



**SUBJECT:** RECOMMENDATION REPORT  
Objection to Inclusion on the Heritage Register and Objection to Notice of Intention to Designate – Phase IX Properties

**PREPARED BY:** Evan Manning, Senior Heritage Planner, ext. 2296

**REVIEWED BY:** Regan Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning, ext. 2080

**RECOMMENDATION:**

- 1) THAT the Staff report, dated July 16, 2024, titled "RECOMMENDATION REPORT, Objection to Inclusion on the Heritage Register and Objection to Notice of Intention to Designate – Phase IX Properties", be received;
- 2) THAT the written objection to designation under the *Ontario Heritage Act* as submitted by the property owner of 7507 Kennedy Road (Ward 8), be received as information;
- 3) THAT Council affirm its intention to designate 7507 Kennedy Road (Ward 8) under Part IV, Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* in recognition of its cultural heritage significance;
- 4) THAT Councils finds 7507 Kennedy Road (Ward 8) to be a significant cultural heritage resource and does not support its removal from the Markham Register of Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest;
- 4) THAT the Clerk’s Department be authorized to place a designation by-law before Council for adoption;
- 5) THAT the Clerk’s Department be authorized to publish and serve notice of Council’s adoption of the designation by-law as per the requirements of the *Ontario Heritage Act*;
- 6) AND THAT Staff be authorized and directed to do all things necessary to give effect to this resolution.

**PURPOSE:**

This report provides information on an objection submitted for one property for which Council has stated its intention to designate under Part IV, Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (the “Act”), in accordance with the Staff recommendations adopted by Council on May 1, 2024, and noted in the recommendations of this report.

Further, this report recommends that Council does not support the request to remove 7507 Kennedy Road (the “Property”) from the Markham Register of Property of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (the “Heritage Register”) given the Property’s cultural heritage significance.

**BACKGROUND:**

***Notice of Council’s Intention to Designate has been provided to the Property Owner***

On May 1, 2024, Council stated its intention to designate six properties under Part IV, Section 29 of the Act. A notice of intention to designate was provided to the property owners and the Ontario Heritage Trust, and was published in accordance with the Act. The objection period ended on June 7, 2024.

The City Clerk received a notice of objection from the owner (“RHI”) of one of the six properties within the timeframe as set out in the Act: 7507 Kennedy Road. Refer to Appendix ‘A’ for an image of the Property.

The Act requires that Council consider and make a decision on an objection within 90 days from the end of the objection period. Council may decide to withdraw, amend, or affirm its intention to designate. Council has until September 5, 2024, to make a decision on the objection.

If Council decides not to withdraw a notice of intention to designate a property, Council may pass a by-law designating the property. Council has 120 days from after the date of publication of the notice of intention (May 8, 2024) to pass a designation by-law. Should Council not act within this timeframe, a notice of intention to designate is deemed to be withdrawn. As noted, the deadline is September 5, 2024, but given the upcoming Council meeting schedule, the designation by-law will be placed on the July 17, 2024 agenda to comply with the legislative timeframe.

***The Act provides a mechanism for the removal of a property from a municipal Heritage Register***

Section 27 (7) of the Act provides a mechanism for an owner to object to the inclusion of their property on a municipal heritage register. This mechanism is the result of recent amendments to the Act. A property owner can object to the “listing” of their property at any time, even if the property was included on the Heritage Register prior to the aforementioned amendment coming into force, as is the case here.

Section 27 (8) of the Act directs the council of a municipality to consider the notice of objection and decide as to whether the property should continue to be included on the heritage register or whether it should be removed. Note that there are no timelines within the Act for Council consideration of the notice of objection, and that this objection is separate and distinct from the objections considered by Council related to designation of properties under Section 29 of the Act.

***Properties are to be assessed using Provincial Designation Criteria***

Ontario Regulation 9/06, as amended, (“O.Reg. 9/06”) prescribes criteria for determining a property’s cultural heritage value or interest for the purpose of designation. The regulation provides an objective base for the determination and evaluation of resources of cultural heritage value, and ensures the comprehensive, and consistent assessment of value by all Ontario municipalities. Municipal councils are permitted to designate a property to be of cultural heritage value or interest if the property meets two or more of the prescribed criteria (excerpted from O.Reg. 9/06):

- 1. The property has design value or physical value because it is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method.*
- 2. The property has design value or physical value because it displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit.*
- 3. The property has design value or physical value because it demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.*
- 4. The property has historical value or associative value because it has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community.*

5. *The property has historical value or associative value because it yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture.*
6. *The property has historical value or associative value because it demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.*
7. *The property has contextual value because it is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area.*
8. *The property has contextual value because it is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings.*
9. *The property has contextual value because it is a landmark.*

#### **OPTIONS/ DISCUSSION:**

##### ***Heritage Section Staff (“Staff”) considered the Property owner’s reasons for objection to the Notice of Intention to Designate***

Staff received a letter via email from the Property owner outlining their objection to designation (refer to Appendix ‘C’). Below are excerpts from the letter that describe the Property owner’s primary concerns regarding perceived procedural errors related to the designation process followed by a response from Staff:

1. *Council and the City have substantially failed to comply with the express mandatory provisions of the OHA and therefore have acted improperly and without legal authority in their May 1, 2024, decision to issue the NOITD [Notice of Intention to Designate] ...*

##### Staff Response

There is no statutory requirement to notify property owners in advance of Council consideration of a Notice of Intention to Designate (“NOID”). The letter and information package provided to the Property owner in advance of DSC/Council consideration of the NOID is a courtesy offered by Staff. As such, the City has fully complied with the mandatory provisions of the Act when Council adopted Staff recommendations in support of a NOID at its meeting on May 1, 2024.

2. *... the City and Council completely ignored RHI’s **section 27(7)** OHA objection being on the Register, and on May 1, 2024 without proper consideration of this preliminary objection, improperly and summarily approved the issuing of the NOITD [for] the Property.*

##### Staff Response

There is no statutory obligation for Staff to bring forward an objection to listing, as provided for by Section 27 of the Act, in advance of Council consideration of a NOID, as provided by Section 29 of the Act. There is also no timeline provided in the Act for Council consideration of an objection to listing once submitted by a property owner. From a Staff perspective, the issuance of a NOID inherently addressed the objection to listing of the Property on the Heritage Register. It would be contradictory for Council to support Staff recommendations in support of a NOID while simultaneously supporting a property owner’s objection to listing of their property, thereby removing it from the Heritage Register. To satisfy the Property owner’s request for Council consideration of the objection to listing, Staff have included a recommendation within this report opposing the request to “de-list” the Property.

- 
3. *Notice to the Owners of the Property and the Publication of the Notice as required by the mandatory provisions of Sections 29(3), 29(4), 29(4.1), 29(5) and Section 67: The City has failed to comply with these express and mandatory requirements of the OHA in regard to service and publication of notice of the NOITD to the owners of the Property ...*

Staff Response

Staff have fully complied with the statutory notification requirements as described within the Act. There are provisions to allow non-newspaper notice using Section 270 of the *Municipal Act* (the Act indicates that “where a municipality is required by this Part to publish a notice in a newspaper having general circulation in the municipality, notice given accordance with a policy adopted by the municipality under Section 270 of the Municipal Act, 2001 is deemed to satisfy the requirement of this Part to publish notice in a newspaper”. Council adopted a by-law to enable digital posting of notifications where required by the Act at its meeting on May 3, 2023 (refer to By-law 2023-80).

4. *RHI had initially and in “good faith” invited the City’s Heritage staff’s representatives to attend an onsite meeting at the Property to review RHI’s position and discuss the issues, but in three (3) separate emails it was unequivocally stated by staff that such a meeting would not change staff’s view about designation of the Property, but only be used to refine the City’s Statement of Historical Significant, as a result of these closedminded emails, the last one received May 20, 2024 – no such onsite meeting with City Heritage staff has taken place.*

Staff Response

On multiple occasions Staff offered to meet the Property owner and their consultant for an on-site meeting to discuss potential refinements to Property’s heritage attributes, where warranted, and each time were refused. This is an offer we have made to all property owners who have objected to designation (note that where refinements have been made in the past, they have been minor in nature). Out of respect for the Property owner’s time, and to avoid the Property owner expending unnecessary resources on consultant fees, Staff were upfront regarding realistic outcomes from a site visit (i.e. reversal of the Staff position that the property is a significant cultural heritage resource is unrealistic).

***Staff considered the Property owner’s objection to the inclusion of 7507 Kennedy Road on the Heritage Register***

As noted in the appended letter submitted by the Property owner, Council supported Staff recommendations in support of an objection submitted under Section 27(7) of the Act to remove 7696 Ninth Line from the Heritage Register at its meeting on May 1, 2024. Francis Lapointe, the consultant retained by the Property owner to evaluate the heritage significance of 7507 Kennedy Road, has referenced this decision to justify removal of the Kennedy Road property from the Heritage Register, citing similarities between the two buildings. While Staff acknowledge that the two buildings are similar in scale and massing, 7696 Ninth Line has been more heavily modified than 7507 Kennedy Road and is of less design value owing not only to the substantial degree of alterations undertaken, but also its frame rather than brick construction. While the original doors and windows at 7507 Kennedy Road have been removed and replaced with contemporary materials, a condition typical of many heritage buildings within Markham prior to their restoration, period appropriate replacements can easily be installed as part of a future conservation scope. If the absence of original windows and doors was used as a justification to deny heritage protection to a property, Markham would have few remaining heritage resources.

There are also notable differences in context. 7696 Ninth Line is located within the historic hamlet of Box Grove which contains a cluster of nineteenth and early twentieth century buildings, many of which are designated under Part IV on the Act. Relative to these properties, 7696 Ninth Line is of lesser design quality and is not singularly important in supporting the heritage context of the community. In contrast, 7507 Kennedy Road is an isolated fragment. It is one of the few extant buildings dating from the historic community of Milliken. As such, its contextual value is magnified. Without it, the legibility of what was once Milliken is diminished. Further, it is one of few heritage buildings remaining in the portion of the city south of Highway 407.

Staff consider the Property to be a significant cultural heritage resource as described in the Staff report considered by Council on May 1, 2024. At this meeting, Council adopted Staff recommendations in support of designation of the Property for its cultural heritage significance in accordance with the Statement of Significance included within Appendix 'C' of the associated report. Given both the Staff position, and Council's decision to issue a NOID for the Property, its removal from the Heritage Register is not recommended.

***The protection and preservation of heritage resources is consistent with City policies***

Markham's Official Plan 2014 contains cultural heritage policies related to the protection and conservation of heritage resources that are often a fragile gift from past generations. They are a non-renewable resource, and once lost, are gone forever. Markham understands the importance of safeguarding its cultural heritage resources and uses a number of mechanisms to protect them. Council's policy recognizes their significance by designating individual properties under the Act to ensure that the cultural heritage values and heritage attributes are addressed and protected.

***Provincial planning policies support designation***

The Provincial Policy Statement, 2020, issued under Section 3 of the *Planning Act* includes cultural heritage policies that indicate significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved. Designation provides a mechanism to achieve the necessary protection.

***Designation acknowledges the importance of a cultural heritage resource***

Designation signifies to an owner and the broader community that the Property contains a significant resource that is important to the community. Designation does not restrict the use of the Property or compel restoration. However, it does require an owner to seek approval for property alterations that are likely to affect the heritage attributes described in the designation by-law. Council can also prevent, rather than just delay, the demolition of a resource on a designated heritage property.

***The Process and Procedures for Designation under Part IV of the Act are summarized below***

- Staff undertake research and evaluate the property under O.Reg. 9/06 to determine whether it should be considered a significant cultural heritage resource worthy of Part IV designation;
- Council is advised by its municipal heritage committee with respect to the cultural heritage value of the Property;
- Council may state its Intention to Designate the property under Part IV of the Act and is to include a statement explaining the cultural heritage value or interest of the Property and a description of the heritage attributes of the Property;

- Should Council wish to pursue designation, notice must be provided to the owner and the Ontario Heritage Trust that includes a description of the cultural heritage value of the Property. A notice, either published in a local newspaper or posted digitally in a readily accessed location, must be provided with the same details (i.e. the City's website);
- **Following the publication of the notice, interested parties can object to the designation within a 30-day window. If an objection notice is received, Council is required to consider the objection and make a decision whether or not to withdraw the notice of intention to designate;**
- Should Council proceed with designation, it must pass a by-law to that effect within 120 days of the date in which the notice was published. There are notice requirements and a 30-day appeal period following Council adoption of the by-law in which interested parties can serve notice to the municipality and the Ontario Land Tribunal ("OLT") of their objection to the designation by-law. Should no appeal be received within the 30-day time period, the designation by-law comes into force. Should an objection be received, an OLT hearing date is set to examine the merits of the objection and provide a final decision.

**FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS:**

There has been a significant increase in the number of designation by-laws adopted by Council in response to recent amendments to the Act through Bill 23. As a result, there may be an increase in the number of OLT appeals relative to previous years, along with the potential need to secure additional funds from Council to support Staff preparation and attendance at the OLT. Should existing funding sources be found inadequate, staff will advise Council through a future Staff report.

**HUMAN RESOURCES CONSIDERATIONS:**

Not Applicable

**ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIC PRIORITIES:**

The protection and preservation of cultural heritage resources is part of the City's Growth Management strategy.

**BUSINESS UNITS CONSULTED AND AFFECTED:**

Heritage Markham, Council's advisory committee on heritage matter, was consulted on the designation proposals. Clerks and Planning and Urban Design Department (Heritage Section) will be responsible for future notice provisions. An appeal to the OLT would involve staff from the Planning and Urban Design (Heritage Section), Legal Services, and Clerks Department.

**RECOMMENDED BY:**

---

Giulio Cescato, RPP, MCIP  
Director of Planning and Urban Design

---

Arvin Prasad, MPA, RPP, MCIP  
Commissioner of Development Services

**APPENDICES:**

Appendix 'A': Location and Image of the Property

Appendix 'B': Statement of Significance

Appendix 'C': Letter of Objection

Appendix 'D': Research Report

**APPENDIX ‘A’**  
**Location and Image of the Property**

**7507 Kennedy Road (Ward 8): “John and Elizabeth Smith House”**  
*Primary Elevation and Property Map*





## **APPENDIX ‘B’: Statement of Significance**

### STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

#### John and Elizabeth Smith House

7507 Kennedy Road  
c.1850

The John and Elizabeth Smith House is recommended for designation under Part IV, Section 29 of the Ontario Heritage Act as a property of cultural heritage value or interest, as described in the following Statement of Significance.

#### **Description of Property**

The John and Elizabeth Smith House is a one-and-a-half storey brick former dwelling located on the east side of Kennedy Road in the historic community of Milliken. The building faces west.

#### **Design Value and Physical Value**

The John and Elizabeth Smith House is a representative example of a mid-nineteenth century brick farmhouse in the vernacular Georgian architectural tradition. This style persisted in Ontario long after the Georgian period ended in 1830. The essential design principles of symmetry, balance and formality extended beyond the 1830s to influence local vernacular architecture for much of the nineteenth century. In Markham, most examples of this conservative approach to domestic architecture were constructed in the 1850s. Alterations to the c.1850 dwelling were made as part of its conversion to commercial use, but its essential form has remained intact and its character as a mid-nineteenth century farmhouse is readily discernable.

#### **Historical Value and Associative Value**

The John and Elizabeth Smith House has historical value, representing the locally significant theme of agriculture through its function as the former farmhouse of John and Elizabeth Smith, and for its association with the significant wave of British families who arrived in Markham Township in the 1820s-1830s. It also has historical value for its association with the locally prominent Milliken family after whom the community takes its name. John Smith, an English immigrant, married Elizabeth “Betsy” Milliken in 1838. Elizabeth Milliken was the daughter of Norman Milliken, a United Empire Loyalist who came to Markham via New Brunswick in 1807. In 1844, John Smith purchased a small farm on the south-west quarter of Markham Township Lot 4, Concession 6. A brick farmhouse was constructed there c.1850. The property was later farmed by John and Betsy Smith’s son, John B. Smith, until 1892.

#### **Contextual Value**

The John and Elizabeth Smith House has contextual value for being physically, functionally, visually and historically linked to its surroundings. It is one of a small number of nineteenth century buildings that

remain in south-central Markham, and one of the few remnants of the agricultural past in the community of Milliken.

### **Heritage Attributes**

Character-defining attributes that embody the cultural heritage value of the John and Elizabeth Smith House are organized by their respective Ontario Regulation 9/06 criteria, as amended, below:

*Heritage attributes that convey the property's design and physical value as a representative example of a mid-nineteenth century brick farmhouse in the vernacular Georgian architectural tradition:*

- Rectangular plan;
- One-and-a-half storey height;
- Fieldstone foundation;
- Brick walls in Flemish bond;
- Medium-pitched gable roof with projecting eaves and eave returns;
- Three-bay primary (west) elevation with a centrally placed single-leaf door and transom light remnant;
- Flat-headed rectangular window openings with projecting lugsills and radiating brick arches.

*Heritage attributes that convey the property's historical value and associative value, representing the themes of agriculture and immigration, as the former farmhouse of John and Elizabeth Smith, and for its association with the locally prominent Milliken family:*

- The dwelling is a tangible reminder of the Smith-Milliken family that historically resided here from and farmed the land c.1850 to 1892.

*Heritage attributes that convey the property's contextual value because it is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings:*

- The location of the building on its original site, facing west, within the historic community of Milliken.

*Attributes of the property that are not considered to be of cultural heritage value or are otherwise not included in the Statement of Significance:*

- Shed-roofed front veranda;
- Modern windows;
- Non-functional shutters;
- Modern front door;
- Rear addition.

**APPENDIX 'C': Letter of Objection**

*Provided under separate cover*

## **APPENDIX ‘D’: Research Report**

### **RESEARCH REPORT**



**John and Elizabeth Smith House**  
**South-West Quarter Lot 4, Concession 6, Milliken**  
**7507 Kennedy Road**  
**c.1850**

**Heritage Section**  
**City of Markham Planning & Urban Design**  
**2024**  
*Update of a Research Report from 1993*

#### **History**

The John and Elizabeth Smith House is located on a portion of the south-west quarter of Markham Township Lot 4, Concession 6, in the historic community of Milliken.

This part of Markham, known as Milliken, began as a rural crossroads hamlet that straddled the border between Markham and Scarborough Townships. When a local post office was established in 1859, it was named Milliken Corners after a prominent United Empire Loyalist family that settled here in 1807.

In the early twentieth century, a number of village lots were severed from farms in the area and modest homes were constructed on the east and west sides of Kennedy Road north of Steeles Avenue. Turff Avenue and Thelma Avenue were established in 1930. Victory (originally Victor) Avenue was constructed at a later date. Older buildings in the area include a small number of nineteenth century houses remaining from Milliken's early history, and twentieth century houses dating from about 1900 to the mid-1950s. Many of the later houses are typical of the modest homes built by returning veterans of World War II – hence the name Victory Avenue.

Shivers Cozens received the Crown Patents for Markham Township Lots 3 and 4, Concession 6, in 1802. Cozens was a member of a family of United Empire Loyalists from New Jersey that received generous land grants in Upper Canada in compensation for their losses during the American Revolution. In 1804, Cozens sold both lots to Ira Bentley who began to sell his properties in smaller parcels shortly after his purchase. Ira Bentley was one of four or five brothers that came to Upper Canada in about the year 1800. Elijah Bentley, believed to have been Ira Bentley's brother, purchased the western half of Lots 3 and 4 in 1807. He was an Anabaptist preacher. In 1813, Elijah Bentley was charged and tried by the colonial government of Upper Canada for disloyal behavior during the American occupation of the Town of York during the War of 1812.

There were numerous transactions involving both of these properties in the early nineteenth century. In 1844, John Smith purchased the south-west 50 acres of Lot 4, Concession 6 from Simon P. Dumond. John Smith (1803-1851) was an English immigrant. In 1838, he married Elizabeth Milliken (1811-1886), known as "Betsy." They were members of the Wesleyan Methodist Church. Betsy Milliken was the daughter of Norman and Susannah Milliken, prominent members of the Milliken community. Norman Milliken was a United Empire Loyalist who came to Markham via New Brunswick in 1807. He was engaged in the lumber industry, supplying timber to the British naval authorities.

In the early years of John and Betsy Smith's marriage, they resided on an 11-acre parcel of Lot 1, Concession 5 that Betsy Smith inherited from her father in 1843. Brown's Directory of Markham Township, 1846-47, placed John Smith on that property. It appears that the brick farmhouse on Lot 4, Concession 6 had not yet been constructed.

By the time of the 1851 census, John and Betsy Smith were residing in a one-and-a-half storey brick dwelling on Lot 4, Concession 6 (7507 Kennedy Road). John Smith was a farmer, age 49. Betsy Smith was 41. In the same household was their daughter Mary, age 13, their son John, age 7, and Betsy's brother John Milliken, a farmer.

John Smith died later in 1851. He bequeathed the 50 acres in the south-west corner of Lot 4, Concession 6 to his son John B. Smith, and the 11-acre parcel on Lot 1, Concession 5 to his daughter Mary.

Betsy Smith (nee Milliken) married Henry Sanders in 1858. The 1861 census lists Henry and Betsy Sanders as residing on the eastern half of Lot 2, Concession 3 in the general vicinity of German Mills. Henry Sanders' children from his previous marriage, as well as Betsy's youngest child, John Smith Jr., were also listed in the household. The property on Lot 4, Concession 6 in Milliken was occupied by a tenant in the

1860s, according to Markham Township assessment rolls from that period. Betsy's daughter, Mary, and her husband, Robert Vardon, farmed the property until John Smith Jr. was old enough to farm there himself.

The 1871 census listed John Smith Jr. with his widowed mother on Lot 4, Concession 6. Henry Sanders had passed away, and Elizabeth/Betsy had reverted to her previous surname, "Smith." Mary Vardon, John Smith Jr.'s married sister, and her son William, were also listed in the household.

By the time of the 1881 census, John Smith Jr. was married. John and Margaret Smith were both 34 years old and had three children between the ages of eight and one. Margaret Smith was known as "Maggie." John Smith Jr. was a farmer. The family were of the Methodist faith. In 1891, there were six children in the Smith household. Their dwelling was described as a two-storey brick structure containing seven rooms.

In 1892, John and Maggie Smith mortgaged their property to Lady Sarah E. C. Mulock, wife of The Honourable Sir William Mulock of Toronto, for \$3,500. They subsequently defaulted on the mortgage payments and lost the property in 1903 when it was sold under power to John Reid, a farmer and carpenter. John Reid was the owner until 1918. After that, the property passed through a series of owners and was reduced in size until the existing house remained on a small portion of the original 50-acre farm. By the mid-1970s, the house was converted to commercial use, serving as an office for Action Communications Limited.

### **Architecture**

The John and Elizabeth Smith House is a one-and-a-half storey brick building with a rectangular plan. The building, a former dwelling, rests on a fieldstone foundation. The brick walls, laid in Flemish bond, have been painted for many years. A full-width shed-roofed veranda extends across the west or front elevation, supported on slender wood posts. This veranda does not appear to date from the nineteenth century. It has been in place since at least the mid-1970s. A two-storey frame addition of indeterminate age is located along the rear wall.

The medium-pitched gable roof has projecting, boxed eaves and eave returns. There is a bedmould below the flat soffits and a simple wood frieze along the raking eaves. Up until the 2010s there were single-stack brick chimneys with elaborately corbelled caps at each gable end. Now only the bases of those chimneys remain.

The three-bay primary (west) elevation has a centrally placed single-leaf door with a wood panel occupying the former location of a flat-headed transom light. The door is a modern replacement. On either side of the door are flat-headed rectangular window openings with projecting lugsills and radiating brick arches. Fixed plate glass replacement windows occupy these window openings as well as all others on the historic structure. Windows are flanked with non-functional decorative louvered shutters.

On the gable end walls, windows on the second storey are smaller in proportion to those on the ground floor. A large plate glass window has been inserted in the north gable end wall positioned towards the west front corner of the building.

The John and Elizabeth Smith House is a representative example of a mid-nineteenth century brick farmhouse in the Georgian architectural tradition. This style persisted in Ontario long after the Georgian period ended in 1830. The essential principles of uncluttered designs with a sense of symmetry, balance and formality carried forward to influence vernacular architecture for much of the nineteenth century. In Markham, most examples of this style were constructed in the 1850s.

Alterations to the c.1850 dwelling have taken place as part of its conversion to commercial use, but its essential form has remained intact and its character as a mid-nineteenth century farmhouse is readily discernable.

### **Context**

The John and Elizabeth Smith House is one of a small number of nineteenth century buildings that remain in south-central Markham, and one of the few remnants of the agricultural past in the community of Milliken. The former farmhouse is on its original site and represents a still point in a neighbourhood that has undergone significant suburban growth beginning in the 1970s.

### **Sources**

Abstract Index of Deeds for Markham Township Lot 4, Concession 6.

Canada Census: 1851, 1861, 1871, 1881, 1891, 1901, 1911 and 1921.

Maps of Markham Township: McPhillips (1853-54), Tremaine (1860) and Historical Atlas of the County of York, Ontario (1878).

Property File for 7507 Kennedy Road, Heritage Section, City of Markham Planning & Urban Design.

Milliken Family File, Heritage Section, City of Markham Planning & Urban Design.

Entry for William Milliken, *History of the County of York, Ontario*, Volume II: Biographical Notices. C.

Blackett Robinson, publisher, 1885.

Research Report on the Widow Smith House by Dorie Billich, Heritage Section, Town of Markham Planning & Urban Design, 1993.

Champion, Isabel (ed.). *Markham 1793-1900*. Markham: Markham Historical Society, Second Edition, Revised, 1989. Page 161, 276.

### **Compliance with Ontario Regulation 9/06, as amended – Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest**

*The property has design value or physical value because it is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method.*

**The John and Elizabeth Smith House has design value and physical value as a representative example of a mid-nineteenth century brick farmhouse in the vernacular Georgian architectural tradition.**

*The property has historical value or associative value because it is associated with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community.*

**The John and Elizabeth Smith House has historical value, representing the locally significant theme of agriculture as the former farmhouse of John and Elizabeth Smith, and for its association with the significant wave of British families that arrived in Markham Township in the 1820s-1830s. It also has historical value for its association with the prominent Milliken family after whom the community takes its name.**

*The property has contextual value because it is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings.*

**The John and Elizabeth Smith House has contextual value because it is physically, functionally, visually and historically linked to its surroundings where it has stood since c.1850.**