

# Design Review Panel (DRP)

## Minutes

**Tuesday, November 20, 2018**

**Council Chambers, City Hall at 6:30 pm**

### **Attendance:**

Eric Jones	Chris Millar
Mark Kudreikis	Greg Hynde
Richard Baker	

**Regrets: None**

- 
1. **Call meeting to order (Acting Chair)**  
Greg Hynde called the meeting to order at 6:45 pm
  2. **Additions/Deletions to the Agenda**  
None.
  3. **Motion to approve the Agenda**  
Moved by C. Millar **CARRIED**
  4. **Motion to adopt the minutes of the previous meeting (October 16, 2018)**  
Moved by R. Baker **CARRIED**
  5. **Declarations of Interest**  
Greg Hynde declared a conflict regarding 24 Woodmount as he is owner of the property. He will excuse himself from the meeting when that proposal is being considered.
  6. **1070 Vansickle Road North - Proposal to Sever Lot for Semis**  
The DRP considered a proposal to sever an existing vacant lot for the purpose of constructing two wheelchair-friendly one-storey semi-detached units. Proposed new lots would each require a variance for maximum lot area (max. 465 m<sup>2</sup>) and minimum lot frontage (min. 12m). The proposed building on Part 1 would require a variance for minimum garage setback (must be flush or recessed) and each dwelling would also require variances for setback from Vansickle Road due to averaging.

The DRP reviewed the plans provided by the applicant for the proposal and noted concerns that the proposed design did not provide for suitable interior liveable space. The 8 foot wide bedroom widths shown, for example, would be too narrow for easy wheelchair use. It was the opinion of the Committee that the proposed 8 to 9 m frontages per semi were not wide enough (compared to the 12 m required) and suggested that this was an overdevelopment of the lot. As one of the objectives of the

applicant was to generate rental income from part of the property, DRP members encouraged the applicant to consider a duplex or triplex design for the lot allowing the full main floor/basement to be available for wheelchair access by the owner plus one or two apartments on the upper floor and possibly basement) as a source of rental income.

Moved by R. Baker:

Subject to confirmation from staff that a duplex or a triplex would be permitted as an alternative use, that the DRP does not support the proposed lot creation, believing it to be an overdevelopment of the site; and

That the owner is encouraged to consult with staff and building professionals regarding the possibility of a duplex or triplex for the site.

**CARRIED**

7. **11 Shelley Avenue: Proposal to Sever Vacant Lot for Two Semis**

The DRP considered a proposal to sever a vacant lot into two parts for the purpose of constructing two two-storey semi-detached units. Property is located within the Port Dalhousie Heritage Conservation District. Proposed new lots would each require variances for minimum lot frontage (min. 7.5m) and maximum building coverage (max. 45% - includes the balcony). Although the initial agenda notes stated the adjoining existing duplex was to be demolished, it is being renovated back into a single resident and is to be retained.

As Shelley is currently a combination of existing cottages and redeveloped singles, the DRP suggested that a single detached dwelling, like at #17 Shelley, might be a more appropriate use of the proposed severed lot. Given the existing streetscape character, the Committee also questioned the appropriateness of a 6m frontage as opposed to the 7.5 m required.

The Committee may be more receptive to a proposal for semis if the proponent could provide alternative plans and elevations of the proposed semis so the building design and finishes could be more fully evaluated. At the same time, the Committee recognized that the final decision on said design and finishes would rest with the Port Dalhousie Heritage Committee.

Moved by C. Millar:

That consideration the application be deferred until next meeting so full information can be provided by the Applicant, including revised site and elevation plans that demonstrate improved fit within the neighbourhood and streetscape.

**CARRIED**

8. **58 Park Avenue: Proposal to demolish existing and sever Lot for Two Semis**

The DRP considered a proposal to demolish the existing home and to sever property into two parts for the purpose of constructing two two-storey semi-detached units.

Southerly proposed new lot (Part 2) would require variances for both minimum lot area (min. 280 m<sup>2</sup>) and minimum frontage (min. 7.5m). Part 1 would also require a variance for minimum setback from Cedardale Avenue (min. 5.3m due to averaging).

The DRP did not believe that the site plan presented, with the two semis fronting on Park Avenue, enhanced the streetscape of either Park Avenue or Cedardale Avenue. The DRP also recognized that the required Cedardale setback of 5.3 m makes the visually attractive division of the property difficult. The Committee discussed whether or not two back to back semis severed in a North/South direction with driveway access on Park and Cedardale might be more appropriate. However, the DRP also acknowledged without site plans and elevations to that effect along with an outline of required variances, the impact of such a severance could not be properly evaluated by the Committee.

Moved by C. Millar:

The DRP recommends that the proponent investigate an alternative site layout, including two back to back semis, severed in a North/South direction with driveway access on Park and Cedardale respectively.

**Four in Favour – One Against CARRIED**

**9.. 1074 Vansickle Road North: Proposal to Sever Vacant Lot for Two Semis**

The DRP considered a proposal to sever a vacant lot for the purpose of constructing two semi-detached dwellings. The applicant presented elevations with a stone/stucco front façade, low-pitched roof and brick/siding on the sides and rear.

The DRP was generally supportive of the proposed design but suggested that staggering the front façade of the two semis would eliminate the severance for the front yard set-back on Part 2 and (while the proposed building materials shown blend in with the current streetscape) also provide an opportunity to vary the front facades of the two units. In the current design they are a mirror image of each other. Staggering the two units would also help to differentiate them by creating a varying roof line. The DRP also noted that the one-storey design works well with the neighbouring one storey. The DRP had no problem with the NW corner rear yard set-back, given the average size of the total amenity area.

Moved by M. Kudreikis:

That the DRP supports the lot creation, as proposed, provided that the setbacks of the two units be staggered to improve driveway depth, and remove the need for a front yard setback variance for Part 2. The DRP also suggests that, with staggering, the applicant consider individualized façade design for Part 2 to differentiate the second unit.

**CARRIED**

**10. 542 Geneva Street: Proposal to demolish existing and sever Lot for 2 Singles**

The DRP considered a proposal to demolish the existing home and to sever the lot for the purpose of constructing two two-storey detached units. The proposed building on Part 1 would require variances for minimum rear yard setback (min. 7.5m) and minimum side yard setback (min. 2m for a two-storey dwelling). Both dwellings may also require a variance for minimum front yard setback due to averaging. The required Geneva Street set-back was estimated by the applicant at between 8 and 9m as opposed to the 5.14 m shown. Understanding the need to preserve the Geneva Street streetscape, and given the shape of the Part 1 lot at the corner of Geneva and Guy Road, the applicant has angled the proposed dwelling on Part 1 to reflect the varying set-back of the abutting Geneva Street property and the placement of the dwelling moving towards the street intersection. This deflection assists in preserving the site lines along Geneva Street. The applicant also expressed a willingness to include architectural features on the Geneva Street façade of Part 1 to make it appear as a front façade and to preserve the existing soft edge of Guy Road.

The DRP stated that it believes the negative impact of the current house on the streetscape is far greater than what is proposed. The suggested two new detached units offer far better liveability, sight lines and streetscape for the existing abutting properties.

The DRP expressed concern that that the dwelling at 540 Geneva has a row of cedars on property line and that these should be preserved. It was also noted that the property has a number of large pines in the current Geneva Street front yard that should be preserved but acknowledges that some or all of these may need to come down.

Moved by C. Millar:

That the DRP supports the lot creation, as presented, with the deflection of the structure on Part 1, provided that the facade on Geneva Street is enhanced through bump outs, fenestration, and building materials as outlined by the applicant to enhance the Geneva street streetscape by appearing as a front façade. The DRP also recommends that the line of cedars at 540 Geneva be retained and that the soft edge of Guy Road be maintained if possible.

**CARRIED**

**G. Hynde left the meeting at 9:15 PM. Chris Millar acted as Chair.**

**11. 24 Woodmount: Proposal to Sever Lot for Three Townhomes**

The DRP considered a proposal to sever side yard of existing home to facilitate the construction of a two-storey detached dwelling on the new lot. Proposed lots (new and retained) would each require a variance for maximum lot area (max. 538 m<sup>2</sup>) and minimum lot frontage (min. 16.5m). The proposed new building on Part 1 would require variances for minimum rear yard setback (min. 7.5m), minimum front yard setback (averaging) and minimum garage setback (must be flush or recessed). The retained lot (Part 2) would also require a variance for maximum driveway width (max

50%).

The applicant's representative outlined how Woodmount was an older suburban neighbourhood with a unique, large dead-end cul de sac at the end of the street resulting in a small existing frontage for this property and others. There is a precedent in the area for smaller frontages with lots in the neighbourhood and along the brow in particular. The neighbourhood has significant landscape features throughout like large Blue Spruce bracketing driveway entrances (which the applicant intends to protect with the new infill along with considerable additional landscaping in keeping with the existing trees to provide a soft buffer for neighbouring dwellings).

The current dwelling is an architecturally significant home, positioned far from the driveway entrance, with Frank Lloyd Wright elements that the current owner wishes to preserve. The representative also showed how the geometry of the property allows a unique infill opportunity while still protecting the character of the existing dwelling, the streetscape of the neighbourhood and avoiding any compromise on developing the remainder of the property in the future

Based on photographs and plans distributed by the representative, the DRP noted the strong architectural elements in keeping with the eclectic mix on the street currently. The DRP felt that the deck on the second floor of the supplied elevations tied the garage into the design and was not concerned about it not being flush. However, it was made clear that the applicant was willing to move the house forward to avoid the variance if need be. Over reviewing the neighbouring properties it was noted that the two most impacted appeared to be higher than the proposed new lot, minimizing overlook from the proposed new infill and maintain what appeared to be clear sightlines.

Moved by M. Kudreikis:

That the DRP supports the proposed lot creation as presented. The quality of the architecture is such that the flush garage door should not be an issue. In light of the non-standard nature of the cul-de-sac, the unique access provision for the driveway is supported.

**CARRIED**

11. **Date of Next Meeting**  
December 18, 2018

12. **Motion to Adjourn**  
Moved by: E. Jones

**CARRIED**