

# **Heritage Markham Committee Meeting City of Markham**

**July 12, 2017  
Canada Room, Markham Civic Centre**

## **Members**

David Nesbitt, Chair  
Councillor Valerie Burke  
Maria Cerone  
Ian Darling  
Ken Davis  
Graham Dewar  
Evelin Ellison  
Anthony Farr  
David Johnston  
Jennifer Peters-Morales  
Councillor Karen Rea  
Zuzana Zila (arrived at 8:08 p.m.)

## **Regrets**

Councillor Don Hamilton

## **Staff**

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.

Councillor Valerie Burke disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 6, 26 Colborne Street, Thornhill, by nature of being the owner of the property, 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
- B) New Business from Committee Members
  - **Property Signs – Site Plan Control Applications (16.11)**

## **Heritage Markham Recommends:**

That the July 12, 2017 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved, as amended.

**CARRIED**

- 2. Minutes of the June 14, 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 June 14, 2017 be received and adopted.

CARRIED

- 3. New Members for Heritage Markham,  
Replacement Member for the Historical Unionville  
Community Vision Committee (16.11)**  
Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham Committee receive as information the appointment of two new members to the committee; and,

That Heritage Markham welcomes Jennifer Peters-Morales (Markham Village) and Maria Cerone (Unionville); and,

That Heritage Markham thanks Templar Tsang Trinaistich for his 3 ½ years of service on the Heritage Markham Committee and for representing the committee on the Historic Unionville Community Vision Committee; and further,

That Heritage Markham appoints David Johnston as the Heritage Markham representative for the rest of his term (ending November 2018) on the Historic Unionville Community Vision Committee effective immediately.

CARRIED

- 4. Conflict of Interest,  
Pecuniary Interest – Indemnification (16.11)**  
Extracts: M. Pettit, Deputy Clerk  
R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham Committee receive as information.

CARRIED

**5. Heritage Permit Application,  
10 Colborne Street, Thornhill Heritage Conservation District  
Proposed Replacement of Thornhill Village Library Area  
Patterned Colour Concrete (16.11)**

File No: HE 17 168611

Extracts: M. Ryan, Asset Management

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

---

The Senior Heritage Planner reviewed the heritage permit application for the replacement of the existing interlock pavers with patterned concrete in the parking lot area of the Thornhill Village Library at 10 Colborne Street in the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District. He advised that the existing interlocking pavers are uneven causing a safety issue for visitors to the library.

Mr. Michael Ryan, Facility Engineer, Asset Management addressed the Committee with two suggested options of patterned concrete using slides.

Evelin Ellison expressed concerns of potential flooding due to increased water runoff if concrete is used.

Responding to a question from committee about flooding issues in the library parking lot, a neighbouring property owner who was present at the meeting advised that there has never been any flooding of the parking lot since she has been the neighbour for the past 3 ½ years.

Michael Ryan, Facility Engineer, Asset Management advised that Operations staff was consulted on the proposed replacement of the existing interlock pavers with patterned concrete. Committee suggested that a written opinion should be sought from Operations staff on the option to use patterned concrete, prior to Heritage Markham's decision on the appropriate material to be used to replace the existing interlock pavers.

Councillor Valerie Burke advised that she had discussions with the Director of Asset Management and Sustainability on the possible use of permeable materials as a replacement option. She further advised that the City should set an example for the residents on conservation and sustainability. She suggested that permeable materials could be used in the non-heavy traffic areas of the parking lot. Councilor Burke also expressed concerns of the patterned concrete becoming slippery in the winter.

There was a suggestion that plain concrete would be the best option as a replacement for the existing interlock pavers.

Councilor Burke suggested that the matter be referred to the City's Accessibility Coordinator to obtain feedback on the preferred option from an accessibility point of view.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That this matter be referred to staff for additional information on the rationale for choosing either Option 1 (Belgiom Block) or Option 2 (Ashlar Slate – Pattern Concrete); and,

That staff provide details on the design, costing and timeline for completion of the proposed works; and,

That this matter be referred to the Markham Accessibility Coordinator for review; and,

That this matter be brought back to the August Heritage Markham Committee meeting for consideration.

CARRIED

- 6. Heritage Permit Applications,  
Delegated Approvals: Heritage Permits,  
7707 Yonge Street, Thornhill,  
22 Colborne Street, Thornhill,  
26 Colborne Street, Thornhill,  
37 Colborne Street, Thornhill,  
144 Main Street, Unionville,  
3 Union Street, Unionville,  
16 Victoria Avenue, Unionville,  
132 Main Street, Unionville,  
137A Main Street, Unionville,  
4 Peter Street, Markham Village,  
10 Heritage Corners Lane, Markham Heritage Estates,  
6 David Gohn Circle, Markham Heritage Estates,  
99 Thoroughbred Way, Berczy Village Community,  
25 Wales Ave, Markham Village,  
202 Main Street, Unionville (Jakes On Main) (16.11)**

File Nos: HE 17 165038  
HE 17 166833  
HE 17 167382  
HE 17 167381  
HE 17 162851  
HE 17 165215  
HE 17 165934  
HE 17 166121  
HE 17 167377  
HE 17 166316  
HE 17 158838  
HE 17 166852  
HE 17 166832  
HE 17 168043  
HE 17 168042

HE 17 168039

HE 17 168038

HE 17 168212

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Councillor Valerie Burke disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 6, 26 Colborne Street, Thornhill, by nature of being the owner of the property, 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 heritage permits approved by Heritage Section staff under the delegated approval process.

CARRIED

- 7. Building or Sign Permit Applications,  
Delegated Approvals: Building and Sign Permits,  
128A Main Street, Unionville,  
7 Joseph Street, Markham Village,  
80 Main Street North, Markham Village,  
175 Main Street North, Markham Village,  
1 Thompson Court, Markham Village,  
128 Main Street North, Markham Village,  
10975 Victoria Square Blvd, Victoria Square,  
91 – 115 Roy Grove Way, Greensborough Community (16.11)**

File Nos: 17 162074 HP  
17 162074 01 HP  
16 140534 AL  
17 157423 AL  
17 159325 HP  
17 161212 AL  
17 166173 AL  
17 165353 PP  
17 135554 HP

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Councillor Karen Rea advised that she received a telephone call from a resident informing her that the owners of 80 Main Street North are erecting a fence on the roof which would potentially block their bedroom window. Councillor Rea requested staff to investigate prior to Heritage Markham Committee approving any applications for further alterations to the commercial building at 80 Main Street North, Markham.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham receive the information on building and sign permits approved by Heritage Section staff under the delegated approval process, with the exception of 80 Main Street North, Markham Village, pending further staff investigations on proposed alteration works on the roof of that building.

CARRIED

**8. Site Plan Control Application,  
31 Wales Avenue,  
Proposed New Front Veranda (16.11)**

File No: SC 17 163230

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

---

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection to the proposed new front veranda at 31 Wales Avenue from a heritage perspective provided that the design of the veranda posts be revised to reflect historic Markham examples; and,

That final review of the application be delegated to Heritage Section Staff; and,

That the applicant enter into a Site Plan Agreement containing the standard conditions regarding appropriate materials, colours etc.

CARRIED

**9. Site Plan Control Application,  
6350 Steeles Avenue East,  
Relocation of Existing Dwelling (16.11)**

File No: SC 17 163000

Extracts: G. Duncan, Project Planner  
S. Campbell, Manager, East District  
R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

---

Responding to a question from Councillor Karen Rea, the Senior Heritage Planner advised that the \$125,000 Letter of Credit was the amount specified in the conditions of the original Site Plan Agreement. Councillor Rea suggested that staff investigate the possibility of getting a \$250,000 Letter of Credit, as recently approved in the Site Plan Control By-law review.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the site plan application for the Jarvis-Fairty House subject to further study of the design for the front porch; and,

That final review of the application be delegated to Heritage Section Staff; and,

That the applicant enter into a Site Plan Agreement containing the standard conditions regarding appropriate materials, colours etc.

CARRIED

**10. Site Plan Control Application,  
11584 Highway 48, Markham,  
Proposed Addition to an Existing Heritage Farmhouse (16.11)**

File No: SC 17 122468

Extracts: P. Wokral, Heritage Planner

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

---

The Heritage Planner reviewed the site plan control application for a proposed addition to an existing heritage farmhouse at 11584 Highway 48, Markham. This building was designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act in response to a demolition permit application. The owner is now proposing to construct a 5,350.5 ft<sup>2</sup> addition to the existing heritage farmhouse.

The Heritage Planner advised that although the proposed addition is significantly larger than the existing farmhouse, the position of the existing house, well set back from the highway on a gentle rise of the land combined with the design of the addition, hides the scale of the addition from public view. The Heritage Planner further advised that staff is generally supportive of the form, massing, and materials of the proposed new addition and the proposed restoration of the exterior of the Graham-Wideman House, but acknowledges that without any District Plan policies or an Infill By-law, there is little from a policy perspective to compel the applicant to reduce the proposed scale of the addition.

Responding to a question from Committee, the Heritage Planner advised that staff are unable to restrict potential severance of this parcel of land. However, the property may be subject to Green Belt restrictions with respect to sub-dividing the land. The Committee may choose to add severance/subdivision conditions to the recommendation, if it so desires.

Responding to a question from Committee, the architect of the project, Mr. Roy Chan advised that the applicant does not intend severing the property. Mr. Chan further advised that the property is subject to other environmental restrictions, considering its proximity to the Oak Ridge's Moraine.

Responding to a question from Committee, Mr. Chan advised that the intention is to restore the house with hardie board sidings which is commonly used in the Unionville and Markham Heritage Conservation Districts. Mr. Chan further advised that hardie board will also be used

for the new addition to the house. Peter Wokral advised that restoration of existing wood siding would be required for the heritage building.

Councillor Valerie Burke expressed concerns about the clear railings on the rear of the building that could cause a potential death trap for migratory birds, considering the close proximity of the property to the Oak Ridges Moraine.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection to the proposed addition to 111584 Highway 48 and the proposed restoration of the Graham-Wideman House subject to the requirement to restore the existing wood siding; and,

That final review of the site plan application be delegated to Heritage Section staff provided there are no significant deviations in the opinion of staff from the plans dated June 1, 2017; and,

That the applicant enter into a Site Plan Agreement with the City containing the standard conditions regarding materials, windows, colours etc.

CARRIED

**11. Correspondence: July 12, 2017 (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the following correspondence be received as information:

- a) Berczy Settler's Gazette – Summer 2017 issue.

CARRIED



**12. Site Plan Control Application,  
30B Rouge Street,  
Markham Village Heritage Conservation District,  
Proposed Infill Dwelling (16.11)**

File No: SC 17 134363

Extracts: P. Wokral, Heritage Planner

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

---

The Heritage Planner reviewed the site plan control application for a proposed infill dwelling at 30B Rouge Street in the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District. He advised that when this matter was considered at the April 2017 Heritage Markham Committee meeting, the Committee expressed concerns about the height of the proposed house in relation to the neighbouring heritage house at 32 Rouge Street, and the Committee recommended that the Architectural Review Sub-Committee meet on site to obtain a better understanding of the impact of the proposed height of the new house.

The Heritage Planner advised that the Architectural Review Sub-Committee met on site on May 16, 2017 and reviewed the heights of new infill houses in the neighborhood of 30B Rouge Street. He further advised that the Architectural Review Sub-Committee met again on June 28, 2017 to review the heights of the infill buildings across the street, and the streetscape elevations provided by the applicant, and the Sub-Committee was of the opinion that the proposed new house at 30B Rouge Street does not comply with the guidelines for the height of new infill buildings in the Markham Village Conservation District Plan because the height of the proposed new house dominates and is not compatible with the height of the adjacent heritage building at 32 Rouge Street.

The Heritage Planner further advised that ERA Architects, Toronto, the heritage consultant for the applicant, have suggested reducing the height of the proposed new building by 2 feet and increasing the setback from the street which would reduce the perceived massing of the house in relation to the adjacent heritage house.

Ms. Jasmine Frolick, Planner from ERA Architects, advised the Committee that a letter was provided to heritage staff suggesting recommendations in response to concerns raised by the Architectural Review Sub-Committee. By using concept drawings, Ms. Frolick illustrated to the Committee the visual perspective of the proposed new building by increasing the front setback and reducing the height by 2 feet.

The Committee suggested decreasing the overall building height by an additional 2 feet. The Committee suggested reducing the height of the ground floor which would add to the reduction of the overall building height.

Ms. Dianne Kasias, the owner of the property advised the Committee that if the building height was reduced by 2 feet, the garage height would have to be reduced by 2 feet, resulting in a 10 feet garage ceiling height. She advised the Committee that her husband's trucks and work related equipment would not fit in such a garage.

Committee suggested reducing the height of each floor by a foot. Ms. Kasias, the property owner did not agree with this suggestion.

Heritage Markham Committee recessed at 8:50 p.m. and reconvened at 9:00 p.m.

A motion moved by David Johnston and seconded by Graham Dewar to:  
Reduce the ground floor elevation above grade by approximately 2 feet, to achieve an overall building height to approximately 28 feet, including the setback as recommended by ERA Architects was defeated.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the overall building height of the proposed infill dwelling at 30B Rouge Street be reduced by 3 feet, to a height of approximately 29 feet, to be worked out between Heritage staff and the applicant, and shall include the suggested setback of the dwelling from the street, as recommended by ERA Architects

CARRIED

**13. Site Plan Control Application,  
Zoning By-law Amendment Application,  
Official Plan Amendment Application,  
Plan of Subdivision,  
7 Town Crier Lane, Markham Village Heritage Conservation District,  
Proposed Redevelopment of Site (16.11)**

Extracts: P. Wokral, Heritage Planner  
S. Campbell, Manager, East District  
S. Corr, Project Planner  
R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

---

The Heritage Planner provided an update on the proposed redevelopment of 7 Town Crier Lane in the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District. The owner has submitted an Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment, Subdivision, Condominium and Site Plan Control applications to demolish the existing former dairy building and to subdivide the property into 12 residential building lots, 11 of which would front a private condominium road, and to construct 11 new 2 storey single detached dwellings. The twelfth lot is to remain vacant and fronts onto Parkway Avenue. Six shared visitor parking spaces are proposed along the east side of the private roadway.

The Heritage Planner advised that this application was considered by Heritage Markham Committee in October 2016 when the following issues were identified and recommendations made by the Committee:

- That the existing Dairy Building should be retained as part of the development and not be demolished;
- That the space between the proposed new dwellings should be increased to reflect the larger spaces typically found between homes in the Heritage District or that the minimum side yard setback of the Infill By-law of 6 ft for two storey homes be provided;
- That at a minimum, the floor areas of the proposed dwellings should be reduced to reflect the maximum floor area permitted by the In-fill By-law;
- That the designs of the proposed dwellings should be revised and simplified to more closely resemble historic Markham homes in terms of scale, height, roof forms, and architectural details;
- That the applicant consider constructing detached garages located at the rear of the lots;
- That as much of the mature vegetation be preserved as possible; and
- That an entrance feature is not supported as it is not characteristic of Markham Village.

The Heritage Planner further advised that following the number of meetings held to consider this application, the applicant has made the following revisions to the plans recommended by the Public, staff, and Heritage Markham:

- The site plan has been modified by creating a cul-de-sac at the south end to increase the distance of the proposed new houses from the existing homes on Markham Street by separating them with their respective backyards;
- The height of the proposed dwellings has been reduced and the designs simplified and revised to reflect historic late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> domestic architecture of Markham Village;
- The side yard setbacks between the proposed houses has been increased to 1.55 m (5 ft) from 1.21m (4 ft) whereas the By-law would require a minimum side yard setback of 6 ft for a two storey dwelling; and
- Entrance feature is no longer being proposed.

The applicant has not revised the proposal as recommended by Heritage Markham to:

- Retain the former Dairy Building;
- Reduce the floor area of the proposed dwellings to comply with the infill By-law;
- Preserve more of the existing vegetation; and
- Illustrate detached garages in the rear of the lots.

Mr. Stefano Di Giulio and Ms. Nancy Simpson, local residents, addressed the Committee expressing their opposition of the demolition of the former dairy building and subdividing 7 Town Crier Lane to 12 residential building lots.

Councillor Karen Rea advised that the City's Planning staff need to be informed that the proposed 5 ft. rear yard setback and the massing, size and height of the proposed dwellings are not acceptable in a Heritage District. Councillor Rea suggested that the minimum frontages should be 60 ft. She believes that the applicant needs to comply with the Heritage District Plan and the In-Fill By-law. Councilor Rea further suggested that revised drawings and plans need to be brought back for consideration by Heritage Markham Committee. A mechanism needs to be

put in place to notify the neighbouring residents when this matter will be considered by the Heritage Markham Committee.

The Committee was of the opinion that the proposed residential infill development does not fit the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District context and that Planning staff need to be made aware that Heritage Markham Committee does not support this proposal. The proposal needs to be revised to comply with the Heritage District Plan and brought back for consideration by Heritage Markham at its meeting in September. The Committee was also of the opinion that an independent heritage consultant should be engaged to review and help design a conceptual plan for development of the property that could be supported by Heritage Markham.

#### Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the deputations by Mr. Stefano Di Giulio and Ms. Nancy Simpson be received; and

That Heritage Markham rejects the proposal as it does not comply with the Infill By-law and the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District Plan; and

That Heritage Markham provides the following comments from a heritage perspective on the revised application to permit the redevelopment of 7 Town Crier Lane:

#### Former Dairy Building

- support the preservation and restoration of the building on-site;
- no support for demolition;
- secure a Heritage Easement Agreement as a condition of development approval;

#### Side Yard Setbacks

- the proposed side yard setbacks are out of character with the adjacent residential neighbourhood, may pose problems for building maintenance and drainage, and do not seem appropriate for the larger scale of the proposed dwellings;
- typically dwellings in the heritage conservation district have larger spaces between dwellings which could be achieved by locating detached garages at the rear of the lots;
- at minimum, the required 6 ft side yard setbacks of the Infill By-law should be maintained;

#### Lot Sizes

- proposed lot sizes comply with the zoning by-law (with the exception of Lot 4) and are generally consistent with lots in the general area;

#### Size of Dwellings

- in relation to neighbouring dwellings, the proposed dwellings (with garage) are large (4,939 to 5,638 sq ft) and not in character with the historic building stock or newer modern infill housing in the heritage conservation district;

- massing, proportions and size of dwellings should be generally compatibility with dwellings in the heritage conservation district – average size in immediate area is approximately 2,200 sq ft;
- at minimum, dwellings should comply with sizes permitted by the Infill Zoning By-law Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 45%, which would on average be 3,933 ft<sup>2</sup>;

#### Building Design Issues

- any proposed new building should be designed so that they add to the overall heritage character of the district—form, height, shape and details such as windows, doors and colour should complement surrounding “A” class buildings as much as possible;
- windows should generally follow the proportions of heritage type buildings;
- colours- traditional brick colours, traditional paint colours;
- design of dwelling for Lot 1 should be complementary with the heritage resource located at 1 Town Crier Lane from a height, massing and design perspective, and not negatively impact the heritage resource including its attributes;
- **Architectural Style** – the revised elevations better reflect the materials, roof forms and architectural details of Markham’s late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century homes (See attached comparison of street facing elevations);
- **Building Height** – the reduced roof heights are more in scale with surrounding homes in the neighbourhood;
- **Garage Placement** – consider detached rear garages or locating the attached garage further back from the front façade (subservient to the main dwelling);

#### Trees

- retain as much mature vegetation as possible as these features are important and support the heritage character of the heritage conservation district;
- reintroduce trees and vegetation as part of the new development; and

That staff hire an independent professional heritage consultant to review and help design a development concept for the property on behalf of the Heritage Markham Committee and the City to create an alternative vision appropriate to the special context of this significant piece of land in the heart of the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District.

CARRIED

#### **14. Site Plan Control Application, 45 John Street, Thornhill Heritage Conservation District, Addition to Existing One Storey Dwelling (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 addition to the exiting one storey dwelling at 45 John Street in the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District. He

advised that the existing building is a ranch bungalow with modern interpretation of a Victorian veranda and gable details, built in 1949. The building is a Class C building in the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District.

The Senior Heritage Planner advised that a Site Plan Control Application has been received for a major addition to the existing one storey dwelling. The proposal involves retaining a portion of the existing dwelling and expanding it to the rear, while re-building the garage and introducing living space into loft areas within the new roof structure. It appears that a new 10 feet deep foundation will be constructed. The character of the bungalow will be updated with additional windows, raised wall heights and a higher roofline. There will be a walkout condition at the rear and structured landscaping adjacent to the dwelling. The overall proposed Gross Floor Area (GFA) is 5,025 square feet. The applicant met with staff during a pre-consultation meeting at which time he was advised of the Maximum Net Floor Area Ratio of 3,692 square feet (33%) for this property. The zoning search previously prepared for the property confirmed this figure. The applicant was advised that large variances are not typically supported by the City.

The applicant's table of statistics on the site plan notes a Net Floor Area Ratio of 30.75%, which must be an error because at 33% the maximum GFA is 3,692 square feet. A GFA of 5,025 as proposed by the applicant would result in a Net Floor Area Ratio larger than 33%. The applicant is proposing 1,333 square feet over the allowable size. The degree of alteration needed to achieve a 10 feet wall height on the front wall, a 10 feet high basement and the roof structure to cover the new floorplate appears to require demolition of the entire existing structure. However, the applicant has advised that the existing dwelling is to be retained within the context of the renovations. More information from the architect is needed to address this issue.

The Senior Heritage Planner further advised that an arborist's report has been submitted with the application and some trees will be removed or injured if the project is constructed as proposed. Urban Design has indicated that a formal tree inventory and preservation plan diagram, with the trees numbered to correspond to the chart within the written report, is required to assist with the City's analysis. Staff has prepared a chart to provide initial feedback to the applicant based on the policies and guidelines of the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District Plan. Staff believes that a detailed review of the proposal is premature until the applicant confirms the Net Floor Area calculations and Urban Design has reviewed and commented on tree preservation.

Mr. Ilya Batov, the owner of the property addressed the Committee in favour of the proposed addition to the existing one storey dwelling at 45 John Street in the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District. He advised that only 3 trees will need to be removed from the property to accommodate the proposed works.

Mr. Paul Helps, a local resident addressed the Committee expressing concerns with respect to the overall massing and size of the proposed addition to the existing one storey dwelling at 45 John Street in the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District.

The Committee expressed concerns with respect to the overall size and height of the proposed new dwelling as compared to the adjoining properties.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the deputation by Mr. Paul Helps be received; and,

That the Site Plan Control application for additions and renovations to the existing ranch bungalow at 45 John Street be deferred to the August Heritage Markham Committee meeting to permit time for Urban Design staff to complete their review of tree preservation matters and for the applicant to clarify the figures in the statistics chart on the site plan, particularly with respect to the Net Floor Area Ratio in relation to the height as compared to the adjoining properties; and,

That the applicant be requested to reduce the overall size of the addition to comply with the By-law maximum of 3,692 square feet, including all living space and garage; and,

That the applicant clarify if the existing building will be demolished to accommodate the new wall height, new foundation height and new roof structure.

CARRIED

**15. Site Plan Control Application,  
28 Wales Avenue,  
Markham Village Heritage Conservation District,  
Second Storey Addition (16.11)**

File No: SC 17 158971

Extracts: G. Duncan, Project Planner

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Senior Heritage Planner reviewed the site plan control application to construct a second storey addition on the existing rear portion of the dwelling and modify the south wall of the existing dwelling at 28 Wales Avenue in the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District. The Senior Heritage Planner advised that the proposed rear addition is modest in scale and designed to complement the heritage dwelling. The Net Floor Area Ratio is 41.01% and the lot coverage is 25.67%.

The applicant is proposing the introduction of a brick wall dormer with three windows on the second floor (south elevation). The alteration to the second floor wall and roof can be supported subject to brick from the rear of the house being re-used and the return eaves being simplified. A driveway, not shown on the current site plan, exists on the south side of the property, which staff suggest should be removed and replaced with sod.

The applicant is proposing a revised bay window on the south elevation wall of the existing house. The windows should be 1/1 pane division.

Mr. Shane Gregory, the architect of the project addressed the Committee and confirmed that no variances are required for the proposed works.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham supports the proposed design for a second storey addition to the heritage dwelling at 28 Wales Avenue from a heritage perspective subject to the following:

- Simplify the pane division in the windows to 1/1 rather than 4/1 in the new addition;
- Re-use existing brick from the rear wall of the house for the wall dormer alterations to the south wall and remove the returned eaves;
- Revise the windows in the new box bay window of the south side to 1/1 pane division; and
- Remove the south driveway (which is not shown on the site plan but is currently existing) and replace with sod; and,

That the applicant enter into a site plan agreement with the City, to include appropriate materials, colours, etc.

CARRIED

**16. Site Plan Control Application,  
16 George Street,  
Markham Village Heritage Conservation District,  
Second Storey Addition and New Detached Garage with Loft (16.11)**

File No: SC 17 152318

Extracts: G. Duncan, Project Planner

\_\_\_\_\_  
R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Senior Heritage Planner reviewed the site plan control application for a proposed second storey addition on the existing 1½ storey rear wing of the existing dwelling at 16 George Street in the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District. An existing solarium and a second storey dormer will be removed from the south side of the rear wing and reconstructed as full 2 storey space. The existing frame garage on the property is proposed to be demolished and replaced with a new detached 2-car garage with loft. The total Gross Floor Area, including the garage, will be 4,062.97 square feet, and the lot coverage is proposed to be 26.57%.

The Senior Heritage Planner advised that the applicants have been working on a solution to improve the living space within the existing house. This requires higher headroom in the rear section, which currently has a very low ceiling height. The applicants and their designer have worked with staff to create a design that preserves the important exterior design and details of the oldest portion of the house. Staff support the proposed design as it addresses all the heritage conservation concerns discussed during the pre-consultation process. The applicant has been requested to itemize any variances that will be required to implement the proposed design.



The proposed lot coverage of 26.57%, is well below the By-law maximum of 35%. Staff has no issues with a small variance for a proposed increase to the Maximum Net Floor Area Ratio. The variance for garage height is also supportable and is in keeping with the general trend of building garages with lofts in the city's heritage conservation districts and Markham Heritage Estates. Other variances, once clarified, can be evaluated within the context of the proposal. It appears that one tree will be impacted by the driveway on the south side property line.

The Committee discussed various options of repositioning the proposed new two-car garage.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham supports the proposed design for a second storey addition to the heritage dwelling at 16 George Street, and the proposed new detached garage with loft from a heritage perspective; and,

That Heritage Markham has no objection to the variances required to implement the development as proposed; and,

That the applicant enter into a site plan agreement with the City, to include appropriate materials, colours etc.

CARRIED

**17. Site Plan Control Application,  
5 Buttonville Crescent East,  
Buttonville Heritage Conservation District,  
Proposed Addition to an Existing Heritage Dwelling (16.11)**

File No: SC 17 160621

Extracts: P. Wokral, Heritage Planner

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

---

The Heritage Planner reviewed the site plan control application for the proposed addition to an existing heritage dwelling at 5 Buttonville Crescent East in the Buttonville Heritage Conservation District.

The applicant is proposing to construct a 5,274 ft<sup>2</sup> addition to the existing heritage dwelling. The proposed new construction takes the form of a one storey portion, and a two storey portion attached to the existing 1½ storey heritage house organized around an east facing courtyard. Most of the ground floor of the heritage house would be converted into three garage bays facing north, while the second storey and remainder of the ground floor would stay in residential use. An east facing dormer is also proposed to be added to the east facing slope of the heritage house

Staff has reviewed the application and believes the proposed addition generally complies with the policies and guidelines contained in Section 9.2 of the Buttonville Heritage Conservation District Plan regarding additions and alterations to Class A heritage buildings in the following ways:

- The architectural form, massing and height of the proposed addition reflects traditional roof forms and building proportions, and do not dominate, overwhelm or obscure the form and volume of the existing heritage building;
- The proposed addition is in scale with existing heritage buildings and neighbouring structures and is attached to the heritage dwelling through a low one storey link located on the least significant elevation of the heritage building not visible from the public realm;
- The proposed pre-finished horizontal wooden cladding of the addition on the exterior facing walls reflects local historic claddings;
- The proposed window proportions and informal arrangement of window openings reflects local vernacular architecture; and
- The proposed new dormer on the heritage portion of the house is located on the east facing slope not visible from the public realm of the street.

The architect proposes to use a metal roof on the proposed one and two storey portions of the addition. The District Plan recommends both cedar and asphalt shingles for use on heritage buildings and states that a metal roof may only be appropriate for use on accessory buildings. Staff believes the courtyard arrangement of the proposed addition and the way in which the gabled parts of the one and two storey portions of the addition are separated by a low flat roofed one storey link, which makes the addition both distinct from the existing heritage dwelling, and

somewhat reminiscent of a loose arrangement of traditional accessory buildings, making a simple galvanized metal roof an appropriate architectural gesture for the proposed addition.

The proposed conversion of most of the ground floor of the existing heritage dwelling into a 3-bay garage is a significant departure from the policies and guidelines of the District Plan which recommends that garages be preferably detached buildings, or if attached, should be significantly setback from the rest of the house and ideally hidden from the public realm.

The architect defends the proposed location of the garage with the following arguments:

- The location of the existing house makes it difficult to position a garage that complies with the guidelines of the district plan, minimizes paving, while providing connectivity to the rest of the house;
- The proposed garage location is on a secondary elevation only visible from the public realm when looking south along Buttonville Crescent East, and on an elevation that has already been altered from its original appearance and recently rebuilt from new material, so no significant architectural elements are being altered;
- Although the proposed garage takes up most of the existing ground floor of the house, a portion of the ground floor remains in residential use including the original front entrance of the heritage house as well as the entire second storey; and
- The proposed garage doors are to be of high quality design and materials, and are complementary to the existing heritage dwelling.

The Heritage Planner advised that staff generally agrees that the benefits of the proposed addition outweigh the negative impacts to the heritage dwelling, and supports the proposed additions and renovations to the existing heritage dwelling at 5 Buttonville Crescent East.

Mr. Christopher McCormack, architect of the project who was present responded to the various questions from the Committee with respect to the property and confirmed that it is currently being used as a residential house.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That this matter be referred to the Architectural Review Sub-Committee for a site visit.

CARRIED

**18. Information,  
6031 Highway 7,  
Markham Village Heritage Conservation District,  
Veteran's Square and Cenotaph Project (16.11)**

Extracts: S. Neal, Park Development Coordinator  
R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

---

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection to the proposed works for Veteran's Square from a heritage perspective; and,

That Parks staff work with Heritage Section staff to ensure that any materials to be used in the Veteran's Square area are complementary to the heritage conservation district.

CARRIED

**19. New Business,  
Property Signs – Site Plan Control Applications (16.11)**

Extract: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

---

Responding to a question from Councillor Karen Rea with respect to erecting signs when a site plan control application is being considered by the Heritage Markham Committee, the Senior Heritage Planner advised that the site plan application process is between the applicant and the City, and is not a public process, unlike a zoning amendment or a minor variance consideration, where the Planning Act requires appropriate signage on the property. A proposal to erect signage in the case of site plan control applications may need to be reviewed by the City's Legal Department.

Councilor Valerie Burke advised that she has been advising her constituents to regularly check the Heritage Markham Committee agendas to keep themselves informed of any potential development activity in the heritage districts.

David Nesbitt, Chair advised that Heritage Markham agendas are distributed to the various Ratepayers' Associations in the City, and other interested parties in the Heritage Conservation Districts.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That staff report back on the process of notifying neighbours when a site plan control application has been received by the City.

CARRIED

The Heritage Markham Committee meeting adjourned at 11:57 PM.