

Heritage Markham Committee Meeting City of Markham

May 10, 2017

Canada Room, Markham Civic Centre

Members

David Nesbitt, Chair
Councillor Don Hamilton
Councillor Karen Rea
Ian Darling
Ken Davis
Graham Dewar
Evelin Ellison
Anthony Farr
David Johnston

Regrets

Peter Wokral, Heritage Planner
Councillor Valerie Burke
Zuzana Zila
Templar Tsang-Trinaistich, Vice-
Chair

Staff

Regan Hutcheson, Manager, Heritage Planning
George Duncan, Senior Heritage Planner
Laura Gold, Committee Secretary

David Nesbitt, Chair, Chair, convened the meeting at 7:21 PM by asking for any disclosures of interest with respect to items on the agenda.

Graham Dewar disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 13, 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.

Councillor Karen Rea disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 17, by nature of being a Director on the Board of Directors, 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

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the May 10, 2017 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved.

CARRIED

2. **Minutes of the April 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 April 12, 2017 be received and adopted.

CARRIED

3. **Heritage Permit Applications,
15 Colborne St, Thornhill,
37 Colborne St, Thornhill,
210 Main Street Unionville,
329 Main Street North, Markham Village
Delegated Approvals: Heritage Permits (16.11)**
File No: HE 17 159518
HE 17 160531
HE 17 159836
HE 17 159348
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 delegated approval process.

CARRIED

4. **Building or Sign Permit Application,
21 Colborne St, Thornhill,
12 Station Lane, Unionville,
155 Main Street, Unionville,
210 Main Street, Unionville,
8 Main Street North, Markham Village,
6840 14th Avenue, Box Grove,
Delegated Approvals: Building & Sign Permits (16.11)**
File No: 17 160494 HP
17 155186 HP
17 158998 HP
17 159673 AL
17 160157 SP

17 158042 HP
Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

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

CARRIED

**5. Site Plan Control Application,
10 Albert Street,
Proposed Semi-Detached Dwelling (16.11)**

File No: SC 17 154505
Extracts: P. Wokral, Project Planner
R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection to the design of the proposed semi-detached heritage dwelling at 10 Albert Street dated April 7, 2017 from a heritage perspective; and,

That final review of the application and any additional applications 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, colour, windows etc.

CARRIED

**6. Site Plan Control Application,
30B Rouge Street,
Proposed Infill Dwelling (16.11)**

File No: SC 17 134363
Extracts: P. Wokral, Project Planner
R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham receive notice of the proposed Architectural Review Sub-Committee meeting for the week of May 15th, 2017.

CARRIED

- 7. Heritage Permit Application,
149 John Street, Thornhill,
Update on Driveway Entrance Gate (16.11)**
Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham receive as information.

CARRIED

- 8. Demolition Permit Application,
27 Church Street, Markham
Update on Proposed Demolition of a
Single Detached Dwelling (16.11)**
Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham Committee receive as information.

CARRIED

- 9. Correspondence: May 2017 (16.11)**
Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the following correspondence be received as information:

- a) Markham Historical Society “Remember Markham” newsletter, Spring 2017 (Staff has full copy).
- b) National Trust for Canada: Locale Magazine, Winter 2017 (Staff has full copy).
- c) Forests Ontario: Heritage Tree Program and Ontario’s Green Leaf Challenge.
- d) Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill: May 2017 Newsletter (see article about Marion Matthias).

CARRIED

- 10. Site Plan Control Application,
60 Aksel Rinck Drive,
Philip Eckardt Log House (16.11)**
File No: SC 17 114747
Extract: G. Duncan, Project Planner
R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Committee reviewed the notes and recommendations from the Architectural Review Sub-Committee held on April 26, 2017 and minor changes to the restoration plans. Members were satisfied with the staff recommendation.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham supports the development proposal for the Philip Eckardt Log House at 60 Aksel Rinck Drive, including its minor on-site relocation, restoration and addition, from a heritage perspective, subject to the following:

- That as much of the existing stone foundation as possible be retained to serve as a protected landscape feature and archaeological marker of the original site of this important heritage building;
- That the restoration plan be based on physical evidence, the oldest known archival photograph of the building, and historic precedents;
- That due to the exceptional cultural heritage value of the log house, as much of the early remaining material (windows, doors, trimwork, flooring, and structural elements) as possible is to remain within the context of the restoration to ensure a high level of historic integrity;
- Due to the significance of the building, a wood shingle roof is recommended for the historic portion of the proposed house, and the restoration of the original dormer and brick chimney;
- Existing exterior cladding is to be removed to expose the logs in order to assess their condition and assess the feasibility of leaving them exposed. If the logs are not in a condition to leave them exposed, they should be re-clad in a sympathetic wood material;
- As far as interior features are concerned (pine floors, doors, trim, etc.), details of what will be retained in the context of the renovations to the living space should be provided.

It is understood that some changes will be necessary to convert the interior to functional space for modern living, however given the significance of the Philip Eckardt Log House, as much of the original material should be retained as possible.; and,

That staff be delegated the review function to fine-tune the details of the restoration plan and addition design; and,

That the applicant enter into a Site Plan Agreement containing the usual clauses regarding colours, materials, etc.

CARRIED

**11. Committee of Adjustment Variance Application,
15 George Street,
Proposed Semi Detached Dwellings
Further Revised Minor Variance Application (16.11)**

File No: A/19/17

Extract: G. Duncan, Project Planner

R. Punit, Committee of Adjustment

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Mr. Russ Gregory, the agent for the applicant was in attendance to present a revised Minor Variance Application Plan for 15 George Street. The revisions included: moving the location of the garage; lowering the height of the roof to 12 ft to be in compliance with the City's by-law; reducing the square footage of the semi detached dwelling so that it only covers 40% of the property; and reducing the number of variances being requested.

The Committee expressed concern regarding the rear yard setback of 21 ft and the north side setback of 4ft. The agent advised that there will still be enough green space in the rear of the property due to the large width of property. There will also be a considerable amount of distance between the house and its neighbouring property on the north side due to where the neighbour's house is situated.

The Committee asked if the owner or agent had spoken to the neighbouring property owners. The agent indicated that he had spoken to the neighbour on the north side of the home regarding the proposed side yard setback. The neighbour had not indicated any concerns with the setback, as their home was a considerable distance (about 40 feet) away from the property line. The agent noted he also attempted without success to speak with other neighbours.

The Committee was concerned that the neighbour on the north side of the property line may renovate their property in the future reducing the distance between the properties, which could have a future impact on the heritage character of the area. Committee Members were also hesitant to support a 21 ft setback in the rear yard, as it reduces the green space in the area, which could also influence the heritage character of the area.

A Committee Member asked for the square footage of the semidetached homes. The agent advised that the square footage of the proposed homes is approximately 4,835 sq. ft, which includes the garage.

A Committee Member asked if the shrubs on the north side of the property will be maintained if the minor variance is permitted. The agent advised that they would try to keep as much of the shrubs as possible.

A Committee Member asked if the new sign regarding the application for minor variances had been erected. The agent reported that the new sign had been erected.

The Committee suggested that all applicants should be requested to submit a streetscape of the heritage home, and the new development which can be reviewed with the application by the Committee. Staff advised that applicants are asked to submit a streetscape for site plan applications, but are not required to for minor variance applications at this time.

The Committee decided not to support the minor variance for the rear yard setback of 21ft and side yard setback of 4ft, as it could impact the heritage character of the area.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the following variance requests:

- Reduced front yard setback for the proposed semi-detached dwellings
- Reduced minimum lot area for semi-detached dwellings; and,

That Heritage Markham does not support the requested variances for side and rear yard setbacks for the proposed semi-detached dwellings; and,

That the approval of any variances be subject to the applicant obtaining Site Plan Endorsement for the development and executing a Heritage Easement Agreement with the City; and further,

That Heritage Markham will provide further comments on the proposed semi-detached dwellings when a Site Plan Control Application is submitted.

CARRIED

**12. Consent Application,
104 John Street, Thornhill,
Severance of a Vacant Parcel of Land to
Transfer to 10 Deanbank Drive (16.11)**

File No: B/07/17

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

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Senior Heritage Planner advised that the request is for the severance of a rear part of 104 John Street, a vacant parcel of land adjacent to the heritage outbuilding; and the transfer of the land to the side yard of 10 Deanbank Drive. The transfer of the land will benefit both property owners with no impact to the heritage property and minimal impact to the trees on the property.

The Committee asked if 10 Deanbank Drive could be enlarged if the transfer of the land is approved. Staff advised that the house could potentially be renovated in the future,

subject to zoning provisions, noting the severance will only be granted with the condition that the land transferred is merged with the 10 Deanbank Drive property.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection to Consent Applicant B/07/17 from a heritage perspective.

CARRIED

**13. Site Plan Control Application,
36 Peter Street,
Retention of Historic Exterior Cladding (16.11)**

File No: SC 15 109816

Extract: P. Wokral, Project Planner

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Graham Dewar disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 13, 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 Manager, Heritage Planning reported that a meeting was scheduled to assess the condition of the original cladding to see if it can be preserved, but due to heavy rain, and the fact the original siding was still covered, the condition of the siding could not be assessed. Staff recommended that the visit be rescheduled.

Mr. Graham Dewar, addressed the Committee representing the 36 Peter Street homeowners. He reported that he was hesitant to disturb the original siding as he found lead above the legal limit in the paint on the original cladding. The cladding can now only be removed through an environmental abatement process, which makes scheduling a viewing challenging. Another challenge is that the insul brick has baked onto the original cladding in some areas and when the material is removed from the cladding it peels off the paint.

The Committee asked that the site visit be rescheduled despite finding lead paint on the original siding, as it is not unusual for heritage properties from this time period to be painted with lead paint and measures can be taken to safely view the siding.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the later claddings of 36 Peter Street be removed as per the conditions of the Site Plan Agreement, so that Staff and Heritage Markham can determine the appropriateness of retaining and restoring the historic cladding; and,

That a site visit be scheduled to 36 Peter Street for the Architectural Review Sub-Committee, with the authority to review on behalf of the full Committee, once the

contractor has removed the later claddings so that its condition can be accurately assessed.

CARRIED

**14. Site Plan Control Application,
9 Station Lane, Unionville,
Stiver Mill Development Phase -2 (16.11)**

Extract: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning
A. Ierulli, Community Recreation Manager

Anthony Ierulli, Community Recreation Manager North presented the plans for Phase 2 of the restoration of the Stiver Mill. The Committee felt the plans were consistent with the Stiver Mill's Master Plan and with the community's expectations for the project.

The Committee asked if any vegetation will be removed from the site. Mr. Ierulli advised that some shrubs along the railway track will be removed to extend the boardwalk. It was noted that part of the original design concept was to have the boardwalk very close to the rail to create a unique experience.

A Committee Member asked if the project impacted the farmers market and where residents will enter the market. Mr. Ierulli advised that the farmers market will continue to operate as usual (albeit relocated on the site during construction) and that the entrance will remain in the same location it is in now.

A Committee Member asked if access between the proposed parking lot and Station Lane will continue to be blocked. Mr. Ierulli advised that vehicular access will be blocked off with a curb stop and visual barrier. The Committee Member suggested that this may not be sufficient to prevent residents from taking Station Lane to access Eureka. Using a chain to block access was suggested.

A Committee Member asked what will happen to the fence that was recently installed by the rail track. Mr. Ierulli advised that the fence will be repurposed.

A Committee Member noted that night sky friendly lights should be used for this project.

The Manager of Heritage Planning reported that the plans for Phase 2 of the Stiver Mill Restoration Project will be presented to the Historical Unionville Community Vision Committee next week. Councillor Don Hamilton asked for the electronic version of the site plan.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham Committee has no objection from a heritage perspective to the proposed site improvements to the Stiver Mill property (Phase 2) subject to the following:

- the same design treatment used in Phase 1 for features such as light fixtures, site furnishings, boardwalk railing design and boardwalk treatment should be used.
- the colour/texture of permeable pavers should be complementary to the industrial heritage character of the site; and,

That Heritage Markham delegates any further review requirement on this project to Heritage Section staff.

CARRIED

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

File No: SC 17 150501

Extract: P. Wokral, Project Planner

R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Committee supported the Staff recommendation with respect to the removal of the existing tail to the existing heritage house.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham receive the information regarding the historic one storey rear tail of 31 Peter Street as information; and,

That Heritage Markham does not object to the removal of the rear tail component subject to the approval of a new, complementary addition to the dwelling.

CARRIED

**16. New By-laws,
New Property Standards By-Law and
New Keep Markham Beautiful By-Law Protecting
Cultural Heritage Resource (16.11)**

Extract: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Manager of Heritage Planning reported that the City approved new Property Standards and Keep Markham Beautiful By-Laws. The new by-laws will provide staff with the necessary tools to address the property standards of neglected heritage properties. Staff will start with its top 10 priority heritage properties. It is expected that three by-law officers will be trained on the new provisions.

The Committee asked for a reminder of the ten priority heritage properties. Staff noted that City is unable to speak about these properties once a by-law order has been issued.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham receive the information on the new Property Standards By-law and the Keep Markham Beautiful By-law as information.

CARRIED

**17. New Business,
1 Thompson Court,
Balcony Refurbishment (16.11)**

Extract: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Councillor Karen Rea disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 17, by nature of being a Director on the Board of Directors, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

The Manager of Heritage Planning presented a building permit application to refurbish the metal railings on the balconies at 1 Thompson Court with tinted bronze glass panels with a brown metal frame.

Councillor Karen Rea addressed the Committee on behalf of the condominium board. She advised that the glass panels were selected by the residents living in the building.

The Committee suggested that the building permit should be reviewed by the City's architect and that the original integrity of the design should be maintained, as it did not think the glass matched the architecture of the building. Regan Hutcheson advised that Heritage Staff review the applications in heritage districts for architectural considerations.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the Heritage Markham Committee recommend that the original architectural integrity of the building at 1 Thompson Court be maintained; and,

That the Heritage Markham Committee does not support the restoration of the balconies at 1 Thompson Court with glass panels.

CARRIED

**18. New Business,
Demolitions In Thornhill (16.11)**

Extract: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Evelin Ellison noted the concern with demolitions in Thornhill over the last couple of years. In order to maintain the heritage district in Thornhill, the Committee should think wisely prior to approving anymore demolition of heritage properties in Thornhill.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Evelin Ellison's request regarding demolitions in Thornhill be received for information purposes.

CARRIED

19. In-Camera Matter

CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That, in accordance with Section 239 (2) of the Municipal Act, Heritage Markham Committee resolve into a confidential session to discuss the following matters (9:28 PM):

- (1) PERSONAL MATTERS ABOUT AN IDENTIFIABLE INDIVIDUAL,
INCLUDING MUNICIPAL OR LOCAL BOARD EMPLOYEES
(APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS/COMMITTEE) (16.24)
[Section 239 (2) (b)]

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the Heritage Markham Committee rise from the confidential session 10:01 pm.

CARRIED

Adjournment

The Heritage Markham Committee meeting adjourned at 10:11 PM.