

Heritage Markham Committee Meeting City of Markham

**September 13, 2017
Canada Room, Markham Civic Centre**

Members

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

Regrets

Jennifer Peters-Morales

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 7:20 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 # 12, 116 Main Street, Unionville, by nature of being the immediate neighbor of the property, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

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

1. Approval of Agenda (16.11)

- A) Addendum Agenda
- **Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review, Request for Meeting;**
 - **Demolition Permit Application, 30 Washington Street, Markham Village Heritage Conservation District.**
- B) New Business from Committee Members
- **Last minute / incomplete applications.**

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the September 13, 2017 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved, as amended.

CARRIED

**2. Minutes of the August 9, 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 August 9, 2017 be received and adopted.

CARRIED

**3. Heritage Permit Application,
Delegated Approvals: Heritage Permits,
9231 Woodbine Ave, Buttonville,
15 Eureka St, Unionville,
329 Main St N., Markham Village,
48 Main St N., Markham Village,
44 Church St, Markham Village, (16.11)**

File Nos: HE 17 171640
HE 17 173687
HE 17 172635
HE 17 172480
HE 17 172795

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

- 4. Building or Sign Permit Applications,
Delegated Approvals: Building and Sign Permits,
11 Deanbank Dr, Thornhill,
9064 Woodbine Ave, Buttonville,
10720 Victoria Square Blvd, Victoria Square,
9 Eckardt Ave, Unionville,
9 Rouge St, Markham Village,
12 David St, Markham Village,
23 Washington St, Markham Village,
80 Main St N., Markham Village,
3693 Elgin Mills Rd, Rural Markham, (16.11)**

File Nos: 17 170961 HP
17 172514 NH
17 171959 AL
17 174252 HP
17 161842 HP
17 170238 HP
17 170392 HP
17 173978 SP
17 172730 HP

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

- 5. Information,
Language on Commercial Signage in Heritage Conservation Districts (16.11)**
Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham receive as information.

CARRIED

6. **Events,
Doors Open Markham Committee Minutes,
August 30, 2017 (16.11)**
Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham receive as information.

CARRIED

7. **Site Plan Control Application,
Committee of Adjustment Variance Application,
31 Wales Ave, Markham Village,
Proposed Front Veranda (16.11)**
File Nos: SC 17 163230
A/115/17
Extracts: P. Wokral, Heritage Planner
R. Punit, Committee of Adjustment
R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the requested variances for 31 Wales Avenue to permit:

- a minimum front yard setback of 4.9 ft., whereas the By-law requires a minimum front yard setback of 25 ft.;
- a maximum building depth of 25.09m, whereas the By-law permits a maximum building depth of 16.8m;
- a maximum front yard encroachment of 40 inches for the front steps, whereas the By-law permits a maximum yard encroachment of 18 inches;

as they relate to the proposed front veranda reviewed by the Committee in July of 2017.

CARRIED

8. **Committee of Adjustment Variance Application,
310 Main Street North, Markham Village
Variance Application (16.11)**
File No: A/63/17
Extracts: P. Wokral, Heritage Planner

R. Punit, Committee of Adjustment
R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham does not support any of the requested variances at 310 Main Street North from a heritage perspective, because they do not conform with the City's Official Plan and Zoning By-law designations of the property, they seek to expand a legal non-conforming use beyond what was originally approved by the Ontario Municipal Board in 1977, and they seek to legalize a rear addition not constructed in accordance with what was approved by the City.

CARRIED

**9. Site Plan Control Application,
32 Victoria Avenue, Unionville
Proposed Minor Additions to a Non-Heritage Dwelling**

File No: SC 17 159335

Extracts: G. Duncan, Senior Planner

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham supports the proposal to add to and remodel the exterior of the existing Class B dwelling at 32 Victoria Avenue from a heritage perspective subject to the applicant obtaining the required permits from the TRCA and subject to entering into a site plan agreement (minor) with the City including materials, colours, etc.

CARRIED

**10. Site Plan Control Application,
45 John Street, Thornhill,
Proposed Residential Addition and Renovations (16.11)**

File No: SC 17 158926

Extracts: G. Duncan, Project Planner

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Senior Heritage Planner reviewed the Site Plan Control Application for alterations and a major addition to the existing one storey dwelling at 45 John Street, Thornhill. The dwelling is a 1949 ranch bungalow with modern interpretation of a Victorian veranda and gable details. This item was considered by Heritage Markham Committee at its previous two meetings.

At its August 9, 2017 meeting, Heritage Markham Committee referred this matter to the Architectural Review Sub-Committee for a site visit, further review and report back to Heritage Markham Committee for consideration at its September meeting.

Subsequent to the August 23, 2017 site visit by the Architectural Review Sub-Committee, the applicant revised the site plan and elevations to address comments made at the site meeting. The west wall of the proposed addition has been pulled back from the side property line as recommended by the arborist, for tree protection purposes. The roof line has been modified in response to recommendations from staff and Heritage Markham's suggestions. The garage has been re-positioned to be recessed from the front wall of the existing dwelling. The building footprint has been redesigned to eliminate the need for any variances, and revised site plan and floor plans have been provided reflecting these changes. The existing foundation will be retained which will aid in tree protection.

Councillor Burke advised that she attended the Architectural Review Sub-Committee site visit on August 23, 2017, and that her name should be included in the notes of the Sub-Committee site visit. Staff indicated the meeting notes would be revised. Councillor Burke further complemented the applicant for redesigning the proposed works based on the suggestions/recommendations made by the Architectural Review Sub-Committee. She however sought clarification on whether the front windows of the existing house have been redesigned to a more traditional "old Thornhill" design as this was not obvious from the current revised elevations.

Mr. Ilya Batov, the owner advised that the size of the windows has been reduced and he and his architect will be working with staff on this matter.

Responding to a comment from a Committee member, the Senior Heritage Planner advised that the Architectural Sub-Committee has suggested that the garage roof be changed from flat to pitched, if possible. However staff is of the opinion that either roof design can be accepted without major impact on the overall appearance of the building.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the Architectural Review Sub-Committee meeting notes from August 23, 2017 be received as information; and,

That Heritage Markham supports the revised site plan and elevations for 45 John Street from a heritage perspective on the basis that no variances are required, and delegates final review of minor design details such as window glazing patterns, decorative trim and railings to staff; and,

That the applicant enter into a Site Plan Agreement for the project, including materials, colours, etc.

CARRIED

**11. Committee of Adjustment Variance Application,
Site Plan Control Application,
44 Church Street, Markham Village
New 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

The Senior Heritage Planner reviewed the Committee of Adjustment Variance Application for a new detached garage with loft. The current dwelling is a 1½ storey brick house fronting on Church Street with rear access from Markham Street and was built in the mid-1880s, with a major rear addition in 2006. The property includes an old stable with storage loft adjacent to the Markham Street frontage.

The current application is to replace an existing old frame stable adjacent to Markham Street with a new two car detached garage with loft space above, and a covered porch in the rear yard amenity space. A Minor Variance application has been submitted in combination with a Site Plan Control application. The new building will have similar setbacks to the existing accessory structure that is proposed to be removed.

The Senior Heritage Planner further advised that in 2009, Heritage Markham and staff assessed the old stable in the rear yard and were of the opinion that due to its condition, it could be removed subject to the preservation of a large walnut tree adjacent to its north wall. The tree has since died and is about to be removed so is no longer an issue.

The Senior Heritage Planner further advised that the following variances will be required:

- A minimum rear yard setback of 0.6m for an accessory building, whereas the By-law requires a minimum setback of 1.22m from any lot line;
- A minimum east yard setback of 0.6m for an accessory building, whereas the By-law requires a minimum setback of 1.22m from any lot line;
- A maximum building height of 5.1m for an accessory building, whereas the By-law permits a maximum building height of 3.81m;
- A maximum floor area ratio of 68.15%, whereas the By-law permits a maximum floor area ratio of 45%;
- A maximum lot coverage of 45.9%, whereas the By-law permits a maximum lot coverage of 35%;

Responding to a question from a Committee member, Mr. Russ Gregory, the project designer advised that the owners wanted a newer style garage, as compared to the older stable/barn look. Mr. Gregory further advised that letters of support from neighbours have been submitted to the Committee of Adjustment.

Responding to another question from a Committee member with respect to the coverage area of the dwelling and replacement garage as compared with the overall coverage area of the dwelling and the stable, Mr. Gregory advised that he did not have the calculations available at the moment, but could provide the coverage area of the original house and stable.

The Senior Heritage Planner advised that without the covered porch, the lot coverage would be 39%, whereas the by-law permits 35% maximum lot coverage. It was also noted that there still would be ample amenity space in the rear yard.

Responding to a question from a Committee member, Mr. Gregory advised that the estimated footprint of the stable would be approximately 35-40, maybe 50 sq.ft.

Committee members expressed concerns with respect to the maximum floor area ratio variance of 68.15% as compared to the allowable 45%.

Councillor Karen Rea suggested that matter should be referred to the Architectural Review Sub-Committee for a site visit with delegated authority.

Mr. Campbell, the owner of the property addressed the Committee in support of the proposal.

Responding to a question from a Committee member, the Senior Heritage Planner advised that the staff memo provides an analysis of the property and rationalization of the variances required and why they can be supported. He directed the Committee to the last paragraph on Page 88 of the Heritage Markham Committee agenda, where it is stated that staff is of the opinion that because the accessory building is detached and in the rear yard, and has similar massing to the existing old structure, the variance is supportable from a heritage perspective based on architectural design and that it will have no significant impact on the subject property and adjacent properties.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That this matter be referred to the Architectural Review Sub-Committee with delegated authority to provide a recommendation on behalf of the Heritage Markham Committee.

CARRIED

**12. Site Plan Control Application,
116 Main Street, Unionville,
Proposed Rear Addition to Existing Heritage Dwelling (16.11)**

File No: SC 17 162457

Extracts: P. Wokral, Heritage Planner,
R. Kendall, Manager, Development

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

David Nesbitt, Chair disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 12, 116 Main Street, Unionville, by nature of being the immediate neighbor of the property, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

Ian Darling, Vice Chair, assumed the Chair when this matter was considered.

The Heritage Planner reviewed the site plan control application for a proposed rear addition to the existing heritage dwelling at 116 Main Street, Unionville. This matter was considered at the August 9, 2017 Heritage Markham Committee meeting when a neighbor addressed the Committee expressing concerns that a decision by the Committee should be deferred pending comments from the TRCA. As well, questions about the accuracy of the survey were raised at that meeting. The Heritage Planner advised that TRCA has now provided preliminary comments on the application and indicated that they are generally satisfied with the drawings and that additional comments may arise subject to a more detailed review. He further advised that the applicant has also provided a survey from October 2012 that was prepared by a qualified Ontario Land Surveyor.

The Heritage Planner advised that Staff is satisfied with the location, scale, massing, form and materials of the proposed addition, but recommends that the windows of the addition be simplified to reflect a more typical Edwardian style window pane division. The Heritage Planner further advised that no variances are required.

Responding to questions and concerns from a Committee member with respect to drainage, the Heritage Planner advised that the applicant has submitted a site plan application and all grading issues will be dealt with by the City's Engineering Department. The applicant will need to provide proper grading plans indicating no grading impact on neighbouring properties prior to receiving a building permit from the City. The Department of Planning and Urban Design is currently assessing and commenting on the design footprint, and the Engineering Department will then work with the applicant to achieve a satisfactory grading plan.

The Committee was reminded that drainage issues do not typically fall within the mandate of Heritage Markham and will be dealt with by the Engineering Department.

After extensive discussion, the Committee expressed concerns with respect to the overall scale and massing of the proposed development.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham does not support the site plan control application for a proposed rear addition to the existing heritage dwelling at 116 Main Street, Unionville due to its scale and its impact on the green space.

CARRIED

**13. Special Event,
Heritage Markham Awards of Excellence 2017 (16.11)**
Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

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

The Manager of Heritage Planning reminded members of the Heritage Markham Committee to send in nominations for consideration by the Sub-Committee for the Heritage Markham Awards of Excellence 2017.

A member suggested that staff contact former members (2013-2017) to solicit nominations. The Chair reminded the Committee that the following members constituted the Sub-Committee:

David Nesbitt, Evelin Ellison, Councillor Karen Rea, David Johnston, Graham Dewar, and Ken Davis.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham receive as information.

CARRIED

**14. Markham Official Plan 2014,
Cultural Heritage Policies (16.11)**
Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Manager of Heritage Planning reviewed the 2014 Markham Official Plan's Cultural Heritage Policies with the Committee, as approved by the Ontario Municipal Board. He advised that the Plan and Policies are available on the City's website, as well, staff can provide hard copies to the Committee members if required.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham receive as information.

CARRIED

**15. New Business
Demolition Permit Application 17 175034 DP
Removal of Rear Wing and Shed/Garage**

30 Washington Street
Markham Village Heritage Conservation District
Extracts: G. Duncan, Project Planner

The Senior Heritage Planner reviewed the demolition permit application for the removal of the rear wing and shed/garage of a Type A heritage building at 30 Washington Street in the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District. The property owners wish to address the deteriorated condition of the one storey rear wing of the dwelling, and the frame shed/garage in the rear yard in preparation for upcoming Site Plan Control and Building Permit applications. The applicants are in the process of planning an addition and exterior restoration of the heritage dwelling, and a heritage grant has been approved to assist with the cost of restoring the wood siding and decorative bargeboards.

The Senior Heritage Planner advised that any demolition application will require Council approval, therefore a report to the Development Services Committee will be prepared by staff, containing Heritage Markham's recommendation. He further advised that the removal of rear wings of similar dwellings has been permitted in the past, to enable new additions to be attached to heritage structures in a manner that has the least degree of visual impact from the street view.

Although the rear wing is an original or old part of the c.1878 dwelling, it is a secondary component and does not contribute significantly to the heritage character of the building or streetscape. Given the poor condition of both the rear wing and shed/garage, staff has no objection to their removal.

The Committee expressed concerns with respect to the lack of a condition assessment in support of the demolition application, or drawings showing the proposed addition.

Committee members were concerned that the applicant did not attend the meeting to present their application.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham does not support the demolition permit application for the rear wing and shed at 30 Washington St.; and

That the applicant be requested to provide a condition assessment of the existing property and the proposed redevelopment plan.

CARRIED

16. New Business
Comprehensive Zoning By-law Review
Request for Meeting
R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Manager of Heritage Planning advised that the City is conducting a comprehensive zoning by-law review and the consultant is planning to meet with the committee to seek their input and comments in this regard.

The Committee members agreed that a special Heritage Markham Committee meeting with the consultant would be more productive. The Manager of Heritage Planning advised that he will seek potential dates when the consultant is available for consideration of the Heritage Markham Committee

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham receive as information.

CARRIED

17. New Business

Last minute / Incomplete applications

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

A few Committee members expressed concerns with respect to items being added to the Committee agenda just before the commencement of the meeting. As well, some members felt that incomplete items are being included on the agendas. Committee members believe this is causing issues in as far as insufficient time to review late applications and insufficient information to consider incomplete applications.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham receive as information.

CARRIED

Adjournment

The Heritage Markham Committee meeting adjourned at 10:00 PM.