

**Heritage Markham Committee Meeting
City of Markham**

MINUTES

April 12, 2017

Canada Room, Markham Civic Centre

Members

Templar Tsang-Trinaistich, Vice-Chair
Councillor Valerie Burke
Ian Darling
Ken Davis
Graham Dewar
Evelin Ellison (8:20 p.m.)
Councillor Don Hamilton
David Johnston
Councillor Karen Rea
Zuzana Zila

Regrets

David Nesbitt, Chair
Anthony Farr

Staff

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

Templar Tsang-Trinaistich, Vice-Chair, convened the meeting at 7:44 PM by asking for any disclosures of interest with respect to items on the agenda.

Templar Tsang-Trinaistich, Vice Chair, disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 4, 12 Peter Street, Markham Village, by nature of his father-in-law being the applicant, 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 # 4, 12 Gleason Avenue, Markham Village, by nature of his wife 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.

David Johnston, disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 4, 42 George Street, Markham Village, by nature of being the architect for 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 # 21, 36 Peter Street, Markham Village, by nature of being the contractor of the project, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

Graham Dewar disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 22, 36 Peter Street, Markham Village, by nature of being the contractor of the project, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

Heritage Markham Committee recessed at 10:10 PM and reconvened at 10:25 PM.

1. Approval of Agenda (16.11)

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the April 12, 2017 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved.

CARRIED

**2. Minutes of the March 8, 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 March 8, 2017 be received and adopted.

CARRIED

**3. Heritage Permit Application,
15 Colborne Street, Thornhill,
31 Colborne Street, Thornhill,
206 Main Street, Unionville,
230 Main Street North, Markham Village,
7 David Street, Markham Village,
21 Renfrew Dr, Buttonville,
Delegated Approvals Heritage Permits (16.11)
File Nos: HE 17 156897
HE 17 157661
HE 17 155911
HE 17 156068
HE 17 156069**

HE 17 157086

HE 17 157577

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

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

CARRIED

- 4. Building or Sign Permit Applications,
31 Colborne Street, Thornhill,
139 Main Street, Unionville,
216 Main Street, Unionville,
4360 Highway 7, Unionville,
2 Station Lane, Unionville,
12 Peter Street, Markham Village,
5 Washington Street, Markham Village,
89 Main Street North, Markham Village,
17 Jerman Street, Markham Village,
12 Gleason Avenue, Markham Village,
42 George Street, Markham Village,
2730 Elgin Mills Road East, Victoria Square,
9680 9th Line, Greensborough,
8949 Reesor Road, Locust Hill,
3812 19th Avenue, Almira (16.11)**

File Nos: 17 155298 HP
10 122760 AL
17 154233 NH
17 156177 AL
17 157037 SP
16 139160 HP
17 156029 AL
17 157423 AL
17 157634 HP
17 156567 HP
17 156845 HP
17 156708 SP
17 156709 SP
17 157719 SP
17 157142 NH
17 156257 NH

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

Templar Tsang-Trinaistich, Vice Chair, disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 4, 12 Peter Street, Markham Village, by nature of his father-in-law being the applicant, 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 # 4, 12 Gleason Avenue, Markham Village, by nature of his wife 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.

David Johnston, disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 4, 42 George Street, Markham Village, by nature of being the architect for the project, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

Graham Dewar assumed the Chair for this item.

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; and

That staff report back with respect to the parking issue relating to 5 Washington Street, Markham Street.

CARRIED

**5. Information,
Heritage Statistics for Ontario, OHA + More Blog (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham Committee receive as information.

CARRIED

**6. Information,
Class Environmental Assessment Study – McCowan Rd
from Steeles Avenue to Major Mackenzie Drive, Markham (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham receive as information.

CARRIED

**7. Information,
Heritage Building Status: William Lot House
7926 Highway 7 (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham receive the Staff memorandum concerning the status of William Lott House at 7926 Highway 7 as information.

CARRIED

**8. Request for Feedback
2-49 Marmill Way,
Marmill Entry Feature (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the condominium corporation be advised that the entry feature for “Old Markham Village” at Beech Street was installed as part of the approved development plan and is a feature that should be maintained for the site to remain in conformity with the Site Plan Agreement; and,

That due to the identified deterioration of some of the historic materials used to construct the entry feature, Heritage Markham has no objection to the removal of the deteriorated components and replacement with new or salvaged wood through the submission of a Heritage Permit Application; and,

That the condominium corporation is recommended to investigate how to better protect the structure from water damage (i.e. by applying wood preservative, introducing flashing or caulking to prevent water infiltration).

CARRIED

**9. Committee of Adjustment Variance Application,
7 Joseph Street, Markham Village,
Variances to Permit a Two Storey Covered Deck (16.11)**

File No: A/46/17
Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning
R. Punit, Committee of Adjustment
P. Wokral, Project Planner

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the variances requested for 7 Joseph Street indentified in application A/46/17.

CARRIED

**10. Site Control Plan Application,
23 Washington Street, Markham Village,
Proposed Second Storey Addition to Existing
Triplex Dwelling (16.11)**

File No: SC 17 158116
Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning
P. Wokral, Project Planner

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the design of the proposed second storey addition to the existing triplex dwelling at 23 Washington Street, date stamped March 23, 2017; and,

That the profile and colour of the cladding proposed for the second storey addition match the cladding used on the remainder of the building; and,

That the applicant be encouraged to remove the existing aluminium cladding and restore the underlying original siding or introduce a wood or wood-like cladding if the original siding is no longer in existence, and use the same material on the second storey addition; and,

That review of the site plan application be delegated to Heritage Section staff, provided there are no significant changes to the architectural design date stamped March 23, 2017; and further,

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

CARRIED

**11. Site Control Plan Application,
4 Peter St, Markham Village,
Proposed Second Storey Addition (16.11)**

File No: SC 17 156221
Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning
P. Wokral, Project Planner
R. Blake, Senior Manager of Development

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the design of the proposed second storey addition at 4 Peter Street, dated stamped March 1, 2017; and,

That final review of the application be delegated to the City's Planning Department; and,

That the applicant enter into a site plan agreement with the City containing the standard conditions regarding materials, windows, colours etc.

CARRIED

**12. Information,
Bill C-323, An Act to Amend the Income Tax
Act (rehabilitation of historic property) (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning
L. Hau, Clerks Department

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham receive as information; and,

That Heritage Markham Committee recommends that Council offer its support in requesting that the Parliament of Canada adopt Bill C-323- An Act to Amend the Income Tax Act (rehabilitation of historic property).

CARRIED

**13. Request for Feedback,
2780 19th Avenue,
Potential Relocation of Alfred Read House to
Markham Heritage Estates (16.11)**

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

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham reconsider the appropriateness of relocating the Alfred Read House to Markham Heritage Estates after the proposed amendments to the City's Property Standards and Keep Markham Beautiful By-laws, have been considered by Council in the spring of 2017.

CARRIED

14. Correspondence: April 2017 (16.11)

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the following correspondence be received as information:

- a) Ontario Historical Society: OHS Bulletin, March 2017 (Staff has full copy)

CARRIED

**15. Site Plan Control Application,
60 Aksel Rinck Drive,
Philip Eckardt Log House,
Proposed Restoration and Addition (16.11)**

File No: SC 17 114747

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

The Senior Heritage Planner introduced the site plan control application for the Philip Eckardt Log House at 60 Aksel Rinck Drive, which involves the proposed restoration and a major addition to the south side of the heritage building, connected with a smaller link to provide a measure of separation between the old and new. The Philip Eckardt Log House is the oldest house in Markham and the oldest house in York Region and is currently vacant. The property is designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, and is protected by a Heritage Conservation Easement that includes exterior and interior features.

The Senior Heritage Planner advised that the applicant proposes to put an addition on the south side of the existing house to make it livable. They have worked with staff over a period of months to work out the parameters on how the addition will relate to the original building. As shown in a picture that was projected, it can be seen how the south wall of the Eckardt Log House is the least significant side of the property. This is where alterations have taken place, and if an addition is to be made to the building, this is where this can be done.

The Senior Heritage Planner advised that the applicant proposes to construct a 2 storey addition to the south and this addition will be designed in a contemporary architectural motif that will pick up on some of the roof forms and massing of the log house and will relate in some form to the design, but will not imitate the look of an older building. This will allow the log house to stand as a signature piece and will be restored to its 2-storey look that is shown in archived photographs probably taken in the 1890s. The Senior Heritage Planner further advised that the house in its original form had a balcony going all the way around and a wood shingle roof and part of the chimney still remains within the structure

The Senior Heritage Planner advised that the City's heritage conservation policies place a high level of importance on retaining heritage buildings on their original site on their original foundations. Notwithstanding this policy position, staff can support the slight relocation of the heritage building on the current site by constructing a new foundation to address foundation condition issues that currently exist and to support the weight of a 2-storey structure and enable the mass of the proposed addition to be positioned in the most favourable way to retain significant views and building elevations of the Philip Eckardt Log House.

The Senior Heritage Planner advised that staff is suggesting that much of the existing historic foundation could be left intact and filled in as a landscape feature on the property, and for archaeological reasons, thus preserving this aspect of the site's history. Staff generally supports the proposed plans for the restoration and renovation of the heritage building as a component of the overall development proposal.

Mr. Scott Rushlow, the applicant's agent addressed the Committee and stated that he agrees with staff's recommendations, as noted in the staff memo.

Responding to a question from Committee, the applicant's agent advised that the proposed design is supportive and complementary to the existing building, and that the proportions are appropriate for that particular massing. He further advised that the dormers are existing.

The Senior Heritage Planner advised that the written records of the Philip Eckardt Log House show the supports of the balcony, and pockets in the bottom of the rafters indicate where the posts were attached. He advised of a photograph of a restored museum building in Switzerland from the same culture and time period that had the same design of the proposed changes to the Philip Eckardt Log House. He further advised that there are no design guidelines for additions to buildings outside of a heritage district. Every design is unique unto itself. He also alluded to an example of the restoration of an 1870's farm house by Mr. Michael Larkin on McCowan Road who used a very contemporary addition as a contrast to the existing heritage house.

The Committee discussed at length the need for reviewing the detailing of the proposed windows and retaining the heritage value of the log house.

Responding to a question from Councillor Hamilton, the Senior Heritage Planner advised that property went through a Site Plan Control Application (SC 12 110625) in 2012 as a condition of approval for the Upper Unionville Subdivision. That application retained the heritage building in its existing size and shape, in its existing position on the property. A detached garage was proposed for the south side, with a small link to the residence, which was approved but the project, was not constructed. The developer of Upper Unionville sold to a builder who did not construct the project, but sold the property to a new owner who has now submitted a new Site Plan Control Application for a different, more intensive development of the property.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That this matter be referred to the Architectural Review Sub-Committee for further review.

CARRIED

**16. Site Plan Control Application,
30B Rouge St, Markham Village,
Proposed Infill Dwelling (16.11)**

File No: SC 17 134363

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

The Heritage Planner reviewed the site plan control application for a new 1 ½ to 2 storey infill house at 30B Rouge Street in Markham Village. Markham Council has approved Heritage Markham Committee's recommendation for the demolition of the existing 1967 single detached non-heritage dwelling.

The Heritage Planner advised that staff has worked with the applicant to revise the design of the proposed house to eliminate variances to the Infill By-law, but has some concern over the height of the proposed house, (which is the maximum permitted by the By-law) considering the modest height of the adjacent heritage dwelling at 32 Rouge Street, and is now in receipt of a streetscape elevation of the proposed house to help determine the impact the height would have on the adjacent heritage dwelling. Staff is otherwise generally satisfied with the form, massing and materials of the proposed infill dwelling. The proposal is for a brick cladding with stucco in the main roof gable (including the header) and stucco in the smaller roof dormers (including stucco window sills).

Committee discussed possible shadow impact on the neighbouring property to the east due to the height of the proposed new construction, various options of lowering the height of the proposed new dwelling, impact of the backyard lifestyle on the neighbouring property to the east, impact of privacy for the property to the east considering the proposed 2nd floor balconies, etc.

Ms. Dianne Kasias, the owner of the property at 30B Rouge Street addressed the Committee with respect to concerns of shadowing and privacy affecting the property to the east. She advised that the trees along the side between the two houses block views from the balconies and the shadows are caused by these trees. She further advised that the heritage house does have an addition at the rear, which is why it is considered 2-storeys. She also advised that the floor height of the proposed new dwelling on every level is 9 feet, including the basement.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

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

CARRIED

**17. Committee of Adjustment Variance Application,
1 Franklin Street, Markham Village,
Proposed Infill Dwelling (16.11)**

File No: A/46/17

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

The Heritage Planner reviewed the Committee of Adjustment Variance Application for a proposed infill dwelling at 1 Franklin Street in Markham Village, to replace the existing Type 'C', one storey, single detached dwelling. The variances requested include:

- a. maximum building height of 10.59 m whereas the By-law permits a maximum building height of 9.8m;
- a maximum building depth of 23.89 m whereas the By-law permits a maximum building depth of 16.8 m; and
- a maximum lot coverage of 36.78% whereas the By-law permits a maximum coverage of 35%.

The Heritage Planner advised that the application has not yet been reviewed by the City's Zoning examiner and there may be other variances required that have not been identified by the applicant. He further advised that further clarification is required regarding the maximum building depth calculation. The Heritage Planner advised that the applicant will need to obtain Council's approval for the demolition of the existing dwelling because it is designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act.

The Heritage Planner advised that staff believes it is premature for Heritage Markham to comment on the proposed variances as it appears that the requested building depth variance is inaccurate, and because there may be variances that have not yet been identified by the City's Zoning Section, as well, heritage staff have identified errors and various issues from the

heritage standpoint. Staff advise that the applicant provide a streetscape drawing for comparison with dwellings in the neighbourhood. He further advised that staff has no objection to the demolition of the current dwelling, considering its Type 'C' classification.

Staff recommends that the applicant submit a site plan application and work with staff to revise the design of the proposed house to achieve compliance with the policies and guidelines of the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District Plan and the development standards of the Infill By-law.

Committee discussed the incomplete application and was of the opinion that this application should not be considered by the Committee of Adjustment until it has been reviewed and appropriate recommendations are made by the Heritage Markham Committee.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection from a heritage perspective to the demolition of the existing one storey, single detached dwelling at 1 Franklin Street subject to the applicant obtaining Site Plan Approval for a new infill dwelling; and,

That Heritage Markham does not support the current design of the proposed new house at 1 Franklin Street based on its form, massing, materials and architectural design, or any requested variances which support its approval and construction; and,

That the applicant submit a site plan control application to the City and work with Heritage Section staff to revise the design of the proposed house so that it complies with the policies and guidelines for new buildings contained in the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District Plan and the development standards of the Infill By-law; and,

That the applicant submit streetscape drawings illustrating the proposed dwelling on both Franklin Street and Joseph Street; and further;

CARRIED

**18. Committee of Adjustment Variance Application,
15 George Street, Markham Village,
Revised Minor Variance Application,
Proposed Semi-Detached Dwellings (16.11)**

File No: A/19/17

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

The Senior Heritage Planner reviewed the revised Committee of Adjustment Variance application for proposed semi-detached dwellings at 15 George Street in Markham Village. He further advised that this development application was first considered by the Heritage Markham Committee in March 2017. A variety of variances were requested in support of the design, however, it was not known at that time that there were three additional variances that the Committee was not aware of, specifically the north side yard setback for the new dwelling, the lot coverage and the compliance of the lot size for a semi-detached dwelling.

The Senior Heritage Planner briefly advised that the Infill By-law does not apply to the proposed development because the Infill By-law only applies to single detached dwellings, whereas By-law 1229 applies to semi-detached dwellings. The size of the house is regulated by lot coverage and by setbacks rather than by the floor area ratio.

Mr. Russ Gregory, agent for the applicant and designer for the project, addressed the Committee and explained that staff discovered two additional variances and one that created an additional variance. He discussed the revisions to the application based on the recommendations from the March 2017 Heritage Markham Committee meeting. Mr. Gregory noted that the actual lot size has been recalculated to be 8,151 sq ft versus 8,200 as required by the Zoning By-law. He also indicated the garage size has been reduced and that from a coverage perspective, 350 sq ft are covered porches. If the porches were removed the coverage would be 37.4%.

Committees discussed the lot size, lot coverage, and size of the entire project vis-à-vis the proposal to construct a semi-detached dwelling. It was noted that if the proposal was for a single detached dwelling the maximum size would be 3,330 sq ft.

Responding to a question from a member, the Senior Heritage Planner advised that a tree preservation report has not been included with the application. He further advised that Urban Design staff did have a concern about the tree on the south side of the property adjacent to the garage, hence the requirement for a 4 feet side yard setback.

Mr. Gregory advised that a site plan application has not yet been made, and a tree preservation report will be provided as part of the site plan application.

Councilor Burke suggested that the Google Map view of the streets be made available at Heritage Committee meetings going forward.

Ms. Jacqueline Gardiner, a local resident addressed the Committee expressing concerns about development around Type A heritage dwellings.

Ms. Rita Hughes, a local resident addressed the Committee expressing concerns about the size and massing of the proposed semi-detached dwelling in the heritage district.

Ms. Barbara Teague, a local resident addressed the Committee expressing concerns about the impact of the garage on trees.

Committee discussed concerns about protecting Class A heritage dwellings. The Senior Heritage Planner advised that the heritage house will not be moved from its current location. The addition is designed to separate the new from the old.

Responding to a question from the Vice Chair, the Manager of Heritage Planning advised that the Committee could make a new recommendation based on the additional information provided in the current revised variance application.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection to the variance requests for the front yard setback and the lot area; and,

That Heritage Markham does not support the proposed rear yard setback and the side yard setback of the semi-detached dwelling or the coverage of the semi-detached dwelling; and,

That Heritage Markham does not support the height or setbacks or any variances related to the setbacks for the garage; and,

That the approval of any variances be subject to the applicant obtaining Site Plan Approval 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

**19. Site Control Plan Application,
31 Peter St, Markham Village,
Proposed Addition (16.11)**

File No: SC 17 150501

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

The Heritage Planner reviewed the site plan control application for a proposed addition to a heritage house at 31 Peter Street in Markham Village, which is a 1 ½ storey single detached heritage dwelling constructed in 1892, designated under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act and classified as a Type A building that defines the heritage character of the district. The owner has submitted an application seeking approval to remove the

one storey rear tail of the existing heritage dwelling and replace it with a two storey addition, which will increase the total area of the house to 4,495 sq. ft.

The Heritage Planner advised that although the application has not been reviewed by the City Zoning Examiner, there are variances that have been identified by Staff including:

- a Net Floor Area Ratio of 54.49% where a maximum Net Floor Area Ratio of 45% is permitted;
- a Maximum Building Depth of at least 19.2 m whereas a Maximum Building Depth of 16.8 m is permitted by the By-law; and
- It also appears that the side yard setback for the 2 storey garage is only 4 ft (1.26 m) whereas it should be a minimum of 6 ft.

It is also noted that if the “Open to Below” space shown on the second storey was converted to a bedroom, which could easily be done, the Maximum Net Floor Area Ratio of the dwelling would be 64%.

The Heritage Planner advised that Staff will need to confirm and report back to Heritage Markham Committee if the existing one storey addition possesses any cultural heritage value and if it would need to be retained. He further advised that Staff supports the fact that the proposed addition is predominantly to the rear of the heritage house and that the plan retains the exposure of the existing windows on the south elevation.

Staff is concerned about the magnitude of the identified variances as well as the massing of the proposed addition, which is significantly higher than the existing heritage dwelling. In addition, the larger mass of the addition is directly attached to the existing heritage dwelling and lacks a suitable transitional architectural link. Staff recommends that the massing of the addition be reduced in scale by reducing the proposed height of the roof structure and the floor area and that the design include a more appropriate architectural link to better separate the addition from the existing heritage dwelling.

Mr. Shane Gregory, the agent for the application addressed the Committee and spoke in favour of the proposal. He advised that it is intended to maintain the two mature trees at the front of the existing dwelling. The owner of the property has spoken to the museum and to City staff about the existing one storey dwelling at the rear of the property to ascertain if it has any heritage value.

Mr. Eric Wheeler, a local resident addressed the Committee and spoke in favour of an addition to the existing dwelling at 31 Peter Street in Markham Village, however, he supports staff recommendation that the addition stay within the limits of what the By-laws prescribe. He noted he believes the tail addition is original to the main house but subordinate. Mr. Wheeler drew the Committee’s attention to the mature cedar trees between his property and 31 Peter

Street and suggested that these be maintained, as they act as a very good privacy buffer between the two houses, and hoped that these trees do not become endangered during the construction activity at 31 Peter Street. Mr. Wheeler also drew the attention of the Committee to a Manitoba Maple tree on the berm in front of his property that has been a hazard to hydro lines through falling tree branches.

Responding to a question from Councillor Rea, Mr. Wheeler confirmed that his property does not have any flooding issues because his house is located at the top of the hill.

A member suggested that this appears to be an incomplete application, as tree preservation report, existing streetscape, surveys, etc. are not included in the application. He further suggested that staff need to indicate to applicants that an application is incomplete when supporting documentation is not included.

Councillor Burke advised that the applicant needs to provide a tree preservation plan. She expressed concerns with respect to the size of the proposed addition which could potentially make it look like a modern subdivision home, and the existing dwelling could lose its heritage value. The issue of bird friendly windows was also noted.

Responding to questions from Councillor Rea, the Heritage Planner advised that it is a preference to have a detached garage, but staff and Heritage Markham have supported many attached garages, provided they are subordinate to the primary residential dwelling.

Responding to a question from Councillor Hamilton, staff advised that all site plan applications are subject to a pre-consultation process, which includes a check-list of documentation required to determine whether an application is complete in all respects for processing. During the pre-consultation process, staff inform the applicant of potential issues that may arise. Front counter staff go through a check-list to ensure that all required documentation is submitted along with a site plan application. Incomplete applications are not accepted if they are found to be missing any required documentation. In this instance, staff were satisfied with the documentation supplied along with the application, and in reviewing the application, staff had anticipated that the applicant would likely be requested to resubmit a revised application considering the comments received from the Heritage Markham Committee.

Councillor Hamilton suggested that going forward staff should not bring any incomplete applications for consideration by the Heritage Markham Committee.

The Manager of Heritage Planning advised that tree preservation material is not normally provided to the committee. Urban Design staff reviews the impact of construction activity, if any, on existing trees and their comments are included in the staff report to the Heritage Markham Committee.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Section staff provide further details to Heritage Markham as to any cultural heritage value associated with the existing one storey rear tail addition which is proposed to be removed; and,

That Heritage Markham does not support the massing, form and scale of the proposed addition to 31 Peter Street from a heritage perspective, and recommends:

- that the proposed height of the addition be reduced to be much closer to the height of the existing heritage dwelling;
- that the floor area be reduced to comply with the Maximum Net Floor Area Ratio of the Infill By-law; and
- that the bulk of the addition's mass be separated from the existing heritage dwelling by an appropriately scaled transitional architectural link; and further,

That the applicant provide a streetscape plan for consideration by Heritage Markham.

CARRIED

**20. Commercial Facade Improvement Grant Program,
Review of 2017 Grant Applications (16.11)**

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

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham supports a matching grant of up to \$ 10,355.00 for the replication of the missing front porch at 48 Washington Street based on surviving physical evidence and appropriate period design, provided the owner enters into a Heritage Conservation Easement Agreement with the City, removes existing grandfathered inappropriate commercial signage, and obtains a building permit and/or site plan approval for the proposed front porch; and,

That Heritage Markham does not support grant assistance for the recently installed historically appropriate windows at 2977 16th Avenue because the work was required as per an agreement the applicant entered into with the City in order to avoid being charged under the Ontario Heritage Act for removing the original historic wood windows without approval, where the applicant failed to do the work in the agreed upon timeframe; and,

That Heritage Markham does not support grant assistance for the replacement of the concrete sidewalk and curb outside of 87 Main St. North because these are not considered to be significant heritage attributes, or a façade feature of the building; and,

That Heritage Markham does not support grant assistance under the Commercial Façade Improvement Program for 15 Church Lane because the property is residential/institutional, but

recommends that the application be considered for grant assistance under the 2017 Designated Heritage Property Grant Program; and further,

That Heritage Markham supports the City entering into Heritage Conservation Easement agreements with the owners of 48 Washington Street for any grant exceeding a value of \$5,000.00.

CARRIED

**21. Designated Heritage Property Grant Program,
Review of 2017 Grant Applications (16.11)**

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

Graham Dewar disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 21, 36 Peter Street, Markham Village, by nature of being the contractor of the project, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

Councillor Burke suggested that St. Vladimir's Ukrainian Catholic Church, 15 Church Lane be requested to relocate the heritage bronze plaque so that it is more visible to the community.

Responding to a question from Councilor Hamilton, the Manager of Heritage Planning advised that staff are waiting for Council to approve the Property Standards By-law and the Keep Markham Beautiful By-law so staff can enforce heritage by-law conditions.

The Manager of Heritage Planning thanked the Heritage Planner for his excellent work on the 2017 Grant Applications process.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham recommends to Council that the un-allocated grant funding from the Commercial Façade Improvement Grant Program in the amount of \$14,547 be transferred to the 2017 Designated Heritage Property Grant Program for a total combined grant fund of \$44,547 (\$30,000 plus \$14,547); and,

That Heritage Markham supports the funding of the following eleven grant applications in the amounts noted at a total cost of \$44,547 subject to conditions noted on the individual summary sheets:

- 19 George Street (up to \$5,000);
- 248 Main St North (\$3,366.85;
- 30 Washington Street (\$5,000);
- 36 Peter Street (\$5,000);

- 10 David Gohn Circle (\$7,500);
- 23 Victoria Avenue, Unionville (\$3,842);
- 12 David Gohn Circle (\$7,500);
- 22 George Street (\$3,220.50)
- 15 Church Lane, Thornhill (\$1,400)
- 309 Main Street North (\$1,521.88);
- 370 Main Street North (\$1,195.77); and,

That Heritage Markham does not support the grant request for the replacement of the cedar shingle roof for the accessory building at 6 David Gohn Circle because it is not a heritage building; and,

That Heritage Markham does not support the grant request to make structural improvements to the floor at 17 Mill Street, because the work is not visible to the public, is not required for the long term preservation of the building and it proposes to demolish the existing stone foundation which is a heritage attribute of the property; and further,

That Heritage Markham does not support the grant request to recondition the windows at 99 Y.M.C.A. Boulevard because it could be perceived as rewarding poor stewardship of the building that was restored in 2008 but left vacant and unprotected from the elements and vandalism.

CARRIED

**22. Request for Feedback,
36 Peter St, Markham Village,
Proposed Installation of New Cladding (16.11)**

File No: SC 16 109816

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Project Planner

Graham Dewar disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 22, 36 Peter Street, Markham Village, by nature of being the contractor of the project, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

The Heritage Planner reviewed the application for feedback with respect to a condition in a site plan agreement, which required the owner to re-clad the entire house at 36 Peter Street in Markham Village with new wooden tongue and groove siding replicating the profile and dimensions of the original historic siding. He further advised that the contractor has revealed a few sections of the original siding and found the original cladding to have shrunk, opening up at the joints, and is quite weathered, and claims that restoration of the original cladding is not feasible or reasonable.

Heritage staff have conducted a site visit to the property and confirm that the historic siding is quite damaged and likely not able to be restored. However, if the contractor is permitted to use new wooden cladding, staff recommends that the layer of insulation installed under the most recent cladding, and the original historic cladding, be removed from the heritage portion of the dwelling to ensure that the proper relationship of architectural features such as trims, sills and soffits be retained as close as possible to what they were originally.

Graham Dewar, the contractor of the project advised that the original siding was covered with insulbrick, and that the tar backing of the insulbrick has impregnated into the surface of the original wooden siding due to heating by sun. Mr. Dewar also advised that if the existing exterior board insulation is required to be removed, the interior studs will have to be strapped out to provide the proper thickness of insulation to comply with Ontario Building Code. He further advised that only two heritage windows currently exist in the house, the remainder of the windows have been replaced with casement windows in the 60s or 70s. A trim package is being prepared to indicate how the windows looked like. The additional works involved will escalate costs of renovations to the dwelling to an astronomical amount.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the Architectural Review Sub-Committee of Heritage Markham conduct a site visit to 36 Peter Street in Markham Village with the delegated authority of the Heritage Markham Committee to recommend any changes to the conditions regarding the retention of the original siding contained in the Site Plan Agreement for the dwelling; and,

That if the Architectural Review Sub-Committee does recommend the installation of new wooden tongue and groove siding to the heritage portion of 36 Peter Street, that it be of the same dimensions and profile as the original, and that the historic siding and any subsequent layers of the wall assembly be removed to ensure that the new tongue and groove siding be installed to maintain the original relationship of the exterior cladding to the existing window sills, trims, soffits etc.

CARRIED

**23. Request for Feedback,
40 Peter St, Markham Village,
Proposed Change to Cladding of New Addition (16.11)**

File No: SC 16 117837

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

The Heritage Planner reviewed the request for feedback with respect to installing vinyl siding on the new addition to the heritage dwelling at 40 Peter Street instead of the wooden board and

batten siding specified in the Site Plan Agreement. He advised that the applicant has used the proposed vinyl siding on an accessory building designed to look like a heritage building.

The District Plan indicates that for B buildings, materials appropriate and typical to the Heritage District should be used with an emphasis on natural materials such as wood and brick. Manmade materials that resemble or complement the original may be acceptable. Staff has no objection to an appropriate vinyl siding being used on the new addition to 40 Peter Street as it can resemble older siding, but wants Heritage Markham to be aware of the potential change to the conditions of the Site Plan Agreement before authorizing the change.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the Architectural Review Sub-Committee of Heritage Markham conduct a site visit to 40 Peter Street in Markham Village with the delegated authority of the Heritage Markham Committee to recommend any changes to the proposed siding for the new addition contained in the Site Plan Agreement for the dwelling.

CARRIED

**24. Consolidated Zoning By-Law Project 2017,
Heritage Markham Feedback (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning
A. Henriques, Senior Planner, Zoning/Special Projects
T. Villella, Manager, Special Projects

The Manager of Heritage Planning reviewed the outcome of the consolidated zoning by-law project and thanked the Heritage Area Zoning Issues Sub-Committee for reviewing the current zoning provisions and helping to identify where they could be more supportive of heritage conservation district plan objectives and policies. The goal is to provide a document summarizing Heritage Markham's input for the benefit of Planning Staff and the Project's consulting team. The Sub-committee met twice and the meeting notes from March 29, 2017 were circulated along with the main agenda. Heritage Section staff would like to thank the Zoning Supervisor for his review of the document prior to the last Sub-Committee meeting and for providing his feedback for the Sub-Committee's consideration.

The Manager of Heritage Planning advised that the Project Consulting team would like to meet at a Special Heritage Markham Committee meeting for further consultation when a strategy has been formulated as to how the new zoning by-law will address zoning issues and matters within the City's heritage conservation districts.

Graham Dewar commended the Manager of Heritage Planning for the excellent work on the Consolidated Zoning By-Law Project 2017.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the Meeting Notes of the Heritage Areas Zoning Issues Sub-Committee held on March 29, 2017, be received; and,

That Heritage Markham Committee forward the document entitled “Zoning By-law Review – Heritage Areas, Heritage Markham Committee Feedback on Consolidated Zoning By-law Project 2017” as its formal submission to the Planning Department staff and the consultants responsible for the Consolidated Zoning By-law Project 2017; and

That Heritage Markham Committee requests the consultants and Planning Department staff coordinating this project attend a future special Heritage Markham meeting for further consultation when a strategy has been formulated as to how the new zoning by-law will address zoning issues and matters within the City’s heritage conservation districts.

CARRIED

**25. Information,
Markham’s Canada 150 Neighborhood Grants (16.11)**
Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham receive as information.

CARRIED

**26. New Business
Minutes of the February 8, 2017
Heritage Markham Committee Meeting (16.11)**

Councillor Rea advised of an error in the motion recorded in the minutes of the February 8, 2017, Heritage Markham Committee meeting with respect to Item 12, Committee of Adjustment Variance Application, 14 George Street, Markham Village, Residential Addition and Detached Garage. These minutes were approved and adopted by Heritage Markham Committee at the March meeting.

Committee recalled the discussion with respect to this item at the February 8, 2017, Heritage Markham Committee meeting, and resolved to amend the motion and the minutes of that meeting, to read as follows:

Heritage Markham Recommends

That the City arborist review and provide an opinion on the health of the walnut tree at 14 George Street, Markham Village Heritage Conservation District; and

That the applicant reduce the overall scale and massing of the proposed residential addition to the existing heritage dwelling at 14 George Street, Markham Village Heritage Conservation District, and build within the existing by-laws.

CARRIED

27. New Business

**Improving Overall Quality of Applications for consideration
By the Heritage Markham Committee (16.11)**

Heritage Markham Recommends

That staff report back to a future Heritage Markham Committee meeting on the current system of pre-consultation meetings prior to a complete application being presented to the Heritage Markham Committee for consideration.

CARRIED

Adjournment

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