

**Heritage Markham Committee Meeting**  
**City of Markham**  
**January 10, 2018**  
**Canada Room, Markham Civic Centre**

**Members**

David Nesbitt, Chair  
Ian Darling, Vice Chair  
Councillor Valerie Burke  
Ken Davis  
Graham Dewar  
Evelin Ellison  
Anthony Farr  
Councillor Don Hamilton  
David Johnston  
Councillor Karen Rea

**Regrets**

Maria Cerone  
Jennifer Peters-Morales  
Zuzana Zila

**Staff**

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning  
George Duncan, Senior Heritage Planner  
Peter Wokral, Heritage Planner  
John Britto, Committee Secretary (PT)

David Nesbitt, Chair, convened the meeting at 7:22 PM by asking for any disclosures of interest with respect to items on the agenda.

Graham Dewar disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 7, 11 Albert Street, Markham Village, by nature of being the contractor of the project, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

David Johnston disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 7, 11 Albert Street, Markham Village, by nature of being the Architect of the project, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

The Committee recessed from 9:07 to 9:14 p.m.

**1. Approval of Agenda (16.11)**

- A) Addendum Agenda
- B) New Business from Committee Members

The Manager of Heritage Planning advised that the election of the Chair and Vice Chair, which is usually held at the first meeting of the year, will now be held at the February 2018 Heritage Markham Committee meeting.

The spelling of Young in Item # 3 of the Agenda was corrected to Yonge.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the January 10, 2018 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved, as amended.

CARRIED

- 2. Minutes of the December 13, 2017  
Heritage Markham Committee Meeting (16.11)**  
Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the minutes of the Heritage Markham Committee meeting held on December 13, 2017 be received and adopted.

CARRIED

- 3. Building and Sign Permit Applications,  
Delegated Approvals: Building and Sign Permits,  
7765 Yonge Street, Thornhill,  
144 Main Street North, Markham Village  
11 Heritage Corners Lane, Markham Heritage Estates,  
8 Chapel Place, Buttonville, (16.11)**  
File Nos: 17 179071  
17 182002  
17 176810  
17 182538  
Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham receive the information on building or sign permits approved by Heritage Section staff under the delegated approval process.

CARRIED

**4. Heritage Permit Applications,  
Delegated Approvals: Heritage Permits,  
Main Street and Eureka Street Unionville RR Crossing,  
50 Peter Street, Markham Village, (16.11)**

File Nos: 17 130245  
17 182625

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham receive the information on heritage permits approved by Heritage Section staff under the delegated approval process.

CARRIED

**5. Information,  
New Publication, Markham Historical Society,  
“Markham 1900-2000 – Our Past Inspires Our Future” (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham receive as information.

CARRIED

**6. Site Plan Control Application,  
10720 Victoria Square Blvd.,  
Portable Classroom,  
Victoria Square United Church/ Stonebridge Baptist Church, (16.11)**

File No: SC 17 152168

Extracts: G. Duncan, Project Planner

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the proposed construction of a portable classroom to serve the place of worship at 10720 Victoria Square Blvd. subject to the applicant entering into a site plan agreement with the City containing the usual conditions regarding colours, materials, etc.

CARRIED

**7. Committee of Adjustment Variance Application,  
11 Albert Street, Markham Village,  
Proposed Second Residential Unit in Existing Garage/ Accessory Building,  
(16.11)**

File No: A/187/17  
Extracts: P. Wokral, Heritage Planner  
R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

---

Graham Dewar disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 7, 11 Albert Street, Markham Village, by nature of being the contractor of the project, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

David Johnston disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 7, 11 Albert Street, Markham Village, by nature of being the Architect of the project, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no comment on the variance application from a heritage perspective to convert the second storey of the existing accessory building/garage at 11 Albert Street into an additional residential unit; and,

That Heritage Markham delegates review of any applications required for the proposed additions to the existing garage/accessory building at 11 Albert Street to Heritage Section staff.

CARRIED

**8. Correspondence (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

---

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the following correspondence be received as information:

- a) OHS Bulletin, Newsletter of the Ontario Historical Society, December 2017 (full version available from staff);
- b) Remember Markham, Newsletter of the Markham Historical Society & Markham Museum, December 2017 (selected pages)
- c) CHO News, Publication of Community Heritage Ontario (also sent electronically to members); and
- d) Berczy Settlers Gazette, December 2017 (selected pages).

CARRIED

**9. Zoning By-law Amendment Applications,  
269 Main Street North, Markham Village,  
Proposed Triplex Building, (16.11)**

File No: ZA 17 151 164

Extracts: S. Lapenna, Planner

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

---

The Manager of Heritage Planning reviewed the Zoning By-law Amendment Applications for a proposed Triplex building, including a new rear addition to the existing heritage structure with seven (7) proposed at-grade parking spaces to the east of the building. The applicant has only submitted drawings and a site plan in support of the zoning by-law amendment and has not submitted an official Site Plan Control Application for review.

The Manager of Heritage Planning advised that at present, it appears that the building is already being utilized for multi-residential units (four). MPAC identifies the structure as a triplex, with renovations undertaken in 1984. Although a garage is shown on the legal survey, it appears to have been removed at some point in time.

Heritage staff have identified the following design issues with respect to the proposed works:

- the proposed addition is in the form of a rectangular box behind the main house, but projecting to the south;
- West Elevation: there does not appear to be any changes to the front (west) elevation of the dwelling;
- West Elevation Addition: there are no windows in this façade. Brick wall;
- South Elevation: the bottom window has been replaced with a door with porch to facilitate internal access to the second and third floors. Heritage policies do not normally support alterations to the existing features on a heritage building's publicly viewable facades. The upper window may have also been enlarged;
- South Elevation Addition: The windows appear to be very large in scale;
- North Elevation: there does not appear to be any changes to the heritage building with the exception being that the roof and wall of the addition continue from the heritage building rather than being setback to create a break between old and new;
- North Elevation Addition: the windows are extremely large and not representative of the windows supported in the District. They are also likely not bird-friendly; and
- East Elevation Addition: no windows (only in roof), but two balconies are proposed for the first and second floors.

The Manager of Heritage Planning advised that this type of change of use and major alterations to a detached dwelling would permit the City to secure a Heritage Conservation Easement Agreement (as per City policy). The Easement Agreement would help protect the building and its heritage attributes in the future.

The Committee discussed issues with respect to ingress/egress, privacy, parking, snow removal, garbage collection, tree protection, etc. The Manager of Heritage Planning advised that the planning related issues will need to be considered at the site plan application stage.

The Manager of Heritage Planning advised that the 2014 Official Plan allows residential low rise detached, semi-detached, townhouse, and small multiplex buildings with 3 to 6 units, having direct frontage on a public street, with a maximum building height of 2½ storeys. The current proposal is for three residential units with the new addition at the same height as the original structure.

In response to a Committee member's comments that this application is incomplete in as far as a site plan requirement, the Manager of Heritage Planning advised that the proposal is to rezone the property from R1 under By-law 1229 to a zone that would permit three units, and the application is to facilitate the development of the proposal. He further advised that Markham does not require a site plan application to be submitted with a re-zoning application.

Responding to a suggestion from a Committee member that Heritage Markham should only deal with the rezoning aspect of this application, the Manager of Heritage Planning advised that it is advisable for the Committee to also provide feedback on the concept plan and drawings that will help provide direction for a future submission of a Site Plan Control Application.

Responding to a question from the Chair, the Manager of Heritage Planning advised that any recommendations made by Heritage Markham Committee will be considered by Markham Council, in conjunction with information received from other departments.

#### Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham Committee has no objection from a heritage perspective to the proposed conversion of the property from one dwelling unit to three dwelling units, subject to the acquisition of a Heritage Conservation Easement Agreement, and,

That the Committee provides the following feedback on the concept plan and drawings, as submitted:

- West Elevation Addition: introduce heritage scale windows to help animate the proposed brick wall.
- South Elevation: the internal staircase should be changed to avoid altering the heritage attributes of the south façade through the introduction of the porch and door feature, and maintain the existing window sizes and openings on the heritage building.
- South Elevation Addition: new windows should be reflective of the size and shape of traditional windows and be bird-friendly.

- North Elevation: create a slight setback to create a break between the heritage building and the new addition to avoid the new roof and wall becoming an extension of the existing building.
- North Elevation Addition: new windows should be reflective of the size and shape of traditional windows and be bird-friendly

However, this does not imply that the Committee supports the addition to the building until further information is provided, including but not limited to parking requirements, snow removal and tree protection.

CARRIED

**10. Demolition Permit Application,  
10 Dryden Court, Markham Village,  
Proposed Demolition of a Type “B” Dwelling (16.11)**

File No: DP 17 181477

Extracts: P. Wokral, Heritage Planner

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

---

The Heritage Planner reviewed the demolition permit application to demolish a dwelling designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act and classified as a Type “B” building or non-heritage buildings that are considered to be complementary to the heritage district in terms of scale, form, massing, materials, architectural details, etc. The owner has submitted an application to demolish the existing house and is proposing to replace the existing house with a new two storey detached dwelling. The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority has indicated that they do not support an extension either horizontally or vertically of the existing home due to its location within their screening zone and the regional flood line.

The Heritage Planner advised that although the Markham Village Heritage District Heritage Conservation District Plan contains policies which encourage the retention of Type ‘B’ buildings and discourages their demolition, Staff supports the requested demolition for the following reasons:

- The existing house is located in a discreet court setting of larger, two storey, late 20<sup>th</sup> century homes, and due to its smaller scale and materials, it does not relate to the neighbouring homes nor does it contribute to a discernible heritage character; and
- The restrictions imposed by the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority do not permit the owner to construct a complementary addition to the existing dwelling.

The Committee discussed the various reasons why demolition would be supported, specifically the stability of the site, and the restrictions imposed by the TRCA to not permit any complementary addition to the existing dwelling.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection to the demolition of the existing one storey single detached dwelling at 10 Dryden Court because its style does not relate to the surrounding homes, it does not contribute to a discernible heritage character, and the restrictions imposed by the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority do not allow for a complementary addition to the existing house, subject to site plan approval for a new infill house in accordance with the Markham Village Heritage District Heritage Conservation District Plan.

CARRIED

**11. Demolition Request,  
26 Station Street, Markham Village,  
Request to Demolish a Heritage Dwelling (Peter and Lily Reesor House),  
(16.11)**

Extracts: P. Wokral, Heritage Planner  
R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

---

The Heritage Planner reviewed the request to demolish a heritage dwelling designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act and classified as a Type "A" building (buildings that define the heritage character of the district). The proposed demolition would permit the construction of a new home fronting Backus Court which forms the rear boundary of the subject property.

The Heritage Planner advised that once a letter of intention to demolish a property designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act has been received by the Municipality, Council has 90 days to either approve the demolition, approve the demolition with conditions, or deny the application. Appeals to the decision of Council are considered by the Ontario Municipal Board. The date of the letter's receipt by the City is December 18, 2017. A report will be prepared by Staff for Council's consideration of the request

The Heritage Planner advised that given the Type 'A' status of the existing heritage house, its connection historically to the Reesor family, and its existing heritage attributes such as the vertical tongue and groove siding and fieldstone foundation, Staff does not support the proposed demolition of the building.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham does not support the demolition of the existing heritage dwelling at 26 Station Street and recommends that it be retained on site.

CARRIED



**12. Site Plan Control Application,  
Committee of Adjustment Variance Application,  
14 David Street, Markham Village,  
Proposed Addition to a Dwelling, (16.11)**

File No: SC 17 171213  
A/180/17

Extracts: P. Wokral, Heritage Planner  
R. Cefaratti, Committee of Adjustment  
C. Tsang, Committee of Adjustment  
R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

---

The Heritage Planner reviewed the Site Plan Control Application and Committee of Adjustment Variance Application for the proposed addition to a dwelling at 14 David Street in Markham Village, which is designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act, and classified as a Type 'C' building, or buildings that do not contribute to the character of the district.

The Heritage Planner advised that the owner has submitted a site plan application seeking permission for a new two storey addition to the 1,474.6 ft<sup>2</sup> existing house, as well as a second storey addition to be constructed on top of the existing foundation. The newly proposed floor area of the house is 3,319.4 ft<sup>2</sup>. He further advised that the proposed remodeling of the existing house would require the following variances to the Zoning By-law:

- a minimum flankage yard setback of 9.9 feet, whereas the By-law requires a minimum flankage yard setback of 10 feet;
- a minimum east side yard setback of 3.93 feet for the two-storey portion of the building, whereas the By-law requires a minimum side yard setback of 6 feet for the two-storey portion;
- a front porch step encroachment of 5.94 feet, whereas the By-law permits front porch steps to encroach 18 inches into the required yard; and
- a Net Floor Area Ratio of 49 percent, whereas the By-law permits a maximum Net Floor Area Ratio of 45 percent (there was some confusion as to whether this was the correct number).

Heritage Section Staff is generally satisfied with the proposed scale, form, massing, and height of the proposed house and believes that it is complementary to the heritage character of the neighbourhood and compatible with the scale of the adjacent dwellings. Three of the requested variances are related to the building footprint of the existing house, while the value of the proposed Maximum Net Floor Area ratio is partially attributable to the relatively small size of the lot 6,643 ft<sup>2</sup>, whereas the average size of building lots on Peter Street is approximately 8,600 ft<sup>2</sup>. However, from a design perspective, staff recommends that the classical revival architectural features of the house be revised to

reflect the architectural detailing of the later 19<sup>th</sup> century heritage homes found on David and Peter Street.

Recommended changes include:

- A reduction in the size and width of the proposed windows;
- Use of 2 over 2 window pane divisions rather than the earlier style multi-paned windows;
- Use of vertical tongue and groove wooden siding;
- The elimination of the proposed classical eave returns and pediment gables;
- Addition of decorative wooden gable and porch decorations;
- The use of turned porch posts and elimination of the proposed flat porch roof and classical porch pillars;
- Elimination of the proposed entrance door sidelights; and
- An enhanced garage door treatment.

The Committee discussed the incorrect information provided and questioned if the garage and basement were included in the Net Floor Area Ratio calculation. A member suggested that the applicant should provide a survey from a certified Ontario Land Surveyor with proper calculations, and also certify whether the dwelling is one or two storey house. He further suggested that consideration of this matter be deferred to a future Heritage Markham Committee meeting, and that the applicant be requested to provide proper information in support of the application.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That consideration of this matter be deferred to the February Heritage Markham Committee meeting; and

That the applicant be requested to provide proper information in support of the application.  
CARRIED

**13. Site Plan Control Application,  
340 Main Street North, Markham Village,  
Addition to an Existing Heritage Dwelling, (16.11)**

File No: 17 173713

Extracts: G. Duncan, Project Planner

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Senior Heritage Planner reviewed the site plan control application for the addition to an existing 2½ storey brick dwelling at 340 Main Street North, Markham Village, which

is a Type 'A' heritage building within the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District.

The application is to create an attached two-car garage with storage loft above, connected to the dwelling through a single-storey link at the rear of the dwelling. Some restoration work will be done to the front door and windows, and a dormer will be added on the north roof slope of the original house. With the proposed additions, the overall gross floor area will be 2,182ft<sup>2</sup>, according to the applicant's calculations. The applicant has calculated that the lot coverage will be 13.25%. Staff note that the drawings do not have site statistics and these will need to be added by the architect or designer to enable the zoning examiner to confirm compliance with the by-law.

Staff has worked with the applicant to refine the design, particularly with respect to the treatment of the heritage house. The applicant will be requested to provide site statistics with all required information to allow the site plan application to be further processed. Otherwise, the proposed additions are reasonable in scale and their design is well coordinated with the character of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century dwelling.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham generally supports the proposed additions to 340 Main Street North from a heritage perspective subject to the applicant providing complete site statistics on the drawings to demonstrate compliance with the by-law, and the revision of the drawings to show the existing porch to remain, the restoration of the two large front windows with transom lights, and the re-instatement of the small ground floor window on the south elevation; and,

That if the zoning review shows that no variances are required, and once the applicant makes the requested changes to the plans and elevations, that final review be delegated to Heritage Section staff; and,

That in the event variances are required, that the application come back to Heritage Markham for review and comment; and further,

That the owner enter into a site plan agreement to include the usual clauses regarding materials, colours, etc.

CARRIED

**14. Request for Feedback,  
11022 Kennedy Road,  
The Reverend Jenkins House (16.11)**

Extracts: P. Wokral, Heritage Planner  
R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

---

The Heritage Planner reviewed a request for feedback on the relocation of the Reverend Jenkins House at 11022 Kennedy Road to the Markham Heritage Estates. He explained that the owner has hired a contractor who specializes in the restoration of heritage buildings to coordinate the relocation and restoration of the Reverend Jenkins House to the Markham Heritage Estates. After inspecting the existing condition of the Jenkin's House and the portions of the post and beam structure that were both visible and accessible, the contractor believes that there is extensive damage to the structural frame and that the building must be disassembled in order to repair it and make it ready to be relocated.

Given that disassembly of buildings is not permitted when heritage buildings are being relocated to Heritage Estates, and the contractor's belief that most of the post and beam structure would have to be replaced, the contractor is of the opinion that the only viable and feasible approach to saving the Reverend Jenkins House is to construct a new structural frame for the Reverend Jenkins House, on-site in Heritage Estates, based on measured drawings of the existing house, and to carefully salvage significant exterior and interior features such as the clapboard cladding, trims, stone foundation, windows, and doors so that they may be installed on the modern structural frame, to replicate the original house.

The Heritage Planner advised that recent photographs of the Jenkins House taken from above the interior reveal significant structural damage to the floor systems of the house which have collapsed along with the roof into the basement. Although the contractor believes that restoration of the structural elements of the original post and beam structure is not feasible, he believes that upward of 80% of the original visible exterior and interior features can be carefully salvaged and installed on a new structural frame. The proposed new frame would be made of standard modern stick framing as opposed to the post and beam structure employed on the Jenkin's House.

The proponent of relocating the house to Markham Heritage Estates, Mr. de Leon (who is not the owner of the property), has already invested several thousand dollars in the production of restoration drawings and in contractors who have either refused to work on the house due to its condition, or who were not appropriate for the job. Heritage Markham did not support the relocation of the Reverend Jenkins House to Markham Heritage Estates and recommended that it be restored on its original site. Council supported the relocation of the Reverend Jenkins House to Heritage Estates on the condition that it be moved as a complete structural entity and not disassembled. Disassembly is not supported as a means of relocating homes to Markham Heritage Estates because it triggers the

implementation of the current Ontario Building Code, which may compromise certain heritage attributes.

The owners of the property are not prepared to restore the house on site, and have had a report prepared by a structural engineer recommending that the Jenkins House be demolished due to its extremely poor physical condition. The proponent, Mr. de Leon is still willing to pursue the project, based on the contractor's belief that most of the character defining exterior and interior elements of the house can be salvaged and incorporated into the replication of the house.

The Heritage Planner advised that Staff has no way of verifying the assessment by the proponent's contractor on the structural soundness of the Jenkins House, other than requiring a second opinion by another qualified contractor. Given the dangerous condition of the house, the only way of determining the true condition of the original structure would be to remove all the roof and flooring debris which has collapsed into the house as well as remaining interior finishes to examine the condition of the post and beam structure. This work would cause further expense and delays which could potentially lead to the loss of more significant heritage attributes and potentially the entire building. Requiring the Jenkins House to be restored on site will be opposed by the owners of the property, and the structural report prepared by their engineer will likely lead to its demolition, and the loss of any money invested by the proponent in their efforts to relocate and restore the Jenkins House. The Jenkins House is considered to possess high historic and architectural significance, and the proponent who wishes to relocate the house has spent significant time and money on obtaining permission to relocate the house to Markham Heritage Estates.

The Heritage Planner suggested that the Committee consider one of the following options:

- 1) Photographically document the existing condition of the building and allow it to be demolished; or
- 2) Support disassembly of the structure and the replication of the original house with a new structural frame, based on the measured drawings of the existing structure, incorporating all salvaged sound historic materials including the exterior cladding, hardware, trims, windows, doors and fieldstone foundation.

Mr. Michael Flynn, a relocation contractor addressed the Committee on behalf of the applicant and spoke in favour of relocating the disassembled Reverend Jenkins House to Markham Heritage Estates. He noted that rather using post and beam construction for the new house frame, the project may be better served by investing in features that will be seen as opposed to being covered up.

Responding to a question from a Committee member, Mr. Flynn, the relocation contractor advised that he has not relocated a heritage house in the past.

The Committee discussed the option of disassembling the structure and the replication of the original house with a new structural frame, based on the measured drawings of the existing structure, and incorporating all salvaged sound historic materials including the exterior cladding, hardware, trims, windows, doors and fieldstone foundation.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham supports the replication of the Reverend Jenkins House at Markham Heritage Estates with a new post and beam structural frame, based on measured drawings of the existing house and the salvaging and incorporation of all sound historic materials, including the historic cladding, trims, hardware, windows, doors and stone foundation, to the satisfaction of Heritage Section staff.

CARRIED

**15. Studies/Projects,  
Heritage Week Celebrations,  
Update (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Manager of Heritage Planning reviewed the various activities planned for Heritage Day – February 19, 2018, and Heritage Week, which will be organized during the second week of February (February 18-24, 2018). He advised that Heritage Section staff will install a small heritage display in the Great Hall at the Civic Centre for Heritage Week, and the Prince of Wales flag will be raised at City Hall to commemorate Heritage Week.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham Committee receive as information.

CARRIED

**16. Information,  
Ontario Heritage Conference 2020,  
Community Heritage Ontario,  
Update (16.11)**

Extracts: S. Chait, Director, Economic Growth, Culture and Entrepreneurship  
R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

---

This matter was considered at the December 2017 Heritage Markham meeting and was referred to staff to investigate a collaborative effort with the Culture and Economic Development and any other City Department's to explore the potential of a proposal for 2020/2021/2022 to host the Ontario Heritage Conference.

The Manager of Heritage Planning met with Councillors Burke, Rea and Hamilton and the Director of Culture and Economic Development on December 20, 2017 to discuss this project. The Director indicated that he was very supportive of Markham undertaking this project and indicated that there are staff that have expertise that could be of assistance in this undertaking. The consensus was that the City should send a letter to Community Heritage Ontario indicating that the City is potentially interested in pursuing the 2020 Ontario Heritage Conference. The Manager of Heritage Planning advised that a staff report will be presented to the Development Services Committee in February seeking Markham Council permission to pursue the possibility of hosting the conference.

Mr. Barry Nelson, Heritage Advocate, representing the Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill (SPOHT), addressed the Committee and advised that SPOHT would like to express an active interest in participating in the organizing of the 2020 Ontario Heritage Conference, if hosted by the City of Markham.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the deputation by Mr. Barry Nelson, Heritage Advocate, representing the Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill (SPOHT), be received; and

That Mr. Barry Nelson, SPOHT, be considered as a potential member of the local organizing committee for the 2020 Ontario Heritage Conference, if the City decides to pursue the event..

CARRIED

**17. In-Camera Matter**

Moved by: Anthony Farr  
Seconded by: Ken Davis

That, in accordance with Section 239 (2) of the *Municipal Act*, the Heritage Markham Committee resolve into an In-Camera Session to discuss the following confidential matter:

**1. LITIGATION OR POTENTIAL LITIGATION, INCLUDING MATTERS  
BEFORE ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNALS, AFFECTING THE  
MUNICIPALITY OR LOCAL BOARD  
73 MAIN STREET SOUTH (16.11)**

[Section 239 (2) (e)]

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Moved by: Anthony Farr  
Seconded by: Ken Davis

That Heritage Markham rise from the in-camera session at 11:05 p.m.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The Heritage Markham Committee meeting adjourned at 11:10 PM.