

**HERITAGE VAUGHAN COMMITTEE – JULY 20, 2022****COMMUNICATIONS****Distributed July 19, 2022****Item**

- |     |  |   |
|-----|--|---|
| C1. | Valerie Burke, dated July 19, 2022.                              | 1 |
| C2. | Adam Birrell, Thornhill Historical Society, dated July 19, 2022. | 1 |

**Disclaimer Respecting External Communications**

Communications are posted on the City's website pursuant to Procedure By-law Number 7-2011. The City of Vaughan is not responsible for the validity or accuracy of any facts and/or opinions contained in external Communications listed on printed agendas and/or agendas posted on the City's website.

**Please note there may be further Communications.**

**C1**  
**Communication**  
**Heritage Vaughan Committee -**  
**July 20, 2022**  
**Item # 1**

**From:** [Clerks@vaughan.ca](mailto:Clerks@vaughan.ca)  
**To:** [Adelina Bellisario](#)  
**Subject:** FW: [External] Item 4. RESTORATION, ADDITION AND NEW OFFICE-RESIDENTIAL MIXED-USE CONSTRUCTION – ADAPTIVE REUSE OF EXISTING HERITAGE STRUCTURE LOCATED AT 46 CENTRE STREET, THORNHILL HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT  
**Date:** July-19-22 10:24:02 AM

---

---

**From:** Valerie Burke [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 19, 2022 10:23 AM  
**To:** Clerks@vaughan.ca  
**Cc:** Alan Shefman <Alan.Shefman@vaughan.ca>; Debi Traub <Debi.Traub@vaughan.ca>  
**Subject:** [External] Item 4. RESTORATION, ADDITION AND NEW OFFICE-RESIDENTIAL MIXED-USE CONSTRUCTION – ADAPTIVE REUSE OF EXISTING HERITAGE STRUCTURE LOCATED AT 46 CENTRE STREET, THORNHILL HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT

Re: Item 4. RESTORATION, ADDITION AND NEW OFFICE-RESIDENTIAL MIXED-USE CONSTRUCTION – ADAPTIVE REUSE OF EXISTING HERITAGE STRUCTURE LOCATED AT 46 CENTRE STREET, THORNHILL HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT

To the members of Heritage Vaughan Committee

I support the submission from the Thornhill Historical Society (THS) and commend the applicant for their plan for the exterior restoration of the original historic home at 46 Centre Street. I have the following comments and concerns.

Proposed Demolitions

I oppose the proposal to demolish the tail wing because it is complementary to the original home, and the west wall of the existing house. It provides significant street presence (see image #30) that would be diminished if the tail wing were to be removed. I have no objection to the proposal to demolish the late 20th century, circa 1996 addition.

I also object to the proposal to remove the second floor structure in the original house and the stairway within the front portion of the house, adjacent to the original fireplace. These features are integral to the historical fabric of this house and the understanding of this building's former function as a home.

Windows

The windows at the north elevations of the two buildings should not be "walls of glazing" for two reasons. Firstly, the buildings are very visible from the public laneway adjacent to Thornhill Park. Secondly, the windows will pose a danger to migratory and resident birds colliding with the glass due to the proximity of the natural park area. Window treatment with muntin bars, in keeping with the HCD Plan, would be preferable. The application of heritage

style window treatments would be consistent with recent additions to both 18 and 24 Centre Street, which also have a public exposure to Park Road to the north.

It is unclear from the report as to whether the window on the front of Building B emulates a more traditional storefront. I support a storefront design rather than barn-like windows.

#### Trees and Landscaping

While I realize that Urban Design Planning is responsible for trees and landscaping, I feel compelled to defend our tree canopy. The proposed removal of 55% of the tree canopy in this lot is excessive. Mature tree coverage in the Thornhill Heritage Conservation District is a significant contributor to the beauty and uniqueness of the area. Newly planted trees don't always survive. We are losing more and more mature trees. The recent Sustainable Neighbourhood Action Plan from the Toronto and Regional Conservation Authority indicates that there is a deficiency of tree canopy. Where will the proposed trees be planted? Will there be a screen of vegetation separating the property to the east (Thornhill Veterinary Clinic)? I have contacted Urban Design Planners and am awaiting their response.

Sincerely,

Valerie Burke

July 19, 2022

**Re: Restoration, Addition And New Office-Residential Mixed-Use Construction – Adaptive Reuse Of Existing Heritage Structure Located At 46 Centre Street, Thornhill Heritage Conservation District**

To the members of Heritage Vaughan Committee;

On behalf of the Thornhill Historical Society (THS), I have the following comments on this application.

THS commends the applicant for their plan for the exterior restoration and adaptive re-use of the original historic home at 46 Centre St.

However, THS opposes the proposal to demolish the tail wing (see “Yellow” section on p.6 of the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report). Though the extension of the tail wing is slightly later in date, it is complementary to the original home, and the west wall of the existing house (including front portion and the western edge of the tail wing) has significant street presence (see image #30) that would be diminished if the tail wing were to be removed.

THS also objects to the proposal to remove the second floor structure in the original house and the stairway within the front portion of the house, adjacent to the original fireplace. These features are integral to the historical fabric of this house and the understanding of this building’s former function as a home.

THS calls upon Vaughan to pursue designation of 46 Centre St. under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*, as recommended by D. R. Chalykoff, Heritage Consultant, In the Cultural Heritage Evaluation Report (p.3).

THS has no objection to the proposal to demolish the late 20th century (c.1996) addition.

Our comments regarding the architectural value of the tail wing, the second floor structure and the original house stairway having been made, THS does not object to the style or massing of the proposed addition and the new building B on their own merits. However, we are recommending that the addition to Building A be revised to allow for the retention of the tail wing structure within the final design.

The window openings on the north elevation of Building B and the addition to Building A fill the entire wall and are lacking in any divisions. This would be acceptable in an enclosed private yard. However, given that this extension and new construction will face the public

road of Park Rd., a window treatment with muntin bars, in keeping with the HCD Plan, seems appropriate in this instance. The application of heritage style window treatments would be consistent with recent additions to both 18 and 24 Centre St., which also have a public exposure to Park Rd. to the north.

It is unclear from the report as to whether the window on the front of Building B emulates a more traditional storefront. We support a storefront design rather than barn-like windows. Finally, the proposed removal of 55% of the tree canopy in this lot is excessive. Mature tree coverage in this neighbourhood is one of the features that makes it so great. The City should be doing everything possible to promote the retention of healthy tree stock when new development is proposed. New plantings should not be promoted as an equitable alternative to mature tree preservation.

Sincerely,

Adam Birrell

President,  
Thornhill Historical Society  
[www.thornhillhistoric.org](http://www.thornhillhistoric.org)  
Facebook: [facebook.com/ThornhillHistoricalSociety](https://facebook.com/ThornhillHistoricalSociety)  
YouTube: [youtube.com/channel/UCPLCMYqfPv1sMUAWqOpgfQ](https://youtube.com/channel/UCPLCMYqfPv1sMUAWqOpgfQ)  
Instagram: <https://www.instagram.com/thornhillhistoricalsociety/>