



Heritage Markham Committee Minutes

Meeting Number: 4
April 10, 2024, 7:00 PM
Electronic Meeting

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

1. CALL TO ORDER

Councillor Reid McAlpine, Chair, convened the meeting at 7:01 PM by asking for any disclosures of interest with respect to items on the agenda.

2. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

There were no disclosures of pecuniary interest.

3. PART ONE - ADMINISTRATION

3.1 APPROVAL OF AGENDA (16.11)

A. Addendum Agenda

B. New Business from Committee Members

Recommendation:

That the April 10, 2024 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved.

Carried

3.2 MINUTES OF THE MARCH 13, 2024 HERITAGE MARKHAM COMMITTEE MEETING (16.11)

See attached material.

Recommendation:

That the minutes of the Heritage Markham Committee meeting held on March 13, 2024 be received and adopted.

Carried

4. PART TWO - DEPUTATIONS

4.1 MAIN ST UNIONVILLE STREETSCAPE REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT WAYFINDING SIGNAGE REVIEW (16.11)

Extract:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

T. Lewinberg, Public Realm Coordinator

Tanya Lewinberg, Public Realm Coordinator, joined the meeting and provided a presentation on the Main Street Unionville Streetscape Redevelopment Project Wayfinding Signage Review. The proposed wayfinding signage is proposed to be attached to the new light poles at select locations on Main Street Unionville as part of streetscape improvements in 2025.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Expressed concerns about the size of the signs adding to visual workload for drivers (if they try to use the signage for guidance).
- Expressed preference for a more traditional looking sign than the example prepared by the signage consultant (Entro) in order to provide consistency with the existing signage in the District. The use of a less modern font was also suggested.
- Inquired about the choice of red as the colour for the sign. Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage, advised that Council selected a colour scheme for each Heritage Conservation Districts in the city, confirming that maroon and cream were selected for Unionville. Mr. Hutcheson

advised that this scheme is used for directional and entry signage, street signs, and other elements within the District.

- Expressed support for the simplicity of the second option proposed by the signage consultant.
- Asked if the sign panels are the same size as the banners currently used on poles along Main Street. Ms. Lewinberg confirmed that the signs would be the same size, which are 52 inches long.
- Asked how hanging flower baskets would work with the signs and expressed concerns that the flower baskets could block portions of the signs. Ms. Lewinberg noted that she believes the hangers for the flower baskets could be adjusted slightly to ensure minimal obstruction.
- Suggested that perhaps the flower baskets not be placed on the poles with signage to ensure no obstruction.
- Suggested that the logo be placed on a separate sign atop the cross bar of the directional signage to allow for more available area on the directional sign. Ms. Lewinberg confirmed that this could be explored.
- Asked if the sign could be achieved using a banner. Ms. Lewinberg advised that the reason for the rigid sign type is that the City's sign shop can create the sign and replace them with new signs whenever they begin to fade or are damaged.

In summary, the Committee appreciated the need to ensure that the signs address AODA requirements and are legible, but also want to ensure there is a proper balance between a modern aesthetic and maintaining the heritage character of this District.

Recommendations:

THAT the presentation provided by Tanya Lewinberg entitled "Main St Unionville Streetscape Redevelopment Project Wayfinding Signage Review" be received;

AND THAT the comments from the Heritage Markham Committee be considered by Staff as the design of wayfinding signage progresses.

Carried

5. PART THREE - CONSENT

5.1 MINOR HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATIONS

**DELEGATED APPROVAL BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF
22 COLBORNE ST., THORNHILL, 7822 HIGHWAY 7 EAST,
UNIONVILLE, 33 COLBORNE ST., THORNHILL, 6 DAVID GOHN
CIRCLE, MARKHAM HERITAGE ESTATES (16.11)**

File Numbers:

24 163072 HE,
24 164313 HE,
24 164972 HE,
24 166431 HE

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning
E. Manning, Senior Heritage Planner

Recommendation:

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

Carried

5.2 BUILDING OR SIGN PERMIT APPLICATION

**DELEGATED APPROVAL BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF
27 MAIN ST. N. (MVHCD), 156 MAIN ST. U. (UHCD) (16.11)**

File Numbers:

SP 24 162473,
SP 24 161448

Extracts:

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

The Committee inquired about signage installed at 156 Main St Unionville, noting that the sign appears to be vaguely heritage in style but does not appear to be of a particularly high quality or sophisticated design. The Committee asked if Heritage Section Staff have the ability to recommend improvements for signage that otherwise complies with relevant policies and guidelines. Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner, advised that as long as signage requirements are met with respect to size, colours, and are not illuminated, Heritage Section Staff will typically not comment further, adding that historically there were many examples of signs with a plain, utilitarian appearance.

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 MINOR HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATION

PROPOSED ROOF-MOUNTED SOLAR PANELS 6 PETER STREET, MARKHAM VILLAGE (16.11)

File Numbers:

HE 24 164322

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Senior Heritage Planner

Evan Manning, Senior Heritage Planner, introduced this item as an application for solar panels on the roof of the rear porch and on two roof slopes of an accessory building at 6 Peter Street. Mr. Manning advised that there is a lack of policy direction in the Heritage District Plan for Markham Village with respect to solar panels. Mr. Manning displayed images to show visibility of the aforementioned roof surfaces from the street, noting that the panels on the rear porch would not be visible from the street while those on the east slope of the accessory building roof would be partially obscured by foliage in the spring and summer months. Mr. Manning advised that Staff asked the applicant if panels could only be installed on the west slope of the accessory building, noting that the Applicant advised that the project would only be feasible if they were installed on both roof slopes of the accessory building. Mr. Manning advised that Heritage Section Staff are not opposed to this application.

The Committee expressed concerns with any precedent that managing applications such as this on a case-by-case basis might set. Mr. Manning confirmed that these requests would be assessed on a case-by-case basis, with visibility being a consideration as well as impact on any heritage attributes. Mr. Manning advised that the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District Plan will be updated and confirmed that direction/guidance on solar panels will be provided in the updated Plan.

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection to the installation of solar panels on the roof of the rear porch and along the east and west roof slopes of the barn at 6 Peter Street, given that the visibility from the street is minimal, and recommends approval of the submitted Minor Heritage Permit.

Carried

6.2 COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT VARIANCE APPLICATION

PROPOSED REAR ADDITION WITH INTEGRATED GARAGE 86 JOHN STREET, THORNHILL (16.11)

File Numbers:

A/106/23

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Senior Heritage Planner

Evan Manning, Senior Heritage Planner, introduced this item, reminding members that this has been before the Committee twice previously. Mr. Manning advised that since this item was last before the Committee, the application has been revised in a number of ways. Mr. Manning provided an overview of the revisions to the application and advised that Staff feel that the Applicant has, in good faith, attempted to respond to concerns raised by the Committee.

Darryl Simmons, deputant and Owner, explained that they are seeking to expand their living space as they wish to provide an accessible living space for an elderly family member and eventually for others in the family. Mr. Simmons noted that they have worked diligently to protect the trees on their property and have considered this through the application and revisions.

Francis Lapointe, deputant and architect, Lapointe Architects, representing the adjacent owner at 4 Leahill Drive, expressed opposition to the application, regardless of the view of the addition from the street or sidewalk. Mr. Lapointe noted that there are homes behind and next to this property and stressed the importance of adhering to the guidelines in the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District Plan regarding the scale and siting of additions. Mr. Lapointe expressed concerns with the proximity of the addition to 4 Leahill Drive. Mr. Lapointe expressed concern that the addition would not conform with the building code, noting that laundry facilities are not available to each unit. Mr. Lapointe expressed concerns with emergency services accessing the addition. Mr. Lapointe

also provided a written submission summarizing the identified issues and concerns.

Valerie Burke, deputant, expressed support for the application being further revised, noting continued concern with the massing and height of the addition. Ms. Burke indicated concern about the three mature trees which would be removed to build the addition and the possibility that other trees on the property could be damaged during construction

Evelin Ellison, deputant, expressed appreciation for the efforts of the Owner in returning to the Heritage Committee, but expressed continued concerns with the application and the size of the proposed addition. Ms. Ellison expressed concern that the Owner of 86 John Street was not adhering to the conditions of the Heritage Easement Agreement (HEA) in relation to proper maintenance of the existing detached garage.

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage, commented that monitoring HEAs are handled in different ways depending on if the Owner is taking part in the tax rebate program in which case photos would be reviewed every two years to ensure that the conditions of the HEA are being complied with. In this case, the existing garage noted in the HEA is proposed to be removed.

Darryl Simmons responded that the garage has been greatly improved once signing the HEA, acknowledging that the garage was not in good condition when they purchased the home. Mr. Simmons confirmed that they have not taken part in the property tax rebate program.

Scott Rushlow, designer, noted that the brief from the client was to create three separate suites. Mr. Rushlow advised that the proper siting and massing of the addition relative to the existing heritage building were paramount considerations and that concerns from the Committee were taken into account and incorporated into the revised proposal, noting that the building was also pulled back from the rear property line to reduce visual impact and address the concerns of the Owner of 4 Leahill Drive. Mr. Rushlow advised that the building depth and length of the link were also reduced and expressed his opinion that the Applicant has taken steps in good faith to address community concerns.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Thanked the Applicant for making some changes to the application.
- Requested a Staff response to the report submitted by Francis Lapointe. Mr. Manning responded that from a massing perspective, the proposed addition is optimal in its siting. Mr. Manning noted that items outlined in

Mr. Lapointe's report are guidelines rather than policies within the District Plan and Staff consider them on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Manning expressed Staff's view that the addition being brought closer to the existing building would cause visual confusion between the heritage building and the addition, noting a preference for separation between the two volumes. Mr. Manning also noted that privacy issues are land use issues which are more appropriately dealt with through the Committee of Adjustment but observed that the rear yard of 4 Leahill Drive is quite vegetated.

- Questioned the addition's visibility from the street, asking if there is a rendering which shows the visibility from Leahill Drive. Mr. Manning explained that the visibility from John Street has been considered a higher priority as John Street is one of the primary streets within the District.
- Asked if the configuration suggested by Mr. Lapointe could be adopted. Mr. Manning confirmed that any configuration which brings the addition closer to the heritage resource would be considered less desirable by Heritage Section Staff as it would diminish the prominence of the heritage building as viewed from John Street.
- Asked if the application has gone to the Committee of Adjustment at this point. Mr. Manning confirmed that the application has not gone to the Committee of Adjustment as the Applicant and Staff are first seeking Heritage Markham support before proceeding.
- Expressed that Heritage Markham's decision could be influenced by what the Committee of Adjustment is willing to allow.
- Asked if the size of the garage could be reduced to provide more of a setback. Mr. Rushlow noted that one of the Owners requests was for a large garage to accommodate vehicles and yard maintenance equipment, adding that the Owners were willing to concede a four-car garage.
- Sought clarification on the original length of the link. Mr. Rushlow advised that the link was originally 25 ft. and was reduced by 8 ft.

Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the revised proposal for 86 John Street including the requested variance to permit:

- a building depth of 31.48 metres; whereas the By-law allows a maximum building depth of 16.8 metres;

- a rear yard setback of 14.85 feet; whereas the By-law requires a minimum rear yard setback of 30 feet;
- a floor area ratio of 44.73%; whereas the By-law allows for a maximum floor area ratio of 33%

AND THAT the written submission from Francis Lapointe be received.

AND THAT the depositions from Darryl Simmons, Francis Lapointe, Valerie Burke, Evelin Ellison, and Scott Rushlow be received.

AND FURTHER THAT future review of a Major Heritage Permit application, and any other application required to enable the proposed development including a demolition permit application for the garage, be delegated to Heritage Section staff should the design be substantially in accordance with the drawings as appended to this memo.

Carried

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

Extract: Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Heritage Conservation District Plans

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage, advised that Heritage Section Staff have begun working on the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District Plan terms of reference, noting that they will endeavor to initiate the project in the Fall but are working to first determine the role of Staff and where consulting services would be leveraged, considering the ongoing priority designation process program.

The Committee asked about the status of the Unionville Heritage Centre Secondary Plan. Mr. Hutcheson confirmed that it is currently on hold, noting capacity issues.

The Committee asked if the Heritage Conservation District Plan for Markham Village would include new policies and guidelines on signage. Mr. Hutcheson confirmed that the Heritage Conservation District Plan update would address signage and that this Plan is the current focus, beginning with the formulation of a work plan.

7.1 REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK

SITE VISIT REGARDING PROPOSED DEMOLITIONS IN 2024 ROUGE NATIONAL URBAN PARK (16.11)

Extract:

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage, reminded the Committee that the proposed demolitions at Rouge National Urban Park were raised under new business at the last Heritage Markham Committee meeting. Mr. Hutcheson advised that another Architectural Sub-Committee meeting has not yet been held due to capacity issues but raised the item at this time as it still needs to be held, ideally prior to the May meeting of the Heritage Markham Committee.

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham receive the memo as information and that a Sub-Committee meeting be arranged prior to the May Heritage Markham meeting.

8. PART SIX - NEW BUSINESS

Lake Trevelyan shared a motion he had prepared related to By-law Enforcement and property maintenance issues on heritage properties. Mr. Trevelyan acknowledged staffing issues within the By-law Services Department but expressed concerns with ongoing non-compliance issues.

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage, advised that the manager of By-law Enforcement Services, Chris Bullen, is aware of concerns and is willing to attend a future Heritage Markham Committee meeting to present on current processes and issues encountered by By-law Enforcement. Mr. Hutcheson suggested that the member's motion be modified to seek information on enforcement matters and offered an alternate motion for consideration.

The Committee noted that some compliance issues have been addressed recently and By-law Enforcement has been noticed in the Heritage Districts. The Committee also expressed frustration with some enforcement issues in the past, acknowledging that the department is under new leadership which provides optimism for improvements.

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham requests City staff to provide information on by-law enforcement processes and procedures related to issues affecting cultural heritage resources and properties within the City's heritage conservation districts, including:

1. Does the administration of heritage and property standards bylaws include the use of an AMPS automatic fine system?
2. Are there opportunities that may be available to enhance fines, such as:

1. Can a fine be introduced regarding the notification of an infraction? (ie. an amount similar to or greater than costs of adherence to ensure their deterrent value).
2. Is there an opportunity to consider a refund of the “ticket”, or a portion thereof, if the property or issue is brought into compliance within an agreed upon time frame consistent with how long compliance might take?
3. If not in compliance within the set time, (or an extension requested and agreed upon) can a new fine be issued, and the initial fine is no longer refundable?
3. Are there best practices in other jurisdictions that could be considered for Markham, and would the support of the Heritage Markham Committee be helpful when considering implementation?

Carried

9. ADJOURNMENT

The Heritage Markham Committee adjourned at 9:12 PM.