

**Heritage Markham Committee Meeting
City of Markham**

**August 10, 2016
Canada Room, Markham Civic Centre**

Members

Councillor Don Hamilton, Acting Chair
Councillor Valerie Burke
Ken Davis
Graham Dewar
Evelin Ellison
Anthony Farr
David Johnston
Councillor Karen Rea
Zuzana Zila

Regrets

David Nesbitt, Chair
Templar Tsang-Trinaistich, Vice-Chair
Julie Chapman
Ian Darling

Staff

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

Councillor Don Hamilton, Acting Chair, convened the meeting at 7:25 PM by asking for any disclosures of interest with respect to items on the agenda.

Graham Dewar disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 5, 5 Euclid Street, Unionville by nature of being the contractor 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 # 6, 29 Jerman Street, by nature of being the contractor for 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 # 11 and Item # 12, 30 Colborne Street, by nature of being the immediate neighbour of the property and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

David Johnston disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 11 and Item # 12, 30 Colborne Street, 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.

1. Approval of Agenda (16.11)

- A) Addendum Agenda
Site Plan Control Application, 40 Peter Street, Markham
- B) New Business from Committee Members

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the August 10, 2016 Heritage Markham Committee agenda be approved.

CARRIED

**2. Minutes of the July 13, 2016,
Heritage Markham Committee Meeting (16.11)**

Extract: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the minutes of the Heritage Markham Committee meeting held on July 13, 2016 be received and adopted.

CARRIED

**3. Demolition Permit Application,
38 John Street, Thornhill,
Proposed Demolition of Existing House &
Proposed New Dwelling and Detached Garage (16.11)**

File No. DP 16 115753

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

The Heritage Planner reviewed the Committee's previous deliberations on the demolition permit application of an existing dwelling, and an application for a proposed new dwelling and detached garage at 38 John Street, Thornhill. He advised that Heritage Markham at its last meeting did not support the application for demolishing the existing dwelling which was constructed in the 1950s, but supported the first 20 feet of the existing structure be preserved and a complementary structure be added to the rear of the dwelling to preserve the scale and massing.

The Heritage Planner further advised that at its May 24, 2016 meeting, the Development Services Committee recommended that Council not support the demolition of the existing house but rather consider an architecturally compatible addition which would incorporate the first 20 feet of the existing dwelling. The applicant subsequently met with heritage staff and has now provided a new design proposal for a stucco house and a detached garage, which will need a variance for the net floor area ratio.

The Heritage Planner further advised that Council, at its May 31, 2016, meeting passed a resolution recommending deferral of the demolition permit application until September 13, 2016, to provide the applicant an opportunity to review the application and provide an alternative design.

The Heritage Planner also advised that Heritage Staff has previously indicated no objection to the complete demolition of the existing house at 38 John Street, due to the lack of its cultural heritage and architectural significance as determined through the City's formal evaluation process, and that Heritage Markham consider this new design proposal and requested variance in order to formulate a recommendation for Council's consideration at its meeting on September 13, 2016.

Mr. Russ Gregory, agent for the applicant, spoke in agreement with the comments by the Heritage Planner. By way of slides of the new proposal, Mr. Gregory advised Heritage Markham Committee that the applicant intends to keep the general footprint of the existing house, however, the massing is now different considering that it will be a two storey house as compared to the existing one storey building.

Mr. Gregory further advised that the massing of the proposed house will be maintained within the 3,000 sq.ft. mark as compared to the previous new house massing which was approximately 3,200 sq.ft. He further confirmed that the detached garage will be a two-car, single storey garage.

Mr. Barry Nelson, representing the Executive of the Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill (SPOHT), who had spoken to the Heritage Markham Committee about this matter previously, advised the Committee that he also attended the Development Services Committee (DSC) on May 24, 2016, in opposition of the demolition and is in support of the DSC's recommendation and Council's resolution of May 31, 2016. SPOHT still supports retention of the existing dwelling. Mr. Nelson advised that he did however have concerns with respect to the square footage of the proposed new dwelling. Mr. Nelson commended the applicant's agent on the effort to move the garage to the rear of the dwelling.

Mr. Nelson mentioned SPOHT's concerns with respect to the square footage of the proposed dwelling. Comments were also made of the four key objectives to Heritage conservation in Markham: (1) retain and protect heritage resources; (2) ensure that original material of heritage resources is maintained; (3) ensure that a new development attached to a heritage resource or a heritage conservation district is complementary; and (4) implement the policies of the official plan and the heritage conservation district plans.

Mr. Russ Gregory advised the Committee that there is nothing worth saving in the existing dwelling. He is of the opinion that the dwelling should be demolished and that is staff's opinion as well. He further advised that the owner of the property has made significant changes to his original design and plans to come up with a modestly designed dwelling.

Based on discussions, Heritage Markham Committee was concerned with the size of the new proposed dwelling.

In response to a question, the Heritage Planner advised the Committee that the maximum size permitted for 38 John Street would be 2,489 sq.ft. including the garage.

Councillor Valerie Burke expressed concerns with respect to the windows on the second floor. She was of the opinion that the proposed new dwelling should be compatible with neighbouring properties and there should be sufficient screening from the neighbouring properties. Councillor Burke suggested that Heritage Markham re-confirm its decision from its May 11, 2016 meeting that Heritage Markham recognizes that 38 John Street is located in the sensitive core of the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District and supports the 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. Councillor Burke mentioned 82 John Street as an example.

A member noted that the streetscape, specifically the scale of the houses should be maintained.

After consulting heritage staff, Councillor Don Hamilton suggested that this matter should be referred to Council to consider Heritage Markham's recommendation from its meeting of May 11, 2016.

Marion Matthias, a local resident, spoke in opposition of the demolition of this building, which would be the first demolition in the core area of the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the following correspondence in opposition to a new dwelling be received as information:

- a) Linda Nichol dated August 9, 2016;
- b) Olana Alcock dated August 10, 2016; and
- c) Ken and Daila Webster, dated August 10, 2016;

That the depositions by Russ Gregory, agent on behalf of the applicant, Barry Nelson, representing the Executive of the Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill (SPOHT) and Marion Matthias, regarding the demolition permit application for 38 John Street, be received; and

That this matter be referred back to Council for consideration of Heritage Markham's recommendation from its May 11, 2016, meeting that Heritage Markham recognizes that 38 John Street is located in the sensitive core of the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District and supports the 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

CARRIED

**4. Heritage Permit Application,
149 John Street,
Driveway Gate Installed Without Approval (16.11)**

File No. HE 15 169425

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

The Heritage Planner reviewed this application which was first considered by Heritage Markham in July 2015, for a newly installed iron gate at 149 John Street, which was not approved by the City. He further advised that in September 2015, the property owners appeared before Heritage Markham Committee and provided reasons why the gate was installed which included matters of security, physical evidence indicating that there had once been a gate, and a misunderstanding that the installation of a gate did not require City approval. The Committee deferred making a decision on whether or not to permit the existing gate but requested Heritage Section staff to try and search for any evidence of an original gate or what the original gate might have looked like.

The Heritage Planner advised that neither staff nor the applicant have been able to locate any photographs indicating a gate at this location or showing what an original gate at 149 John Street may have looked like if it ever existed.

Shakiba Dilmaghani, the owner of the property, by way of photographs of gate hardware, advised the Committee that there was a gate previously installed at the property. She also advised the Committee that the dwelling is a long distance from the street and is shielded by trees and shrubs, making it a target for theft. She further advised that the gate was installed for safety and security reasons.

Councillor Valerie Burke advised the applicant that crime prevention workshops had been organized by the Ward Councillor, and that the police are available to advise residents on ways to make their homes less attractive in efforts to avoid theft.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the deputation by Shakiba Dilmaghani, owner of the property, with respect to the heritage permit application for a driveway gate installed without approval at 149 John Street, be received;

That Heritage Markham does not support a heritage permit application to permit the existing gate installed without City approval at 149 John Street; and

That the owners of the property be advised that the iron gate installed at 149 John Street, without City approval be removed no later than 30 days.

CARRIED

5. **Heritage Permit Applications,
John Street, Thornhill,
5 Euclid Street, Unionville,
5 Euclid Street, Unionville,
49 Church Street, Markham Village,
230 Main Street North Markham Village,
230 Main Street North Markham Village,
22 Joseph Street Markham Village,
45 Peter Street, Markham Village,
Delegated Approvals: Heritage Permits (16.11)**

File Nos: N/A

HE 16 124530

HE 16 126629

HE 16 123939

HE 16 124533

HE 16 125561

HE 16 124555

HE 16 1263000

Extract: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Graham Dewar disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 5, 5 Euclid Street, Unionville by nature of being the contractor for 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 the Heritage Permit Applications approved by Heritage Section staff under the delegated approval process:

CARRIED

6. **Building Permits or Sign Permits**
174 Main Street Unionville,
329 Main Street North Markham Village,
109 Robinson Street Markham Village,
60 Main Street North Markham Village,
22 George Street Markham Village,
171 Main Street North Markham Village,
14 Dublin Street Markham Village,
29 Jerman Street Markham Village,
55 Rouge Street Markham Village,
10 Centre Street Markham Village,
369 Main Street North Markham Village,
209 Main Street Markham Village,
201 Main Street North, Markham Village,
6 Heritage Corners Lane, Markham Heritage Estates
Delegated Approvals: Building and Sign Permits (16.11)

File Nos. 16 120225 AL
 15 176568 HP
 16 121082 HP
 16 1123001 SP
 16 123290 HP
 16 124172 SP
 16 124375 AL
 16 124576 HP
 16 1250713 HP
 16 125266 NH
 16 125428 SP
 16 127041 AL
 16 128356 SP
 15 160605 HP

Extract: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Graham Dewar disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 6, 29 Jerman Street, by nature of being the contractor for 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 the building permits and sign permits approved by Heritage Section staff under the delegated approval process.

CARRIED

**7. Committee of Adjustment Variance Application,
115 John Street, Thornhill,
Modification to Development Standards (16.11)**

File No: A/112/16

Extract: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning
R. Punit, Committee of Adjustment

A member expressed apprehension with the size and massing of the proposed new development and was concerned of the potential impact on the properties in front that are located within the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District.

Councillor Hamilton reiterated that the proposed dwelling is located outside the boundaries of the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District, and heritage staff are of the opinion that it does not appear that the proposed dwelling will have any detrimental impact on the attributes of the heritage conservation district.

Councillor Hamilton advised that neighbours of the subject property may consider taking the identified concerns to the Committee of Adjustment when this matter will be considered for variances requested by the applicant.

The Manager of Heritage Planning advised the Committee that staff has evaluated the merits of the proposed two storey dwelling based on Provincial Policy Statement heritage policies, specifically considering that the proposed main house is 60-65 feet from the boundary line and the one storey garage portion is located approximately 29 feet away from the rear property of the heritage district.

Councillor Valerie Burke spoke about past experiences of overwhelming effects of dwelling sizes and massing on neighbouring heritage properties. She suggested that Heritage Markham comments be provided to the Committee of Adjustment.

Marion Matthias, a local resident, spoke in opposition to the proposal. She noted that a mature maple tree will need to be removed to accommodate the proposed dwelling resulting in the visibility of the proposed new dwelling.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the deputation by Marion Matthias, in opposition to the Committee of Adjustment Variance application for modification to development standards of the property at 115 John Street, Thornhill, be received; and

That Heritage Markham Committee has concerns with respect to the size and massing of the proposed new residential dwelling at 115 John Street, Thornhill and the detrimental impact on the attributes of the heritage conservation district in front of the proposed new dwelling.

CARRIED

**8. Site Plan Control Application,
6030 Highway 7,
Dairy Queen Façade Renovations (16.11)**

File No. PRE 16

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

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham supports the proposed façade renovations to the Dairy Queen at 6030 Highway 7, and delegates its review function to staff for the formal site plan control application, subject to the plans in the formal application being substantially the same as those submitted with the Request for Pre-Consultation.

CARRIED

**9. Information -
Class Environmental Assessment Study:
Improvements to 16th Avenue (16.11)**

Extract: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham receive the Class Environmental Assessment Study Improvements to 16th Avenue as information.

CARRIED

10. Correspondence - August 2016(16.11)

Extract: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That the following correspondence be received as information:

- a) Community Heritage Ontario - CHO News, Summer 2016.
- b) Berczy Settlers Gazette, Summer 2016.

CARRIED

**11. Site Plan Control Application,
30 Colborne Street,
Alterations & Additions to a Heritage House (16.11)**

File No. SC 16 114097

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

Councillor Valerie Burke disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 11, 30 Colborne Street, by nature of being the immediate neighbour of the property and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

David Johnston disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 11, 30 Colborne Street, 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.

The Senior Heritage Planner explained this application for alterations and additions to a heritage house at 30 Colborne Street. He advised that the Architectural Review Sub-committee conducted site visits of the property to obtain a better understanding of the house and property prior to Heritage Markham Committee making further recommendations for consideration on August 10, 2016.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham receive the Architectural Review Sub-Committee notes from the meeting held on July 18, 2016, as information.

CARRIED

**12. Site Plan Control Application,
30 Colborne Street,
Revised Proposed Addition to a Heritage Dwelling (16.11)**

File No. SC 16 114097

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

Councillor Valerie Burke disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 12, 30 Colborne Street, by nature of being the immediate neighbour of the property and did not take part in the discussion of or vote on the question of the approval of this matter.

David Johnston disclosed an interest with respect to Item # 12, 30 Colborne Street, 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.

The Senior Heritage Planner explained the site plan control application for a revised proposed addition to a heritage dwelling at 30 Colborne Street. The new revised concept retains original heritage house or a 1½ storey building and the well-designed 1958 addition. The new addition is planned for the east side and the rear of the existing house in a one storey form.

Heritage Markham Committee members had the opportunity to conduct a site visit of the property on July 18, 2016, to better understand the house, its property and its context within the neighbourhood. The applicant has responded to comments and feedback from staff, Heritage Markham and the public with a revised plan prepared by a new architect.

Staff is supportive of the revised concept, which respects the historic integrity of the heritage house, retains the well-designed 1958 addition, and keeps the overall height low. The proposed addition will not be appreciably different from the present side addition from a visual impact perspective. The significant heritage streetscape of Colborne Street will be protected while providing the applicant with needed additional living space and an up-to-date layout. Significant vegetative planting will screen most of the addition from view of the adjoining properties and will create a unique private courtyard space at the rear of the house. Variances will be needed for building depth and maximum floor area ratio to implement the revised plan, however, the impact of these variances on the street will be negligible. The trade-off for the variances is a unique design solution that meets the intention of the Heritage Conservation District Plan and preserves the scale of Colborne Street.

David Johnston, architect for the applicant, by way of slides, explained the new concept. He advised that at the end of all additions, the square footage of the house will be a little over 3,300 sq.ft and the garage will be 500 sq.ft. (whereas only 450 sq.ft. is permitted). He advised that variances will be sought for additional floor space and depth. The spruce tree will need to be removed to facilitate the driveway. He further advised that the addition will need to be raised by a couple of feet.

Councillor Karen Rea suggested that if the matter is sent to Architectural Review Sub-Committee, its comments be considered by Heritage Markham at its meeting in September 2016.

Barry Nelson, representing the Executive of the Society for the Preservation of Historic Thornhill (SPOHT), spoke about the various uncertainties related to the new proposed plan, including the variances that will be sought by the applicant.

Marion Matthias, a local resident, spoke in opposition of the removal of the 2nd floor from the 1958 addition and also the removal of the mature spruce tree. She mentioned that only preliminary designs were provided by the applicant and sought clarifications as to when the final designs would be available. She also sought clarification with respect to the basement.

David Johnston advised that there will be a basement under the addition with no provision for a walk-out. He advised that currently 60% of the house has a basement. He further advised that the 1958 addition is being retained without the kitchen, the windows on the west side will stay exactly where they are and the fireplace is being retained. The removal of the 2nd floor does not change anything from the outside. The addition will be screened by trees and shrubs.

The Manager of Heritage Planning advised the Committee that the Architectural Review Sub-Committee and staff will work with the applicant and architect on the revised design and any potential variances, in order to save time when the matter is re-considered by Heritage Markham at its September meeting.

Councilor Karen Rea requested to be included as a member of the Architectural Review Sub-Committee. She further advised that she would like to see consistency of standards applied for all applications for modifications to heritage dwellings.

A member suggested that 3,350 sq.ft. floor space area could possibly be supported with a rationale that addresses the unique situation of this property and the interior layout inefficiencies associated with a one storey design.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham refer the revised design for an addition to 30 Colborne Street to the Architectural Review Sub-Committee, and that recommendations from the Architectural Sub-Committee be considered by Heritage Markham Committee at its meeting in September 2016.

CARRIED

- 13. Site Plan Control Application,
12 Station Lane,
Proposed Addition to an Existing Heritage House (16.11)**
File No. SC 16 120258
Extract: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning
P. Wokral, Heritage Planner
-

The Heritage Planner explained the site plan control application for 12 Station Lane to permit the construction of a two storey addition to the existing heritage house. The application is also to restore heritage elements of the house.

The Heritage Planner further advised the Committee that this property is subject of a Committee of Adjustment application to remove a hold. He explained that this property, under the Secondary Plan allowed office uses. At the time this was done, all these houses were in residential use, and a hold was put on the properties which allowed the properties to be used for office uses if they met certain criteria. However, no one has taken up the option to turn these properties into offices and they remained entirely in residential use. These residential uses are considered legal, non-conforming uses, and when this use needs to be extended, permission needs to be sought from the Committee of Adjustment to lift this hold. The application is to allow the residential use to continue.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection to the proposed repositioning of the heritage portion of the house as shown on the drawings date stamped July 8, 2016; and,

That final review of the site plan application be referred to Heritage Section Staff provided that:

- The roof of the proposed addition be revised to be complementary to the roof forms of the heritage portion of the house through the use of gables rather than a large hipped roof;
- That the following revisions be made to the restoration plan for the heritage house:
 - Elimination of the proposed eave returns and boxing-in of the eaves;
 - The single, second floor, gable end window openings be maintained;
 - The use of two over two, single or double hung, wooden windows typical of the 1890's date of construction , on the heritage portion of the house;
 - The use of turned veranda posts;
 - The addition of gable end brick chimneys;
 - A note indicating that the existing underlying historic exterior wall cladding is to be retained and restored or accurately replicated in the original material if, Heritage Section Staff is satisfied that the original exterior cladding is incapable of being restored;

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

That Heritage Markham has no objection to the Committee of Adjustment application to address the hold on the property and allow the residential use to be expanded.

CARRIED

**14. Site Plan Control Application,
329 Main Street North,
Detached Rear Yard Garage (16.11)**

File No. SC 16 177385

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

The Senior Heritage Planner explained the site plan control application for a new detached garage in the rear yard to replace an existing frame garage in the same location. Council, in December 2015, approved a demolition permit application for the existing garage, currently being used as a storage shed. This application does not need any variances. Staff has requested the applicant to provide more information about the garage doors. The applicant has also been requested to use corner boards on the siding.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham has no objection to the proposed new garage at 329 Main Street North subject to the applicant agreeing that corner boards of no less than 3 inches will be installed, the horizontal siding being made of wood or having a wood-like appearance, and the garage door being carriage house style, made of wood or having a wood-like appearance, and that these details are specified in a site plan agreement for the project.

CARRIED

**15. Heritage Estates/Threatened Buildings,
Potential Relocations of Heritage Buildings,
to Markham Heritage Estates (16.11)**

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

The Heritage Planner explained that staff has received several requests from residents wanting to relocate threatened vacant heritage buildings to the Markham Heritage Estates. At this point in time, only 7 lots are available in the Heritage Estates for relocation of threatened heritage buildings, and approximately 60 vacant heritage buildings are listed that could be considered to be threatened.

The Heritage Planner advised the Committee that in September 2016, the City's By-law Department will be seeking Council's approval for proposed changes to the City's Property Standards By-law and the Keep Markham Beautiful By-law designed to enhance the level of protection for heritage buildings and their character defining attributes. If approved by Council, it is the hope of Heritage Section staff that vacant heritage buildings can be better protected until re-development of the property occurs in the future, or that the properties will be prevented from being vacant.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham recommends that the consideration of relocating any more heritage buildings to Markham Heritage Estates be deferred until the list of vacant and threatened heritage buildings can be reviewed more comprehensively, to assess the relative heritage significance of each building, and the degree of threat to each building, in the context of the City's proposed enhancements to the Property Standards, and Keep Markham Beautiful By-laws.

CARRIED

**16. Request for Feedback,
Heritage Letters of Credit (16.11)**

Extract: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning

The Manager of Heritage Planning explained that at its July 2016 meeting, Heritage Markham requested that staff review the amounts of Letters of Credits relative to the size of the project. He advised that Heritage Letters of Credit have been used to ensure that heritage buildings are protected and retained as part of the new development, that identified work on heritage properties is undertaken as per approvals, and that new development is undertaken as per approved plans and agreements. He further advised that, in 2009, a Letter of Credit Policy was prepared by Heritage Section staff and approved by the Director of Planning. This Policy attempts to strike a balance between the amount of financial security required for an owner-occupied dwelling in a heritage district versus the amount required from a developer of greenfield projects. In the past, staff has attempted to find an amount that will motivate a homeowner to undertake the work as per approved plans but does not overly penalize the owner for living in a heritage conservation district.

Discussion ensued with respect to the possibility of reviewing the required Letter of Credit amount. Staff was to have further discussions with Councillor Rea on this issue.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham receive as information memorandum dated August 10, 2016, from the Manager of Heritage Planning with respect to Heritage Letters of Credit.

CARRIED

**17. Addendum Agenda
Site Plan Control Application,
40 Peter Street, Markham
Addition to Existing Dwelling (16.11)**

File No. SC 16 117837
Extract: R. Hutcheson, Manager of Heritage Planning
P. Wokral, Heritage Planner

The Manager of Heritage Planning explained the site plan control application for a rear addition to the existing heritage dwelling at 40 Peter Street. He advised the Committee that the applicant has implemented suggestions made by Heritage Section staff to improve the architectural compatibility of the addition and restoration plan for the existing heritage house made at the formal pre-consultation meeting.

The Manager of Heritage Planning further advised the Committee that the applicant was informed that Heritage Markham Committee prefers not to receive addendum agenda items after the agenda has been published as the members would like the opportunity to review staff reports, visit the site, understand any engineering or tree related matters and become aware of any issues.

The Committee members indicated they wanted more time to review and consider this application.

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That Heritage Markham Committee refer the review of the proposed addition to the existing dwelling at 40 Peter Street to the September 2016 Heritage Markham meeting.

CARRIED

**18. New Business
Review of Vacant and Threatened Heritage Buildings
Presentation by Heritage Section Staff (16.11)**

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

Heritage Markham Recommends:

That consideration of this matter be listed as Item # 1 on the agenda for the next appropriate Heritage Markham Committee meeting.

CARRIED

19. New Business

Correspondence (16.11)

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

The Committee discussed an email from a former member of Heritage Markham that was circulated by staff to the Committee members at the request of the former member. It was unanimously agreed that any concerns should be directed to the appropriate City department that deals with such matters and/or the Committee Chair, rather than circulated to committee members directly.

Adjournment

The Heritage Markham Committee meeting adjourned at 10:02 PM.