

Heritage Markham Committee Meeting City of Markham

**October 11, 2017
Canada Room, Markham Civic Centre**

Members

David Nesbitt, Chair
Councillor Valerie Burke
Maria Cerone
Ken Davis
Graham Dewar
Anthony Farr
Councillor Don Hamilton
Councillor Karen Rea
Jennifer Peters-Morales

Regrets

Ian Darling, Vice-Chair
Evelin Ellison
David Johnston
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 7:24 PM by asking for any disclosures of interest with respect to items on the agenda.

David Nesbitt, Chair, disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 4, 116 Main Street, Unionville, by nature of being the immediate neighbor of the subject property, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

Graham Dewar, disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 6, 124 Main Street, Unionville, 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.

1. Approval of Agenda (16.11)

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the October 11, 2017 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved.

CARRIED

**2. Minutes of the September 13, 2017
Heritage Markham Committee Meeting (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The following amendments were made to the minutes of the September 13, 2017 Heritage Markham Committee meeting:

Councillor Karen Rea welcomed a group of students ~~and their teacher~~ from ~~Markham~~ Markville High School who are attending as observers of civic meetings.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the minutes of the Heritage Markham Committee meeting held on September 13, 2017 be adopted, as amended.

CARRIED

**3. Information,
Heritage Markham Committee – Reappointments (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham Committee congratulates Graham Dewar and Anthony Farr for their reappointment to the Heritage Markham Committee.

CARRIED

**4. Site Plan Control Application,
116 Main St. Unionville, Heritage Conservation District,
Proposed Rear Addition (16.11)**

File No. SC 17 162457

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning
P. Wokral, Heritage Planner
R. Kendall, Manager, Development
Winson Mak,

David Nesbitt, Chair, disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 4, 116 Main Street, Unionville, by nature of being the immediate neighbor of the subject property, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

Graham Dewar assumed the Chair when this matter was considered.

The Heritage Planner reviewed the Site Plan Control Application for a proposed 161.9 m² (1,742.9 ft²), two storey addition with an attached garage to the rear, and to make alterations to the south and north exterior wall of the heritage dwelling at 116 Main St., Unionville. The Heritage Planner advised that at its August meeting, Heritage Markham Committee reviewed this application and heard a deputation from the neighbouring property owner who expressed concerns about the property survey and the Committee recommended no further review of the application until the applicant received comments from the Toronto Region Conservation Authority (TRCA) and that the applicant be advised to submit an up-to-date survey and elevation drawings.

The Heritage Planner further advised that at its September meeting, Heritage Markham Committee recommended that it did not support the scale of the proposed rear addition and its impact on the surrounding greenspace. He advised that Mr. Winson Mak, WM Design Studio, the designer of the project would like to address the Committee to seek feedback as to how the proposed addition does not comply with the Unionville Heritage Conservation District Plan, and to receive constructive feedback on what revisions the Committee would like to see made to the design of the proposed addition.

Mr. Winson Mak addressed the Committee and explained the massing and form of the proposed addition and alterations to the existing heritage dwelling using a 3D design modelling software. He noted the addition was similar in scale to others in the neighbourhood. Mr. Mak sought clarification with respect to the Heritage Markham Committee recommendations from its September meeting, which in his opinion, were contradictory to heritage staff's recommendation with respect to the form and massing of the proposed alterations.

The Manager of Heritage Planning advised Mr. Mak that, Heritage Section staff has no issues with the scale and massing of the addition but Heritage Markham Committee, as an independent body, provides their own recommendations based on the merits of individual applications. Hence the difference between the suggested recommendation from Heritage staff and the recommendation from the Heritage Markham Committee.

Responding to a question from the Manager of Heritage Planning, Mr. Mak confirmed that there is no intent to alter the existing foundation of the dwelling, which will have no impact on the grading. Mr. Mak advised that the grading may have to be slightly raised at the end of the driveway closest to the garage entrance to allow for effective water drain off. He further advised that TRCA has not indicated any drainage issues. If required, permeable interlocking or bioswales could be considered to mitigate any drainage issues or concerns.

Responding to a question from a Committee member with respect to the second storey balcony at the rear of the dwelling, the Manager of Heritage Planning advised that the Unionville Heritage Conservation District Plan is silent on this matter.

Responding to a question from a Committee member with respect to specific addresses of properties in the Unionville Heritage Conservation District that have second storey balconies, Mr. Mak was unable to provide any.

Responding to a comment from a Committee member with respect to a neighbouring property owner's concerns expressed at an earlier Heritage Markham Committee meeting, the Manager of Heritage Planning advised that staff has focused on the heritage issues related to the application.

Mr. Mak did confirm that contrary to the current elevation drawings, the windows in the original house would be retained as they are.

Responding to a question from a Committee member, the Manager of Heritage Planning advised that there is no requirement to notify neighbouring property owners about site plan control applications, and it appears that no variances are required with respect to this particular proposal.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the deputation by Mr. Winson Mak, WM Design Studio, on behalf of the applicant, be received; and

That the design of the proposed addition be revised by:

- simplifying the proposed windows of the addition to be more typical of Edwardian window styles found in Unionville and Markham; and,

That Heritage Markham does not support the proposed alteration of the existing south and north façade of the heritage dwelling by introducing new and larger windows, but has no objection to the existing door being converted to a window of the same type and dimension as the heritage windows on the building; and further,

That Heritage Markham would not support any proposal that would alter the exterior dimensions of the existing heritage dwelling or its relationship to the grade.

CARRIED

David Nesbitt assumed the Chair from this point onwards until the end of the meeting.

**5. Heritage Permit Application,
Delegated Approvals: Heritage Permits,
150 John Street, Thornhill,**

**31 Eureka Street, Unionville,
201 Main Street, Unionville,
7 Station Lane, Unionville,
146 Main Street, Unionville,
10 Rouge Street, Markham Village,
50 Peter Street, Markham Village,
7 Heritage Corners Lane, Markham Heritage Estates,
12 Wismer Place, Markham Heritage Estates, (16.11)**

File Nos: HE 17 176244
HE 17 174568
HE 17 174626
HE 17 175328
HE 17 176064
HE 17 173704
HE 17 175100
HE 17 175110
HE 17 177214

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

- 6. Building or Demolition Permit Application,
Delegated Approvals: Building and Demolition Permits,
12 Station Lane, Unionville,
304 Main Street, Unionville,
124 Main Street, Unionville,
42 George Street, Unionville,
304 Main Street, Unionville,
4 Peter Street, Markham Village,
3466 19th Avenue, Rural Area,
201 Main Street, Unionville,
10988 Warden Avenue, Rural Area, (16.11)**

File Nos: 17 155186 HP
17 14624 DP
17 175245 HP
17 156845 HP
17 174625 HP
17 173900 HP
17 175609 HP

17 175489 AL

17 174712 DP

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Graham Dewar, disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 6, 124 Main Street, Unionville, 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.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

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

CARRIED

**7. Site Plan Control Application,
Committee of Adjustment Variance Application,
44 Church Street, Markham Village,
Proposed Detached Garage with Loft (16.11)**

File No. A/123/17

SC 17 175035

Extracts: G. Duncan, Project Planner

R. Punit, Committee of Adjustment

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham receive as information.

CARRIED

**8. Consent Application,
20 Water Street, Markham Village,
Ground Lease for New Building for Assisted Supportive Housing (16.11)**

File No. B/33/17

Extracts: G. Duncan, Project Planner

R. Punit, Committee of Adjustment

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no comment on Consent Application B/33/16 from a heritage perspective; and,

That Heritage Markham will provide comments on the design of the proposed new building at the Site Plan Control Application stage.

CARRIED

- 9. Information,
Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review,
Update on Meeting with Heritage Markham Committee (16.11)**
Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham Committee receive as information.

CARRIED

- 10. Information,
Ontario Building Officials Association Journal,
“The Case for Older Windows” (16.11)**
Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham Committee receive as information.

CARRIED

- 11. Demolition Permit Application,
15 Pavilion Street, Unionville Heritage Conservation District,
Proposed Demolition of Single Detached Dwelling (16.11)**
Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham Committee receive as information.

CARRIED

**12. Request for Feedback,
115 & 117 Main Street N., Markham Village Heritage Conservation District,
Proposed New Storm Windows (16.11)**

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

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection to the owner of 115-117 Main Street North installing aluminum storm windows on the second storey of the building on a site-specific basis provided that they properly fit the round arched window openings and are painted in a colour to match the colour of the underling historic windows sash; and,

That final review of the Heritage Permit application to install new aluminum storm windows on the second storey of 115-117 Main Street North be delegated to Heritage Section Staff.

CARRIED

**13. Site Plan Control Application,
Zoning By-law Amendment Application,
Official Plan Amendment Application,
Plan of Subdivision,
9064-9110 Woodbine Ave, Buttonville,
Proposed Townhouse Development (16.11)**

File No. SC 17 153653
Extracts: P. Wokral, Heritage Planner,
R. Cefaratti
R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham generally supports the form, massing, and height of the proposed townhouses and their orientation to Woodbine Avenue from a heritage perspective; and,

That Heritage Markham recommends that the use of stone be limited to a foundation treatment no higher than the sills of ground floor windows and that the townhouses be clad in an appropriate brick, wood, or wood-like substitute; and,

That Heritage Markham recommends that the architectural detailing of the proposed townhouses better reflect the Georgian Tradition and Classic Revival style of architecture as recommended by the Buttonville District Plan; and,

That Heritage Markham recommends that the proposed visitor parking in front of the existing heritage house be located to a different portion of the property that does not negatively affect the heritage house; and further,

That Heritage Markham does not support the proposed size and configuration of the proposed lot for the existing heritage dwelling because it:

- Does not provide a satisfactory level of privacy for the heritage dwelling;
- Does not provide enough space for an appropriate amenity space or the future construction of a potential addition/two car garage; and
- Does not preserve a significant Silver Maple tree which provides historic context for the heritage dwelling.

CARRIED

**14. Site Plan Control Application,
28 Markham Street, Markham Village,
Proposed Alteration to Non-Heritage House (16.11)**

File No. SC 17 169087

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

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection to the proposed alterations of 28 Markham Street from a heritage perspective, and delegates final review of the Site Plan application and any required development application to Heritage Section Staff.

CARRIED

15. Correspondence (16.11)

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the following correspondence be received as information:

- a) Markham Historical Society: Remember Markham Newsletter, Fall 2017 (Staff has full copy)
- b) York Region: Notice of Open Houses for Improvements to McCowan Road Class Environmental Assessment
- c) HDR Corporation: Notice of Open Houses for Improvements to 16th Avenue from Yonge Street to York Durham Line

CARRIED

**16. Site Plan Control Application,
143 Main Street, Unionville,
Additions and Alterations to the Pingle Tenant Farmhouse (16.11)**
File No. SC 17 172884
Extracts: G. Duncan, Project Planner
R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Senior Heritage Planner reviewed the site plan control application for additions and alterations to the Pingle Tenant Farmhouse dwelling at 143 Main Street in Unionville. He advised that this is a 1 ½ storey heritage dwelling built in the 1860's and relocated to its current location in 1993. The application is for alterations and additions to the rear wing of the original farmhouse, with alterations to the east, north and south brick walls, as well, part of the proposal is a new detached 2 bay garage with loft in the rear yard. A minor variance application may be required, however, the nature of the variances are not known at this stage.

The Senior Heritage Planner advised that the proposed additions and alterations will impact certain original features of the rear wing, including the removal of a pantry, side porch, and side door on the north side of the house; the removal of the upper portion of the gable end wall on the east side of the house; and the removal of a window and door on the south side of the house. He further advised that to make the old and new areas uniform in exterior appearance, the applicant proposes to clad the existing brick rear wing in vertical siding, to match the material proposed for the addition. No information is available on the mature trees on the north side of the house. The valley edge location requires comments and approval from the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA).

Staff believes that considering the level of proposed alterations, it would be advisable for the Architectural Review Sub-Committee to conduct a site visit to assess the extent of alterations to the heritage features and explore ways of lessening the impact upon them, as well as tree preservation. The Senior Heritage Planner advised that the applicant supports the idea of a site visit by the Architectural Review Sub-Committee.

A Committee member suggested that it may be premature to consider a site visit prior to receiving comments from the TRCA, as well, considering that the property is within a Special Policy Area (SPA). The Senior Heritage Planner advised that the applicant has contacted TRCA. He also confirmed that the property is within a SPA. He further advised that the proposed works do not encroach into the TRCA protected zone, except for the garage.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham refer the application for additions and alterations to 143 Main Street to the Architectural Review Sub-Committee for a site visit/meeting to assess the extent of

alterations to original features, and explore ways of lessening the impact upon them while accommodating the space requirements of the applicant; and,

That the application return to Heritage Markham for discussion once the applicant has addressed the comments and recommendations of the Architectural Review Sub-Committee and staff.

CARRIED

**17. Site Plan Control Application,
Committee of Adjustment Variance Application,
1 Markham Street, Markham Village,
Demolition of Existing House & Proposed New House (16.11)**

File Nos. SC 17 158297
A/129/17

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

The Heritage Planner reviewed the site plan control and minor variance application to demolish the existing 1,002 ft² single detached dwelling and 250 ft² detached garage and replace it with a new 4,736 ft² single detached dwelling with an attached two car garage at 1 Markham Street in Markham Village. He advised that the property is designated under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* and is classified as a Group C building or buildings that do not reflect the heritage character of the district.

The Heritage Planner advised that the proposal requires the following variances:

- 1) a minimum north side-yard setback of 3'-6¾" for the one storey portion of the dwelling, whereas the By-law requires a minimum side yard setback of 4' for the one storey portion of the dwelling;
- 2) a minimum north side-yard setback of 3'-6¾" for the two storey portion of the dwelling, whereas the By-law requires a minimum side yard setback of 6' for the two storey portion of the dwelling;
- 3) a minimum front-yard setback of 19'-4 ½" whereas the By-law requires a minimum front yard setback of 25 feet;
- 4) a minimum rear yard setback of 3'-7 ¾"; whereas the By-law requires a minimum rear yard setback of 25 feet;
- 5) a maximum lot coverage of 40.07 per cent whereas the By-law permits a maximum lot coverage of 35 per cent;
- 6) a maximum net floor area ratio of 65 per cent; whereas the By-law permits a maximum net floor area ratio of 45 per cent; and
- 7) a maximum front porch and step encroachment of 14'-7 3/8" into the required front

yard, whereas the By-law permits a maximum yard encroachment of 18”.

The Heritage Planner further advised that the existing house is uniquely sited at the dead end of Markham Street, having Franklin Public School located immediately to the north, and the rear yards of home is fronting Church Street to the south. There are no other homes sharing the same frontage. Because the proposed house will have little impact on neighbouring properties due to its location, Staff is generally supportive of the form and massing of the proposed house, but recommends some revisions to the proposed window styles and pane divisions, and that the stone illustrated on the elevations be revised to an appropriate brick. However, Staff does recommend reducing the scale and depth of the proposed garage to preserve two trees on the property and to reduce the scope of some of the requested variances.

The Committee expressed concerns with respect to the gross floor area ratio. As well, the Committee was not in favour of the demolition of the existing dwelling. However, the Committee supported an extension to the existing dwelling, compatible with the requirements of the District Plan, Official Plan and the Infill By-law.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham does not support the demolition of the existing dwelling at 1 Markham Street, Markham Village; and

That Heritage Markham does not support the requested variances, in support of the proposed new dwelling; and further

That Heritage Markham supports a complementary addition to the existing dwelling compatible with the requirements of the District Plan, the Official Plan and the Infill By-law.

CARRIED

**18. Site Plan Control Application,
128 Harbord Street, Unionville,
Proposed Addition to Philip Eckardt House (16.11)**

File No. SC 17 114747

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

The Senior Heritage Planner reviewed the Site Plan Control Application for a proposed addition to the Philip Eckardt House at 128 Harbord Street in Unionville.

The applicant proposes to restore the heritage building to its appearance in archival photographs, on a new foundation, repositioned slightly to the north-east on the same lot. A major addition is planned for the south side of the heritage building, connected with a smaller

link to provide a measure of separation between the old and new. The new addition has been designed in a traditional architectural style with an extensive material palette inspired by the surrounding subdivision homes. The existing log house has a building footprint of 59.32 square metres (638.5 square feet), and the floor area of the proposed addition is approximately 3,816 square feet.

This property went through a Site Plan Control Application as a condition of approval for the Upper Unionville Subdivision. The application simply retained the heritage building in its existing size and shape, in its existing position on the property. A detached garage was proposed for the south side, with a small link to the residence. The Site Plan Control Application was approved but the project was not constructed. The developer of Upper Unionville sold to a builder who did not construct the project and has now sold to a new owner. The new owner previously submitted a different design proposal for the addition, but has now hired a different architect who has produced the current design proposal for the addition.

The City's heritage conservation policies place a high level of importance on retaining heritage buildings on their original site and on their original foundation. Notwithstanding this policy position, staff can support the slight relocation of the Philip Eckardt House on site for the following reasons: the proposed relocation of the heritage building will address foundation condition issues that currently exist and will enable the mass of the proposed addition to be positioned in the most favourable way to retain significant views and building elevations of the Philip Eckardt Log House. Staff suggest that much of the existing historic foundation could be left intact and filled in as a landscape feature on the property, and also for archaeological reasons, thus preserving this aspect of the site's history. Additionally, a new foundation will enable the restoration of the heritage building to the 2 ½ storey height shown in archival photographs. Staff generally supports the proposed plans for the restoration and renovation of the heritage building, but recommends certain revisions that are listed in the suggested recommendation to the Heritage Markham Committee.

Mr. Joseph Campitelli, the architect for the owners, addressed the Committee and advised that he agrees with the suggested staff revisions to the proposed works for the Philip Eckardt House.

Responding to a question from the Senior Heritage Planner, Mr. Campitelli, advised that he is not aware of the need for any minor variances related with the proposed works.

A Committee member suggested that Markham Council and the York Regional Council be informed of the restoration of the Philip Eckardt Log House on completion of the proposed works.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the deputation by Mr. Joseph Campitelli, Architect for the applicant, be received;

That Heritage Markham generally supports the development proposal for the Philip Eckardt Log House at 128 Harbord Street, including its minor on-site relocation, from a heritage perspective subject to the following revisions to the restoration plan:

- That the existing historic foundation wall material be retained in-situ where possible to demarcate the original house (this would include a partial east and west wall component and the full north wall component);
 - That the small attic dormer be re-introduced into the roof and the details of the chimney replicated as per the archival photographs of the house;
 - That clapboard matching the siding for the ground floor be installed in the north facing gable as per archival photographs;
 - That the windows of the second storey on the east and north elevation shown as two over two windows be revised to the typical eight over eight single hung, wooden windows as shown in archival photographs;
 - That the windows of the ground floor on the north and west elevations be located in the same position relative to the second storey windows as seen in archival photographs;
 - That the detailing of the non-accessible cantilevered second storey wrap-around veranda be revised to resemble that of the photograph of the 18th century Swiss example;
 - That the glazing on the second storey door on the east elevation be eliminated and replaced with a traditional early 19th century solid wood six panelled door;
 - That the door on the ground floor on the west elevation also be an early 19th century solid wood six paneled door;
 - That the applicant provide details of what interior features (pine floors, doors, trim) will be retained in the context of the renovations to the living space (given the significance of the Philip Eckardt Log House, as much of the original material should be retained as possible).
- And subject to the following revisions to the proposed addition:
 - That the proposed material palette should be significantly reduced, as the walls feature patterned shingle, brick, stone veneer and wooden clapboard, and the roof features both asphalt shingles and standing seam metal. The exterior cladding should be limited to an appropriate brick or clapboard to tie in with the clapboard of the heritage house, and the proposed patterned shingles and stone should be deleted;
 - That the roofing materials should be limited to asphalt or cedar shingles like the heritage house, but standing seam metal should be deleted;
 - That the proposed roof form should be simplified by eliminating unnecessary gables to reflect the bold simple lines of the heritage portion of the dwelling;
 - That the windows of the addition should better reflect the windows of the Eckardt House by having wider proportions, perhaps 2/2 pane division and be vertically aligned where possible;

- That the detailing of the external chimney should be simplified in its form and limited to brick in regular coursing, deleting the proposed stone, pre-cast banding, standing seam metal and ornamental brickwork;
- That the proposed features such as corbels and porch columns should be simplified to reflect traditional post and beam construction and be devoid of classical detailing;
- That the proposed columns of the garage should be deleted, and the single garage door be replaced with two separate doors;
- That the entrance door on link between the garage and the main part of the house should have traditional sidelight and transom detail, and not single sidelight; and
- That consideration be given to introducing a wrap-around veranda at the southeast corner which would connect to the Great Room as a feature to address and enhance the street corner; and

That further review and refinement of architectural details, external materials, etc. be delegated to Heritage Section staff.

CARRIED

**19. Site Plan Control Application,
Zoning By-law Amendment Application,
Official Plan Amendment Application,
Plan of Subdivision,
4300 Highway 7, 100 and 12-92 Anna Russel Way, Unionville,
Redevelopment of Union Villa/Heritage Village Bungalows (16.11)**

File No. OP/ZA/SU/SC 17 178335

Extracts: S. Heaslip, Senior Project Manager

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Manager of Heritage Planning reviewed the site plan control application, zoning by-law amendment application, official plan amendment application and plan of subdivision for the redevelopment of the Union Villa/Heritage Village Bungalows at 4300 Highway 7, 100 and 12-92 Anna Russel Way in Unionville. He advised that this proposed development is adjacent to a Cultural Heritage Resource (the Unionville Heritage Conservation District.)

The Manager of Heritage Planning advised that a Statutory Public Meeting for the following specific applications related to this redevelopment proposal is scheduled for October 24, 2017:

- To provide for the future expansion of the Union Villa long term care facility;
- To construct a 12 storey seniors' apartment building in the middle portion of the property (approximately 286 residential units). The Regional Municipality of York is the proponent of this development;
- To replace the existing Heritage Village seniors' bungalow townhouses in the north portion of the property with a new condo townhouse development (approximately 153 townhouse units). Minto Communities is the proponent of this development; and

- It is proposed to retain the existing Union Villa long term care facility and the Wyndham Gardens retirement apartments.

The Manager of Heritage Planning further advised that the purpose of the proposed official plan and zoning by-law amendments is to permit the subject property to be developed as outlined above, and the purpose of the draft plan of subdivision is to facilitate the future division of the Minto townhouse development into individual lots for each of the townhouses. Although this development is not within the Unionville Heritage Conservation District boundary, Heritage Markham Committee is being circulated the applications as the development is adjacent to a cultural heritage resource (the heritage district).

Markham Official Plan 2014 has provisions in the Heritage Policies that permit the review of development on adjacent lands to cultural heritage resources. The City does have the option of requiring a Heritage Impact Assessment if deemed appropriate. The proposed multi-storey building (seniors' apartments) is setback from the boundary of the heritage conservation district which is the railway corridor. The railway and a proposed parking lot area as well as part of the existing Wyndham Gardens building offer a certain degree of buffering. The tallest portion is located in the centre of the site with reduced height (4 storeys) along the west boundary where it is adjacent to low rise residential properties. The building will still be visible from within the boundary of the heritage conservation district as a new feature on the west boundary of the district. The proposed design of this building appears to utilize lighter materials which may help minimize the impact. The proposed townhouses (Minto) are screened in part by the Wyndham Gardens building and there is a large backyard setback between the two heritage houses at 36 and 38 Eureka Street and the proposed townhouses.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham Committee has no comment on the redevelopment concept from a heritage perspective.

CARRIED

**20. Site Plan Control Application,
Committee of Adjustment Variance Application,
31 Peter Street, Markham Village,
Proposed Rear Addition to an Existing Heritage Dwelling (16.11)**

File Nos. SC 17 15050

A/114/17

Extracts: P. Wokral, Heritage Planner,
R. Punit, Committee of Adjustment

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Heritage Planner reviewed the site plan control and minor variance application to remove the one storey rear tail of the existing heritage dwelling at 31 Peter Street in Markham Village and replace it with a two storey addition. He advised that the applicant is seeking the following variances:

- A Maximum Net Floor Area Ratio of 50.90 %, whereas the By-law permits a Maximum Net Floor Area Ratio of 45%;
- A maximum Building Depth of 22.07m, whereas the By-law permits a Maximum Building Depth of 16.8m; and
- A Minimum Front Yard Setback of 7.74 ft, whereas the By-law requires a Minimum Front Yard Setback of 25 ft.

The Heritage Planner further advised Heritage Markham has reviewed this application and made recommendations regarding the proposed addition in April, June, July and August of 2017. The applicant has incorporated several of the recommendations of the Committee and Heritage Staff, and the Committee has indicated that they have no objection to the proposed building depth, and existing front yard setback.

At the Committee of Adjustment meeting of September 13, 2017, this application was deferred to provide the designer time to lower the requested variance for the Maximum Net Floor Area Ratio.

Heritage Markham Committee has consistently recommended that the existing house and proposed addition should be reduced in floor area in order to comply with the Maximum Net Floor Area Ratio of 45% permitted by the Infill By-law, and that a Net Floor Area Ratio greater than 50% could not be supported.

The designer has lowered the Maximum Net Floor Area Ratio from 52.22% to 50.90 % and made the following revisions to the plans:

- Removed 1 foot of length from the great room, kitchen and breakfast nook;
- Removed 1'-2" from the length of the master bedroom and walk in closet;
- Removed 2 feet in the width of the ensuite by the tub to pull the wall further back from the property line;
- Removed the south facing gable on the garage and replaced it with a hip roof to minimize the massing along the south property line; and
- Due to re-design of spaces, the roof lines of the addition also changed and reduced the highest point of the roof by 10 inches.

Staff has received a letter from the neighbouring property owners to the north expressing their concerns regarding the proposed design and associated variances that also encourages the Committee to reconsider its earlier position (to not support a Maximum Net Floor Area Ratio greater than 50%) and instead not support any increase above 45%.

The Heritage Planner advised that he has been informed by Mr. Shane Gregory, of Gregory Design Group, agent for the applicant, that the Committee of Adjustment at its meeting on October 11, 2017 supported the requested minor variances, including the 50.90% net floor area ratio with no conditions.

Mr. Shane Gregory, Gregory Design Group, agent for the applicant, addressed the Committee and explained the various modifications incorporated in the proposal.

Mr. Eric Wheeler, a local resident addressed the Committee noting that he had requested that a Maximum Net Floor Area Ratio of 45% be maintained as required by the Infill By-law to help maintain the area's village-like character. It was noted by a member that the proposals from Heritage Markham for the new comprehensive zoning by-law would be even more restrictive.

The Committee emphasized that the suggested Maximum Net Floor Area Ratio of 45%, as required by the Infill By-law should be adhered to and the Committee should identify site specific reasons when Heritage Markham deviates from the By-law. However, considering that the Committee of Adjustment supports the requested minor variances, members believe that this matter should be received as information.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the following deputations be received:

1. Mr. Shane Gregory, Gregory Design Group, on behalf of the applicant; and
2. Mr. Eric Wheeler, local resident; and

That Heritage Markham Committee receive as information.

CARRIED

**21. Request for Feedback,
Interpretive Plaque Program for Heritage Conservation District Properties
(16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Manager of Heritage Planning reviewed a request from the owner of a property in the Unionville Heritage Conservation District regarding the potential of obtaining a bronze plaque for their home, similar in style to the plaque provided by the City for properties individually designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. The municipality has not provided an interpretive plaque for significant properties in the four heritage conservation districts due to the administrative/ research demands of such a program as it would apply to hundreds of properties as well as the associated costs that would be involved. Buildings at Markham

Heritage Estates are commemorated with large interpretive panels in the traffic islands as opposed to individual house plaques, and some homes in historic Thornhill have wooden interpretive plaques installed as a centennial project in 1967.

In 2008, the Markham Village Conservancy (“the Conservancy”) initiated an interpretive plaque project for heritage properties within the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District, with properties on Peter Street being the first phase to be done. The Conservancy designed a cast aluminium plaque containing the name of the original home owner, their occupation, date of construction of the building and the name of the heritage district. A blue background colour was approved by Council, as requested by the Conservancy, for properties within the Mount Joy neighbourhood of the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District. The colour for the remainder of the district properties is to be black which was approved by Markham Council on March 1, 2017. These plaques are funded by three parties: the City (\$175 fixed contribution) and the remainder funded by the property owner and the local group sponsoring the program.

Markham Council has also approved a policy document titled “***Guidelines for Interpretive Plaques for Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest in Heritage Conservation Districts***”. In 2010, Markham Council authorized the expansion of the interpretive program through an expenditure commitment of \$6,000 to fund the municipal contribution and allow the Markham Village Conservancy to continue their work as well as provide the opportunity to create a similar program in the other heritage districts (if desired). Heritage Staff approached historical associations in both Thornhill and Unionville, but there was little interest in championing the concept or contributing to the program. In 2016, the Conservancy indicated an interest to continue the plaque project with the goal to install plaques on additional Mount Joy buildings as well as within the central part of Markham Village and Vinegar Hill, but at this stage to focus on properties on Main Street Markham. Council was requested to re-direct the \$6,000 funding commitment (from 2010) to specifically focus on Markham Village properties (and increase the City’s funding commitment to \$175 per property). Council supported this request in April 2016.

The Manager of Heritage Planning suggested that given that Council has endorsed a city-wide plaque design to be used for interpretation of significant properties in heritage conservation districts, the use of a bronze plaque similar to the individual designation plaque should not be supported. At present, all municipal funding committed to this district plaque program is directed to Markham Village.

The Manager of Heritage Planning further suggested that the Unionville property owner interested in an interpretive plaque could be directed to explore the option of creating the first plaque for use in Unionville using the City’s design criteria and Unionville background colour. The owner would have to pay the entire cost of the plaque as there is no co-sponsor organization and no City funding allocation. Heritage staff could once again contact organizations focused on historic Unionville to see if there is any interest in being the coordinating/sponsoring organization (Unionville Village Conservancy, Unionville Historical Society, Unionville Village Ratepayers).

Responding to a question from a Committee member, the Manager of Heritage Planning advised that staff would work with the organization that would be interested in coordinating / sponsoring the plaques, to ensure that the correct design and other related information was made available to them. He further advised that if no organization was interested, and the property owner in the Unionville Heritage Conservation District was willing to bear the entire cost of the plaque, staff would ensure that all the correct property information was made available to the owner.

A committee member suggested that Council should consider making funds available to this individual if they desire to install an interpretive panel on their property as this enhances the heritage of the area, educates the people, enhances the streetscape and adds interest to the heritage area.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the request by a Unionville property owner for information on an interpretive plaque for properties of cultural value or interest in the Unionville Heritage Conservation District be received; and,

That given Council's approval of a City-wide plaque design to be used for interpretation of significant properties in heritage conservation districts, the use of a round bronze plaque comparable to the individual designation plaque not be supported as an approach to be used; and,

That the property owner interested in an interpretive plaque be directed to explore the option of creating the first plaque for use in the Unionville Heritage Conservation District using the City's approved design criteria for heritage district interpretive plaques and the Unionville background colour; and further,

That Heritage staff be requested to contact organizations focused on historic Unionville (i.e. Unionville Village Conservancy, Unionville Historical Society, and Unionville Village Ratepayers) to see if there is any interest in being the coordinating/sponsoring organization for an interpretive plaque program similar to the existing program administered by the Markham Village Conservancy.

CARRIED

**22. Doors Open Markham 2017,
Update on Event,
September 30, 2017 (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Senior Heritage Planner provided an update on the Doors Open Markham event held on September 30, 2017, with exceptional support from Corporate Communications including promoting the event through road signage that gave the event excellent visibility. In terms of attendance at the event, the final numbers have not yet been received, but it is anticipated that the overall attendance will be three times the number that attended in 2016 and in the previous years.

On Saturday, , hundreds showed up for the largest annual Doors Open Markham event, with over 20 modern and historic sites to explore. This year's theme focused on Markham's rich cultural diversity, in celebrating Canada's 150th birthday. From heritage homes and buildings, to modern architecture and cultural landmarks, Doors Open Markham provided families the exclusive opportunity to learn just how these amazing structures have shaped the City. Doors were open from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. at 21 locations across the City, including the Heintzman House, award-winning Wong Dai Sin Temple, Markham Village Fire Station, and the McKay Art Centre.

This year's event gave attendees the chance to tour the Unionville Train Station, one of the oldest stations in Canada. It was restored by the City of Markham and now serves as a popular community meeting space. Guests were able to visit the vaults at the Varley at the home of Frederick Varley's fine collection of oils, water colours and drawings. They then had the opportunity to stop by the Group of Seven members' former home at the McKay Art Centre. Families were also able to walk in the footsteps of Markham's firefighters at the Markham Village Fire Station. Home restoration enthusiasts could tour Markham Heritage Estates to see the stages of restoration of the many old houses and witness the intricate work put into refurbishing these buildings.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham Committee receive as information; and,

That the Chair of Heritage Markham Committee write a letter of appreciation to the City for organizing the 2017 Doors Open Markham event.

CARRIED

Adjournment

The Heritage Markham Committee meeting adjourned at 9:31 PM.