well as parking considerations. Staff advised that they have asked that the Development Planner along with the Applicant re-examine potential uses for the heritage building indicating that certain uses may generate parking, but noted that if the building is to be an amenity space for the condominium (as indicated by the applicant), no parking would be needed adjacent to the building.
- Questioned if a fence would be added next to the park which would impact visibility of the heritage building. Staff confirmed that a low fence is typically placed adjacent to the park but through design control and subdivision agreements, Staff could require a lower fence to ensure visibility.
- Discussed the new location of the heritage building, noting support for the building being more visible from Highway 7 while also noting concerns that the heritage building may be underutilized in the applicant's proposed location. There was a concern that due to the driveway separation it would not be used as an amenity space if not easily connected to the condo complex. Some members suggested that the previously proposed location between the two towers would provide further opportunity for the public to interact with the heritage building. A member noted concerns with the

shadow impacts of situating the heritage building between the two towers and suggested a pathway between the condominiums and heritage building at Highway 7 would enhance connectivity.

- Suggested that the City work on the landscaping and visuals of the public park to emphasize the heritage character of the building.
- Suggested that consideration be given to using the heritage building as a park amenity with washrooms or other activities.

The Committee agreed to include clauses within the recommendation which stipulated the need for improved linkages between the condominium and the heritage building, and to emphasize their support for the positioning of the heritage building adjacent to Highway 7 and the proposed park.

Recommendations:

**THAT Heritage Markham supports the heritage building being moved to be adjacent to the park;**

**AND THAT Heritage Markham supports the heritage building having a presence on Highway 7 in order to afford a more direct linkage with the condominium;**

AND THAT Heritage Markham has no comment from a heritage perspective on the Official Plan application for 7128, 7170 & 7186 Highway 7 East, but suggests that the non-residential uses identified in the zoning by-law amendment be re-examined and that none of the identified development standards would impede the placement of the heritage building at its proposed location (i.e. setbacks);

AND FURTHER THAT Heritage Markham delegates review of a future Site Plan Control application or Major Heritage Permit application for 7128, 7170 & 7186 Highway 7 East to Heritage Section staff provided that the submitted drawings are substantially in accordance with the material appended to this memo.

**Carried**

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

**7.1 UNIONVILLE MAIN STREET STREETScape - DETAILED DESIGN STAGE - PAVERS**

FILE NUMBER:

n/a

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

N. Azmy, Senior Capital Works Engineer

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage, reminded the Committee that the Unionville revitalization project is currently in the detailed design stage. Mr. Hutcheson advised that at this stage, he will be sharing images of the pavers being considered for the road, sidewalk, and parking pads, and would be looking to bring forth a Heritage Markham recommendation to establish if the pavers are supportable from a heritage perspective,

Mr. Hutcheson displayed images of the currently planned configurations of the pavers for the roadways, sidewalks, and parking pads.

The Committee discussed the paver configurations at length, with members voicing strong opposition to the white pavers which are incorporated into the current sidewalk design. The Committee agreed that the white pavers made the design appear more modern and expressed concerns with the pattern on the sidewalk being too busy. The Committee agreed that the number of different colour pavers should be limited to simplify the design.

The Committee questioned the planned chevron or herringbone design of the roadway and whether or not there is a concrete pad planned beneath the pavers to prevent sinking. Staff confirmed that there will be a concrete base under the pavers and noted that the chevron design is planned due to operational considerations. Councillor McAlpine, who attended the tour where members of Council were shown the paver designs, noted that he understands that the chevron design is planned to lend to the structural integrity of the roadway as each paver would be connected to six other pavers. Councillor McAlpine also noted that smaller pavers may be more appropriate from a heritage perspective but advised that the City's Operations Department is more comfortable with larger pavers.

The Committee agreed to recommend that the number of different pavers being used on the sidewalks, roads, and lay-bys be reduced in order to simplify the design, to recommend that the same size pavers be used on the road and lay-bys, and to express that they do not support the use of the white pavers within the sidewalk design and prefer the smaller identified paver size.

Recommendation:

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

**AND THAT Heritage Markham Committee does not support the use of white pavers (“Cloudburst”) in the sidewalk design from a heritage perspective;**

**AND THAT Heritage Markham supports the use of only two colours of identified pavers (grey tones) being used for the sidewalk and using the smaller sized pavers (as opposed to the larger paver stones proposed, as they do not provide a heritage appearance) from a heritage perspective;**

**AND THAT Heritage Markham supports the use of only two of the identified colours of pavers for the road and lay-bys from a heritage perspective;**

**AND FURTHER THAT Heritage Markham supports the concept of using the smaller sized pavers on both the road and lay-bys from a heritage perspective.**

**Carried**

**8. PART SIX - NEW BUSINESS**

Councillor McAlpine requested an update on the designation of heritage properties in response to Bill 23. Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage, advised that Heritage Section Staff is triaging properties currently listed on the Heritage Register and looking at basic criteria to prioritize designation. Mr. Hutcheson confirmed that in the next two months Heritage Section Staff will evaluate progress to forecast if they will be able to meet provincial requirements for heritage designation as set out in Bill 23.

Lake Trevalyan, Vice Chair, thanked Ron Blake, Tejinder Sidhu, and David Butterworth for their contributions at their first Heritage Markham meeting.

**9. ADJOURNMENT**

The Heritage Markham Committee adjourned at 11:03PM.