CITY OF VAUGHAN

REPORT NO. 1 OF THE

HERITAGE VAUGHAN COMMITTEE

For consideration by the Committee of the Whole of the City of Vaughan on March 3, 2015

The Heritage Vaughan Committee met at 7:10 p.m., on January 21, 2015.

Present: John Mifsud, Chair

Christine Radewych, Vice Chair

Robert Brown
Roger Dickinson
Lucy Di Pietro
Richard Hahn
Tony Marziliano
Gianni Mignardi
Nick Pacione
Fadia Pahlawan

Councillor Alan Shefman

Claudio Travierso

Also Present: Cecilia Nin Hernandez, Cultural Heritage Co-ordinator

Daniel Rende, Cultural Heritage Co-ordinator

Moira Wilson, Senior Urban Designer

Angela Palermo, Manager of Cultural Services

Rose Magnifico, Assistant City Clerk

The following items were dealt with:

1 PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF PART V DESIGNATED BUILDING 11 STATION STREET WARD 4 - VICNITY OF KEELE STREET AND MAJOR MACKENZIE DRIVE

Heritage Vaughan advises Council:

1) That the recommendation contained in the following report of the Manager of Urban Design and Cultural Heritage, dated January 21, 2015, was approved.

Recommendation

The Manager of Urban Design and Cultural Heritage recommend:

 That Heritage Vaughan approves the demolition of the two buildings at 11 Station Street as they are non-heritage style buildings located within the Maple Heritage Conservation District.

Contribution to Sustainability

This report is consistent with the goals and objectives within *Green Directions Vaughan*, the City's Community Sustainability and Environmental Master Plan, specifically:

Goal 4: To create a vibrant community where citizens, business and visitors thrive

Objective 4.1: "To foster a city with strong social cohesion, an engaging arts scene, and a clear sense of its culture and heritage"

Economic Impact

There are no requirements for new funding associated with this report.

Communications Plan

All agenda items and minutes relating to Heritage Vaughan committee meetings are circulated to relevant City departments, applicants and their representatives.

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to seek Heritage Vaughan approval for the proposed demolition of the existing buildings to allow for an extension of the neighbouring Maple GO Station parking lot.

Background - Analysis and Options

Location

The subject property is located on Station Street, on the north side of Major Mackenzie Drive between Dufferin Street and Keele Street as shown on Attachment #1. The property is located between the Maple Cemetery and the Maple GO Station.

Subject Property Contains Two Non-heritage Style Buildings

The subject property contains two non-heritage style buildings. The first is a one-storey bungalow, constructed circa 1990, while the second building is a concrete block garage. Both of these buildings are considered non-heritage style buildings according to the policies of the Maple Heritage Conservation District Guidelines and demolition can be supported by Cultural Heritage Staff.

Proposal to Create Gravel Parking Lot Extension of Existing GO Parking Lot

The applicant has applied to demolish the existing structures to create a commuter parking lot to support the Maple GO train station. At this time, no paving is being proposed as the parking lot will be gravel. The ditches and curb-less rural profile at the edges of the property will remain and will not be affected by this proposal. The Maple Heritage Conservation District Guidelines state that this curb-less rural profile should be maintained throughout the Heritage Conservation District.

Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2020/Strategic Plan

This report is consistent with the priorities set forth in Vaughan Vision 20/20 Strategic Plan, through the following initiatives, specifically:

Service Excellence:

- Preserve our Heritage & Support Diversity, Arts & Culture
- Lead & Promote Environmental Sustainability
- Promote Community Safety, Health & Wellness
- Demonstrate Excellence in Service Delivery

Regional Implications

N/A

Conclusion

Cultural Heritage Staff is satisfied that the two buildings at 11 Station Street are non-heritage style buildings in accordance with the policies of the Maple Heritage Conservation District Guidelines. Accordingly, the Development Planning Department can support the approval for the demolition of the structures to create a commuter parking lot to support the Maple GO Station.

Attachments

- 1. Location Map
- Site Photos. January 6, 2015

Report prepared by:

Daniel Rende, Cultural Heritage Coordinator, ext. 8112 Moira Wilson, Senior Urban Designer, ext. 8353

(A copy of the attachments referred to in the foregoing have been forwarded to each Member of Council and a copy thereof is also on file in the office of the City Clerk.)

PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF PART IV DESIGNATED BUILDING GEORGE MUNSHAW HOUSE WARD 4 - VICINITY OF BATHURST STREET AND MAJOR MACKENZIE DRIVE

Heritage Vaughan advises Council:

- 1) That the recommendation contained in the following report of the Manager of Urban Design and Cultural Heritage, dated January 21, 2015, was approved; and
- 2) That the developer secure the George Munshaw House by erecting a 6' fence and installing additional lighting, and that the site be visited periodically.

Recommendation

The Manager of Urban Design and Cultural Heritage recommends:

 That Heritage Vaughan refuse the proposed demolition of the George Munshaw House, Designated Part IV under the Ontario Heritage Act through by-law 403-87.

Contribution to Sustainability

This report is consistent with the goals and objectives within *Green Directions Vaughan*, the City's Community Sustainability and Environmental Master Plan, specifically:

Goal 4: To create a vibrant community where citizens, business and visitors thrive

Objective 4.1: "To foster a city with strong social cohesion, an engaging arts scene, and a clear sense of its culture and heritage"

Economic Impact

There are no requirements for new funding associated with this report.

Communications Plan

All agenda items and minutes relating to Heritage Vaughan committee meetings are circulated to relevant City departments, applicants and their representatives.

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to seek a Heritage Vaughan decision prior to a Council decision for the proposed demolition of the George Munshaw House, which is designated Part IV through by-law 403-87.

Background - Analysis and Options

Location

The subject property is located on Major Mackenzie Drive, west of Bathurst Street, and set far back (approximately 130 metres) from the road. The building is located in Draft Plan of Subdivisions 19T-03V13 and 19T-13V11 of which Longyard Properties Inc. is the owner.

Reasons for Designation

The George Munshaw House was designated Part IV under the Ontario Heritage Act due to its historical and architectural value. Architecturally, the house was constructed with vertical plank sheathing as a frame support and represented the transition period from post and beam construction to balloon frame construction. The date of construction of the Munshaw House is circa 1825-1850. The building was moved from Concession 1 Lot 44 in Richmond Hill, east side of Bathurst and south of Major Mackenzie Drive, to its current location in 1985 and a new foundation was put in place.

George Munshaw Jr.'s grandfather, Balsor Munshaw, was one of the founding members of what is modern day Richmond Hill. Balsor Munshaw arrived in Toronto from Pennsylvania in 1793 and settled near Elgin Mills and Yonge Street. Balsor later moved to Yonge Street and Langstaff and would have a total of 9 children. One of the children, George Munshaw Sr., purchased the north half of Concession 1 Lot 44 in 1815 which later contained the vertical plank house discussed in this report, likely built by George Munshaw Sr. himself.

Council and Heritage Vaughan Approval Requirement under Ontario Heritage Act

Part IV, Section 34 of the Ontario Heritage Act requires that Council, with the advice of the Heritage Vaughan Committee, must render a decision for demolition proposals for Part IV, Section 29 individually designated properties.

Council must render one of three decisions as per Section 34. (2) of the Ontario Heritage Act:

- (i) consent to the application,
 - (i.1) consent to the application, subject to such terms and conditions as may be specified by the council, or
- (ii) refuse the application;

Council and Heritage Vaughan Committee Recommended Building to be Preserved and Integrated into Future Subdivision in 2005

The George Munshaw House is located in a plan for subdivision — 19T-03V13, owned by Longyard Properties Inc. - which is associated with Zoning By-Law Amendment Z.13.048 and By-Law 063-2013 which was passed on June 4, 2013. This proposed subdivision was brought to Committee of the Whole on June 16, 2008 and later approved by Council on June 23, 2008. The Plan of Subdivision includes two heritage homes to be preserved and integrated into the subdivision — the Bassingthwaite House at 10244 Bathurst Street and the George Munshaw House at 980 Major Mackenzie Drive. The Plan of Subdivision allocated spaces for these two homes on Block 777 and Block 800 and By-Law 063-2013 stipulates that Block 800, which contains the George Munshaw House, be zoned to allow one detached residential dwelling only.

This item was presented to the Heritage Vaughan Committee on August 24, 2005 and several buildings on the subject property were approved for demolition with the exception of the George Munshaw and Bassingthwaite houses which would be integrated into the subdivision due to their strong Cultural Heritage value. The following is an extract from the Council approved recommendation:

Heritage Vaughan recommends:

That the Bassingthwaite House (at 10244 Bathurst Street) be preserved and integrated into the subject Draft Plan of Subdivision to the satisfaction of Cultural Services staff.

That the owner continue to have the George Munshaw House (the small building at 980 Major Mackenzie Drive) preserved and eventually integrated into the subject Draft Plan of Subdivision to the satisfaction of Cultural Services staff.

Vaughan Official Plan 2010 Supports Conservation and Education of Heritage Resources

Section 6.1 (6.1.1.1 and 6.1.1.2) of the Official Plan states that cultural heritage resources shall be conserved and integrated into future development. Increasing the awareness and education component of heritage resources is also supported in the Official Plan.

Section 6.2.2.4 states that *Designated heritage properties shall be conserved in accordance with Good heritage conservation practice.* The policies regarding education and awareness do not supercede this policy.

Applicant Proposal to Demolish George Munshaw House and Build Commemorative Structure and Commemorate the History of the Patterson Village in the Park

The applicant is proposing Historical Commemoration of the George Munshaw House which entails the complete demolition of the structure and the construction of a commemorative park feature in the subdivision. This proposal does not include the salvage of any building materials as the structure will be composed entirely of new materials. The commemorative structure will be a shade structure modeled after the George Munshaw House at an 80% scale that explains and demonstrates the history of the Patterson Village, the history of the Munshaw family, and the vertical plank construction of the George Munshaw House through plaques and the structure itself.

Please refer to the attached Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment (Attachment #6) submitted by ERA Architects for more information on this proposal.

Relocation of George Munshaw House Preferred Option

Sections 6.2.2.7 and 6.2.2.8 of VOP2010 state conservation in-situ of the same use or through adaptive reuse are the preferred first and second options, while relocation on site or to another site within the City follow as third and fourth options.

Staff has indicated support to the retention, adaptive reuse, and relocation of the house in comments sent to Development Planning on November 10, 2014 as the house was previously moved from modern-day Richmond Hill to its current location in the 1980s because of its recognized Cultural Heritage Value. Similarly, there have been several examples in Vaughan where buildings have been moved within sites or to new sites to accommodate new development and retention of the existing heritage building. The Cultural Heritage Resource Impact Assessment (Attachment #6) examines four possible sites for relocation, however, none of these options are being pursued by the Applicant.

In initial discussions with Parks Development staff, the relocation of the George Munshaw House to a Neighbourhood Park in the subdivision is not a suitable option. The Neigbourhood Park is not large enough to accommodate a structure of this size and there is no feasible adaptive reuse of the building for park purposes. The City's Official Plan 2010 – Volume 1, Section 7.3.1 Parks and Open Space Types identifies that in order to support a variety of parks that are evenly distributed throughout the City and accordance with the Active Together Master Plan, Neighbourhood Parks are to be programed to provide a balance of active and passive uses, such as children's playgrounds, basketball courts, unlit sports facilities, etc. The programing of a Neighbourhood Park does not offer opportunities for the use of a building such as the George Munshaw House, and the park grade also presents restrictions.

The following option is to be explored by the Applicant:

Retention and relocation of the George Munshaw House within the proposed subdivision

The CHRIA submitted by the applicant includes an option to move the George Munshaw House about 180 metres south to create a Major Mackenzie Drive frontage (see page 17

of Attachment #6). The benefit to the City and the public from this new location is to increase the visibility and public appreciation of the heritage structure.

While the adaptive re-use of the building to a non-residential use could be supported, the building could remain residential and be used as a main residence or as an accessory structure to a main residence. If the building is to be used as a main residence, sympathetic additions to the building can be explored.

A key reason staff recommends the retention of the George Munshaw House and its relocation within the proposed development is to support the Official Plan objective to create a clear sense of the City's culture and heritage. The George Munshaw House and the Bassingthwaite House are irreplaceable assets that offer a unique placemaking opportunity that should be leveraged in this development and to provide a link to our City's past.

Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2020/Strategic Plan

This report is consistent with the priorities set forth in Vaughan Vision 20/20 Strategic Plan, through the following initiatives, specifically:

Service Excellence:

- Preserve our Heritage & Support Diversity, Arts & Culture
- Lead & Promote Environmental Sustainability
- Promote Community Safety, Health & Wellness
- Demonstrate Excellence in Service Delivery

Regional Implications

N/A

Conclusion

That Heritage Vaughan refuse the proposed demolition of the Part IV designated George Munshaw House as it contains significant historical and architectural heritage value.

Attachments

- 1. Location Map
- 2. Site Photos
- 3. Vertical sheathing diagram from designation report for Designation By-law 403-87
- Vertical sheathing diagram of William Henry House, constructed 1858-1860 from John I. Rempel's <u>Building with Wood</u>
- 5. Summary of Cultural Heritage Significance
- 6. Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment by ERA Architects submitted by applicant

Report Prepared By

Daniel Rende, Cultural Heritage Coordinator, ext. 8112 Moira Wilson, Senior Urban Designer, ext. 8353

(A copy of the attachments referred to in the foregoing have been forwarded to each Member of Council and a copy thereof is also on file in the office of the City Clerk.)

3 HERITAGE REVIEW OF PROPOSED NEW CONSTRUCTION AT 124, 112-116 WOODBRIDGE AVENUE AND CONSERVATION OF THE GILMOUR HALLETT HOUSE - WARD 2

Heritage Vaughan advises Council:

- 1) That the recommendation contained in the following report of Manager of Urban Design and Cultural Heritage, dated January 21, 2015, was approved; and
- 2) That the following deputations were received:
 - 1. Ms. Rosemarie Humphries, Humphries Planning, Chrislea Road, Vaughan;
 - 2. Mr. Paul Oberst, Rusholme Park Crescent, Toronto; and
 - 3. Mr. Jamie Maynard, William Street, Woodbridge.

Recommendation

The Manager of Urban Design and Cultural Heritage recommends:

- 1. That Heritage Vaughan consider and support the proposal for new construction at 124,112-116 Woodbridge Avenue and conservation of the Gilmour Hallett house subject to the following included as conditions of Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment, Site Plan, and final Heritage Permit approval:
 - a) That a letter of credit in the amount to be determined by Cultural Heritage for the conservation and security of the Gilmour Hallett house be provided prior to adoption of the Official Plan Amendment and implementation of the Zoning By-law Amendment; and,
 - b) That prior to execution of the Site Plan Agreement, the following information be submitted for review and approval to the satisfaction of the Development Planning Department:
 - i. That the 1 storey commercial wing at 124 Woodbridge Avenue remains at the existing height;
 - ii. That the architectural elevations show the average grade and that the building height not exceed 21.3M;
 - That the architectural elevations for the proposed new building be revised to include notes referencing each material assigned to each surface to the satisfaction of Urban Design and Cultural Heritage;
 - iv. That the architectural drawings show an accessible, ground floor pedestrian connection from the proposed building to Market Lane Plaza through the existing one storey commercial building;
 - v. That the Conservation Plan for the Gilmour Hallett house include the following information for review and approval of Urban Design and Cultural Heritage:

- 1. An analysis with photographs of the condition of the existing building as it pertains to the areas affected by the proposed work (in particular the skylight and front porch);
- Architectural drawings clearly indicating any existing construction portions to be removed, added and repaired indicating specific methodology;
- 3. Detailed architectural drawings of the paneling of the porch columns, and sign band as well as material specifications and paint colours pertaining to all elements of the porch; and,
- vi. That a glass canopy matching the canopy proposed at the front of the new building be provided on the north wall of the proposed commemorative plaza to shield the entrance to the pedestrian connection, and that detailed drawings for this canopy be submitted for review and approval by Urban Design and Cultural Heritage;
- vii. That a minimum two sets of architectural construction drawings for the work proposed to the Gilmour house as reflected in the Conservation Plan are submitted to Cultural Heritage for review and approval prior to the approval of a Heritage Permit. These drawings must match building permit drawings;
- viii. That detailed measured drawings for the commemorative plaque including wording, materials, colours, and location within the proposed commemorative plaza, be submitted for review and approval by Urban Design and Cultural Heritage;
- ix. That the applicant submit exterior material samples and specifications for the building, commemorative plaque, signage and landscaping features including furniture for review and approval by Urban Design and Cultural Heritage; and,
- 2. That the applicant submit two copies of the final set of architectural permit drawings for review and approval by Urban Design and Cultural Heritage, including architectural site plan, architectural plans, elevations and landscape plans when all conditions of Site Plan approval have been satisfied to capture all required information for review and approval; and,
- That prior to building permit approval, a set of architectural permit drawings be submitted to Urban Design and Cultural Heritage for review and approval of a Heritage Permit; and,
- 4. That should the design proposal change as a result of issues from review by other City divisions, departments or external agencies (e.g. variance requirements, etc.) the applicant is required to contact Cultural Heritage in order to obtain approval of a revised Heritage Permit. The new submittal may require review by the Heritage Vaughan Committee and any previous approvals granted may be deemed invalid based on the new information provided.

Heritage Vaughan approvals do not constitute approvals of the Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendment and Site Plan applications that apply to the subject lands. The Development Planning Department will continue to review and consider the site specific development applications for these lands in accordance with the applicable planning policies and objectives.

Contribution to Sustainability

This report is consistent with the goals and objectives within *Green Directions Vaughan*, the City's Community Sustainability and Environmental Master Plan, specifically:

Goal 4: To create a vibrant community where citizens, business and visitors thrive

Objective 4.1: "To foster a city with strong social cohesion, an engaging arts scene, and a clear sense of its culture and heritage"

Economic Impact

N/A

Communications Plan

All agenda items and minutes relating to Heritage Vaughan Committee meetings are circulated to relevant City departments, applicants and their representatives.

Purpose

To consider the background and analysis portion of this report in order to review the proposal for new construction at the subject properties.

Background - Analysis and Options

Heritage Status of Property

The subject lands are designated Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act as part of the Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District.

The lands are located within the Woodbridge Avenue Character area as identified in the Heritage District Plan.

124 Woodbridge Avenue is also a Registered property under Section 27 Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. It contains the Victorian building known as the Gilmour Hallett house or Gilmour Hotel dating to 1878. This property is identified as "contributing" to the district character.

Background

The applicant has submitted an application for the development of the lands that includes 124, 112-116 Woodbridge Avenue.

Cultural Heritage staff has provided comments on the subject planning applications (Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-Law Amendment and Site Plan) to provide the applicant with information and guidance regarding compliance requirements of the Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District Guidelines (WHCDG). The applicant has

worked diligently with the Heritage District Plan to arrive at a contributing design for the area and to mitigate impacts to adjacent heritage resources.

The applicant has been advised that the proposal will require the review by the Heritage Vaughan Committee for the current development applications.

Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District Guidelines Requirements

Cultural Heritage reviews applications as to whether they conform to the Heritage Conservation District Guidelines.

The Heritage District Guidelines require new construction within the district to be of contributing contemporary design to the Character Area where the subject lands are located as well as to the Heritage District as a whole.

The following is a summary of the requirements for new construction for this site in order to achieve a contributing proposal to the Heritage District character:

- Maintain and conserve contributing heritage resources and buildings.
- Incorporate attributes of subject character area, requirements in scale, height, setbacks, angular plane, among others.
- Material palette drawn from historical precedents in new composition together with sensitive use of other modern materials.
- Have proportion of parts that relates to immediate context.
- Comply with solidity vs. transparency ratios (20% to 70% solid for Woodbridge Avenue).
- Have detailing that relates in scale, repetition, lines and levels (extrapolation of lines) beam and column solid and transparent that relates to contributing context.
 - In Woodbridge Avenue, detailing can be more contemporary, but in other character areas a more traditional approach should be used.
- Respect adjacent contributing buildings and transition to them through appropriate spacing (1/2 the height of the contributing building).
- New buildings must have building podium, lining street, of 2 to 4 floors maximum
- Additional building height to maximum 6 floors (20M) only when no undue impact to public realm and/or adjacent properties, including impact on sunlight penetration and views. It must step back along a 45 degree angular plane from:
 - The street, starting at 13M, when facing a street and starting at 9.5M, when facing another property; and
 - The height of any contributing building

Analysis of Proposal as it Relates to the Heritage District Plan

Compliant Aspects

The following aspects generally in comply with the Heritage District Guidelines pending additional required clarifications as noted:

1. Materials (WHCDG Section 6.3.3): Exterior materials are required to be submitted in order to inform the design review, including windows. The proposed material list is as follows:

brick (three types), prefinished aluminum and glass sunshade, insulated aluminum panel, prefinished aluminum frames for doors and windows, spandrel glass and panels in aluminum frames, precast molding, glass and frame railing, prefinished metal cap/ flashing, prefinished metal louvers, 4G- Trim Panels, cedar lattice, vertigo board panels.

Required clarification: While materials are listed in the proposed architectural drawings, the notes will be required to be matched with the assigned areas in the elevations. Architectural elevation drawings with this information are required for review and approval to the satisfaction of the Urban Design and Cultural Heritage section.

- 2. Proportion of Parts (WHCDG Section 6.3.3): The building façade composition is based on the proportion of parts of the adjacent contributing historic building known as the Gilmour house. Please refer to attachment section of this report.
- 3. Windows (WHCDG Section 6.3.3): The window design is contemporary while including various proportioned sections to relate back to the predominant verticality in window proportions in traditional architecture.
- 4. Solidity vs. Transparency (WHCDG Section 6.3.3): The glazing to solid ratio on the façade compositions generally complies with the requirement of 40% to 70% solid.
- 5. (WHCDG Section 6.1.2, 6.4 and 6.5): The ground level podium is set back to match the adjacent front set back of the Gilmour house. Transition requirements to adjacent historic resources are respected except for a marginal amount at the top two floors. The 45 degree angle from the height of the historic resource to the limits of the new construction is for the most part respected. The required distance between the historic resource and the new construction exceeds the required minimum distance of half the height of the historic resource. The proposal indicates a width of 7.4M for the plaza while the height of the heritage resource is noted at 7.6M.

The building provides a street wall podium of maximum 4 stories (13 M) in keeping with the Heritage District Plan. The proposed top of podium is noted as 12.725 M. The upper floor plates are recessed back more than the required 45 angle from the top of the podium; this provides further relief from any undue impact to the district character and the adjacent heritage resource. The proposed façade is arranged continuous rhythm of bays with ample vision glass fenestration facing Woodbridge Avenue. The design allows for active uses facing the street and its potential for adaptability overtime. The main entrance to the building is recessed within one of these bays. The Gilmour house is retained in situ. For the Woodbridge Avenue Character Area, new buildings are allowed

to have a zero side yard and front yard distances as long as transitions to heritage resources are met, which they have in the subject proposal. The front setback is aligned with the adjacent heritage resource.

- 6. (WHCDG Section 6.3): The proposed new construction is of a contemporary style which is allowed and supported in the guidelines.
- 7. (WHCDG Section 7 and 8): A Heritage Impact Assessment, Conservation and Commemorative Plan by a qualified heritage consultant for the Gilmour Hallett house have been submitted for review. The commemoration themes of the History of the Gilmour Hallett house and the history of the milling industry in Woodbridge are supported. Please refer to attachment section of the report. The design for the space between the historic resource and the new building is found in general conformity, sympathetic to the Gilmour Hallett house and contributing to the area. Nevertheless, the following are summary comments and required clarifications to be included in a final submission:
 - a. Commemorative plaza landscaping and furniture, re-shingling, and pedestrian connection, material samples and furniture specifications will be require for review.
 - Skylight (pedestrian connection at rear of historic house), demolition lines and photos of the existing condition are required to be included in the building permit drawings.
 - c. Architectural detail drawings will be required to be submitted for review for the signage band and column paneling as well as material specifications and colour paint selections will be required to be submitted for review and approval by Cultural Heritage as a condition of Site Plan approval
 - d. Building Permit drawings reflecting the work proposed to the Gilmour house and the pedestrian walkway (skylight) reflected in the Conservation Plan are required to be submitted to Cultural Heritage Staff for review and approval prior to the release of a Heritage Permit and a building permit.

Non- Compliant Aspects

The list below constitutes a summary of main items that do not comply with the Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District Guidelines (WHCDG). Non-compliant aspects are addressed in the Heritage Impact Assessment.

- Height and Mass (WHCDG Section 6): The proposed mass and height are somewhat over the maximum allowable under the Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District Guidelines (WHCDG):
 - a) Maximum building height is exceeded by 1.3 metres (21.3M proposed versus a maximum 20M allowed). The top storey is substantially recessed from the front edge of the building. The Committee may consider that the proposed additional 1.3M at the top of the building will not adversely affect the Heritage Character of the area. The increase in height represents 6.5% over the allowable height.
 - b) The number of maximum allowable stories is exceeded by an 1 extra storey count. The possible maximum allowable is a 4 storey, 13 M podium with additional 2 floors, stepping back at 45 degree angle to a maximum of

20 M if no undue impact. The Committee may consider that the proposed top storey is for the greater part contained within the permissible 20 M maximum building height and therefore it does not add significantly to the building mass. The building is significantly recessed at the top levels reducing the impact to the streetscape and heritage resource. Moreover, the proposed height of the ground, second, third and fourth stories, result in an elevation composition that is contributing as it permits a visual relationship to the proportions and aesthetics of the adjacent Gilmour house.

- c) The required 45 degree building step back from the height of the adjacent Gilmour Hallett house is not met. The area of the proposed building beyond the 45 degree angle from the Gilmour House is 3.41 square metres (See Attachment #9). The Heritage Vaughan Committee may consider this a relatively marginal amount and that there would be no undue impact to the adjacent heritage resource. Additionally, the upper stories of the proposed building are generously set back. This provides the opportunity for a fifth storey terrace, creating a contributing and attractive use for the podium roof (See Attachment #7).
- d) The WHCDG requires a 45 degree building step back from the 9.5M datum for upper floors when facing "another property". The proposal does not meet the requirement along the east side yard. It should be noted that the proposal has not maximized the build out massing on the east side by stepping back the building starting at a height of 2.8M. In this respect, the Heritage Vaughan Committee may consider that the massing of the building has accommodated other design considerations on the east side to improve the project, such as a large terrace to serve the second floor units, upper balconies set back from the property line, and overall, utilizing the building area in a more efficient manner. The applicant has provided a letter from the owner of the adjacent property indicating support for the development.

Review of Heritage Impact Assessment and Conservation Plan for the Gilmour House at 124 Woodbridge Avenue

Heritage Impact Assessment

The applicant has submitted a Heritage Impact Assessment and Conservation Plan by heritage consultants Phil Carter, architect and planner, and Paul Oberst, architect. The Heritage Impact Assessment portion of the study states that in the professional opinion of the consultants, the building will enhance rather than detract from the character of the Woodbridge Heritage Conservation District. The study discussed the design approach to the new building and identifies the following summarized points in Section 4.2 of the consultant report (please also refer to attachments of agenda report):

- a) "...high quality contemporary design, while being a good neighbor to the Gilmour house and respecting the Woodbridge Avenue character area..."
- b) "...the design scheme for the Woodbridge Avenue elevation is derived from the design of the Gilmour house..."
- c) "...the plaza between the two buildings is greater than the height of the front façade of the Gilmour house, and provides generous views of its east elevation..."

- d) "...the horizontal control lines and vertical bay widths of the new building reflect those of the heritage resource..."
- e) "...the red brick of the first two floors match the height of the Gilmour House façade, reinforcing the street presence..."
- f) "...the diagonal lines, which describe proportional relations within each composition are congruent..."
- g) "...The upper two floors of the podium are in buff brick, reflecting the decorative brick colour on the Gilmour House..."
- h) "...There are contrasting precast blocks at the intersections of columns and spandrels..."
- "...There is a projecting glass canopy on the street, reflecting the verandah of the Gilmour House..."
- j) "...The same proportional modules and details are continued in the east and west elevations... the four storey height of masonry is extended one storey higher in intermittent paired bays toward the rear of the building, which are set slightly forward of the main wall line. Projecting balconies on the floors above reinforce the rhythms established by these bays. The floors above the masonry are of modern window wall construction, so that the cap is visually distinguished from the base..."
- k) "...The overall effect of the design decisions listed above is to break up the facades, both vertically and horizontally, into smaller scale elements. These are well-established techniques for mitigating the visual effect of larger developments in a small-scale context..."

Applicant Proposal for Additional Height and Massing:

The Heritage Impact Assessment and Conservation Plan provide the following analysis relating to the additional massing and height requested in the proposal:

- a) (p.15 HIA Conservation Plan, extract) "...Because the building does not have a higher commercial ground floor, and its floor-to –floor heights have been reduced to maintain scale with the Gilmour House, a seventh floor has been added without a significant increase in the measured height. The proposed building will be 21.35 metres high, exceeding the guidelines by 6.5%".
- b) (p.15 HIA Conservation Plan, extract) "...[T]he proposed penetrates [the required] angular planes in some places and sits well below them in others. The relationship between the angular planes and the building are show in the diagrams...". Please refer to attachment section of the agenda item.
- c) (p.16 HIA Conservation Plan, extract) "...[the] building's floor area and volume are both below what they would be if the building were maximized to the massing permitted by the Guidelines"

Floor Area: 11, 047 sq. metres permitted, 8,476 sq metres proposed Building Volume: 32, 252 cu metres permitted, 25,548 cu metres proposed

Conservation Plan

The Conservation Plan portion of the Heritage Impact Assessment study focuses on the areas of proposed work to the Gilmour house. The proposed work is summarized as renovation work to the lintel and columns of the front porch, renovation of the link in the back of the house to include a glass, roof and new shingles to the entire house. The condition assessment is summarized in page 3 of the report: "[t]he brickwork is in good repair. The asphalt shingle roof is due for renewal, but no other action is necessary at this time".

Staff finds that the proposed design for the front porch follows an understated, sympathetic design incorporating square wood columns with a paneled base and capital. A detailed architectural drawing of the paneling will be required for review and approval as well as material specifications and paint colours pertaining to all elements of the porch.

While the Conservation Plan drawings show a skylight introduced in the rear connection, there is no opening in the east wall of the existing commercial building to provide pedestrian access to the new building. Section 3.2 of the study states: "Skylight: The gap between the north wall of the Gilmour House and the west wing of the Market Square Shopping Centre will be covered by a shed roof skylight, sloping away from the heritage building. This will form a pedestrian link between the new building and the shopping centre. It will not be visible from the exterior, and does not have any negative effect on the heritage character of the Gilmour House." Cultural Heritage supports the introduction of an opening in the east wall. This east wall is not part of the original construction of the Gilmour house, but rather part of the 1980's one storey extension. Staff concurs with the description in the consultant's report and recommends that the architectural drawings show an accessible, ground floor pedestrian connection from the new building, through the proposed skylight connection to the Market Lane Plaza.

The study did not include photographs with in detail condition assessment of the areas being affected by the proposed interventions named above. This is a City of Vaughan standard requirement for Conservation Plans. It is recommended that the Conservation Plan for the Gilmour Hallett house by an experienced heritage consultant provide an analysis with photographs of the condition of the existing building as it pertains to the areas affected by the proposed work (in particular the skylight and front porch), and that the architectural drawings clearly indicating any existing construction portions to be removed, added and repaired indicating specific methodology.

Proposed Property Line Including a Portion of 124 Woodbridge Avenue

The proposal includes a new property line that would include the Gilmour Hallett house and the existing 1 storey commercial building to the rear. This inclusion affects the allowable massing permitted for the proposed building in terms of the upper three floors as it relates to the Heritage District Plan policies for the area. The District Plan requires that the massing of the top floors step back along a 45 degree angle taken from a datum height of 9.5M at the property line on the west side. In locating the new property line as shown (bordering the west elevation of the 1 storey commercial wing, the requirement is met with the proposed form, provided that the 1 storey commercial wing remains at the existing height. The property owner has agreed to cap the building height of that portion at the existing height.

If the proposed new property line includes a portion of 124 Woodbridge Avenue there is the potential to affect the compliance of the subject proposed new building. In that event,

the design will be required to be reconsidered. Any previous approvals may be deemed invalid.

The inclusion of the property at 124 Woodbridge Avenue into the development will require the owner to submit a Letter of Credit in security for the Registered structure known as the Gilmour House as well as a Heritage Impact Assessment and Conservation Plan for review by Cultural Services and the Heritage Vaughan Committee.

Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2020/Strategic Plan

This report is consistent with the priorities set forth in Vaughan Vision 20/20 Strategic Plan, through the following initiatives, specifically:

Service Excellence:

- Preserve our Heritage & Support Diversity, Arts & Culture
- Lead & Promote Environmental Sustainability
- Promote Community Safety, Health & Wellness
- Demonstrate Excellence in Service Delivery

Regional Implications

N/A

Conclusion

Please refer to the recommendation section of the report.

Attachments

- 1. Aerial photo highlighting location of 112, 116 and 124 Woodbridge Avenue.
- 2. Site context photos for 112, 116 and 124 Woodbridge Avenue.
- 3. Site context photos showing Woodbridge Avenue at number 124, and Wallace House across the street.
- 4. 124 Woodbridge Avenue taken in 2013 above and c. 1880 below, courtesy of the City of Vaughan Archives, Clerks Department.
- 5. 3D coloured rendering view south elevation looking east.
- 6. 3D coloured rendering views south elevation looking west and bird's eye view looking east.
- 7. 3D coloured rendering views south portion of proposed building, bird's eye view of podium terrace.
- 8. South street elevation, "control line" relationships between Gilmour House and the proposed new building.
- 9. Plan drawing of conical 45 degree angular plane calculation, struck from midpoint of roof slope on the Gilmour House.
- 10. Massing analysis: green lines represent massing permitted but not utilized in proposal. Red lines show massing exceeding the HCD plan as submitted by applicant.
- 11. Massing analysis: proposed (top); representation of maximum allowable under HCD plan (bottom).
- 12. Coloured elevations as noted; south elevation (top); east elevation (bottom).
- 13. Coloured elevations as noted; west elevation (top); north elevation (bottom).
- 14. Architectural drawings: proposed site plan drawing.
- 15. Architectural drawings: proposed ground floor plan (top) and fifth floor plan (bottom).
- 16. Architectural drawings: south and east elevations.

- 17. Architectural drawings: north and west elevations.
- 18. Gilmour house conservation plan drawings.
- 19. Proposed commemorative plaza landscape plan.
- 20. Proposed draft theme and draft wording for plaque 1.
- 21. Proposed draft theme and draft wording for plaque 2.

Report prepared by:

Cecilia Nin Hernandez, Cultural Heritage Coordinator, ext. 8115 Moira Wilson, Senior Urban Designer, ext. 8353

(A copy of the attachments referred to in the foregoing have been forwarded to each Member of Council and a copy thereof is also on file in the office of the City Clerk.)

4 NEW BUSINESS – VERBAL REPORT ON THE PROCESS OF SECURING BUILDINGS

Heritage Vaughan advises Council:

That Cultural Services staff provided an overview on the process of securing buildings.

The foregoing matter was brought to the attention of the Committee by the Manager of Cultural Services.

The meeting adjourned at 9:04 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

John Mifsud, Chair

Report Prepared by: Rose Magnifico, Assistant City Clerk