

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

**November 9, 2016  
Canada Room, Markham Civic Centre**

## **Members**

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

## **Regrets**

## **Staff**

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

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

Templar Tsang-Trinaistich disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 6, 15 Eureka Street, Unionville, by nature of being the adjacent neighbour of this 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 # 6, 24 Church Street, Markham Village, by nature of being the architect of the project, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

David Johnston disclosed an interest with respect to Items # 6 and #12, 9900 Markham Road, by nature of being the architect of the project, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

Councillor Valerie Burke disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 8, 26 Colborne Street, by nature of being the owner of this property, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

Zuzana Zila disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 15, 80 Main Street, Markham Village, by nature of having dealings with the real estate agent for this property, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

**1. Approval of Agenda (16.11)**

A) New Business

I. Variance Application  
80 Main Street North, Markham Village  
SC 14 107450 & A/56/14.

II. Administrative Matter – Heritage Markham Member Resignation of Julie Chapman.

**Heritage Markham Recommends:**

That the November 9, 2016 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved and items of New Business from the Heritage Manager be considered.

CARRIED

**2. Minutes of the October 12, 2016  
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 October 12, 2016 be received and adopted.

CARRIED

**3. Year End Reception for Heritage  
Markham Members, 2016 (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

**Heritage Markham Recommends:**

That Heritage Markham hold its Year End Reception on Wednesday December 14, 2016, at approximately 8:30 p.m., in the Councillor's Lounge (if available) with refreshments to be arranged by staff.

CARRIED

**4. Site Plan Control Application,  
9 Eckardt Avenue, Unionville,  
Addition to a Heritage House**

File No: SC 16 106959 (16.11)

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

---

The Senior Heritage Planner advised that representatives of this application were not present at the October 12, 2016, Heritage Markham Committee meeting at the time when the item came up, having left the meeting earlier. He further advised that since the last meeting, the applicant has further refined the design in response to comments and recommendations from the Architectural Review Sub-Committee. The main architectural changes include the reduction of the height of the roof of the addition to match the height of the roof of the existing heritage dwelling, the recessing of one of the two garage bays, correction of the openings on the heritage dwelling and addition of articulation on the side elevations. The site plan has been modified to comply with the driveway by-law. These refinements have improved the overall design of the addition to the existing heritage dwelling.

A member advised that the Architectural Review Sub-committee dealt with this application at length, that the final result of the revised site plan is complementary to the other dwellings in the street and that the reconfigured driveway as portrayed in Option B is consistent with other houses in the street.

Responding to a question about the stairs on the outside of the building, it was noted that the stairs outside the building are leading to the basement and are well within the permitted side yard setbacks.

The Senior Heritage Planner advised the Committee that the application has been reviewed by the Toronto Region Conservation Authority and no issues have been identified.

Mr. Henry Song, the applicant's representative, described the revised application using coloured elevations.

Responding to concerns about whether the neighbours were notified about this application, the Senior Heritage Planner advised that no notification is required as no variances are needed.

Mr. Song, the applicant's representative agreed to discuss the design with the neighbours.

Responding to a suggestion by a Committee member, the Manager of Heritage Planning advised that as part of the pre-application consultation, applicants are encouraged to speak with neighbours. In this particular instance, the applicant has worked diligently with staff to address and satisfy conditions and concerns raised by the Architectural Review Sub-committee, and has since revised the application to the satisfaction of Heritage Staff.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham supports the revised design for the proposed addition to the heritage dwelling at 9 Eckardt Avenue from a heritage perspective, conditional on the driveway design recommended by the Zoning Examiner (Option B); and,

That final review of the Site Plan Application be delegated to Heritage Section staff; and,

That the Site Plan Agreement contain the standard heritage conditions regarding materials, windows, colours, etc.; and

That the existing vinyl siding of the dormers be replaced with appropriate wood siding.

CARRIED

**5. Site Plan Control Application,  
4 Wismer Place, Markham Heritage Estates,  
Request for Release of Letter of Credit**

File No: SC 15 148172 (16.11)

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Heritage Planner explained the applicant's request to release the \$5,000.00 Letter of Credit taken by the City to ensure compliance with the approved plans and site plan agreement for a recently constructed rear addition to the heritage dwelling at 4 Wismer Place that was supported by Heritage Markham in 2015.

During inspection of the completed construction, staff identified the following deficiencies from the approved elevations and conditions of the site plan agreement:

- the windows are not made of wood and do not have exterior adhered muntin bars as required in the conditions of the site plan agreement;
- the windows do not have projecting lug-sills as shown in the approved drawings; and
- the eave troughs are made of copper which is specifically prohibited in the conditions of the site plan agreement.

Responding to a question from the Committee, the Heritage Planner advised that the owners have requested the release of the \$5,000.00 Letter of Credit taken by the City be considered by the Heritage Markham Committee.

The Committee members were of the opinion that the issue of releasing a Letter of Credit is not within the purview of the Heritage Markham Committee. It is a legal matter that should be dealt with by City Staff.

The Manager of Heritage Planning advised that if the applicant desires, they will need to make a new application to amend the previously approved site plan which could then be considered by Heritage Markham Committee.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham receive as information.

CARRIED

**6. Building Permit Applications,  
123 Main Street, Unionville,  
15 Eureka Street, Unionville,  
370 Main Street, Markham Village,  
24 Church Street, Markham Village,  
56 Main Street North, Markham Village,  
10 Heritage Corners Lane, Markham Heritage Estates,  
91 & 115 Roy Grove Way, Greensborough Community,  
9900 Markham Road, Mount Joy Community,  
Delegated Approvals of Building Permits**

File Nos: 16 115906 HP  
16 138699 HP  
15 179207 HP  
16 136099 HP  
16 137913 PP  
16 137543 HP  
16 135553 HP & 16 1333554 HP  
16 129523 HP (16.11)

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Templar Tsang-Trinaistich disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 6, 15 Eureka Street, Unionville, by nature of being the adjacent neighbour of this 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 # 6, 24 Church Street, Markham Village, by nature of being the architect of the project, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

David Johnston disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 6, 9900 Markham Road, by nature of being the architect of the project, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

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

CARRIED

**7. Heritage Permit Applications,  
137 John Street, Thornhill,  
197 Main Street, Unionville,  
30 Washington Street, Markham Village,  
7943 Ninth Line, Box Grove Community,  
Delegated Approvals of Heritage Permits**

File Nos: HE 16 137865  
HE 16 138497  
HE 16 132850  
HE 16 132851

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

**8. Heritage Easements,  
292 Main Street North,  
20 Markham Street,  
26 Colborne Street,  
Request for Heritage Easements - Heritage Property Tax Reduction Program:  
2016 Taxation Year (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Councillor Valerie Burke disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 8, 26 Colborne Street, by nature of being the owner of the property, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That 292 Main Street North, 20 Markham Street and 26 Colborne Street be approved for Heritage Easements with the City of Markham.

CARRIED

**9. Request for Feedback,  
2-49 Marmill Way, Markham Village,  
Marmill Garden Feature (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the condominium corporation be advised that the commemorative monument/ landscape arches in the parkette were erected as part of the approved Site Plan Agreement and are a feature of the development that must be maintained for the site to be in conformity with the Site Plan Agreement, which is registered on title to the property; and,

That due to the identified deterioration of the historic materials used to construct the landscape arches, Heritage Markham has no objection to the removal of the deteriorated components and replacement with like-materials through the submission of a Heritage Permit Application; and,

That the condominium corporation investigate how to better protect the structures from water damage (i.e. by applying wood preservative, introducing flashing or caulking to prevent water infiltration and by ensuring adequate drainage around the base of the support posts).

CARRIED

**10. Correspondence (16.11)**

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the following correspondence be received as information:

- a) Ontario Honours & Awards: June Callwood Outstanding Achievement Award for Volunteerism

CARRIED

**11. Demolition Permit Application,  
Request for Feedback,  
38 John Street, Thornhill,  
New Proposal for Renovations and Addition**

File No: 16 115753 DP (16.11)

Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

P. Wokral, Heritage Planner

The Manager of Heritage Planning introduced the request for feedback from the applicant with respect to a demolition permit application for the dwelling at 38 John Street, Thornhill, which was denied by Council at its meeting on October 17, 2016. The applicant is now proposing a modification to the existing dwelling into a Georgian Tradition, two storey house with a detached garage.

Subsequent to receiving notice of Council's decision, Mr. Russ Gregory, agent for the applicant submitted the following proposal to Heritage Staff:

- retain the existing 28' x 32' wood frame bungalow;
- add approximately 5' to the west side and remove the roof for a new second floor addition; and
- construct a two storey addition at the rear of the house to accommodate the remainder of the plan.

On reviewing the revised proposal, Heritage Staff are of the opinion that:

- the new proposal would appear to encapsulate the existing front portion of the bungalow and introduce the design approach previously submitted for the two storey Georgian Tradition house;
- this approach does not address the Council resolution which supported the retention of the front section of the existing dwelling as a distinct component (from a size and shape perspective) with a rear addition;
- it appears that the applicant is proposing the same size of dwelling as previously submitted, which would require a variance for Floor Area Ratio; and
- the current proposal by the applicant does not reflect the direction provided by Markham Council and the Heritage Markham Committee.

Mr. Russ Gregory, agent for the applicant addressed the Committee expressing concerns with respect to maintaining the 20' of the existing bungalow. He further stated that by adding a second storey to the existing bungalow, there is a possibility of achieving a decent looking dwelling that could be complementary to the neighbourhood.

Councillor Valerie Burke expressed concerns with respect to the recommendations of the Heritage Markham Committee and the Markham City Council not being respected by the owners of the property. Councillor Burke also expressed concerns that, as the local Ward Councillor, she was not included in the consultation process. She further expressed concerns that this matter is being repeatedly before the Heritage Markham Committee for consideration despite denials by the Committee and Council.

The Manager of Heritage Planning advised that the matter before the Committee does not include a site plan application. In its current form, the applicant is only seeking feedback from Heritage Markham with respect to a new proposal to modify the existing dwelling into a Georgian Tradition, two storey house with a detached garage.

A member was of the opinion that the matter before the Committee is out of order as no site plan application is included.

Ms. Marion Matthias and Mr. Joseph Ricciuti, local residents, and Mr. Barry Nelson, representing the Executive of the Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill (SPOHT), spoke in opposition to the proposal for 38 John Street, Thornhill.

Heritage Markham Recommends:



That the correspondence from Rob Armstrong, Diane Berwick, and Ken and Daila Webster in opposition to the Demolition Permit - Request for Feedback for 38 John Street, Thornhill, be received as information;

That the following deputations regarding the Demolition Permit - Request for Feedback for 38 John Street, Thornhill, be received:

1. Mr. Russ Gregory, agent for the applicant;
2. Ms. Marion Matthias, Colborne Street;
3. Mr. Barry Nelson, Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill (SPOHT); and
4. Mr. Joseph Ricciuti, Eliza Street; and

That based on the Heritage Markham recommendation of May 11, 2016, and the Council resolution of October 17, 2016, regarding the preferred modification approach to the existing dwelling (i.e. installation of a compatible addition in accordance with the policies and guidelines of the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District Plan, appropriately scaled to its context, in consultation with the Ward Councillor, and that the first 20 feet of the building remains a distinct component of any future addition), Heritage Markham Committee does not support the current proposal.

CARRIED

**12. Plan of Subdivision,  
9900 Markham Road,  
William Clarry House Condition Report**

File No: SU 14 130863 (16.11)  
Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning  
S. Muradali, Project Planner

---

David Johnston disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 12, 9900 Markham Road, by nature of being the architect of the project, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That consideration of this matter be deferred to the December 14, 2016, Heritage Markham Committee meeting, at the request of the applicant.

CARRIED

**13. Site Plan Control Application,  
Demolition Permit Application,  
Committee of Adjustment Variance Application,  
9 Rouge Street, Markham Village,  
Demolition of Existing House and Proposed New Infill House**

File Nos: DP 16 137861  
SC 16 138220  
A/162/16  
Extracts: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning  
P. Wokral, Heritage Planner

---

The Heritage Planner introduced the site plan control application, demolition permit application and Committee of Adjustment Variance application for the demolition of an existing house and a proposed new infill house at 9 Rouge Street in Markham Village. The proposal is to demolish the existing house and replace it with a new 3,706 sq. ft. single detached two storey house with an attached garage. The design of the proposed house requires the following variances to the By-law:

- maximum net floor area ration of 65%, whereas the by-law permits a maximum net floor area ratio of 45%;
- minimum side yard setback of 5 feet for the east and west sides yards for a two storey building, whereas the by-law requires a minimum side yard setback of 6 feet; and
- maximum building depth of 20.2 metres, whereas the by-law permits a maximum bilding depth of 16.8 metres.

Staff has no objection to the proposed demolition of the existing house as it has no cultural heritage value or significance. Staff is also supportive of the form, massing, scale and materials of the proposed new dwelling, but recommends the following revisions:

- reduction in the height of the ridge of the roof to match the height of the street facing gable; and
- elimination of the second storey overhang above the garage.

The Committee discussed the Gross Floor Area of the proposed new dwelling in relation to the neighbouring properties in the street.

Concerns expressed by committee members included:

- the loss of the large mature Norway Maple tree currently on the property. It was suggested that the applicants be required to plant at least two similar trees in lieu of monetary compensation for the removal of the tree.
- concern about the proposed 65% Net Floor Area Ration given the 45% permitted by the By-law.
- concern about the proposed use of all brick, as compared to the neighbouring houses that have a mix of brick and wood sidings.

Heritage Markham Recommends

That Heritage Markham has no objection to the demolition of the existing one storey single detached dwelling at 9 Rouge Street, subject to the applicant obtaining site plan approval for the new dwelling; and,

That this matter be referred to the Architectural Review Sub-Committee to meet with the applicant and staff to seek additional information on the streetscape, GFA comparison with the neighbouring properties, specific details about the proposed height, etc.

CARRIED

**14. Demolition Permit Application,  
27 Church Street, Markham Village,  
Proposed Demolition of an Existing Non-Heritage Dwelling**

File No: DP 16 135847 (16.11)

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

---

The Heritage Planner introduced the demolition permit application for an existing residential dwelling built in 1948, to be replaced with a new two storey single detached dwelling, for which a site plan application has not yet been made. The current dwelling is classified as a Group B building under the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District Plan, which contains the following policies:

- these buildings contribute to the ambience of the heritage district and are therefore considered as an integral and valuable part of the area;
- the historical and/or architectural value may not be outstanding, however, the conservation of these buildings should be encouraged with renovation, as necessary;
- generally there will be opposition to the demolition of Group B type buildings, particularly if the building is relatively significant in terms of adding to the overall heritage character of the district; and
- any proposed new building should be designed so that it adds to the overall heritage character of the district, specifically that the form, height, shape and details such as the windows, doors, colours, etc. should complement the surrounding Group A buildings, as much as possible.

The Manager of Heritage Planning explained the difference between the various categories of buildings groupings within the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District.

The Committee discussed at length the minimum requirements of complementary dwellings specific to the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District.

Heritage Markham Recommends

That Heritage Markham does not support to the demolition of the existing one storey, single detached dwelling at 27 Church Street, as it contributes to the ambiance of the Heritage District, and recommends a complementary addition that retains the existing character not exceeding 1½ storeys.

CARRIED

**15. New Business**

**Variance Application**

**80 Main Street North, Markham Village (16.11)**

File No. A/156/14

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

---

Zuzana Zila disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 15, 80 Main Street, Markham Village, by nature of having dealings with the real estate agent for this property, and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

The Heritage Planner introduced the variance application for an existing two storey commercial heritage building at 80 Main Street North, Markham Village. The applicant is proposing to convert it from retail use to an office use having 16-20 employees. The proposed office use on a portion of the second storey, which was formerly entirely occupied by a residential unit, has triggered a requirement for an increase in the number of on-site parking spaces to 6, whereas only 4 parking spaces can be provided. The Main Street Markham Area Secondary Plan (OPA 108) encourages the retention of retail uses at grade and encourages offices to locate on the second floor of a commercial building in an effort to maintain the vitality of retail on Main Street. The requested variance is related to planning issues and does not have any impact on the heritage resource or the heritage character of the Markham Village Heritage Conservation District.

Councillor Karen Rae expressed concerns about adequate parking for 16-20 employees, with only 4 parking spaces available.

Heritage Markham Recommends

That Heritage Markham has no comment from a heritage perspective regarding the requested variance to permit a minimum of four on-site parking spaces at 80 Main Street North, Markham Village.

CARRIED

**16. New Business**  
**Administrative Matter**  
**Heritage Markham Member**  
**Resignation of Julie Chapman (16.11)**

Extract: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Manager of Heritage Planning advised that Julie Chapman has informed the City that after serving for 1½ years, she is no longer able to meet her commitments as a member of the Heritage Markham Committee

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham Committee thanks Julie Chapman for serving on the Committee for the last 1½ years, and for her interest and contribution to the protection and preservation of heritage resources in Markham.

CARRIED

**Adjournment**

The Heritage Markham Committee meeting adjourned at 10:36 PM.