

Heritage Markham Committee Meeting City of Markham

**June 14, 2017
Canada Room, Markham Civic Centre**

Members

David Nesbitt, Chair
Councillor Valerie Burke
Ian Darling
Ken Davis
Graham Dewar
Anthony Farr
Councillor Don Hamilton
David Johnston
Jennifer Peters-Morales
Councillor Karen Rea
Zuzana Zila

Regrets

Templar Tsang-Trinaistich, Vice-Chair
Evelin Ellison

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 # 11, 36 Peter 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 # 18, 42 George Street, Markham Village Heritage Conservation District, 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.

Graham Dewar disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 20, 10 Beech Street, Markham Village by nature of having had discussions with the property owners, 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)

- A) Addendum Agenda
- **Minor Variance Application, 42 George Street, Markham Village Conservation District;**
 - **Demolition Permit Application, 31 Victory Avenue, Milliken Community;**
 - **Building Permit Application, 10 Beech Street, Markham Village.**
- B) New Business from Committee Members
- **Signage Along Main Street, Markham;**
 - **Email Etiquette.**

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the June 14, 2017 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved, as amended.

CARRIED

**2. Minutes of the May 10, 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 May 10, 2017 be received and adopted.

CARRIED

**3. Confidential Minutes of the May 10, 2017
Heritage Markham Committee Meeting (16.11)**
Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the confidential minutes of the Heritage Markham Committee meeting held on May 10, 2017 be received and adopted.

CARRIED

Ms. Jennifer Peters-Morales, who was recently appointed to the Heritage Markham Committee, introduced herself to the Committee.

4. Information,

Conflict of Interest and Pecuniary Interest (16.11)

Extracts: M. Pettit, Deputy Clerk

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Ms. Martha Pettit, Deputy City Clerk, City of Markham provided a brief high-level refresher on the *Municipal Conflict of Interest Act* (MCIA) by way of PowerPoint slides. Ms. Pettit advised the Committee that she can only respond to questions that are factual in nature with respect to pecuniary interest and conflict of interest. She further advised that she cannot provide advice on matters directly related to individual members' situations. Members need to seek their own legal counsel if they feel they may have a potential conflict of interest in a matter. Members were advised that when in doubt, they should declare a conflict. Members were also advised that if a conflict of interest was declared, and a member later realized that they don't have a conflict, they need to advise the Committee at the next available opportunity in order to be able to participate in future consideration of that matter. Such occurrences need to be recorded in the meeting minutes and in the City's future registry of official records.

Ms. Pettit advised the Heritage Markham Committee that Bill 68 amends some sections of the *Municipal Conflict of Interest Act* (MCIA). Part of the changes includes the requirement for members to complete a declaration form. Staff are preparing the form which members will need to complete at every meeting when they declare a conflict with respect to an agenda item. A written record of all conflict of interests declared will be maintained by the City.

Ms. Pettit advised that she will inform the Committee as soon as the City receives the updated MCIA that includes the relevant changes from Bill 68.

Responding to a question from a Committee member, Ms. Pettit advised that the Council Procedure By-law provides information with respect to conduct of the public attending committee meetings. She further advised that the Chair has the authority to expel any member of the public from the meeting for unruly or disruptive behavior. She also advised that assistance from the City's security staff can be requested for this purpose. Ms. Pettit advised that the City does not have an Indemnification Bylaw, but that additional material on the subject matter and indemnification will be circulated to members of the Heritage Markham Committee, either through the Committee Clerk or through Heritage Planning staff.

Ms. Pettit also advised that City was preparing a Code of Conduct for advisory committees as part of the requirement under Bill 68.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the presentation by the Deputy City Clerk, Legislative Services on conflict of interest and pecuniary interest, be received.

CARRIED

5. **Heritage Permits Applications,
Delegated Approvals: Heritage Permits,
22 John Street, Thornhill,
15 Church Lane, Thornhill,
8A Station Lane, Unionville,
114 Main Street, Unionville,
3 Union Street, Unionville,
69 Main Street North, Markham Village,
8 Wismer Place, Markham Heritage Estates (16.11)**

File Nos: HE 17 160989
HE 17 164791
HE 17 161656
HE 17 162851
HE 17 164509
HE 17 161737
HE 17 161401

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 Sign Permit Applications,
Delegated Approvals: Building and Sign Permits,
109 John Street, Thornhill,
4450 Highway 7 E, Unionville,
142 Main Street, Unionville,
16 Gleason Avenue, Markham Village,
9 Rouge Street, Markham Village,
122 Main Street North, Markham Village,
5 Washington Street, Markham Village,
60 Main Street North, Markham Village,
5930 16th Avenue, Markham Village,**

**122 Main Street North, Markham Village,
60 Main Street North, Markham Village,
2929 Elgin Mills Rd, Victoria Square Community,
7943 9th Line, Box Grove Community (16.11)**

File Nos: 17 159713 HP
17 161380 AL
17 161510 SP
16 131334 HP
16 137861 DP
17 156365 AL
17 157017 NH
17 157296 AL
17 157909 AL
17 160900 SP
17 162744 SP
17 163150 SP
17 159829 HP

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

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

CARRIED

IT WAS MOVED BY: Councillor Karen Rea; and

SECONDED BY: Graham Dewar

THAT Item # 6 be reconsidered.

CARRIED unanimously

Councillor Rea requested an update on the parking issues relative to the Lynde Centre for Dermatology at 5 Washington Street, Markham Village.

Councillor Rea requested information on the location of the kitchen exhaust fan for the restaurant at 60 Main Street North, Markham Village as she has been receiving numerous complaints from residents that the exhaust fans are being directed into the archway.

Councillor Rea inquired about which dining room is being renovated at 5930 16th Avenue, Markham Village.

Responding to the above questions from Councillor Rea, with respect to 5 Washington Street, Markham Village, the Senior Heritage Planner advised that the Lynde Centre for Dermatology has purchased the former restaurant with the intention to change the current use to a medical clinic. In view of this, Zoning staff is of the opinion that as a medical clinic has a lower parking requirement than a restaurant, they would accept the change of

use and not require additional parking – as it is currently a legal non-conforming use. A building permit has been issued by the City, and staff believes that, based on the scope of work, a site plan control application will not be required.

With respect to 5930 16th Avenue, Markham Village, the Senior Heritage Planner advised that this is an application for a minor renovation of the dining room of a seniors' residence.

With respect to 60 Main Street North, Markham Village, the Heritage Planner advised that the application is for installing a kitchen exhaust fan system for a new pizza restaurant. He further advised that staff are aware of complaints received from residents about the exhaust fumes. On reviewing the site plan agreement, staff have confirmed that no specific exhaust system is mentioned. Staff also confirmed that the works are being done in accordance with the Building Code.

Councillor Rea suggested that, going forward, business names should be provided in the agenda.

Responding to a question from Councillor Rea, the Manager of Heritage Planning advised that staff have met with the owners of Lynde Centre for Dermatology, and confirm that they are complying with the zoning requirements for parking. He further advised that unauthorized parking should be referred to By-law Enforcement.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

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

CARRIED

**7. Request for Feedback,
6031 Highway 7,
New Parking Lot Lighting – Markham Village Library (16.11)**

Extracts: Khwaja Waker, Asset Management

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection to the proposed parking lot lighting replacement for the Markham Village Library, including the pole lights and sidewalk street lamps, and supports Urban Design staff's recommendations regarding using a grey colour and placement of the sidewalk lights to frame the future entry feature to the Library Square.

CARRIED

**8. Committee of Adjustment Variance Application,
2830 Highway 7,
Zion Alliance Church (16.11)**

File No: A/75/17

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

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no comment on Minor Variance Application A/75/17 regarding the Zion Alliance Church at 2830 Highway 7 from a heritage perspective.

CARRIED

**9. Request for Feedback,
9064 Woodbine Ave, Buttonville,
Proposed Restoration of Exterior (16.11)**

Extracts: P. Wokral, Heritage Planner

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection to the proposed restoration of the exterior of the Buttonville Mill House at 9064 Woodbine Avenue as shown in the drawings dated May 26, 2017, provided the south wall of the one storey, frame rear tail is revised to reflect the existing fenestration and that the four pane window treatment only reflects the exterior storm windows and does not constitute approval of replacing the original one over one single hung windows.

CARRIED

**10. Site Plan Control Application,
60 Aksel Rinck Drive (being re-addressed as 128 Harbord St.),
Updated Design for Addition to Philip Eckardt Log House (16.11)**

File No: SC 17 114747

Extracts: G. Duncan, Project Planner

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Senior Heritage Planner reviewed the site plan control application for the updated design for additions to the Phillip Eckardt Log House at 60 Aksel Rinck Drive. Heritage

Markham Committee passed a resolution supporting the submitted design, based on the comments received from the Architectural Review Sub-Committee meeting of April 26, 2017. Following the meeting, the applicants contacted staff and advised that they decided to revisit the design of the proposed addition to provide a full second storey rather than the half storey design reviewed by Heritage Markham and staff.

The Senior Heritage Planner further advised that a further amended design was provided to staff after the agenda for the June 14, 2017 Heritage Markham Committee was distributed. This design was emailed to the Heritage Markham Committee. The applicant since advised the Senior Heritage Planner that they would like to withdraw all the previous designs submitted to the City and pursue a completely new design.

The owner of the property at 60 Aksel Rinck Drive addressed the Committee and explained a proposed schematic design, using slides. He also displayed photographs and sought Heritage Markham Committee's advice/opinion on the use of the proposed external cladding of stone veneer.

The Committee discussed the extent of the overall massing and height of the proposed new building positioned against the south wall of the existing heritage Philip Eckardt Log House. The Committee advised the applicant that it would be easier for Heritage Markham to consider this application if more details are provided.

It was noted that the transition roof between the new and old buildings was important and that traditional cladding materials (brick, wood, stucco) should be utilized.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

THAT Heritage Markham refer consideration of the addition to the Philip Eckardt Log House to the Architectural Review Sub-Committee for review and comment on receipt of revised drawings.

CARRIED

**11. Site Plan Control Application,
36 Peter Street, Markham Village
Proposed New Siding (16.11)**

File No: SC 15 109816

Extracts: P. Wokral, Project Planner

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Graham Dewar disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 11, 36 Peter 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.

The Heritage Planner reviewed the site plan control application for a proposed new

siding on a two storey, single detached dwelling constructed in 1903 at 36 Peter Street, Markham Village. He advised that the Heritage Markham Committee, at its May meeting, recommended that the later claddings be removed entirely as per the site plan agreement and that the Architectural Review Sub-committee conduct a site visit with the authority to review on behalf of the full Committee once the contractor had removed the later claddings, so that its condition could be accurately assessed. On June 1, 2017 members of the Architectural Review Sub-Committee met on site, and were only able to inspect small windows cut into the building wrap and insulation board exposing the historic cladding.

The Heritage Planner further advised that the Architectural Review Sub-Committee recommended that the historic cladding under the veranda be exposed and restored as per the site plan agreement, but supported the contractor's proposal to install new wooden tongue and groove siding over the top of the historic siding, insulation and building wrap, matching the original, on the remainder of the historic portion of the house, provided that the frames, sills and casings of the remaining historic windows be moved forward to reflect the original relationship between the siding and these elements.

The Heritage Planner suggested that going forward, the later claddings of heritage dwellings subject to Site Plan Control applications, be removed in their entirety to reveal the physical condition of the original cladding, so that appropriate conditions regarding treatment can be incorporated into the Site Plan Agreement.

The Committee discussed the need for applicants, contractors, designers and architects to ensure properties are protected in advance of deciding to carry out other remedial works on the heritage building.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That going forward, Heritage Markham recommends that the later claddings of heritage dwellings subject to Site Plan Control applications, be removed in their entirety to reveal the physical condition of the original cladding, so appropriate conditions regarding its treatment can be incorporated into the Site Plan Agreement and staff report back on how this would be implemented;

That as per the recommendation of the Architectural Review Sub-Committee, Heritage Markham has no objection to new wooden vertical tongue and groove siding, matching the profile and dimensions of the original historic cladding being installed over the existing solid board insulation, building wrap, and strapping on the north, south and east walls not located below the veranda roof, provided that the frames of the remaining historic wooden windows are moved forward to maintain the original relationship of the sills and casings with the historic siding; and,

That as per the recommendation of the Architectural Review Sub-Committee, Heritage Markham recommends that the historic siding on the south and east walls of the historic house located under the veranda roof, from one interior corner to interior corner be revealed and restored, as per the Site Plan Agreement, to maintain the original relationship of the historic window casings and sills with the exterior siding.

CARRIED

**12. Site Plan Control Application,
31 Peter Street, Markham Village
Proposed Rear Addition to Existing
Heritage House (16.11)**

File No: SC 17 150501

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

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Heritage Planner reviewed the site plan control application for a proposed rear addition to the existing heritage house at 31 Peter Street. The owner has applied for approval to remove the one storey rear tail of the existing heritage dwelling and replace it with a two storey addition. This application was initially considered by Heritage Markham on April 12, 2017. Staff did not support the massing and form of the proposed addition as well as any variance to the Infill By-law necessary to permit it. In May of 2017, Heritage Markham Committee indicated that they had no objection to the removal of the existing one storey kitchen tail. Since that time, the designer has revised the design of the proposed addition to create a more suitable architectural transition from the old house to the new addition, reduced the height of the addition, and increased the north side yard setback and cantilevered the wall in order to preserve cedar trees which were earlier marked for removal on the tree inventory plan.

The Heritage Planner advised that the revised addition would still require the following variances:

- A Net Floor Area Ratio of 53.09% (54.4% if the second storey open to below area is counted) whereas the By-law permits a Net Floor Area Ratio of 45%
- A Maximum Building Depth of approximately 21.8m whereas the By-law permits a Maximum Building Depth of 16.8m;
- A Minimum Side Yard Setback of 4 ft for a two storey portion of the building whereas the By-law requires a Minimum Side Yard Setback of 6 ft for a two storey portion of the building;

Heritage Section Staff is pleased with the revisions to the design of the addition. The proposed building depth is similar to the property to the north, the architectural transition from the old part of the house to the addition is better than the earlier proposal, the height of the proposed addition is more compatible with the height of the existing house, the garage is well set back from the street and significant trees which provide privacy to the

neighbouring property owner to the north are now to be retained instead of removed. The 3D perspective shows that the addition is well considered in its massing, compatible with the architectural style of the original house, and should not have any negative impact on neighbouring property owners.

Mr. Shane Gregory, the project designer was present at the meeting and addressed the Committee in favour of the proposal.

The Committee expressed concerns with respect to the overall height and massing of the proposed addition, and with the side yard setback and suggested that the size and massing be reduced and the 6 feet setback for a 2-storey building be maintained.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

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

CARRIED

**13. Committee of Adjustment - Variance Application,
310 Main Street North, Markham Village
Proposed Addition to Automotive Service Garage and
Requested Variances (16.11)**

File No: A/63/17

Extracts: P. Wokral, Project Planner

R. Punit, Committee of Adjustment

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Heritage Planner reviewed the Committee of Adjustment Variance application for a proposed addition to an existing automotive service garage at 310 Main Street North, Markham Village. The one storey single detached dwelling was constructed in 1948 and a one storey garage was constructed in 1977. The property is designated under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* and classified as a Group C building or buildings that do not reflect the heritage character of the district.

The Heritage Planner advised the Committee that the owner has applied to the Committee of Adjustment seeking variances to permit:

- a maximum accessory building height of 16.8 feet, whereas the By-law permits a maximum accessory building height of 12 feet;
- a maximum lot coverage of 28.5% for an accessory building, whereas the By-law permits a maximum lot coverage of 10% for an accessory building;
- a minimum rear yard setback of 3 feet 2 1/8 inches for an accessory building, whereas the By-law requires a minimum rear yard setback of 4 feet

- for an accessory building;
- a maximum lot coverage of 40.2%, whereas the By-law permits a maximum lot coverage of 35%;
- a maximum net floor area ratio of 56.9%, whereas the By-law permits a maximum net floor area ratio of 45%;
- Outside storage of vehicles, supplies and parts at the rear of the property, whereas the By-law does not permit 'outside storage of vehicles, supplies and parts'; and
- the 'sale of vehicles at the rear of the property', whereas the By-law does not permit the sale of vehicles.

The above variances relate to a proposed new one storey addition to the existing garage located behind the existing detached dwelling, which will provide two additional garage bays.

Although the property is only zoned for a single detached dwelling, a By-law approved by the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) in 1977 permitted a two bay Automobile Service Garage of approximately 1,050 square feet. Although the original 1976 By-law was intended to provide a two-year temporary use to a specific individual based on an agreement with the Town, no agreement was ever executed, and an Automobile Service Garage has operated as a Legal Non-Conforming Use, under different owners since 1979. Therefore, the use is permitted, as long as the property is operated as a two bay automobile service garage.

The variance requested to permit a minimum rear yard setback of 3'-2 1/8" is to recognize the setback of the existing garage built in 1977 from the property line.

The proposed variances would permit the expansion of a legal non-conforming use (an automobile service garage with two bays as per the 1976 By-law) as well as additional uses not currently permitted by the 1976 By-law (outdoor storage and the sale of vehicles). There appears to be no compelling reason to support any of the requested variances with the exception of the variance requested to recognize the existing rear yard setback of the existing automobile service garage building.

The City never intended the current automobile service garage to continue beyond 1979, and there have been complaints from neighbouring property owners over the years regarding signage and outdoor storage on the premises. Therefore, supporting variances intended to significantly expand the current legal non-conforming use are not desirable for the appropriate development of the land in the opinion of Heritage and Planning Staff, and no additional commercial uses beyond what was permitted by the OMB in 1977 is supported in this predominantly residential area.

Written correspondence dated June 13, 2017, received from the applicant's representative was distributed to the Heritage Markham Committee at the meeting.

Mr. P. Fernando, local resident, addressed the Committee expressing concerns with respect to the unauthorised expansion of the non-conforming use of the subject property and the change in the landscaping from the original lawns to current gravel that would affect the effective storm water drainage.

The owner of the property and/or their representative did not attend the meeting.

The Committee discussed the original background landscaping of the property which recently consisted of grass, but is now hard surfaced.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the deputation by Mr. P. Fernando, local resident in opposition of the proposed addition to the existing automotive service garage and requested variances, be received;

That correspondence from Mr. Stefano Di Giulio, SDG Design, Elm Street, Markham, dated June 13, 2017, distributed to the Heritage Markham Committee at its meeting on June 14 2017, be received;

That Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the requested variance to permit:

- a minimum rear yard setback of 3 feet 2 1/8 inches for the existing accessory building whereas the By-law requires a minimum rear yard setback of 4 feet for an accessory building;

That Heritage Markham does not support the requested variances to permit:

- a maximum accessory building height of 16 feet, 8 inches whereas the By-law permits a maximum accessory building height of 12 feet;
- a maximum lot coverage of 28.5% for an accessory building whereas the By-law permits a maximum lot coverage of 10% for an accessory building;
- a maximum lot coverage of 40.2% whereas the By-law permits a maximum lot coverage of 35%;
- a maximum net floor area ratio of 56.9% whereas the By-law permits a maximum net floor area ratio of 45%;
- Outside storage of vehicles, supplies and parts at the rear of the property whereas the By-law does not permit 'outside storage of vehicles, supplies and parts'; and
- the 'sale of vehicles at the rear of the property' whereas the By-law does not permit the sale of vehicles;

as these would permit a significant expansion of the legal non-conforming use of the property not supported by the Official Plan designation or the Zoning By-law for this property; and

That the property owner be advised to restore the landscaping of the property to its original condition i.e. paved, gravel areas to be replaced with sod.

CARRIED

**14. Demolition Permit Application,
6163 Nineteenth Avenue,
Demolition of Ranch Bungalow (16.11)**

File No: 17 156030 DP

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Senior Heritage Planner reviewed the demolition permit application of a ranch bungalow at 6163 Nineteenth Avenue in the Dickson Hill Community. The applicant has applied for a demolition permit to remove the existing dwelling in order to construct a new dwelling elsewhere on the subject property.

The Senior Heritage Planner further advised that this property was added to the Inventory of Heritage Buildings (now the *Register*) in the early 2000s when staff was including any property that would potentially fall within a future heritage conservation district. This house, a ranch bungalow at the edge of valley land in the Dickson Hill community, is an evolved building that, according to MPAC data, dates from 1927, with later additions and alterations. There is minimal information available about this property. Its estimated date of construction places it well after the history of the surrounding property connected to John Dickson's grist mill. Recently, the owner undertook work on the property, including an addition to the house, without obtaining the required permits from the City or the TRCA. The City took action and the owner is now in the process of bringing his property into compliance.

The TRCA's preference is that the existing dwelling be removed and future development be further away from the valley edge.

Staff believes that the house at 6163 Nineteenth Avenue appears to be of minor cultural heritage interest as it does not relate to the early history of the area and has been extensively altered.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection to the demolition of the bungalow at 6163 Nineteenth Avenue as it appears to be of minimal cultural heritage interest.

CARRIED

**15. Site Plan Control Application
30B Rouge Street, Markham Village
Proposed Infill Dwelling**

File No: SC 17 134363

Extracts: P. Wokral, Project Planner

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That consideration of this matter be deferred to the July 2017 Heritage Markham meeting.

CARRIED

**16. Doors Open Markham 2017,
Committee Minutes May 3, 2017 and May 31, 2017 (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham receive as information.

CARRIED

**17. Planning Studies,
Future Urban Area- Community Structure Plan,
Cultural Heritage Resources (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Manager of Heritage Planning introduced the item on planning studies being undertaken as part of the Future Urban Area - Community Structure Plan. He advised that as part of the Conceptual Master Plan (CMP), a Community Structure Plan has been prepared. This plan illustrates the proposed key road network and land uses for the area and identifies the location of existing cultural heritage resources. The CMP will be used to guide the future Secondary Plan for this area.

The Manager of Heritage Planning advised that in late 2013, Council initiated the CMP process by authorizing a number of studies required to inform the detailed planning for the north Markham Future Urban Area (FUA). The FUA is identified in the 2014 Markham Official Plan as one component of Markham's strategy to accommodate forecast growth to 2031. This area will accommodate approximately 20% of residential growth. The first stage of detailed planning is the CMP which is intended to provide a high-level Community Structure Plan across the FUA lands as the basis for more detailed statutory secondary

plans for each of the four concession blocks. The preliminary Community Structure Plan includes a protected Greenway System, a transportation network, an open space network and broad land use categories which will deliver the structural elements for the new communities and employment areas. An interim report was received by Markham Council in October 2016, and the next steps include finalizing the CMP for Council endorsement in September 2017.

The Manager of Heritage Planning advised that the CMP identifies 27 Cultural Heritage Resources, seven of which are designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The remaining properties were given a preliminary evaluation rating by Heritage Section staff, based on an examination of existing photographs and available documentation as follows:

- Group 1 – 5 properties (major significance, worthy of designation);
- Group 2 – 10 properties (significant and worth of preservation);
- Group 3 – 1 property (noteworthy);
- Group 2/3 – 2 properties;
- Majority of the non-designated properties will require in-depth research;
- The likelihood of potential archaeological resources was also examined, and further archaeological assessment will be required at the secondary plan stage.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham receive the information on the identification of cultural heritage resources within the boundaries of the Future Urban Area – Conceptual Master Plan, and that further analysis/research of these resources be undertaken as part of the future secondary plan process.

CARRIED

**18. Minor Variance Application A/86/17,
Dever Residence,
42 George Street
Markham Village Heritage Conservation District**

Extracts: G. Duncan, Senior Heritage Planner
R. Punit, Committee of Adjustment
R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

David Johnston disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 18, 42 George Street, Markham Village Heritage Conservation District, 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 Senior Heritage Planner reviewed the minor variance application which was submitted as the result of a zoning review of the building permit for the residential addition which

previously received site plan approval. A building depth variance was identified due to the dining room projection into the rear yard and a porch roof. A maximum building depth of 18.2 metres is requested, whereas the By-law permits 16.8 metres. The projection of the front steps into the front yard was also identified as a matter requiring a variance. A front yard encroachment of 50 inches is requested whereas the By-law permits 18 inches. Additionally, the applicants have decided to convert the loft storage space over the garage into living space, which results in a requested maximum floor area ratio of 47.5% whereas the By-law permits 45%.

The Senior Heritage Planner further advised that this project received site plan approval on March 17, 2017. The project involves re-positioning the existing house on the property and building an addition onto it, including an attached garage. Originally, the loft space above the garage was to be used for storage. The overall habitable GFA will increase from 3,909 square feet permitted by the By-law to 4,104 square feet. The original net floor area ratio is 43.89%. The proposed net floor area ratio is 47.5%.

Staff believes that the requested variances will not change the building elevations or site plan layout as currently approved under the site plan approval process. As well, the increase in habitable GFA is minor and will have no exterior impact.

The Committee discussed the potential increase in overall height subsequent to the repositioning of the existing house.

David Johnston, architect of the project confirmed that the overall height will increase. He further advised that a building permit has been obtained for the project.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection to the Minor Variance Application A/86/17 for 42 George Street, Markham Village Heritage Conservation District.

CARRIED

19. Demolition Permit Application 17 165027 DP

Alexander McPherson House

31 Victory Avenue

Millken Community

Extracts: G. Duncan, Senior Heritage Planner

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Senior Heritage Planner reviewed a demolition permit application for the Alexander McPherson House in the Milliken Community. He advised that this application had to be added to the agenda for the June 14, 2017 Heritage Markham Committee meeting as there is a window of opportunity for it to be considered by the Development Services Committee

at its meeting on June 26, 2017 – which is within the 60-day period after notice of receipt of the application has been sent to the applicant.

The Senior Heritage Planner advised that the property at 31 Victory Avenue is a heritage house in the Milliken community of Markham which is listed on the City of Markham's *Register of Property of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest*. The property is also included as a cultural heritage resource in Appendix IV – Heritage Buildings in the Milliken Main Street Secondary Plan (OPA 144) – 2005. The Alexander McPherson House, c.1840, is a 1½ storey frame farmhouse in the Georgian architectural tradition, with modern claddings. This feature was portrayed to the Heritage Markham Committee by way of photographs of the building. The Senior Heritage Planner further advised that the current application is for demolishing the vacant residence at 31 Victory Avenue, and no development application is being considered at this time.

The Senior Heritage Planner advised that the Secondary Plan contains policies regarding heritage conservation and the integration of heritage buildings into the redevelopment of the area. He further advised that the Secondary Plan is currently undergoing an update, and road patterns, development blocks and land uses remain in a flexible state, pending review by the City and a report to Development Services Committee anticipated to occur in the fall of 2017.

The Senior Heritage Planner further advised that given that there is no immediate development impact on the property, and that the Secondary Plan update is still in progress, staff is of the opinion that the demolition permit application is premature. Opportunities to preserve the McPherson House and integrate it into the community's redevelopment have yet to be explored and discussed. In order to protect the building in this context, an Intention to Designate under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* is necessary, based on a recommendation of Heritage Markham to Council.

Staff recommends that Heritage Markham Committee pass a resolution recommending to Council that the demolition permit application for the Alexander McPherson House at 31 Victory Avenue be refused and that the Alexander McPherson House be designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

Staff further recommends that the applicant be requested to work with City Planning and Heritage Planning staff to find an appropriate way to integrate the heritage building into their redevelopment framework as part of the Secondary Plan update process.

As well, staff request that the applicant allow members of the Heritage Markham Committee and City staff to conduct a site visit of the property.

The Senior Heritage Planner advised Heritage Markham Committee that Council has enacted the Heritage Property Standards By-law, and that Heritage Planning and By-law Enforcement staff are working on a strategy to implement the Heritage Property Standards By-law in the City of Markham, going forward.

Mr. Jeff Chan, representing the applicant was present at the meeting, and was informed by the Committee that Heritage Markham would like to preserve significant heritage buildings in the City of Markham. The applicant was advised to seal the holes in the roof to prevent further water damage to the building.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

THAT Heritage Markham recommends to Council that the demolition permit application for the Alexander McPherson House at 31 Victory Avenue be refused;

THAT Council designate the property under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* on the basis of its cultural heritage value or interest;

THAT the applicant be requested to work with City Planning and Heritage Planning staff to find an appropriate way to integrate the heritage building into their redevelopment framework as part of the Secondary Plan update process; and

THAT the applicant take necessary measures as soon as possible to seal the roof to prevent further deterioration of the property.

CARRIED

**20. Building Permit Application
10 Beech Street, Markham Village
HP 17 161156**

Extracts: P. Wokral, Heritage Planner

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Graham Dewar disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 20, 10 Beech Street, Markham Village by nature of having had discussions with the property owners, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

The Heritage Planner reviewed a building permit application to construct a 1½ storey stone clad garage/accessory building in the rear yard of the property at 31 Beech Street, Markham Village. The existing building is a one storey detached dwelling constructed in 1968, designated under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, and classified as a Group C building or buildings that do not reflect the heritage character of the district.

The Heritage Planner advised that the applicant applied for a building permit in early May 2017, but was not informed that the proposed building would require a site plan approval until the application was reviewed by Heritage staff later in the month. The Heritage Planner further advised that the applicant has just participated in a formal pre-consultation meeting and is now able to submit a site plan application. Staff has no objection to the

form, massing and height of the proposed accessory building, but do not support the use of stone as an exterior cladding other than as a foundation treatment rising no higher than the bottom of the ground floor window sills and staff recommend that wood, or an appropriate synthetic siding or brick be used for the remainder of the exterior.

The Heritage Planner advised that although the proposed accessory building will have minimal visibility from the public realm, staff notes that the accessory building may become more visible in the future should the existing house be replaced with a new home.

Because of the straight forward nature of the application, and the recent processing delay, feedback from Heritage Markham Committee would help expedite this application. The proposed accessory building may require a variance to permit a maximum height of 16.25 ft. whereas the By-law permits a maximum height of 12 feet for an accessory building.

Responding to questions from the Committee, the Heritage Planner advised that there is a side yard access to the rear of the property, and construction material can be moved to the rear by using a crane.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection to the massing, form, and height of the proposed accessory building at 10 Beech Street, and delegates final review of the site plan application and any variance applications required to construct the building to Heritage Section Staff, provided that stone is not used as more than a foundation treatment, not exceeding the height of the ground floor window sills.

CARRIED

21. New Business

Signage Along Main Street, Markham (16.11)

Extracts: C. Alexander, Acting Manager By-law Enforcement and Regulatory Services

Councillor Karen Rea advised that she has received numerous complaints from residents about inappropriate signage being put up by certain businesses along Main Street in Markham Village.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That By-law Enforcement staff conduct a thorough inspection of the areas along Main Street, Markham Village to ensure that businesses are complying with the City's Sign By-law.

CARRIED

22. New Business
Email Etiquette (16.11)

Graham Dewar advised the Committee about the improper use of email communication by Committee members using the “Reply All” option, resulting in emails being received by persons that should not be receiving them.

The Committee discussed proper email etiquette. The Committee also expressed concerns about members who were not attending a meeting, commenting on applications that were yet to be considered at the meeting.

David Nesbitt, Chair volunteered to email a copy of the Email Etiquette Policy to members of the Heritage Markham Committee.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham receive as information.

CARRIED

Adjournment

The Heritage Markham Committee meeting adjourned at 11:18 PM.