



## **Heritage Richmond Hill**

### **Minutes**

**HRH#09-21**

**Tuesday, December 7, 2021, 7:00 p.m.**

**(Electronic Meeting pursuant to Section 238(3.3) of the Municipal Act, 2001)**

An Electronic Heritage Richmond Hill Meeting, pursuant to Section 238(3.3) of the *Municipal Act, 2001*, of the Council of the City of Richmond Hill was held on Tuesday, December 7, 2021 at 7:00 p.m. via videoconference.

Committee Members present via videoconference:

Marj Andre (Richmond Hill Historical Society) - Chair  
Barbara DiMambro (Ward 5) - Vice-Chair  
Councillor West  
James Counter (Ward 1)  
Helen Lu (Ward 3)  
Kidambi Raj (Ward 3)  
Dan Kelly (Ward 4)  
Doris Dumais (Ward 6)

Regrets:

Councillor Cilevitz  
Tom Pechkovsky (Education Community)  
Al Itwar (Member at Large)  
Jenica Veenstra (Richmond Hill Public Library)

The following members of Staff were present via videoconference:

J. Leung, Manager, Urban Design  
P. Vega, Urban Design/Heritage Planner  
R. Ban, Deputy City Clerk  
S. Dumont, Council/Committee Coordinator

The Chair called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and provided opening remarks with respect to tonight's electronic Heritage Richmond Hill meeting.

**1. Adoption of Agenda**

Moved by: D. Dumais

That the agenda be adopted as distributed by the Clerk.

Carried

**2. Disclosures of Pecuniary Interest and General Nature Thereof**

There were no disclosures of pecuniary interest by members of the Committee under the *Municipal Conflict of Interest Act*.

**3. Minutes of Previous Meeting**

**3.1 Minutes - Heritage Richmond Hill meeting HRH#08-21 held on November 9, 2021**

The minutes of Heritage Richmond Hill meeting HRH#08-21 held on November 9, 2021, were amended to clarify the ask of the Sub-committee in Agenda Item 5.5. D. Dumais clarified that the request was for staff to come back to the Sub-committee and Heritage Richmond Hill to present the work they were doing on digitizing all the information related to heritage sites, as presented by P. Vega, Heritage and Urban Design Planner, at a prior Committee meeting.

Moved by: J. Counter

a) That the minutes of Heritage Richmond Hill meeting HRH#08-21 held November 9, 2021 be adopted, as amended.

Carried

**3.2 Extract - Council meeting C#48-21 held November 24, 2021**

Moved by: Councillor West

a) That the extract from the Council meeting C#48-21 held November 24, 2021, regarding staff report SRPI.21.103 - Heritage Permit Application for 53 Arnold Crescent (The McNair - Stallibrass House), be received.

Carried

**4. Delegations**

There were no delegations.

## 5. Scheduled Business

### 5.1 Delegated Authority for Minor Heritage Permits - Discussion by Joanne Leung, Manager, Urban Design, and Pamela Vega, Urban Design/Heritage Planner

Committee members discussed the merits of defining the term “minor work”. It was noted that the definition appeared to be circular in nature due to the use of the words “small” and “minor” in defining “minor work”. It was confirmed that staff drafted the definition as a tool to be used to assess minor alteration applications to properties, and that it was not defined in the Ontario Heritage Act. Committee members suggested that the definition continue to be refined, and that a comprehensive list of examples be prepared as a tool for staff to expedite the approval process and for residents to understand what a minor alteration is.

Staff reviewed the purpose of simplifying the minor heritage permit process, as discussed at last month’s Heritage Richmond Hill meeting. Committee members discussed the challenges of owning a heritage property, the benefits of simplifying the process for homeowners, and conveyed their understanding of the spirit and intent of having delegated authority for minor heritage permits.

Committee members shared their opinion on whether “addition, removal, replacement or alteration of lighting features” and “alterations to hard landscaping features” should be included on the list provided as Agenda Item 5.1. Joanne Leung, Manager, Urban Design, clarified that projects were not looked at in isolation but within the context of the cultural value of the entire property, and that the list was not meant to be constraining, but provided as possible examples of minor alterations. Committee members also suggested that the federal standards and policies be referenced as guidance documents in ascertaining if projects were minor in nature.

Moved by: D. Dumais

a) That the discussion and all comments from Heritage Richmond Hill Committee members regarding the Delegated Authority for Minor Heritage Permits, be received for consideration in making refinements to the definition of Minor Heritage Permits that includes a list of examples of Minor Alterations to Heritage properties.

Carried

## **5.2 Draft Listing Templates - Discussion by Joanne Leung, Manager, Urban Design, and Pamela Vega, Urban Design/Heritage Planner**

P. Vega, Urban Design/Heritage Planner, confirmed that the draft templates were revised based on feedback provided by Committee members, and that the purpose of bringing them forward at the meeting was to determine if further refinements were needed.

With respect to the Cultural Heritage Value Evaluation Form, it was suggested that the credentials of the evaluator be included. Clarification was sought on the differences between the Cultural Heritage Value Evaluation Form and the Listing on the Heritage Register – Nomination Form, the purpose of the forms, and who would be using them. Staff confirmed that the Cultural Heritage Value Evaluation Form reflected Ontario Regulation 9/06, as provincial staff had advised heritage planners to use the same criteria used for designation towards potentially listing properties on the Heritage Register.

P. Vega advised that more details were added to the Nomination Form to provide a more wholesome description of the physical attributes of a building or a property. She also advised that the numerical evaluation had changed to “strongly agree, agree, and disagree” within the Cultural Heritage Value Evaluation Form. J. Leung continued by outlining next steps with respect to the forms.

Committee members identified that further discussion was needed on the evaluation process and the role of the Committee, staff and the public. J. Leung suggested that Committee Member Dan Kelly provide a review of the proposed process at the next Committee meeting. She suggested that the process be reviewed in the context of what authority was available for Heritage Richmond Hill, and if there was another way of extending the connection to other organizations.

Moved by: B. DiMambro

a) That the discussion and all comments from Heritage Richmond Hill Committee members regarding draft Listing Templates, be received.

Carried

## **5.3 Designation Sub-committee - Verbal Update**

The Designation Sub-committee did not have an update to provide.

**5.4 Toronto Star Articles dated August 20, 2021 and September 12, 2021 regarding Demolition by Neglect – Discussion and Proposed Motion by Dan Kelly**

D. Kelly provided background information to provide context on the proposed motion, noting that over the last 13 years heritage inventory had reduced by 34 percent. He provided examples of properties that were demolished or recommended to be demolished as they were unsafe or in poor condition due to neglect. D. Kelly suggested that properties be reviewed on a regular basis, as some were vacant for years. He shared his belief that that this approach would be a proactive method of ascertaining the condition of the property, and could avoid the possibility of a property being demolished due to neglect. D. Kelly also shared his opinion that this approach would allow the Committee to provide better advice and recommendations to Council.

Committee members expressed concerns with the logistics and costs of implementing the proposed process. It was suggested that it be referred back to staff for further consideration, and that staff come back to discuss the subject at a future Committee meeting. Members commented on the importance of protecting heritage properties without imposing a significant burden on heritage property owners or requiring additional resources from the City. Committee members also raised concerns regarding the tools available to the Committee to make recommendations regarding a practical course of action with respect to protecting heritage resources.

J. Leung advised of a few methods of determining if a property was vacant, noting that it was not as direct as they wanted it to be. She recognized that there were obstacles that would need to be confronted, and that further investigation was required to understand the implications of the proposed work.

Moved by: J. Counter

- a) That the Toronto Star articles “Heritage home destroyed despite city order to stop” dated August 20, 2021, and “Outrage after two heritage homes razed” dated September 12, 2021, be received for information;
- b) That staff be directed to review the latest City of Richmond Hill Inventory of Cultural Heritage Resources using the following criteria:
  - i. Vacant or the appearance of being vacant for 2 years or more, and/or poorly maintained or in need of repairs; and

- ii. Listed or designated to create and maintain a sub-list of properties of interest.
- c) That staff provide the HRH Committee with status updates of each property every 4 to 6 months with options to protect the heritage values so that the HRH Committee can provide recommendations regarding a practical courses of action.

**Motion to Defer:**

Moved by: Councillor West

- a) That the Toronto Star articles “Heritage home destroyed despite city order to stop” dated August 20, 2021, and “Outrage after two heritage homes razed” dated September 12, 2021, be received for information;
- b) That consideration of Clauses b) and c) be deferred to a future Heritage Richmond Hill Committee.

Carried

**6. Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting of Heritage Richmond Hill was scheduled on Tuesday, February 15, 2022 at 7:00 p.m.

**7. Adjournment**

Moved by: D. Dumais

That the meeting be adjourned.

Carried

The meeting adjourned at 8:48 p.m.