

Heritage Markham Committee Meeting City of Markham

**August 9, 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
Jennifer Peters-Morales
Councillor Karen Rea

Regrets

Zuzana Zila

Staff

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

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

David Johnston disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 5, 17 Mill Street, Markham Village, by nature of being the architect of the project, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

David Johnston disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 7. 124 Main Street Unionville, 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 # 7. 124 Main Street Unionville, by nature of being the contractor of the project, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

David Johnston disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 15, 30 Colborne Street, Thornhill, 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.

Councillor Valerie Burke disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 15, 30 Colborne Street, by nature of being the immediate neighbour of the property, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

David Nesbitt, Chair disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 21, 116 Main Street, Unionville, by nature of being the neighbour 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 Committee recessed at 10:15 PM and reconvened at 10:25 PM.

1. Approval of Agenda (16.11)

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the August 9, 2017 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved.

CARRIED

2. Minutes of the July 12, 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 July 12, 2017. be received and adopted, as amended as follows:

1. Item #12, Site Plan Control Application, 30B Rouge Street – replace the recommendation with the following:
“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.”; and,
2. Item # 5, Heritage Permit Application, 10 Colborne Street, Thornhill Heritage Conservation District:
Paragraph 6 – Councillor Valerie Burke advisedShe suggested that permeable materials could be used in the non-heavy traffic areas of the parking lot.; and,
3. That the spelling error be corrected in Councillor Rea’s name.

CARRIED

**3. Administration,
Election Vice-Chair (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Ian Darling be confirmed as Vice Chair of Heritage Markham as of August 9, 2017, and shall hold office until a successor is elected.

CARRIED

**4. Heritage Permit Application,
10 Colborne Street, Thornhill Heritage Conservation District,
Library Parking Lot Re-Surfacing (16.11)**

File No: HE 17 168611

Extracts: M. Ryan, Asset Management

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

This application was considered by the Heritage Markham Committee at its meeting in July 2017, when the Committee requested additional information. Heritage staff previously noted that the use of patterned concrete would be similar to stamped coloured asphalt which is a product identified in the District Plan, and when comparing the two samples, the Belgium Block appears to be more complementary to the village character of Thornhill.

Comments from Sustainability and Asset Management indicate that given the high water table, staff recommend that a stamped concrete parking lot surface be installed as opposed to asphalt, as using a non-ferrous reinforcement will prevent spalling of the concrete surface and extend the life of the concrete. With asphalt, given the high-water table staff are concerned that potholes may become an issue. The City retained geotechnical engineer did not agree with the use of a permeable material as the soil is near saturated and there is little “room” for absorption of water. Essentially, if the soil is saturated it will act as an impermeable surface. In view of this, Operations is prepared to support the paving of the entire parking lot at this time.

Responding to Councillor Burke’s concerns of patterned concrete becoming slippery in the winter, Asset Management staff believe that as with any surfaces, stamped concrete or plain concrete will become slippery in winter unless it is salted. The stamped concrete recommended by staff is used at the Mount Joy GO Station. The surface of concrete only becomes slippery if a sealer is used which makes the surface shiny. It is proposed to use a penetrating sealer which will not make the concrete surface slippery. Both options (stamped and plain concrete) could work, however for aesthetics, staff suggest that stamped concrete be used.

Comments from the City's Accessibility Coordinator state: "Accessibility standards allow exceptions if compliance would cause substantial harm to cultural, historic, religious, or significant natural features or characteristics, however generally, if the design meets the building code, it will meet required accessibility, not exceed it, but meet it. It would be difficult to demonstrate the proposed changes would "cause substantial harm" to the area. The key focus is whether the lot is firm and stable and slip resistant."

After prolonged discussions, the Committee was unable to make a decision with respect to the proposed materials to be used for resurfacing the parking lot of the Thornhill Village Library.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That consideration of this matter be referred to Council.

CARRIED

- 5. Heritage Permit Applications,
Delegated Approvals: Heritage Permits,
135 Bay Thorn Dr, Thornhill,
7707 Yonge St, Thornhill,
9231 Woodbine Ave, Buttonville,
210 Main St., Unionville
22 George St, Markham Village,
6031 Highway 7, Markham Village,
47 Washington St, Markham Village
17 Mill St, Markham Village (16.11)**

File Nos: HE 17 170683
HE 17 168259
HE 17 169035
HE 17 169800
HE 17 167672
HE 17 169801
HE 17 170310
HE 17 169820

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

David Johnston disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 5, 17 Mill Street, Markham Village, by nature of being the architect of the project, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham 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
9231 Woodbine Avenue, Buttonville,
19 Victoria Avenue, Unionville,
182 Main St, Unionville,
32 Washington St, Markham Village,
59 Main St. N., Markham Village,
9 David St, Markham Village,
107 Main St. N., Markham Village,
6031 Highway 7, Markham Village (16.11)**

File Nos: 17 1628969 AL
17 165727 01 HP
17 167189 SP
17 160193 HP
17 169257 SP
17 169942 HP
17 170044 AL
17 170589 PP

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

- 7. Committee of Adjustment Variance Application,
124 Main Street, Unionville Heritage Conservation District,
Enclosed Exterior Basement Stairway (16.11)**

File No: A/98/17

Extracts: R. Punit, Committee of Adjustment,
G. Duncan, Project Planner,

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

David Johnston disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 7. 124 Main Street, 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 # 7. 124 Main Street, by nature of being the contractor of the project, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection to Minor Variance application A/98/17 from a heritage perspective, to allow the construction of an enclosed exterior basement stairway at 124 Main Street, Unionville.

CARRIED

**8. Information,
Data on Millennials and Heritage (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham Committee receive as information.

CARRIED

**9. Information,
Site Plan Control Applications,
Notification/Signs (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham Committee receive as information.

CARRIED

**10. Site Plan Control Application,
20 Deanbank Dr, Thornhill Heritage Conservation District,
Proposed One Storey Rear Addition and
Front Porch (16.11)**

File No: SC 17 171012

Extracts: P. Wokral, Heritage Planner

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Staff confirmed that the applicant would be requested to comply with the City's Bird Friendly Guidelines.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection to the proposed one storey addition and front porch at 20 Deanbank Drive subject to the proposed bubble skylights being substituted with flat, low profile skylights, and recommends that final review of the site plan application be delegated to Heritage Section Staff; and,

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

CARRIED

**11. Site Plan Control Application,
2 Alexander Hunter Place, Markham Heritage Estates,
Proposed Addition and Detached Accessory Building (16.11)**

File No: SC 17 167062

Extracts: P. Wokral, Heritage Planner

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Heritage Planner reviewed a site plan control application for a proposed two storey addition to the heritage dwelling and a 1½ storey detached garage at 2 Alexander Hunter Place in the Markham Heritage Estates.

The Heritage Planner advised that staff has reviewed the proposed addition and the accessory building and has no objection to the proposed scale, massing or materials, but has some minor recommendations regarding window pane divisions, and the detailing of the veranda elements.

Mr. Russ Gregory, agent for the applicant, addressed the Committee in response to questions with respect to the garage and whether the infill by-law applies to this proposal. The Ward Councillor advised that she should be kept informed if any variances were required, going forward.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection to the scale, massing, form and materials of the proposed addition and detached accessory building at 2 Alexander Hunter Place, date stamped July 2017, and recommends that final review of the site plan application and any development application necessary to approve the proposal as well as any minor changes to windows and architectural detailing be delegated to Heritage Section Staff; and,

That the Ward Councillor be kept informed of any variances, if required; and,

That the applicant enter into a Site Plan Agreement with the City containing the standard conditions regarding materials, windows, colours etc. as well as entering into a Heritage Conservation Easement Agreement.

CARRIED

**12. Committee of Adjustment Variance Application,
6890 14th Avenue,
Variance in Support of proposed Addition (16.11)**

File No: A/93/17

Extracts: 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 proposed variances for 6890 14th Avenue.

CARRIED

13. Correspondence: August 2017 (16.11)

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the following correspondence be received as information:

- a) Toronto Historical Association Newsletter: Summer 2017
- b) Markham Zoning By-law Project – Upcoming meetings
- c) Ontario Historical Society Bulletin, July 2017 (full copy available from Staff)

CARRIED

**14. Site Plan Control Application,
45 John Street, Thornhill Heritage Conservation District,
Follow-up Review: Addition to an 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 revised site plan control application for an addition to the existing one storey frame dwelling at 45 John Street in the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District.

At its July 12, 2017 meeting, Heritage Markham recommended that the application be brought back to the August 9, 2017 meeting to allow time for Urban Design staff to complete their review of tree preservation matters, for the applicant to re-examine the building calculations relative to the By-law requirements, and for the applicant to clarify if the project will involve demolition and re-construction of the dwelling, given the degree of alterations shown on the drawings.

Since the time of Heritage Markham's July meeting, the applicant and his architect met with staff to discuss a revised submission. At that meeting, the applicant stated that the GFA would be reduced to meet the By-law by removing the habitable space within the roof (loft area). Staff advised the applicant to re-design the front windows to reflect a more traditional "old Thornhill" style and scale and to simplify or reduce the number of dormer windows. Heritage staff are awaiting comments from Urban Design with respect to tree preservation matters. 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 has used the checklist for new construction (as opposed to the policies and guidelines for Additions/Alterations to Class C Buildings), considering that the entire existing building appears to have been significantly reworked to accommodate higher wall heights, larger window and door openings, a deeper basement, and a larger roof structure.

Mr. Ilya Batov, the owner of the property addressed the Committee and advised that he is working to revise the plans to reduce the GFA to comply with the By-law requirement of maximum 3,692 square feet. Responding to questions from the Committee, Mr. Bartov advised that he has received support from neighbouring property owners.

Ms. Diane Berwick, a local resident addressed the Committee and advised that although she supports the proposal, she does not support any demolition of the existing building. Ms. Berwick also suggested that Heritage Markham consider a site visit.

On further consideration of the proposal, the Committee advised the applicant that a site visit is in order, and advised the applicant that all relevant drawings be made available at the time of the site visit.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the emailed correspondence from Mr. Rob Armstrong dated August 9, 2017, be received; and,

That the deputation by Ms. Diane Berwick be received; and,

That this matter be referred to the Architectural Review Sub-Committee for a site visit, further review and report back to Heritage Markham Committee in September 2017.

CARRIED

**15. Site Plan Control Application,
30 Colborne St, Thornhill Heritage Conservation District,
Proposed Addition to a Heritage Dwelling and
New Detached Garage (16.11)**

File No: 17 168354

Extracts: G. Duncan, Project Planner,
R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

David Johnston disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 15, 30 Colborne Street, Thornhill 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.

Councillor Valerie Burke disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 15, 30 Colborne Street, Thornhill Heritage Conservation District, by nature of being the immediate neighbour of the property, 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 site plan control application for a 1½ storey frame dwelling with a rear addition from 1958 that had a subsequent east side addition later. He advised that Heritage Markham Committee has previously reviewed a number of submissions for a rear addition to the existing heritage dwelling, and that the current submission, as supported by Markham Council, involves removing the existing rear addition mainly dating from the 1950s, and replacing it with a two storey rear addition in a similar architectural style, but with a different massing. He further advised that the most recent plans also involve the construction of a new basement under the heritage dwelling to raise the building above the current grade, and a two car, detached garage is proposed on the west side of the dwelling, replacing an existing garage.

In the current design, the heritage house remains as a 1½ storey building with the new addition having clapboard sidings, multi-paned windows, and medium-pitched gable roof shapes that echo the details of both the original heritage dwelling and the 1950s addition. The building height transitions up from that of the heritage dwelling using varied roof forms until the full two-storey height of the main volume of the rear addition is realized. The applicant's architect has advised that no variances will be required to implement this new revised design for the dwelling. The gross floor area proposed for the dwelling is 2,998 square feet, which is below the By-law cap of 3,000 square feet. The existing garage is to be demolished, and the gross floor area proposed for the replacement garage is 436 square feet, which again is below the By-law cap of 450 square feet.

The Senior Heritage Planner further advised that the issue of the appropriateness of the proposed addition, and whether the 1958 addition was worthy of retention, was addressed by the Development Services Committee (DSC) of Council at its meeting on May 8, 2017. The resolution from the DSC, and supported by Council was:

*“That the current design for the proposed addition to the c.1852 portion of the dwelling is supported, conditional on compliance with the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District Plan; and further
That staff be authorized and directed to do all things necessary to give effect to this resolution.”*

The matter of removing the heritage dwelling from its existing fieldstone foundation and placing it on a new basement (including an increase to the finished first floor) was not previously discussed.

David Johnston, the architect for the project addressed the Committee. He advised that the existing floor of the heritage house is only 4 inches higher than ground immediately outside, so it is proposed to raise the height of the existing floor to be 3 steps higher than the existing floor to avoid grading issues. He further advised that it is proposed to delete the garage to address a zoning by-law compliance issue, and that no trees currently on the property will be removed. Mr. Johnston further advised that a structural engineering report from LEA Consulting has been submitted to Heritage staff.

Ms. Diane Berwick, a local resident, Ms. Pam Birrell, representing the Society for the Preservation of Heritage Thornhill (SPOHT), Mr. Barry Nelson, Ms. Joan Honsberger and Mr. Joseph Ricciuti, all local residents addressed the Committee in opposition of the proposal, specifically concerned about raising the existing dwelling and altering the appearance of the 1850s house from the street. The general consensus was that the existing foundation should be repaired.

The Committee discussed at length Section 9.2.4.4 of the Thornhill Markham Heritage Conservation District Plan, specifically relating to Additions and Alterations to the foundation of Heritage Buildings. The Committee believed that City engineering staff should review the structural engineering report from LEA Consulting submitted by the applicant.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the email correspondence from Mr. Rob Armstrong dated August 9, 2017, in opposition to the Site Control Application for the new revised proposed addition to a heritage dwelling and new detached garage at 30 Colborne Street, Thornhill, be received; and,

That the following deputations, in opposition to the Site Plan Control Application for the new revised proposed addition to a heritage dwelling and new detached garage at 30 Colborne Street, Thornhill, be received:

1. Ms. Diane Berwick, Colborne Street;
2. Ms. Pam Birrell, Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill (SPOHT);
3. Mr. Barry Nelson, Colborne Street;
4. Ms. Joan Honsberger, Elgin Street;
5. Mr. Joseph Ricciuti, Eliza Street; and,

That this matter be referred to City engineering and heritage staff for further review and a decision that supports retaining the existing foundation and floor level as is, or if not possible, raising any exterior wood no more than 8 inches above grade as determined by city planning and engineering staff for the heritage component of the development at 30 Colborne Street to maintain the heritage character of the house, and that the existing foundation be retained and repaired, if possible; and further,

That further review and refinement of architectural details be delegated to Heritage Section staff.

CARRIED

**16. Site Plan Control Application,
15 George Street, Markham Village Heritage Conservation District,
Proposed Semi-Detached Dwellings**

File No: SC 17 150453

Extracts: G. Duncan, Project Planner,

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Senior Heritage Planner reviewed the Site Plan Control application which is a follow-up to a Minor Variance Application that was approved by the Committee of Adjustment on May 24, 2017. The applicant proposes to construct an additional dwelling unit to the north of the existing single detached dwelling, and join the two with an attached garage to create a semi-detached building form. A detached rear yard garage is proposed to be constructed to serve the southerly unit. The existing rear addition to the southerly unit will be removed and replaced by a larger, two storey rear addition.

The Senior Heritage Planner advised that the existing R3 zoning under By-law 1229, as amended, allows singles and semi-detached dwellings. He further advised that this proposal in concept is similar to the new semi-detached dwellings at 36/38 George Street. The provisions of Infill By-law 99-90 do not apply to the proposed development because the Infill By-law only applies to single detached dwellings. At its meeting on May 10, 2017, Heritage Markham Committee had concerns with the north side yard and rear yard setbacks for the dwellings, but had no concerns about the reduced front yard setback and reduced minimum lot area which is an existing condition.

The Senior Heritage Planner further advised that Committee of Adjustment supported the requested variances, and their decision became final and binding after no objections were filed during the 20 day appeal period. Staff did not have any concerns with the proposal at the time of the Minor Variance application, being of the opinion that the development was appropriate for its context and preserved the principal views of the heritage building at 15 George Street. Staff continues to support the proposal as currently submitted as a Site Plan Control application and recommends that the development be supported by Heritage Markham, subject to the applicant entering into a Site Plan Agreement containing the usual clauses regarding materials, colours, etc.

Mr. Russ Gregory, representing the applicant addressed the Committee in support of the proposal and responded to questions from Committee members with respect to the garage and external colours of the dwellings.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham supports the proposed development of semi-detached dwellings at 15-17 George Street subject to the applicant entering into a Site Plan Agreement with the City containing the usual clauses regarding colours, materials, etc.

CARRIED

**17. Demolition Permit Application
15 Pavilion St, Unionville Heritage Conservation District,
1948 House (16.11)**

File No: 17 170321 DP

Extracts: C. Dimou, Building Department,
R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Senior Heritage Planner reviewed the demolition permit application for the existing dwelling at 15 Pavilion Street, Unionville Heritage Conservation District, in preparation for a potential new dwelling to be constructed on the property. He advised that at this time, no development applications have been made, or pre-consultation requests submitted.

The Senior Heritage Planner advised that in the Unionville Heritage Conservation District Plan, Group B buildings are defined as “Buildings that are important in terms of contextual value”. Group B buildings are further described in the District Plan: “They may not be of significant historical or architectural value, however they contribute substantially to the visual character of the village landscape. They support and help define the character of the District.” The Senior Heritage Planner further advised that some Group B buildings are heritage buildings that have had alterations done to them to the degree that they did not warrant a Group A classification at the time when the District Plan Building Inventory was

prepared. They also include some older buildings that in 1997 were not old enough at the time to be considered to be of cultural heritage value.

The Senior Heritage Planner advised that the house at 15 Pavilion Street represents a later phase of Unionville's development in the mid-20th century, when undeveloped residential lots remaining from 19th century plans of subdivision were infilled with modern-era housing. These more recent buildings were designed and constructed at a modest scale that was a good fit with the historic pattern of development that began in the mid to late 19th century. When the house at 15 Pavilion Street was built, Unionville was still a rural village within the larger context of Markham Township. Other than the date of construction (MPAC data) of 1948, there is no further historical information on this property. Staff believes that the demolition permit should be refused on the basis of the Group B classification and given that there is no current development proposal for the property. A staff report, with recommendations from the Heritage Markham Committee, will need to be submitted for the consideration by the Development Services Committee (DSC) in the fall, within the 90-day period prescribed by the *Ontario Heritage Act*, for demolition permits for designated properties.

Mr. Hendrik Spaans, the property owner addressed the Committee in support of the demolition request.

The Committee advised Mr. Spaans that Heritage Markham Committee does not support requests for demolition of heritage dwellings. The Chair advised Mr. Spaans that he could appeal Heritage Markham Committee's decision to the DSC at its next meeting scheduled to be held in September.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Council refuse the demolition permit application for the existing dwelling at 15 Pavilion St, Unionville Heritage Conservation District on the basis of its Group B classification in the Unionville Heritage Conservation District Plan (contextual value); and,

That the applicant be advised that interior renovations and a compatible addition are supported by the City as a means of property improvement, subject to the policies and guidelines of the Unionville Heritage Conservation District Plan and the applicable planning applications.

CARRIED

**18. Minor Variance and Site Plan Control Application,
31 Peter Street, Markham Village Heritage Conservation District,
Proposed Addition and Requested Variances (16.11)**

File Nos: 17 150501
A/114/17
Extracts: P. Wokral, Heritage Planner
R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Heritage Planner reviewed the Minor Variance and Site Plan Control Application to remove the one storey rear tail of the existing heritage dwelling at 31 Peter Street in the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District and replace it with a two storey addition.

The Heritage Planner advised that applicant is seeking variances to permit:

- a maximum Net Floor Area Ratio of 52.22 %, whereas the By-law permits a maximum Net Floor Area Ratio of 45%;
- a maximum Building Depth of 22.07 meters, whereas the By-law permits a maximum Building Depth of 16.8 meters; and
- a minimum Front Yard Setback of 7.74 feet, whereas the By-law requires a minimum Front Yard Setback of 25 feet.

The Heritage Planner further advised that Heritage Markham had previously reviewed and made recommendations regarding the proposed addition in April, June and July of 2017. The applicant has incorporated several recommendations of the Committee and Heritage Staff, and the Committee has indicated that they have no objection to the proposed building depth, and existing front yard setback. However, the Committee recommended that the proposed addition should be reduced in floor area in order to comply with the maximum Net Floor Area Ratio of 45% permitted by the Infill By-law, and that they could not support a Net Floor Area Ratio greater than 50%. The applicant believes that a Net Floor Area Ratio below 50% cannot be achieved without negatively impacting the planned function of the house, and prefers to seek approval from the Committee of Adjustment rather than complying with the Infill By-law or the recommendation of Heritage Markham.

The Heritage Planner advised that Heritage Section Staff is satisfied with the design of the addition and the revisions that have been made to the design of the proposed addition which include:

- a reduction in the proposed height of the addition;
- a better architectural transition from the existing house to the addition;
- an increase in the north side yard setback which will preserve significant trees;
- preservation of a cedar hedge that provides privacy to the neighbour to the north;
- a building depth that is similar to the neighbouring house to the north; and
- a garage that is well set back from the street that is subordinate to the existing heritage house.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection to the requested variances at 31 Peter Street to permit:

- a maximum Building Depth of 22.07 meters, whereas the By-law permits a maximum Building Depth of 16.8 meters;
- a minimum Front Yard Setback of 7.74 feet, whereas the By-law requires a minimum Front Yard Setback of 25 feet; and,

That Heritage Markham does not support the requested variance to permit a maximum Net Floor Area Ratio of 52.22%, whereas the By-law permits a maximum Net Floor Area Ratio of 45%, and recommends that the applicant reduce the floor area of the proposed addition so that the maximum Net Floor Area Ratio does not exceed 50%.

CARRIED

**19. 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

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham supports the proposed additions and alterations to the heritage dwelling located at 5 Buttonville Crescent East, and delegates final review of any development application required to permit its construction to the City (Heritage Section Staff) provided there are no significant deviations from the design received by the City on July 5, 2017 and the design of the proposed addition complies with the City's Bird Friendly Guidelines; and,

That the application will return to Heritage Markham if any significant issues are raised during the application circulation; and,

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

CARRIED

**20. Building or Sign Permit Application,
216 Main Street,
Unionville Heritage Conservation District,
Public Information Signage – Varley Art Gallery (16.11)**

Extracts: G. Duncan, Heritage Planner
N. O’Laoghaire, Manager, Varley Art Gallery
R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Manager of Heritage Planning reviewed information regarding a proposed Public Information Sign at the Varley Art Gallery, 216 Main Street, Unionville Heritage Conservation District.

The Manager of Heritage Planning advised that the Gallery is making much needed repairs to its courtyard, not refreshed since opening in 1997. The repairs include removal of the brick/glass kiosk currently at the northwest corner of Carlton and Main which is faced with plywood and is in a state of disrepair. The Varley Art Gallery is proposing to install a new wooden ground sign in the courtyard, the overall dimensions of which will be 78”H x 72”W x 13”D. The sign will be white and the Varley logo will be affixed to it. In 2017, the logo will be the 20th anniversary logo. It is intended to rebrand the gallery and have a new logo introduced in 2018. The sign will be located near the top of the steps in the courtyard’s southeast corner to attract people to mount the steps and approach the gallery. The Gallery submitted their proposal as a Heritage Permit application, but has since been informed that a Sign Permit through the Building Department is required.

The Manager of Heritage Planning further advised that this is considered a “Public Information Sign”, defined as signs erected by or under the jurisdiction of a government agency and signs permitted by the City to promote City objectives or messages associated with stated City Corporate Goals. As for approval of public information signs, the Sign By-law indicates that, “the approval of Heritage Markham is required when a sign is located within a Special Sign District, as described in section 10 of this by-law”. The sign is wooden, is of a contemporary and simple design, and the proposed sign area may be larger than permitted by the Sign By-law.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That consideration of this matter be deferred to a future Heritage Markham meeting for additional information.

CARRIED

**21. Site Plan Control Application,
116 Main Street Unionville,
Unionville Heritage Conservation District,
Proposed Two-Storey Addition and
Alteration to Existing Heritage Dwelling (16.11)**

File No: SC 17 162457

Extracts: P. Wokral, Heritage Planner
R. Kendall, Manager, Development - Central
R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

David Nesbitt, Chair disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 21, 116 Main Street, Unionville Heritage Conservation District, by nature of being the neighbour of the property, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

Councillor Don Hamilton assumed the Chair when this matter was considered.

The Heritage Planner reviewed the site plan control application for a proposed 161.9 m² (1,742.9 ft²), two-storey addition and alteration to the south and north exterior wall of the existing heritage dwelling at 116 Main Street in the Unionville Heritage Conservation District.

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 window pane division, such as one over one, or six over one, single or double hung windows, as seen on other Unionville Edwardian period homes. Staff does not support the proposed new and larger windows to be installed in the south and north exterior wall of the heritage house as per the policies and guidelines of the Unionville Heritage Conservation District Plan, which recommend the retention of original windows, and do not support the introduction of new windows and doors on elevations other than at the rear of a historic building where they cannot be seen by the public. There is an existing door on the south elevation which is not currently in use (as the former landing/stair has been removed). The conversion of this doorway into a window of the same typical dimensions as on the heritage building could be supported.

The Heritage Planner advised that an earlier set of proposed plans indicated that the roof of the heritage house was to be raised to accommodate higher ceiling heights, but it is unclear if the drawings still reflect this proposal. Heritage Staff would not support any proposal to raise the existing roof of the heritage building or alter the existing exterior dimensions. The drawings also illustrate a more exposed foundation wall (south elevation) between the basement window sill and the existing grade, which will need clarification.

Mr. Harry Eaglesham, a local resident addressed the Committee expressing concerns with respect to grading, property boundary measurements, stormwater runoff and fence height. He also noted it is important to have the TRCA feedback prior to any decision.

The Committee discussed at length the numerous issues related to this dwelling and the time and resources utilized by the City in trying to resolve these issues. As well, considering that this property is situated on a floodplain, the Committee would like a review and comments from the Toronto Region Conservation Authority.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That no further review of this matter be considered without the applicant submitting written comments from the Toronto Region Conservation Authority with respect to any impact the proposed development would have on the lands; and,

That the applicant be advised to submit an up to date survey and elevation drawings for the proposed development.

CARRIED

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

**22. Demolition Permit Application,
11091 Warden Ave,
Proposed Demolition of Heritage Barn (16.11)**

File No: DP 17 171281

Extracts: P. Wokral, Heritage Planner
S. Shah, Faculty Asset Coordinator

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Heritage Planner reviewed an application to demolish the heritage barn located on the property at 11091 Warden Avenue which is listed on the Markham Register of Buildings of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest.

The Heritage Planner advised that the City purchased the property for an unspecified future use, but has no use for the barn buildings. The City's Asset Management Department has indicated that they want to demolish the barn because they believe it is structurally unsafe and part of the floor has already collapsed.

The Senior Heritage Planner further advised that the City has 60 days to respond to a request for a demolition of a heritage property listed on the Register. Preliminary research of the barn building completed by Heritage Section staff dates the gambrel roof section of the barn to circa 1900, while the rear extension appears to be of earlier construction, including some recycled materials on top of a later hollow clay foundation.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the demolition permit be denied by Council and both the existing heritage barn and the farmhouse be designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

CARRIED

**23. Awards,
Heritage Markham Awards of Excellence 2017 (16.11)**

Extracts: G. Duncan, Heritage Planner
R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Manager of Heritage Planning advised that since 2000, Heritage Markham has had an awards recognition program when the first 25 Awards of Excellence were awarded as part of the 25th anniversary celebrations for Heritage Markham. Heritage Markham Committee has traditionally held the Awards of Excellence ceremony on an annual or bi-annual basis. The last Awards of Excellence was held in January 2014 (approximately 3 ½ years ago). In 2011, 11 projects were honoured at a ceremony at the Markham Museum and in 2014, 10 projects/individuals were acknowledged as part of a Community Recognition Council event.

The Manager of Heritage Planning suggested that the following be considered by Heritage Markham:

- Confirmation that the 2017 Awards of Excellence be held later this fall (possibly a date in November);
- An Awards of Excellence sub-committee be formed immediately to work with staff on this event (help select the venue, date and type of refreshments to be offered); and
- Members of Heritage Markham, staff and the Sub-Committee members should submit nominations for potential award candidates in the identified categories for works completed between 2014 and 2017 (these nominations would be reviewed by the Sub-Committee and the final recipients be approved by the Heritage Markham Committee).

A Committee member suggested that Heritage Markham consider increasing the number of categories for the awards as he believed that some deserving candidates have missed out on being nominated/awarded for their excellent works from the heritage perspective.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham Committee confirms that the 2017 Heritage Markham Awards of Excellence ceremony be held in the fall of 2017 or early spring of 2018, and that the Awards of Excellence Sub-Committee work with Heritage Section staff to determine an appropriate date, venue and other organizational aspects; and,

That the following members of Heritage Markham be appointed to the Heritage Markham Awards of Excellence Sub- Committee for 2017:

- David Nesbitt, Chair
- Evellin Ellison
- Councillor Karen Rea
- David Johnston
- Graham Dewar
- Ken Davis; and,

That Heritage Markham members submit nominations of potential candidates for the 2017 Awards of Excellence program (project completed from Jan 2014 to the present) for consideration by the Heritage Markham Awards of Excellence Sub- Committee.

CARRIED

The Heritage Markham Committee meeting adjourned at 11:58 PM.