

Heritage Markham Committee Meeting City of Markham

**February 8, 2017
Canada Room, Markham Civic Centre**

Members

David Nesbitt, Chair
Templar Tsang-Trinaistich, Vice-Chair
Councillor Valerie Burke
Ian Darling
Graham Dewar
Evelin Ellison
Anthony Farr
Councillor Don Hamilton
Councillor Karen Rea
Zuzana Zila

Regrets

Ken Davis
David Johnston

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 7:20 PM by asking for any disclosures of interest with respect to items on the agenda.

Councillor Burke disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 11, 30 Colborne Street, Thornhill, 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.

Heritage Markham Committee recessed at 9:30 PM and reconvened at 9:40 PM.

1. Approval of Agenda (16.11)

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the February 8, 2017 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved.

CARRIED

2. Minutes of the January 11, 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 January 11, 2017 be received and adopted.

CARRIED

3. Community Heritage Ontario

- Workshops/Webinars (16.11)

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends

That Heritage Markham receive as information.

CARRIED

**4. Building or Sign Permit Applications,
2977 16th Avenue, Buttonville,
2 Station Lane, Unionville,
20 Main Street North, Markham Village,
20 Main Street North, Markham Village,
6030 Highway 7 East, Markham Village,
Delegated Approvals: Building and Sign Permits (16.11)**

File Nos: 16 139338 AL
16 131059 AL
16 138528 AL
17 153037 SP
17 152622 AL

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

**5. Site Plan Control Application,
2830 Highway 7 East,
Proposed Addition to Zion Alliance Church (16.11)**

File No: SC 16 175490
Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning
G. Duncan, Project Planner

Heritage Markham Recommends

That Heritage Markham supports the proposed addition to the Zion Alliance Church at 2830 Highway 7 subject to the applicant agreeing in the Site Plan Agreement to designation of the property under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act and providing, at their cost, a Markham Remembered interpretive plaque telling the story of the church and the site.

CARRIED

**6. Site Plan Control Application,
17 Jerman Street, Markham Village,
Residential Addition (16.11)**

File No: SC 16 132207
Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning
G. Duncan, Project Planner

Heritage Markham Recommends

That Heritage Markham supports the design for a garage, screened porch and rear deck additions to the existing dwelling at 17 Jerman Street subject to the applicant entering into a site plan agreement with the City including the standard requirements for colour, materials, etc.

CARRIED

**7. Committee of Adjustment Variance Application,
40 Peter Street, Markham Village,
Variances to Permit Rear Addition and Existing Accessory Building (16.11)**

File No: A/03/17
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 requested variances to permit a maximum building depth of 18.44 m for the rear addition, and the existing side and rear yard setbacks for the existing accessory building.

CARRIED

**8. Demolition Permit Application,
7926 Highway 7 East,
William Lott House (16.11)**

File No: 16 149285

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Senior Heritage Planner reviewed the demolition permit application for the William Lott House at 7926 Highway 7 East. This is a circa 1884, 1 ½ storey, frame, vernacular village dwelling, lying vacant on the property of an auto body shop. The dwelling is a Group 2 Heritage Building and is listed on the *Markham Register of Property of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest*. The property owner is not using the vacant former dwelling, which is in an advanced stage of deterioration, however, the owner does not intend to repair the building for future use.

The Senior Heritage Planner advised that this application was considered by the Development Services Committee in January 2017. After considerable discussion on this matter and the City-wide problem with vacant heritage buildings and “demolition by neglect”, the Development Services Committee passed a resolution to approve the demolition permit application subject to the owner providing a Markham Remembered interpretive plaque on the property, at their cost.

When Council considered the minutes of the January 23, 2017 meeting of the Development Services Committee, the matter was opened up and after further discussion the original resolution was modified to include that the heritage building be advertised for relocation. The owners have advised that this advertisement will appear in the Markham Economist on Thursday, February 9, 2017 and the following week. Others interested in relocating heritage building have also been informed about his property and have been in contact with the owner of this property.

The Senior Heritage Planner further advised that he had been contacted by a person interested in acquiring this property, conditional on Markham Council permitting him to move the property to Markham Heritage Estates.

The Manager of Heritage Planning advised the Committee of the limited availability of unoccupied properties at Markham Heritage Estates.

After considerable discussions, the Committee agreed that the William Lott House should be permitted to be considered for relocation to the Markham Heritage Estates.

Responding to a question from a Committee member about protecting the roof of the existing William Lott House, the Senior Heritage Planner advised that the resolution from the Council meeting of January 30, 2017 did not include any conditions with respect to protecting the existing William Lott House, but that staff could recommend specific restoration requirements as a condition of relocation to Markham Heritage Estates.

Heritage Markham Recommends

That Heritage Markham receive the staff memorandum concerning the demolition permit application for 7926 Highway 7 as information; and

That the William Lott House be considered for relocation to the Markham Heritage Estates.
CARRIED

- 9. Information,**
149 John Street, Thornhill,
Driveway Entrance Gate - Installed without City Approval (16.11)
Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Councillor Burke advised that this matter was going to Development Services Committee on February 13, 2017.

Heritage Markham Recommends

That Heritage Markham receive as information.

CARRIED

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

Heritage Markham Recommends

That Markham Council support Bill C-323: Tax credit for restoration of historic places
CARRIED

**11. Site Plan Control Application,
30 Colborne Street, Thornhill,
New Revised Proposed Addition to a Heritage Dwelling and New Detached
Garage (16.11)**

File No: SC 16 114097

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

Councillor Burke disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 11, 30 Colborne Street, Thornhill, by nature of being the immediate neighbor 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 new revised proposed addition to a heritage dwelling and a new detached garage at 30 Colborne Street, Thornhill. This is the third submission since the Site Plan Control Application was made in June of 2016. In this new revised design, the heritage house remains as a 1 ½ storey building, and the existing rear addition, mainly dating from the 1950s, is removed and replaced by a two storey rear addition in a similar architectural style but with different massing.

Heritage Markham's January 11, 2017, recommendation was considered by the Architectural Review Sub-Committee meeting on January 19, 2017. It should be noted that the Architectural Review Sub-Committee were not unanimous in their support of the revised design, with two of the Thornhill representatives continuing to express concerns about the compatibility of the proposed addition to the heritage building in comparison to the compatibility of the 1958 addition. A vote was taken, resulting in a majority of members of the Architectural Review Sub-Committee in attendance in favour of the revised design. At the Sub-Committee meeting, the applicant was asked to lower the height of the proposed addition. Subsequent to the meeting, the applicant agreed to lower the roof ridge by 1.5 feet, and revised elevations were submitted to staff on January 20, 2017. Staff noted that the ridge of the proposed addition has improved the overall massing, which was intended by the applicant to address height concerns and concerns about side views of the addition.

Joan Honsberger, Joseph Ricciuti, Diane Berwick, Valerie Tate, Pam Birrell, James Broughton, Barry Nelson, Rob Armstrong, Keith Irish and Marion Matthias addressed the Committee in opposition to the new revised proposed addition to the heritage. All were in favour of retaining the 1958 addition. Comments expressed included:

- the 1958 wing is a case book example of a complementary addition in scale, massing, placement and height – will the proposed addition be cited by the City as a great addition in the future?;
- the earlier addition was added by former owner, Dr. Frank Glassow (a 20th C pioneer who should be recognized). He was a prominent, internationally renowned

hernia specialist who performed over 30,000 hernia operations and was a published medical journalist who travelled the globe giving lectures and demonstrations. The hernia technique he used is still used today at the famous Shouldice Hospital. Prior to coming to Canada, Dr. Glassow served in the Army Medical Corps during WW2 where he was a front line doctor, and participated in the D-Day landing treating 600 injured men.

- other more recent buildings in the District have been given enhanced status: 26 Church Lane, 1953 (Class B) and 24 Deanbank, c.1963 (Class B)- at what point does “history become history or achieve significance” -the 1958 addition should be given a B classification;
- the property has a Class A status which should include the 1958 addition- this should have been identified as a valuable cultural heritage feature when the District Plan was revised in 2007;
- the core area is a very special/ unique part of the heritage district that needs special consideration- don’t destroy the atmosphere and character that people come to visit;
- concern about precedent for future additions to other properties if this was supported;
- changes over time to buildings can be important to illustrate historic evolution of properties;
- community has passionate views about local heritage coupled with frustration as to why the removal of the 1958 addition would even be considered.

Responding to a question from a Committee member with respect to the information provided by residents about the significance of former owner Dr. Glassow, the Senior Heritage Planner advised that when the building classification was done and the description of heritage features was created, staff did not have this information. He further advised that there is a mechanism within the District Plan to revise the building classification, which would need to be considered by Markham Council. He further advised that if Heritage Markham Committee feels it is appropriate to re-classify the property based on new information provided, a report could be taken to Council with recommendations to that effect.

The owner of the property responded by indicating that the 1958 addition is not a healthy building as it has water issues due to the current grading as well as ventilation issues. If Option B was to be pursued, the basement would need to be raised which would affect first floor ceiling heights requiring the removal of the second floor and capturing the lost floor area elsewhere. There was a need for a small variance of about 300 sq ft which many in the community opposed at the Committee of Adjustment. The owner noted his frustration.

After discussions and referring to the District Plan, the Committee agreed that the 1958 addition should not be demolished and that the proposed addition is not compatible in scale to the existing house.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the correspondence from Diane Berwick dated February 7, 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. Joan Honsberger, Elgin Street;
2. Mr. Joseph Ricciuti, Eliza Street;
3. Ms. Diane Berwick, Colborne Street;
4. Ms. Valerie Tate, Colborne Street;
5. Ms. Pam Birrell, Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill (SPOHT);
6. Mr. James Broughton, Kirk Drive;
7. Mr. Barry Nelson, Colborne Street;
8. Mr. Rob Armstrong, Eliza Street;
9. Mr. Keith Irish, Eliza Street; and
10. Ms. Marion Matthias, Colborne Street; and

That the applicant be requested to redesign the proposed addition to the heritage dwelling at 30 Colborne Street, Thornhill, retaining the 1958 Glassow addition, with the exception of the kitchen and sun room, with a new compatible addition of either 1 or 1 ½ storeys that is within the maximum GFA requirements; and

That staff review the 1958 addition to the house, specific to its design/physical, cultural/associative and contextual values, and bring forward a report to consider reclassifying the existing heritage dwelling at 30 Colborne Street, Thornhill.

CARRIED

**12. Site Plan Control Application,
Committee of Adjustment Variance Application,
14 George Street, Markham Village,
Residential Addition and Detached Garage (16.11)**

File No: SC 16 140424

A/202/16

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

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

The Senior Heritage Planner reviewed the Site Plan Control Application and Committee of Adjustment Variance Application for a 2 storey rear addition and the construction of a detached garage/pool cabana in the rear yard at 14 George Street in Markham Village. The garage is proposed to have an unfinished storage loft space.

The existing dwelling is a circa 1855, 1 storey board and batten vernacular village dwelling with a low 2nd floor living space that was added later within the original attic space. The dwelling is a Class A heritage building in the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District. The heritage dwelling is proposed to be placed on a new foundation, shifted slightly to the south so that the side wall is parallel with the side lot line. The dwelling currently has a partial basement. The existing gross floor area of the dwelling is approximately 1,600 square feet, which includes the second storey living space. This is based on MPAC data. The net floor area of the proposed building will be 3,827 square feet and 732 square feet for the accessory building. The residential addition will be sided in clapboard to contrast with the board and batten of the heritage building and it is proposed to add a porch across the front.

The variances will be considered by the Committee of Adjustment on March 8, 2017. The Senior Heritage Planner advised that the variances are as follows:

- A maximum net floor area ratio of 55.0% whereas the By-law permits 45%.
- A maximum lot coverage of 36.1 % whereas the By-law permits 35%.
- A maximum building depth of 23 metres whereas the By-law permits 16.8 metres.
- A minimum side yard setback of 5 feet 2 inches whereas the By-law requires 6 feet.
- A maximum height for an accessory building of 18 feet whereas the By-law permits a maximum height of 12 feet.
- A Front Yard setback variance will also be required because the by-law requires a front yard setback of 25 feet.

The subject property is located within a part of Markham Village that contains a variety of lot sizes and building types. Staff has reviewed the square footage of other houses in the immediate area and has arrived at an average size of 1,633 square feet. So the proposed 3,827 square feet for the house alone is larger than the houses currently in the area. It was noted that there is a tendency to build larger houses in the area when additions are proposed which reflects an emerging pattern of development in the area.

With respect to the relocation of the building, the Senior Heritage Planner advised that the retention of heritage buildings on their original sites and on their original foundations is a key Heritage Conservation policy of the Markham Official Plan. However, he advised the Official Plan also provides other options for preservation when circumstances do not favour the retention of heritage resources in their original locations. From time to time, the City has allowed buildings to be relocated on-site onto new foundations for various reasons,

on a case-by-case basis. In this case, the applicant is proposing to construct a new foundation to allow for a usable basement. The existing house only has a partial cellar under the rear portion of the main block of the house.

The Senior Heritage Planner further advised that the proposal involves the retention of the main body and side wing of the c. 1855 dwelling, with the addition of a veranda across the front of the main body and the extension of the existing veranda across the front of the recessed side wing. The rear addition has been designed to transition up to a two storey height using varied massing and roof forms, in order to preserve the street view of the original heritage building at its current scale by placing the two-storey addition at the rear.

Committee was advised of a mature walnut tree on the north side property line which will be impacted by the construction of the proposed addition and new basement for the heritage dwelling. The arborist's report indicates that this tree is on the neighbouring property at 16 George Street and it is in poor condition (divided trunk). The arborist has recommended the tree's removal. The applicant has advised that the owner of 16 George Street is agreeable to removing the tree as it will impact future plans they have for an addition on the south side of their house. Urban Design has not opposed the removal based on the tree's condition and impact from the proposed development. However, the City arborist has been requested to also examine the tree to provide a second opinion to the applicant's arborist.

Staff noted that the variances for lot coverage and maximum floor area ratio required to implement the proposed development represent the approach generally being used for the enlargement of older dwellings in this part of the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District. The subject property is a large lot in an area that has a great deal of variation in lot sizes, building sizes, and building types. The applicant has advised that the purpose of the higher garage is to screen views to the commercial properties on Main Street.

Mr. Russ Gregory, agent for the owners of the property addressed the Committee in support of the proposed residential addition and detached garage at 14 George Street. He reiterated that the proposed house (minus the garage to be located at the far rear of the property) would have a floor area ratio of 46.1% versus the 45% permitted by the by-law and that it was the house component that would have the most impact on the neighbourhood character and streetscape.

Heritage Markham Committee discussed at length the requested variances related to the size and massing of the proposed additions to the existing heritage dwelling, and are of the opinion that the applicant should be advised to reduce the size and massing of the proposed development to generally comply with the by-law.

Heritage Markham Recommends

That the applicant consider reducing the overall scale and massing of the proposed residential addition to the existing heritage dwelling at 14 George Street, Markham Village Heritage Conservation District, comparable to the existing neighbourhood.

CARRIED

**13. Building or Sign Permit Application,
6840 Fourteenth Avenue, Box Grove,
Residential Restoration and Addition,
Franklin H. Raymer House (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning
A. Wilson-Peebles, Assistant City Solicitor

The Senior Heritage Planner reviewed the building permit application for the restoration of the heritage house and construction of a major two storey addition to the rear of the property at 6840 Fourteenth Avenue, Box Grove. The heritage house will be placed on a new foundation and shifted slightly to the north to improve the driveway access to an attached garage.

Upon receipt of the application to demolish, , Heritage Markham recommended that the property be designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act . Council approved the recommendation and an Intention to Designate was served on the owner. The owner appealed the Intention to Designate and the matter was referred to the Conservation Review Board.

The property owner has since withdrawn the Demolition Permit Application however the appeal of the City's Intention to Designate remains before the Conservation Review Board. The disposition of the appeal involved the owner agreeing to withdraw the demolition permit, which would have the effect of preserving the heritage building, and agreeing to restore the heritage house in the context of an addition. The City achieved the negotiated result in exchange for the withdrawal of the Intention to Designate, subject to the owner obtaining approval for the restoration and addition to the Franklin H. Raymer House.

During the appeal process, the property owner worked with staff on a plan that will preserve and restore the heritage building while adding an addition of a size that will enable the property owner to develop the property in keeping with the emerging character of development in the area.

The existing dwelling has a partial basement only and although policies in the City's Official Plan place a priority on retaining heritage buildings on their original sites on their original foundations, in the interest of conservation of this heritage building, placing it upon a new foundation will create a dry, usable basement and allow for a garage set back from the heritage building. The new basement will allow the applicant to deal with some of the

condition issues that led to the application to demolish. The heritage dwelling will be restored to a stucco finish, while the addition will be in brick, to provide a contrast between the old and new. The addition, while substantial in size, is set back on the lot and is entirely at the rear of the heritage building. The height transitions up from the heritage building using a varied roofline.

Heritage Markham Recommends

That Heritage Markham generally supports the design direction for the proposed new foundation, exterior restoration, and addition to the Franklin H. Raymer House at 6840 Fourteenth Avenue, Box Grove; and,

That Heritage Markham's review function for the final phase of restoration design be delegated to Heritage Section staff.

CARRIED

**14. Committee of Adjustment Variance Application,
20 Water Street, Markham Village,
New Building for Assisted Supportive Housing (16.11)**

File No: A/217/16
Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning
R. Punit, Committee of Adjustment
G. Duncan, Project Planner

The Senior Heritage Planner reviewed the Committee of Adjustment Variance Application for a new, free-standing assisted supportive housing building proposed to be constructed on the south part of the property at 20 Water Street, Markham Village. The existing dwelling is a six storey building with a 150 unit seniors housing building constructed in 1990. The dwelling is a Class C building in the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District.

The proposed new building will contain 32 units and will be 5 storeys. The new building will be brick-clad to tie in with the general architectural theme of the existing complex, and will be constructed in the parking lot next to the bulb at the north end of Water Street. The requested variances include a minimum front yard setback of 0.98 feet, whereas the By-law requires 25 feet; and to permit 129 parking spaces whereas the By-law requires 150 parking spaces.

This project, by the Water Street Non-Profit Homes Inc., and the Markham Inter-Church Committee for Affordable Housing (MICAHA) is being funded by the Region of York.

The applicant has submitted a Parking Utilization Study to determine the appropriate amount of parking needed to support the residential and seniors' centre uses on the site.

Based on the findings, staff is of the opinion that the minor variance is appropriate for the overall development. The reduced front yard setback from 25 feet to 0.98 feet appears very large, but when the unique siting of the property and its relationship to the bulb at the top of Water Street are considered, the minimal setback reflects an urban setting and will not have any negative impact on surrounding existing development.

Heritage Markham Recommends

That Heritage Markham has no objection, from a heritage perspective, to the requested variances for front yard setback and parking spaces for 20 Water Street (Minor Variance Application # A/217/16); and,

That Heritage Markham will provide comments on the design of the proposed new building at the Site Plan Control Application stage.

CARRIED

**15. Request for Feedback,
10541 Highway 48,
Potential Relocation of Samuel Wideman House to Markham Heritage Estates
(16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Manager of Heritage Planning reviewed the potential relocation of Samuel Wideman House to the Markham Heritage Estates at 10541 Highway 48. The Samuel Wideman House is a 1 ½ storey single detached dwelling constructed c. 1855, and is currently vacant. This property is listed on the Markham Register of Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and Designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.

The Manager of Heritage Planning further advised that a person is interested in relocating the house to the Markham Heritage Estates. The interested party has obtained a letter of intent from the development company who owns the property, and would like to receive feedback from Heritage Markham as to whether relocation is supported.

The house has been vacant since 2010 when it was boarded up following the eviction of the tenants. The development company that owns the property has agreed to provide minimum security measures and monitoring of the site to help ensure the building survives until the property is redeveloped in the future. The property is not located in the City's Future Urban Area so any redevelopment of the property is several years away;

It is expected that amendments to the City's Property Standards, and Keep Markham Beautiful By-laws will improve the chances of having vacant heritage buildings re-tenanted

and properly maintained. These documents are expected to be in front of Council in the next few months.

The Samuel Wideman House was identified as one of the ten most threatened and historically significant vacant heritage buildings by Heritage Section staff. The dwelling is also situated in an isolated location which makes it difficult to monitor its physical condition and security.

Committee discussed various options, reasons and merits for relocating heritage dwellings to Markham Heritage Estates.

Heritage Markham Recommends

That Heritage Markham does not support the relocation of the Samuel Wideman House at 10541 Highway 48 to Markham Heritage Estates; and,

That when the revised Property Standards and Keep Markham Beautiful By-laws are approved, these documents be utilized to better secure the building.

CARRIED

16. Comprehensive Zoning By-law Project (2017), Heritage Areas Zoning By-law Issues (16.11)

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends

That in order to provide meaningful feedback and input into the City's Comprehensive Zoning By-law Project, a Heritage Areas Zoning Issues Sub-Committee is created consisting of the following members:

David Nesbitt, Graham Dewar, Zuzana Zila, Templar Tsang-Trinaistich, Ian Darling, Karen Rea and Anthony Farr; and,

That the task of the Sub-Committee be as follows:

- review background materials on heritage related zoning issues including the current infill by-law provisions and the background reports prepared by the Consultants in Phase 1 of the Zoning Project;
- identify issues of concern from a heritage perspective, including instances where the zoning by-law may not support heritage policies;
- provide options or a preferred course of action to address specific issues and concerns; and,
- report back to Heritage Markham Committee with recommendations.

CARRIED

17. New Business
Need for a New Heritage Estates Subdivision (16.11)

Heritage Markham Recommends

That Markham Council expedite the process to acquire an additional Markham Heritage Estates to address the issue of threatened heritage resources.

CARRIED

Adjournment

The Heritage Markham Committee meeting adjourned at 11:00 PM.