



SUBJECT: RECOMMENDATION REPORT
Objection to Notice of Intention to Designate – Phase XIII and XIV Properties

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

REVIEWED BY: Regan Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning, ext. 2080
Stephen Lue, Senior Development Manager, ext. 2520

RECOMMENDATION:

- 1) THAT the Staff report, dated December 10, 2024, titled "RECOMMENDATION REPORT, Objection to Notice of Intention to Designate – Phase XIII and XIV Properties", be received;
- 2) THAT the written objection to designation under the *Ontario Heritage Act* as submitted on behalf of the property owner of 7530 Ninth Line (Ward 7), be received as information;
- 3) THAT Council affirm its intention to designate 7530 Ninth Line (Ward 7) under Part IV, Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act* in recognition of its cultural heritage significance;
- 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.

[Redacted]

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 September 25, 2024, and noted in the recommendations of this report.

BACKGROUND:

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

On September 25, 2024, Council stated its intention to designate four properties under Part IV, Section 29 of the Act as part of Phase XIII and XIV of the Priority Designation Project. A Notice of Intention to Designate (“NOID”) was provided to the affected property owners and the Ontario Heritage Trust. The NOID for each property was also posted on the City’s website in accordance with the Act. The statutory objection period ended on November 6, 2024.

The City Clerk received a notice of objection for 7530 Ninth Line (“Abram and Margaret Raymer House” or the “Property”) within the timeframe set out in the Act. Refer to Appendix ‘A’ for an image of the Property.

The Act requires that Council consider and make a decision on an objection. Council may decide to withdraw, amend, or affirm its intention to designate. If Council decides not to withdraw the NOID, Council may pass a by-law designating the property or properties. Council has 120 days from the date of publication of the NOID to pass a designation by-law (notice occurred on October 7, 2024).

Should Council not act within these timeframes, the NOID is deemed to be withdrawn. The 120-day deadline for the Phase XIII and XIV properties ends on February 4, 2025 (this is the date by which Council must adopt a by-law should it wish designate the Property under 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 for 7530 Ninth Line

Staff received a letter via email from an agent of the Property owner outlining their objection to designation (refer to Appendix ‘C’). It is the position of the agent that the Property does not meet the required O.Reg 9/06 criteria to merit designation under Part IV of the Act. Specifically, the agent contests the design/physical value of the Property and finds that the Property lacks historical/associative and contextual significance.

Staff reviewed the reasoning provided by the agent in the appended letter and remain of the opinion that the Abram and Margaret Raymer House is a significant heritage resource that warrants designation under the Act. Below is a response to the agent's assessment organized by three groupings of O.Reg 9/06 criteria:

Design/Physical Value

The agent states that the defining architectural elements of the building (i.e., those that are classifiable as vernacular Gothic Revival and High Victorian Queen Anne Revival) were not constructed at the same time. As such, the agent contends that the dwelling lacks design significance because of a lack of "intentional eclecticism". It is the opinion of Staff that the gradual evolution of the dwelling, as described by the agent, does not diminish its design significance as it reads as a cohesive composition. Whether the eclectic architectural character of the dwelling existed at the time of construction or whether it emerged over time does not mean that the work was not intentional, nor does it mean that an evolved dwelling, of which many heritage buildings are, lacks design significance.

The agent also states there have been unsympathetic alterations and additions to the dwelling that diminish its design value. These include the creation of new window openings on the side elevations and the construction of additions. These alterations can be reversed relatively easily and do not adversely affect the dwelling's primary (street facing) elevation. Staff also note that the Statement of Significance ("SOS") provided to the Property owner specifically identifies those elements of the dwelling that do not contribute to heritage significance (refer to Appendix 'B' for a copy of the full SOS). These include the following:

- Wooden railing on the front veranda;
- Modern principal door with sidelight on the south wall of vestibule;
- French doors on second floor of the south gable end;
- Frame rear addition;
- Accessory buildings.

As such, there has been no oversight on the part of Staff in correctly identifying which elements of the dwelling contribute to its design significance (and should be retained) and those elements that are not complementary and can be removed at a future date without negatively impacting its heritage value.

Historical/Associative Value

The agent contends that the Property lacks historical/associative value as Abraham Raymer does not have a significant connection to the dwelling. When evaluating the historical significance of the Property, Staff consider a broader familial connection that includes both Abraham Raymer, who acquired the land on which the existing dwelling was constructed, and his son, Abram Raymer, who resided in the dwelling. Staff also take a broader interpretation of "community" to include not just Box Grove, but Markham Township more broadly as there were linkages, commercially and socially, between its constituent communities. As described in the appended Research Report, it is the opinion of Staff that the Property has historical value for its association with the early cultural and religious diversity of Markham Township, namely Markham's Pennsylvania German Mennonite community (of which the Raymers were members), and more specifically for its association with Abram Raymer whose family was considered the founders of Mount Joy. In this way, the Property meets the fourth O.Reg 9/06 criterion as it has "*direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community*".

Contextual Value

The agent finds that the Property lacks contextual significance. Specifically, the agent states that the distance between the Property and the intersection of 14th Avenue and 9th Line (approximately 0.7km) diminishes its contextual value as does the construction of contemporary dwellings on nearby lots. Staff contend that the distance from the crossroads of 14th Avenue and 9th Line, the centre of activity within the historic hamlet of Box Grove, does not diminish the Property's contextual value as hamlets were often diffuse in character. Further, Staff are of the opinion that a critical mass of nineteenth and early twentieth century dwellings need to be retained for the historic hamlet of Box Grove to remain legible. The presence of new construction of nearby lots only magnifies the contextual value of the Property.

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 new Provincial Planning Statement (PPS) issued under Section 3 of the *Planning Act* came into effect October 20, 2024, and replaces the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020. The PPS (2024) includes cultural heritage policies that indicate protected heritage property, which may contain built heritage resources or 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 a 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 amendments to the Act through Bills 23 and 200. 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

7530 Ninth Line (Ward 7): “Abram and Margaret Raymer House”
Primary Elevation and Property Map



APPENDIX 'B': Statement of Significance

STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE

Abram and Margaret Raymer House

7530 Ninth Line
c.1889

The Abram and Margaret Raymer 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 Abram and Margaret Raymer House is a one-and-a-half storey brick dwelling located on the west side of Ninth Line, south of the historic crossroads hamlet of Box Grove. The house faces east.

Design Value and Physical Value

The Abram and Margaret Raymer House has design and physical value as a good representative example of a brick dwelling rendered in the vernacular Queen Anne Revival style. The Queen Anne Revival style was popular in late nineteenth century Markham, particularly in the eastern portion of the former Township for frame and brick houses in both villages and in rural areas. It was the most eclectic style of domestic architecture in the nineteenth century. The American version of Queen Anne Revival influenced domestic architecture in Canada. This example combines the L-shaped form and steep centre gable typical of vernacular Gothic Revival with elements of the High Victorian Queen Anne Revival style in the treatment of the front projecting gable with its two-storey canted bay window and fretwork ornamentation. The front veranda with its distinctive decorative detailing and enclosed vestibule is an extant element dating from the building's late 1880s period of construction.

Historical Value and Associative Value

The Abram and Margaret Raymer House has historical value for its association with the early cultural and religious diversity of Markham Township, namely Markham's Pennsylvania German Mennonite community, and more specifically for its association with Abram Raymer. He was a member of a locally important early Pennsylvania German Mennonite family that are considered the founders of Mount Joy which is located immediately north of Markham Village. This ornate brick dwelling was constructed c.1889 on a 25-acre parcel of Markham Township Lot 3, Concession 8 that was purchased by Abraham Raymer in two parts (1854 and 1868). Abraham Raymer lived on an adjacent property to the north where he farmed and owned a sawmill. This property was the home of his son Abram Raymer and his wife, Margaret (Legeer) Raymer, who married in 1889. In addition to farming, Abram Raymer contributed to a religious revival in the Box Grove community by leading Bible study groups and prayer meetings at the old Stone Jug hotel after the business closed. The property remained in the ownership of the Raymer family until 1939.

Contextual Value

The Abram and Margaret Raymer House is of contextual value as one of several nineteenth century dwellings that remain in the vicinity of the historic crossroads community of Box Grove, and because it is physically, functionally, visually and historically linked to the site where it has stood since c.1889.

Heritage Attributes

Character-defining attributes that embody the cultural heritage value of the Abram and Margaret Raymer 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 good representative example of a brick dwelling rendered in the vernacular Queen Anne Revival style:

- L-shaped plan of brick dwelling;
- One-and-a-half storey height;
- Fieldstone foundation;
- Buff brick walls with projecting plinth and radiating arches over door and window openings;
- External fireplace chimney on the north elevation;
- Medium-pitched gable roof with projecting, open eaves and steep gable-roofed wall dormer;
- Decorative fretwork on the primary (east) elevation gable;
- Flat-headed 1/1 single hung wood windows with projecting lugsills;
- Two-storey canted bay windows with large, fixed plate glass windows topped with leaded glass transom lights;
- Shed-roofed front veranda supported on chamfered wood posts and decorated with fretwork brackets and brick-patterned woodwork on the south gable end;
- Frame front vestibule sided in narrow tongue- and groove wood with diamond-shaped four-paned window.

Heritage attributes that convey the property's historical value for its association with the early cultural and religious diversity of Markham Township, namely Markham's Pennsylvania German Mennonite community, and more specifically for its association with Abram Raymer:

- The dwelling is a tangible reminder of Abram Raymer, a member of a locally prominent Pennsylvania German Mennonite family considered to be the founders of Mount Joy, north of Markham Village.

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 east, south of the historic crossroads hamlet of Box Grove where it has stood since c.1889.

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

- Wooden railing on the front veranda;
- Modern principal door with sidelight on the south wall of vestibule;
- French doors on second floor of the south gable end;
- Frame rear addition;

- Accessory buildings.

APPENDIX 'C': Letter of Objection

Provided under separate cover

APPENDIX ‘D’: Research Report

RESEARCH REPORT



Abram and Margaret Raymer House
Northeast Quarter Lot 3, Concession 8
7530 Ninth Line, Box Grove
c.1889

Heritage Section
City of Markham Planning & Urban Design, 2024

History

This house was constructed c.1889 on the northeast corner of Lot 3, Concession 8 as the home of Abram Raymer (1859-1939), a farmer, and his wife Margaret Amelia (Lageer) Raymer (1866-1912). Abram Raymer was a son of Abraham Raymer (1814-1891) and Elizabeth (Byer) Raymer (1823-1903) who farmed and owned a sawmill on Lot 4, Concession 8 to the northwest of this property. An archival photograph of the farmhouse of Abraham and Elizabeth Raymer appears on page 51 of *Markham 1793-1900*. The Raymer (or Ramer) family were Pennsylvania German Mennonites who came to Markham from Dauphin County, Pennsylvania in 1809. They were a prominent local family that are considered to be the founders of the Mount Joy community, now part of Markham Village.

The eastern 100 acres of Lot 3, Concession 8 were granted by the Crown to Peter Milne Jr. in 1846. Peter Milne Jr. (1803-1878) was the son of Alexander Milne and Jane Gibson, and the nephew of Peter Milne Sr., owner of Markham Mills south of Markham Village. Peter Milne Jr. was a store-keeper, sawmill owner, and first postmaster of the hamlet of Milnesville (Highway 48 north of Major Mackenzie Drive). He did not reside in the Box Grove area but lived on Lot 26, Concession 7, in the community that bears his name.

The acquisition of the property on the eastern half of Lot 3, Concession 8 enlarged Peter Milne Jr's already substantial land holdings on Lots 1 and 2, Concession 8, directly to the south. In 1852, Milne sold a 25-acre parcel at the northeast corner of Lot 3, Concession 8 to Peter Whitney. Two years later, Whitney sold 20 acres to Abraham Raymer, the adjacent property owner on Lot 4, Concession 8. Raymer acquired the remaining 5 acres of the 25 acre parcel in 1868. In 1894, the 25-acre property on Lot 3, Concession 8 was willed to Elizabeth Raymer, his wife.

A map of Markham Township dated 1878 in the *Historical Atlas of the County of York, Ontario*, shows that there was a house on the 25-acre property at that time. From a review of the 1851 and 1861 census returns,, this was Peter Whitney's one-storey log dwelling built in 1846. The log house was likely constructed by Peter Milne Jr. as a requirement of obtaining the Crown patent in 1846. Whitney was 69 years of age at the time of the 1851 census. He was born in the United States and appears to have been retired. He lived on the property with his wife Mary and their three children. In 1861, William Glen, a Scottish-born labourer, lived in the log house.

In the late 1880s, the old log dwelling on the Raymer property on Lot 3, Concession 8 was replaced by the existing brick dwelling at 7530 Ninth Line as a new home for Abraham and Elizabeth Raymer's son, Abram Raymer, and his wife, Margaret Amelia (Legeer) Raymer, who married in 1889. They raised a family of four daughters and a son. Abram's widowed mother, Elizabeth, lived in the same household after the death of Abraham Raymer in 1891. According to the 1891 census, the Raymers lived in a two-storey brick house containing ten rooms. Ownership of the property passed to Abram Raymer after the death of his mother in 1903.

Abram Raymer and his family were of the Mennonite faith according to census records. In a history of Box Grove written by Paul Burkholder, it is stated that Abram Raymer conducted Bible study groups and prayer meetings in the old Stone Jug Hotel in Box Grove after the business closed and this local landmark became a private residence. This led to a religious revival in the community.

Margaret Raymer died in 1912. Abram Raymer's second wife was Phoebe Anne (Moyer) Raymer (1876-1961). They married in 1919. Abram Raymer died in 1939 and his executors sold the property out of the family. It has had a succession of owners since that time.

Architecture

The Abram and Margaret Raymer House is a one-and-a-half storey brick dwelling with an L-shaped plan that was later enlarged with a two-storey rear addition. There is a full-width veranda in the street-facing ell. The building rests on a raised coursed fieldstone foundation that provides a basement. The walls are clad in buff-coloured brick veneer laid in running bond with ornamentation limited to a five-course brick

plinth and radiating brick arches over door and window openings. This type of brick, historically referred to as “white brick,” came into use in Markham Township as early as the 1870s but became more common in the 1890s. In previous decades, most brick was locally produced and had a pink-orange variegated colour that was sometimes dyed a dark red to create a more consistent appearance. More research is required to determine the source of the buff brick and greyish-buff brick used in Markham in the late nineteenth century. Was it brought in from another area or was there a local clay deposit that produced a brick that differed from the pink-orange Markham standard?

The cross-gable roof has a medium pitch with projecting, open eaves. No historic chimneys remain. An external fireplace chimney, a later addition, is located on the north side of the building. The brick used on this feature differs slightly in colour from the brick used on the walls.

The street-facing gable is a dominant feature of this late Victorian dwelling, ornamented with fretwork in a rising sun pattern. This pattern was used in at least two other local houses of a similar architectural style, the Wilson House at 144 Main Street North, Markham Village (1888) and the Calvert House at 258 Main Street North in Mount Joy (c.1891). Originally the gable would have also had brackets on either side of the centre bay, but now only the triangular upper portions remain in place, decorated with fretwork in a stylized floral pattern. The appearance of the gable ornamentation prior to the removal of the brackets can be understood by looking at the two aforementioned examples where the details remain intact.



East and North Sides of 7530 Ninth Line.

The street-facing (east) elevation also features a steep centre gable on the front slope of the recessed southern volume. This gable lacks ornamentation but given the amount of detailing on the street-facing gable and veranda, there may have once been fretwork in this smaller gable as well.

The principal entrance is sheltered within an enclosed portion of the front veranda. The shed-roofed veranda is supported on chamfered wood posts and has a base composed of an open southern half and a fieldstone northern half. The veranda railing and deck have recently been replaced. Previously, there was a low wood railing with turned balusters. Below this railing was a fretwork base, a very unusual feature not seen elsewhere in Markham. Fretwork brackets and a brick-like pattern in wood associated with the Anglo-Japanese Aesthetic Movement decorate the south gable end of the veranda where the wooden steps are located. The steps have a balustrade with turned balusters that are in a lighter design than the veranda railing. The enclosed portion of the veranda has narrow tongue and groove V-groove siding and a distinctive diamond-shaped four-paned window. This is another unique feature of the house not seen elsewhere in Markham.

Within the front veranda is a single one-over-one window. A single-leaf nine-paneled door with a single sidelight is located on the south wall of the enclosed portion of the veranda. This doorcase is modern in design. It may have replaced a set of double glazed and paneled doors typical of the period of construction. The gable-fronted projecting gable end has a two-storey canted bay window. The large centre windows have fixed plate glass windows with rectangular transom lights with coloured leaded glass. Flanking these feature windows are narrower one-over-one paned windows. All window openings are flat-headed and have projecting lugsills.



South side view of 7530 Ninth Line showing veranda detailing, south bay window and rear addition.

The south gable end has a wide box bay window with large multi-paned fixed glass windows on the ground floor. This bay window appears to be a later addition, but it has a fieldstone foundation, suggesting it is an old alteration. Above the bay window is a pair of twentieth century style French doors. These doors may have once opened onto a shallow balcony over top of the bay window.

There is a single one-over-one window on the north wall located to the left of the external fireplace chimney. On the rear gable end wall are two one-over-one windows on the ground floor, and a single one-over-one window above.

The rear addition is a modern-era extension of the original building. It is a full two-storey structure sided in wood board and batten. It has a low-pitched gable roof. There is a cantilevered second storey sunroom on the south wall and a bracketed rear porch. Both features have decorative brackets that visually support them, but the actual structural support is from cantilevered beams.

The Abram and Margaret Raymer House is a good representative example of a brick dwelling rendered in the vernacular Queen Anne Revival style. The Queen Anne Revival style was popular in late nineteenth century Markham, particularly in the eastern portion of the former township for frame and brick houses in villages and in rural areas. It was the most eclectic style of domestic architecture in the nineteenth century, originating in England and adopted by American architects who created their own interpretation suited to American tastes. The American version of the Queen Anne Revival style influenced domestic architecture in Canada. Designs were offered in pattern books that featured spacious dwellings with picturesque irregular massing, tall roofs with dormers and multiple gables, projecting bays, deep verandas, and multiple textures in cladding materials. The main design principle was balance rather than symmetry. This example combines the L-shaped form and steep centre gable of the vernacular Gothic Revival style with elements of the High Victorian Queen Anne Revival style in the treatment of the front projecting gable with its two-storey canted bay window and fretwork ornamentation. The front veranda is a rare survivor from the late 1880s period of construction with its distinctive decorative detailing and enclosed vestibule.

Context

The Abram and Margaret Raymer House is one of several nineteenth century dwellings still standing in the vicinity of the historic crossroads hamlet of Box Grove. The property, now a small portion of the original acreage, was once part of the agricultural community that surrounded the hamlet.

Sources

Abstract Index of Deeds for Lots 1, 2, 3 and 4, Concession 8, Markham Township.

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

Maps of Markham Township: McPhillips (1853-54), Tremaine (1860), Historical Atlas of the County of York, Ontario (1878) and 1919 map.

Property File for 7530 Ninth Line, Heritage Section, City of Markham Planning & Urban Design.

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

Elmwood Cemetery Information from Lorne Smith, Markham Official Historian.

Burkholder, Paul. "Box Grove." *Pioneer Hamlets of York*. Kitchener: Pennsylvania German Folklore Society of Ontario, 1977. Page 94.

Champion, Isabel (ed.). *Markham 1793-1900*. Markham: Markham Historical Society, Second Edition, Revised, 1989. Pages 50-52, 75-76, 277.

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 Abram and Margaret Raymer House has design value and physical value as a good representative example of the vernacular Queen Anne Revival style in brick.

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.

The Abram and Margaret Raymer House has historical value for its association with the early cultural and religious diversity of Markham Township, namely Markham’s Pennsylvania German Mennonite community, and more specifically for its association with Abram Raymer. He was a member of a locally important early Pennsylvania German Mennonite family that are considered the founders of Mount Joy, located immediately north of Markham Village.

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

The Abram and Margaret Raymer House has contextual value as one of several nineteenth century dwellings that remain in vicinity of the historic crossroads community of Box Grove and help make legible its former agricultural roots and because it is physically, functionally, visually and historically linked to the site where it has stood since c.1889.