

**From:** DIANE BERWICK

**Sent:** Monday, February 27, 2023 1:34 PM

**To:** Clerks Public <clerkspublic@markham.ca>; Mayor & Councillors <MayorAndCouncillors@markham.ca>; Hutcheson, Regan; Wokral, Peter; Manning, Evan

**Subject:** Development Services Committee - February 28, 2023

To Members of the Development Services Committee:

Item 9.3 - Minor Heritage Permit Application  
145 John Street, Thornhill

I fully support Heritage Markham's staff recommendation to deny the request by owners of 145 John Street to keep in place unauthorized alterations to their front yard property.

Although there is a myriad of excellent resources - both at Markham's city hall and online - to guide homeowners, alterations were made without consent from the City of Markham. These unapproved alterations do not comply with the City of Markham's by-laws or the Thornhill-Markham Heritage Conservation District Plan. Evan Manning's report for this meeting, which I think is excellent, states that the Municipal By-Law Enforcement Officer visited the property in response to resident complaints that the applicant was parking on the paved portion of the front yard. Do we want our neighbours' front yards to become parking lots?

Our City should always "walk the talk." It prides itself on its environmental stand and spends millions of dollars toward that end. I read with interest "Environmental Impact Study Guidelines - December 2018" on the City's website. Environmental issues impact residential properties too. There is negative, irreversible impact, for example: loss of green space, possibly loss of existing trees and shrubs ... thereby affecting air quality, and risk of flooding from run-off. If other property owners want to make similar alterations to their properties and are allowed to do so, the negative effects will be multiplied many times over.

Every homeowner should be held to the same standard - abide by our City's rules, regulations, and bylaws. Allowing this homeowner to keep these unapproved alterations in place sets a precedent and if approved, every other Markham homeowner will adamantly point to your decision on this property when they submit plans to make similar changes to their own properties.

Please deny this application.

Sincerely,

Diane Berwick  
The Robert Jarrott House

From: Joan Honsberger

To: [clerkpublic@markham.ca](mailto:clerkpublic@markham.ca); [mayorandcouncillors@markham.ca](mailto:mayorandcouncillors@markham.ca)

Sent: Monday, February 27, 2023 1:54 PM

Subject: Development Services Committee Item 9.3 re: 145 John St.

Dear Sir and Madam

Re: Item 9.3 Minor Heritage Permit 145 John St.

I believe that the staff report for 145 John St. should be followed for 3 reasons.

1. Mr. Jordan claims to be a member of a non existent rate payers group. A google search of recognized rate payers associations in Markham could not find Mr. Jordan's group. His views should be dismissed.
2. I talked to one of the signatories of the petition, that the owners of 145 John St. circulated. At no point did the applicant explain to the signatory (who is in a vulnerable population) that they were applying to have a by law, that they had broken, to be changed with a variation. Since there was no standard write up, one could surmise the story changed according to the person interviewed.
3. Markham has spent millions of dollars to encourage homeowners to divert downspouts and other sources of run off, from the sewers. Thornhill is well known to have a high water table. Why create a loop hole for other homeowners to pave over their front lawns which would lead to excessive run off to the sewers? This would be a precedent setting move, not only for a heritage area but for all of Markham. Why reward rule breakers?

In conclusion, I recommend that the Development Services Committee accepts the paid Markham staff report.

Joan Honsberger

60 Elgin St, Thornhill, ON

(Napier Simpson designed house)

**From:** Valerie Burke

**Sent:** Monday, February 27, 2023 3:34 PM

**To:** Clerks Public <[clerkspublic@markham.ca](mailto:clerkspublic@markham.ca)>; Gold, Laura; Mayor & Councillors <[MayorAndCouncillors@markham.ca](mailto:MayorAndCouncillors@markham.ca)>

**Cc:** Manning, Evan; Hutcheson, Regan; Wokral, Peter

**Subject:** Item 9.3 - Minor Heritage Permit Application - 145 John Street, Thornhill

To The Members of Development Services

Re: Item 9.3 – Minor Heritage Permit Application – Front Yard Landscape Alterations – 145 John Street

Please support the staff recommendation and deny the minor heritage permit application for approval of the unauthorized alterations.

I am very grateful that Markham is spending millions of dollars to help mitigate flooding. It would be inconsistent with Markham's goals of reducing flooding to then permit the excessive paving. A city-wide precedent could be set for other homeowners to pave over their entire front yards. Increased pavement creates more stormwater runoff and the cumulative effect of more and more hard surface exacerbates flooding issues.

Sincerely,

Valerie Burke

**From:** Valerie Tate

**Sent:** Monday, February 27, 2023 10:03 AM

**To:** Clerks Public <[clerkspublic@markham.ca](mailto:clerkspublic@markham.ca)>; Mayor & Councillors  
<[MayorAndCouncillors@markham.ca](mailto:MayorAndCouncillors@markham.ca)>

**Subject:** Submission to Development Services Meeting, February 28 - Application for Minor Variance at 145 John St.

Enclosed please find my submission regarding Item 9.3, the 145 John St. application.

Thank you.

Valerie Tate

To the Members of the Development Services Committee

Regarding item 9.3, the application for approval of the already completed landscape construction at 145 John St. in Thornhill, I respectfully ask the committee to uphold the by-laws regarding driveway width, the percentage of the property required to be in lawns or gardens, as well as the heritage regulations that prohibit the inclusion of driveway gates, and deny this application. The work was done without the approval of the Heritage Markham staff or committee. There is now, effectively, a parking lot in front of the house as well as gateposts that indicate driveway gates are planned. I am very concerned that allowing this would create precedents that would lead to similar actions across the heritage district. By-laws are in place to protect our neighbourhoods. Homeowners are required to adhere to those by-laws.

The Heritage District in Thornhill has its own protective regulations because it is a precious asset to the community. Its regulations were put in place to preserve not only the heritage buildings but also the heritage appearance of the neighbourhood. It is a special privilege to be a resident in the Heritage District. People who own properties here are expected to comply with the regulations and restrictions which make our neighbourhood the lovely area that it is. People from other neighbourhoods come to walk our tree-lined streets, admire our heritage houses and appreciate our beautiful gardens. The greenery helps the environment. Our lawns and gardens absorb water and reduce run-off into the sewers. Widening driveways and paving over lawns diminishes our neighbourhood's appearance, harms the environment and contributes to flooding. Please support Heritage Markham staff and the Heritage Markham Committee and abide by Markham's by-laws by denying this application.

Sincerely,

Valerie Tate