



Heritage Markham Committee Minutes

Meeting Number: 5
May 8, 2024, 7:00 PM
Electronic Meeting

Members	Councillor Reid McAlpine, Chair Elizabeth Wimmer, Vice-Chair Councillor Karen Rea Councillor Keith Irish Ron Blake David Butterworth	Ken Davis Victor Huang Tejinder Sidhu Lake Trevelyan David Wilson
Regrets	Nathan Proctor	
Staff	Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner Erica Alligood, Election & Committee Coordinator Jennifer Evans, Legislative Coordinator Evan Manning, Senior Heritage Planner	Trinela Cane, Commissioner, Corporate Services Chris Bullen, Manager, By-law Services Graham Seaman, Director, Sustainability & Asset Management Nusrat Omer, Senior Planner, Development

1. CALL TO ORDER

Councillor Reid McAlpine, Chair, convened the meeting at 7:02 PM by asking for any disclosures of interest with respect to items on the agenda.

2. DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST

Ken Davis declared a conflict with the following item as his home was included on the list of properties and did not take part in the discussion or vote on this matter.

ITEM 5.4 - FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE
 2024 DESIGNATED HERITAGE PROPERTY GRANT APPLICATIONS
 REVIEW OF 2024 GRANT APPLICATIONS

1 HERITAGE CORNERS LANE, 6 DAVID GOHN CIRCLE, 22 DAVID GOHN CIRCLE, 29 JERMAN STREET, 34 COLBOURNE STREET, 126 MAIN STREET UNIONVILLE(16.11)

Councillor Karen Rea declared a conflict on the following item as she has outstanding litigation on this matter and did not take part in the discussion or vote on this item.

ITEM 5.3 - PLAN OF SUBDIVISION APPLICATION
7 TOWN CRIER LANE, MARKHAM VILLAGE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT(16.11)

3. PART ONE - ADMINISTRATION

3.1 APPROVAL OF AGENDA (16.11)

A. Addendum Agenda

B. New Business from Committee Members

The Committee consented to reorder the agenda to hear Items 6.1 and 6.4 ahead of the consent agenda as there were external guests present for those items.

Recommendation:

That the May 8, 2024 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved.

Carried

3.2 MINUTES OF THE APRIL 10, 2024 HERITAGE MARKHAM COMMITTEE MEETING (16.11)

See attached material.

Recommendation:

That the minutes of the Heritage Markham Committee meeting held on April 10, 2024 be received and adopted.

Carried

4. PART TWO - DEPUTATIONS

4.1 BY-LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CULTURAL HERITAGE RESOURCES (16.11)

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

C. Bullen, Manager, By-law and Regulatory Services
W. Alleyne, Supervisor, By-law Services
T. Cane, Commissioner, Corporate Services

Chris Bullen, Manager, By-law and Regulatory Services, introduced Winford Alleyne, Supervisor in the By-law and Property Unit to deliver a presentation.

Mr. Alleyne noted that he was responsible for recent Heritage-related enforcement activities and to date his team has been focusing their attention on commercial signage enforcement in heritage areas, and education for property owners with the next phase being property standard violations.

Chris Bullen advised that while the presentation provides some examples on Main Street Unionville, the By-law Services Department would be very vigilant in all heritage conservation districts in the city.

Mr. Bullen facilitated a question-and-answer period with Trinela Cane, Commissioner, Corporate Services, to respond to questions which were previously raised by members of the Heritage Committee:

1. To review the administration of heritage and property standards by-laws that apply to the Heritage Conservation Districts with a view to implementing an AMPS (Administrative Monetary Penalty System).
 - Commissioner Cane responded that the implementation of AMPS is moving forward. An AMP is a penalty imposed directly by the municipality upon an offender within the context of an administrative process rather than a judicial process. Currently, it is only in place for parking offences but is being expanded to a range of other infractions. Commissioner Cane advised that a Team in Legislative Services is currently working with the various departments to determine what will be incorporated into AMPS, including some heritage violations.
2. That a relevant fine with notification of infraction be set (suggested a minimum of \$500) or an amount similar to or greater than costs of adherence to ensure their deterrent value.
 - Commissioner Cane advised that based on the City's legal advice, the fines are associated with the process through which orders are issued and compliance is required, not at the time of notification of the offence. Education of the property owner/tenant is always the first step.
3. 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. Likely 30 days or more on agreement.

- Bullen responded that the intent is to always start with an educational piece, following which Officers would then look to issue orders which carry a fine, after which they will proceed with a charge. Mr. Bullen noted that the goal is to support businesses and property owners by providing them with time to come into compliance.
4. If not in compliance within the set time, (or an extension requested and agreed upon) then a new fine is issued, and the initial fine is no longer refundable.
 - Bullen responded that, as By-law Services does not issue refunds, the process is to provide time to come into compliance before issuing a fine. Mr. Bullen explained that if compliance is not reached, a charge will be issued with a screening and a later hearing to follow.
 5. Consult on these changes with Heritage Markham and review best practices in other jurisdictions.
 - Bullen responded that the By-law Services Department would always consult with Heritage Markham, BIAs, area residents, and other jurisdictions while always striving for improvements.
 6. Present a recommendation to Markham council for a reform of the bylaw enforcement and AMPS fine system relative to heritage conservation districts as soon as possible and no later than December 31, 2024.
 - Commissioner Cane advised that the AMPS implementation update would be presented at an upcoming General Committee meeting, noting that the new AMPS By-law has been enhanced to include a number of offences beyond parking, which will provide a permissive framework for enforcement on a range of infractions, including for By-law Services. Commissioner Cane advised that they hope to have AMPS fully implemented by the end of the year.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Asked if offences or infractions are communicated to the tenant of a property or the owners themselves. Mr. Bullen advised that communications occur with both owners and tenants, advising that BIAs are engaged to assist in identifying owners. Commissioner Cane added that By-law Services also have the ability to place certain costs associated with property standards on the tax roll which would impact owners.

- Encouraged By-law Services to look not only at infractions with respect to shops and business areas, but also in residential areas within heritage conservation districts where a range of property maintenance issues have been observed. Mr. Bullen confirmed that while By-laws is currently looking at sign infractions and issues within the business areas, the enforcement will expand to residential areas.
- Expressed concerns with the follow-up approach required when a notification is given prior to a fine, versus enacting an immediate fine upon discovering of an infraction. Mr. Bullen emphasized the importance of due process, where initial communications are undertaken with the owner and / or tenant, following which an order would be issued after 14 to 15 days of non-compliance.
- Suggested further training of By-law Services Officers within heritage areas once enforcement expands to residential properties, emphasizing the importance of not only lawn maintenance but also the ability to recognize when alterations are undertaken without approval via heritage permits.
- Expressed concerns that all the sign violations have not been identified as a previous Chairman of the BIA found that 80 to 90% of the signs on Main Street Unionville were installed without a permit. Mr. Bullen confirmed that By-law Services would continue to work with Heritage Staff to ensure that illegal signs are identified. Commissioner Cane added that business owners frequently say that they have applied for a permit, but it hasn't yet been processed, following which By-law Officers will find that a permit was never applied for.
- Noted that BIAs provide educational resources to both property owners and tenants, suggesting that it may be a waste of resources to provide further educational material. Commissioner Cane advised that because By-law Services did not previously have a fulsome presence in heritage areas, education is part of the proactive blitz, with dedicated officers such as Winford Alleyne involved to further improve processes. Ms. Cane is also striving for better collaboration between different departments, such as Licencing and Operations to ensure by-law compliance.
- Asked if fines imposed are on the property owners or tenants. Mr. Bullen advised that fine issuance depends on the infraction, noting that if it is an unauthorized sign installed by the business owner, it would be the tenant, but if it is property related, it would be the owner.

The Chair and Members thanked the Commissioner and By-law Enforcement staff for their attendance, presentation and detailed responses to the matters raised regarding enforcement affecting cultural heritage resources.

Recommendation:

That Heritage Markham receive the presentation by Chris Bullen, Manager, By-law Enforcement and Winford Alleyne, Supervisor, as information.

Carried

5. PART THREE - CONSENT

5.1 MINOR HERITAGE PERMIT APPLICATIONS

**DELEGATED APPROVAL BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF
34 COLBORNE STREET, THORNHILL, 6 PETER STREET, MARKHAM
VILLAGE, 3 DAVID GOHN CIRCLE, MARKHAM HERITAGE
ESTATES (16.11)**

File Numbers:

24 166810 HE

24 164322 HE

24 167705 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 APPLICATIONS

**DELEGATED APPROVAL BY HERITAGE SECTION STAFF
218 MAIN ST. U. (UHCD), 9231 WOODBINE AVE., 159 MAIN ST. U.
(UHCD), 20 MAIN ST. N. (MVHCD) (16.11)**

File Numbers:

SP 24 162109,

SP 24 165860,

AL 24 165011,
AL 24 167910

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 PLAN OF SUBDIVISION APPLICATION

7 TOWN CRIER LANE, MARKHAM VILLAGE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT(16.11)

File Numbers:

PLAN 24 162092

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

Councillor Karen Rea declared a conflict and did not take part in the discussion or vote on this item.

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham has no comment on the proposed Plan of Subdivision application

Carried

5.4 FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

2024 DESIGNATED HERITAGE PROPERTY GRANT APPLICATIONS REVIEW OF 2024 GRANT APPLICATIONS

1 HERITAGE CORNERS LANE, 6 DAVID GOHN CIRCLE, 22 DAVID GOHN CIRCLE, 29 JERMAN STREET, 34 COLBOURNE STREET, 126 MAIN STREET UNIONVILLE(16.11)

File Numbers:

n/a

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

Ken Davis declared a conflict and did not take part in the discussion or vote on this matter.

The Committee expressed concerns with 1 Heritage Corners Lane receiving grant money due to ongoing property maintenance issues. Councillor Rea noted that the property has been a source of complaints for a long time and noted that the front yard is being used as storage. Peter Wokral noted that the financial assistance would help maintain the heritage building, as this grant would be for wood shingle roofing.

It was suggested that the funding related to 1 Heritage Corners be deferred to the June Heritage Meeting to find a resolution to the by-law infraction issues on the property.

Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham supports the funding of the following five grant applications at a total cost of \$21,526.74 subject to the amounts and conditions noted on the individual summary sheets:

- 6 David Gohn Circle, Markham Heritage Estates;
- 22 David Gohn Circle, Markham Heritage Estates;
- 29 Jerman Street, Markham Village;
- 34 Colborne Street, Thornhill;
- 126 Main Street, Unionville;

AND THAT consideration of the funding to 1 Heritage Corners Lane, Markham Heritage Estates, in the amount of \$7,500 be deferred to the June Heritage Markham Committee meeting to ensure the by-law infraction issues on the property have been resolved.

Carried

5.5 REVIEW OF 2024 GRANT APPLICATIONS

**2024 COMMERCIAL FAÇADE IMPROVEMENT GRANT PROGRAM
147 MAIN STREET, UNIONVILLE, 5 GEORGE STREET, MARKHAM
VILLAGE (16.11)**

File Numbers:

n/a

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham supports a matching grant of up to \$15,000.00 for the re-conditioning of the historic two over two windows and fabrication of new traditional wooden storm windows at 147 Main Street Unionville subject to the applicant obtaining a Heritage Permit for the proposed work and entering into a Heritage Easement Agreement with the City;

THAT Heritage Markham supports a matching grant of \$2,288 for the new ground sign located at 5 George Street, Markham Village;

Carried

6. PART FOUR - REGULAR

6.1 OFFICIAL PLAN AND ZONING BY-LAW AMENDMENT APPLICATIONS

PROPOSED MULTI-STOREY RESIDENTIAL BUILDING 3009 ELGIN MILLS ROAD EAST & 10731-10745 VICTORIA SQUARE BOULEVARD SAVAGE-SHELL-DENNIE HOUSE, 10737 VICTORIA SQUARE BOULEVARD (16.11)

File Numbers:

24 160555 PLAN

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Senior Heritage Planner

N. Omer, Senior Planner, West District

Evan Manning, Senior Heritage Planner, introduced this item as related to an application for Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendment to permit a proposed multi-storey residential building at 3009 Elgin Mills Road & 10731-10745 Victoria Square Boulevard. Mr. Manning added that as part of this development proposal, the heritage building located at 10737 Victoria Square Blvd will be relocated and restored and will retain its current orientation to Victoria Square

Boulevard. A rear addition is also proposed. Mr. Manning advised that Victoria Square is not in a heritage conservation district but noted that the area includes a number of properties designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. It was also noted that an existing 1950s bungalow on the property which is listed on the Markham Heritage Register would be removed as part of the development project.

The Committee expressed concern with the siting of the heritage resource relative to garbage storage and surface parking for the proposed development and asked if there would be opportunities to further refine the site plan. Mr. Manning confirmed that Heritage Section Staff share these concerns and have relayed them to the applicant. Nusrat Omer, Senior Planner, Development, advised that these comments have been released to the applicant and that Planning Staff will continue to engage with the applicant.

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the proposed relocation of the Savage-Schell-Dennie House to accommodate future development of 3009 Elgin Mills Road East & 10731-10745 Victoria Square Boulevard and has no comment on the OPA/ZBA applications;

THAT heritage approval conditions associated with a future site plan control application include the entering into a Heritage Easement Agreement to ensure the long-term conservation of the heritage resource, and a Conservation Plan to return the heritage resource to a more historically accurate condition;

AND THAT final review of a future Site Plan Control application and Major Heritage Permit application, and any other development applications required to approve alterations to the Savage-Schell-Dennie House in accordance with this proposal, be delegated to Heritage Section staff

Carried

6.2 DEMOLITION PERMIT APPLICATION

PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF THE WILLIAM MERGEN HOUSE AND ACCESSORY BUILDING

10855 KENNEDY RD., THE WILLIAM MERGEN HOUSE (16.11)

File Numbers:

DP 24 168243

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner, introduced this item as a demolition permit from the City's Building Department for removal of the William Mergen House and accessory building which have been vacant since 2003. Mr. Wokral advised that the City took ownership of the property, but it is now owned by others. The property is individually designated. An engineering report has stated that the building is unsafe and should be demolished.

Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection to the proposed demolition of the accessory building at 10855 Kennedy Road as it is not identified as a heritage attribute of the property in the Designation By-law.

THAT Heritage Markham does not support the proposed demolition of the William Mergen House.

AND THAT the owner undertake necessary repairs to the William Mergen House to return it to habitable condition.

Carried

6.3 ZONING AMENDMENT APPLICATION

THE DAVID REESOR HOUSE "SILVER SPRING FARM" PROPOSED RESTAURANT CONVERSION 7960 REESOR ROAD (16.11)

File Numbers:

PLAN 24 16373

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner

A. Chau, Planner, East District

Peter Wokral, Senior Heritage Planner, advised that this item is related to a Zoning By-law Amendment application at 7960 Reesor Road to permit a variety of uses including a proposed restaurant use within the David Reesor House which is designated pursuant to the Ontario Heritage Act. Mr. Wokral indicated that Heritage Section Staff are not opposed to a restaurant use but a conceptual plan submitted in support of the application illustrated how the proposed use would

impact the property's heritage attributes. Mr. Wokral advised that Heritage Section Staff had no comment on the other five proposed buildings.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Asked if the applicant needed to come back to the Heritage Committee with any changes. Mr. Wokral confirmed that the Committee would see a heritage permit in the future indicating any changes or alterations to the house.
- Asked how the type of signage and scale of signage for the restaurant would be reviewed. Mr. Wokral confirmed that any signage would require a sign permit, for which Heritage Section Staff have delegated approval to review from a heritage perspective. Signage should be compatible with the heritage character of the building and comply with the relevant provisions of the Sign By-law.
- Requested clarification as to why the suggested recommendation has been revised. Staff noted that the Applicant has expressed willingness to reverse changes that a previous owner made. Mr. Wokral confirmed that the Applicant has indicated that they have plans which would not propose altering or removing the original front entrance, which was identified as a positive heritage aspect, and that they would rectify the 1990s alterations.
- David Eckler, architect, explained that the list of uses result from the City's new Comprehensive Zoning By-law, noting that the application was originally submitted when there was a lack of clarity as to when the new by-law would be in force. Mr. Eckler expressed his belief that any issues with the schematic proposal of the restaurant can be resolved at the design stage, once the proposed land-use is approved.
- Sought clarification on what Staff believe to be architecturally detrimental alterations to the building. Mr. Wokral shared images displaying the dormers, front projecting bay, and the added balconies, advising that the projecting bay was added without a permit and that it concealed significant architectural features of the original front entrance.

Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham does not object to the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment as it applies to the use and development standards related to the proposed new industrial/commercial buildings;

AND THAT Heritage Markham supports the proposed restaurant use of the David Reesor House conditional upon a future heritage permit that addresses the

architecturally detrimental alterations made in the 1990s, and conserves the original exterior front door and wall.

Carried

6.4 COMMITTEE OF ADJUSTMENT CONSENT AND VARIANCE APPLICATIONS

44 ROUGE STREET, MARKHAM VILLAGE (16.11)

File Numbers:

B/032/23

A/154/23

A/155/23

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

E. Manning, Senior Heritage Planner

Evan Manning, Senior Heritage Planner, introduced this item, reminding the Committee that this is a consent and variance application for 44 Rouge Street, which was before the Committee in October of 2023 and was not supported by the Heritage Markham Committee at that time. The applicant has come forward with a new Committee of Adjustment applications with some of the variances eliminated in response to concerns expressed by the Committee when the applications were last considered.

Edgar De Souza, deputant and resident of Rouge Street, expressed concerns with the severance of the property as he noted that the area is defined by the larger lots and allowing this severance may set a precedent for future severances. Mr. De Souza was of the opinion that the proposed severance and the resulting lot fabric would not conform with policies in the Official Plan. Mr. De Souza mentioned that he does not have concerns with the construction of a dwelling, only with the severance itself.

Nicole McLaughlin, deputant and resident of Rouge Street, echoed Mr. De Souza's comments and noted that Nelson Street is more of a lane, not a full street. Ms. McLaughlin flagged the comparisons drawn in the Staff report between Nelson Street and James Scott Road, which she commented are not the same in width, and as such are not appropriate comparables Ms. McLaughlin expressed concerns with the lot area proposed, noting a difference of over 1000 square feet from the existing lot size.

Sarah and Stephen Kertesz, deputants and residents of Rouge Street, stated that they purchased their home due to the large lots that characterize this part of the Heritage District. Ms. Kertesz noted that if the lot is severed and two homes are built, it would alter the unique character of the area. Ms. Kertesz expressed understanding of the need to build housing but noted that she does not believe it should come at the detriment of maintaining the heritage character of the area. Mr. Kertesz expressed concern with the reduction of greenspace and drainage issues that this severance might result in.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Thanked the Applicant and architect who reduced the variances, while expressing continued concerns with the proposed severance and resulting lot sizes compared to the existing context.
- Expressed concern as to the precedent that would be created by the severance.
- Expressed concern with the reduction of private open space resulting from the severance and subsequent construction of a new dwelling.
- Discussed the purview of the Heritage Committee and whether some of the areas of concern noted should be considered from a heritage perspective.
- Noted that some of the heritage context of the area is diminished due to the fact that most of the homes in the area are mid-century modern.

Recommendation:

THAT Heritage Markham does not support the consent and variances applications for 44 Rouge Street.

Lost

Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the consent and variances applications for 44 Rouge Street;

AND THAT the deputations from Edgar De Souza, Nicole McLaughlin, and Sarah and Stephen Kertesz be received;

AND THAT the petition in opposition to the applications from residents of Vinegar Hill be received.

Carried

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

7.1 REQUEST FOR FEEDBACK – SITE VISIT

PROPOSED DEMOLITIONS – 2024 ROUGE NATIONAL URBAN PARK (16.11)

File Numbers:

n/a

Extracts:

R. Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning

G. Seaman, Director, Sustainability & Asset Management

The Committee consented to table this item following Item 6.1.

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning, reminded the Committee that since last Spring, the Committee has been dealing with the proposed demolition of eight buildings in the Rouge National Urban Park (RNUP). Mr. Hutcheson advised that following a site visit to all the properties last October, Heritage Section Staff and Committee members established a criteria for ranking the resources, considering each building's perceived design, historical and contextual value as well as their external and internal integrity. Mr. Hutcheson advised that an Architectural Review Sub-Committee meeting was held on Monday, May 6th and within the Notes from that meeting which had been sent to all Heritage Markham members, a suggested recommendation was drafted for consideration. Mr. Hutcheson also advised that Graham Seaman, Director, Sustainability & Asset Management who is the City's liaison with RNUP was in attendance to answer any questions specific to his area of expertise.

The Committee provided the following feedback:

- Acknowledged that Parks Canada is not under any obligation to work with the Committee or the City of Markham, and that they have made it clear that they do not have the funds to restore all of the houses but noted that the Heritage Markham Committee mandate is to achieve protection and conservation of significant cultural heritage resources notwithstanding their condition.
- Sought clarification on the role of Sustainability and Asset Management in this process. Director Seaman advised that they have a small capital

budget of \$25,000 to support research and work related to the partnership with RNUP, which could be used to invest in consultation on some of the sites.

- It was noted that any further assessment could demonstrate what it would take to stabilize a building so it can be salvaged by others. Director Seaman noted that the funding would not be enough to assess every property but could be directed to those with the highest ranking to quantify what it would cost to stabilize the building, and structure the leases to make it feasible for investment.
- Asked why a governmental agency would not be a better custodian of heritage assets. Mr. Hutcheson noted that Parks Canada as well as other levels of government, often have budget constraints which impacts their ability to maintain and rehabilitate cultural heritage resources in their ownership.
- Asked if there could be other opportunities through engaging private sector developers to create a heritage restoration fund to assist in the conservation of these community assets. In addition, questioned whether a more comprehensive marketing plan and enhanced incentives could attract more interest in investment. Director Seaman clarified that he believes it is Parks Canada's intention to structure leases for future tenants which would make continued residence and restoration and preservation feasible for the tenant themselves.
- Asked how Parks Canada had advertised or promoted the availability of these properties. Mr. Hutcheson clarified that previously Parks Canada had indicated that they had used a website to seek interest in the buildings, reached out to non-profit groups and had used physical signage on their property noting investment opportunities but were constrained to only allow visitation to structurally sound buildings due to safety issues. Parks Canada staff noted they were willing to forgo rental income for an extended period to help cover rehabilitation costs but there were limited investors who were willing to spend the type of money that the condition of these buildings would require.

Recommendations:

THAT Heritage Markham receive the notes of the Architectural Review Sub-Committee meeting held on May 6, 2024, regarding the review of the Rouge National Urban Park heritage properties proposed for demolition.

Whereas the City of Markham has experience working with property owners in the successful conservation of heritage resources which in some cases were in extremely poor condition; and,

Whereas the Rouge National Urban Park (RHUP) is a unique national park in the Parks Canada portfolio as it has an urban component which includes people living in the park and a mandate to conserve the cultural heritage within its boundaries; and,

Whereas after reviewing and evaluating the eight cultural heritage resources from a historical, architectural, and contextual perspective as well as consideration of their existing physical condition, the properties have been prioritized as to value by the Heritage Markham Committee as follows:

1. 7933 14th Avenue (James Dimma House)
2. 11223 Reesor Road (James Collins House), 11122 Reesor Road (Noble Tenant Farmer's House), 11190 York Durham Line (John Boyles House), and 8200 York Durham Line (William Boyd House)
3. 10676 Reesor Road (Adam Betz House)
4. 10295 Ninth Line (James Brison Johnston House)
5. 8331 14th Avenue (David Badgerow House)

THAT Heritage Markham is of the opinion that all eight buildings proposed for demolition are cultural heritage resources that warrant protection and restoration by Parks Canada;

THAT Heritage Markham encourages Parks Canada to look more comprehensively at incentives, leasing, and marketing programs to find private sector partners to help with the cost of restoration and seeking tenants;

AND THAT to illustrate to Parks Canada the City's commitment to conservation of its local heritage resources and to demonstrate that these resources can be rehabilitated and conserved, Heritage Markham supports the undertaking of a structural review/ conservation plan/strategy and cost estimate by an engineering firm having experience with heritage buildings for the most significant buildings utilizing existing RNUP funding offered by the Sustainability and Asset Management Department.

Carried

8. PART SIX - NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The Heritage Markham Committee adjourned at 10:02 PM.