

Design Review Panel (DRP)

Minutes

Tuesday, April 02, 2019

Burgoyne Woods Room, City Hall at 7:00 pm

Attendance:

Chris Millar	Richard Baker	Eric Jones
Mark Kudreikis	Greg Hynde	

Regrets: None

1. **Call meeting to order (Chair)**
Greg Hynde called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm
2. **Additions/Deletions to the Agenda**
None.
3. **Motion to approve the Agenda**
Moved by R. Baker **CARRIED**
4. **Motion to adopt the minutes of the December 18, 2018 meeting**
Moved by C. Millar **CARRIED**

Motion to adopt the minutes of the previous meeting (February 26, 2019)
Moved by E. Jones **CARRIED**
5. **Declarations of Interest**
None.
6. **Resubmission**
 - a) **18 Howard Street – Proposal to Create a New Lot for the Purpose of Constructing a Detached Dwelling**
The DRP reviewed a proposal to sever 18 Howard Street at the February 26th meeting of the Panel, creating a new lot for the purpose of constructing a new two-storey detached dwelling on the subject lands and the existing dwelling to be retained on the remnant parcel. The DRP had no concerns with the proposed severance but had some concerns with the proposed design and height of the dwelling. To ensure a more suitable design that will achieve compatibility with the neighbouring properties, the DRP suggested two options – Option A, to reduce height in favour of a one and a half storey or side split or raised bungalow, with the

main goal to improve articulation at the street by including dormers, use of stone or brick siding, and a broken up front façade. Option B was to relocate the proposed dwelling further to the east of the site, reducing the rear yard to approximately 2 metres and reducing height to a storey and a half to allow the two activity areas of the subject and remnant parcels to abut each other. Based on the discussion and various design opportunities available for the property, the DRP decided that a redesign and resubmission of the design was necessary to provide a definitive recommendation.

A new applicant submitted a proposal for a side split bungalow on the subject property. The applicant advised that both options from the previous meeting were considered, however in their opinion Option A would ultimately achieve a better fit with the streetscape and resulted in less variances. The Panel requested that good materials be used for the exterior in order to keep the quality up as well as the inclusion of suitable glazing materials.

Moved by R. Baker:

That the DRP recommend approval and leave the plan as revised.

CARRIED

7. New Business

a) 36 Marren Street – Proposal to Create a New Lot for the Purpose of Constructing a Semi-Detached Dwelling

The DRP considered a proposal to sever 36 Marren Street to create a new lot for the purpose of constructing a new two-storey semi-detached dwelling on the subject lands.

The DRP acknowledged that the lot was an awkward piece of land on a corner, and that a number of variances would be required to both parcels of the property. The proposed new lots would require variances for minimum lot area, minimum front yard setback to dwelling to accommodate the covered porches, minimum exterior side yard for the north lot, and minimum rear yard for the south lot. It was noted that the majority of the variances were a result of the irregular parcel shape and fitting an appropriate building envelope on the lot while making efficient use of the land.

The agent advised that although a few options for the site had been considered, the applicant was satisfied with the current option and pleased with the look of the building and the siting of the envelope on the lot. The DRP requested that sufficient landscaping be provided on site to accommodate the requested reductions, and that a landscaping plan be included as part of the development agreement. The DRP also requested that privacy fencing along the rear areas be provided, and specifically along the northern property line, to adequately enclose the back yards. The Panel commented that there were no issues with the layout and that the overall look of the proposal was good. The agent was advised that the front porches were

considered as part of the dwelling and therefore required to be at least 3 metres from the front lot line. The agent was also advised that there was a possibility a road widening may be requested at the time of severance, and this would further decrease the setback to the front porch.

Moved by E. Jones:

That the DRP supports the proposed lot creation, subject to the following criteria for the new dwellings:

- a) That privacy fencing be provided along the north lot line to enclose the rear yards;
- b) That a landscaping plan be included as part of the development agreement; and,
- c) That no second floor decks be permitted, to negate any overlook or loss of privacy for neighbouring properties.

CARRIED

b) 2 Weston Road – Proposal to Sever Lot for Semis

The DRP considered a proposal to retain the existing single family dwelling on the remnant parcel, and to sever two parcels of land for the purpose of constructing a new two-storey, semi-detached dwelling on the subject lot, each with an interior accessory dwelling unit.

The agent for the applicant explained that on Lot 1, adequate amenity space is being provided and the carport is being relocated to hide cars and provide increased side yard. The existing dwelling is planned to be preserved and refurbished. In response, E. Jones pointed out that the proposal did not provide any useable amenity space on the retained property of Lot 1, and added that this was a result of the new side yard being mainly driveway, the original side yard being repurposed for a driveway and garage for one of the new proposed semi-detached dwelling units, and that the proposed Lot 1 rear yard of 3.6 metres is not usable amenity space. He stated that the lot does not offer any other possibilities for amenity space either as the remainder of the lot is limited due to the location of the dwelling and its proximity to the sidewalks.

Further, the agent advised that the intent of the detached garage on Lot 2 was to prevent garage controlled architecture from overwhelming the streetscape on Edith Street, and therefore the parking for the semi-detached unit and interior accessory dwelling unit would be accommodated on the Weston Road frontage. On Lot 3, the garage was unable to be hidden and as such faces Edith Street. The agent advised that reducing the setback to the porches was to take away from the impact of the garage.

The DRP acknowledged that multiple variances would be required on all lots, for lot area, rear yard and interior side yard on Lot 1, lot area, frontage and porch setback on Lot 2, and lot area, rear yard, porch setback, and front yard to the

garage. The Panel expressed concern over the parking configuration on Lot 2. The agent was asked whether a semi-detached was the best option for the site, and whether a single with an interior dwelling unit could be considered. Concerns were expressed regarding the overall sense that the proposal was an overdevelopment of the lot, and the over density of the proposed development.

The Panel asked if other options for the site were considered, such as a single family dwelling on the new parcel, or the removal of the existing dwelling for more efficient use of the whole parcel. The agent advised that townhomes were also explored, however they thought the current proposal was more sensitive to the neighbourhood and planned better for the property.

The DRP provided an alternative option for the new site (Lots 2 and 3 combined), suggesting a single detached dwelling with an interior accessory dwelling. M. Kudreikis stated that in terms of the original proposal, his opinion was that while the proposal is dense, the area is transitioning to a denser area, populated by more semis and towns, and that the proposal is using the space well, albeit tightly. The Committee took two votes – voting on the original proposal, being the semi-detached dwelling (with 4 units), featuring a key lot to provide parking, and the retained single dwelling; and secondly, an option to sever one lot off the existing parcel for the purposes of constructing a single detached dwelling with an interior accessory dwelling unit.

Moved by M. Kudreikis:

That the DRP supports the proposed lot creation for the proposed semi-detached dwelling with interior accessory dwelling units in both units, on Lots 2 and 3.

DENIED, 3-1

Moved by C. Millar:

That the DRP supports the proposed lot creation, but for a single detached dwelling and interior accessory dwelling unit on a severed single lot.

CARRIED, 3-1

The Panel explained that in summary, the original proposal for semi-detached dwelling units and the existing house to remain was too dense for the site and too tight for the property overall. Further, the proposed lots would be too small for the area, and the units are 'shoe horned' into the property and neighbourhood. The DRP stated that the size, form, and arrangement are not suited to a semi-detached dwelling on the lot. E. Jones further acknowledged that the provision of adequate amenity space is not satisfied on Lot 1 in particular, and retaining the existing dwelling with a new single detached dwelling would allow more options to achieve that, while in addition does not require an unusual parking configuration, and that 183 square metres is too small for a sufficient building envelope.

c) **25 Oakdale – Proposal to Sever into Three Lots for Townhouse Dwelling Units**

The DRP considered a proposal to demolish the existing vacant duplex, and to sever the lot into three parts for the purpose of constructing three 3-storey townhouse units, each with a main floor interior accessory dwelling unit. The agent advised that the main level of each unit would be the accessory dwelling unit, and the next two levels would be a self-contained unit, the purposes of which (having the accessory unit on ground level) is to appeal to a greater market for accessible units rather than having stairs to an accessory unit.

The DRP acknowledged that the only variance required would be for the middle unit (Part 2) to the minimum lot area. The DRP was generally supportive of the proposal for three townhouse units. R. Baker requested clarification as to why the garages were configured in the manner they were shown, with the laneway beside each and stairs to the interior against the dwelling. Discussion was had as to whether the garages could be shortened and pulled closer to the dwellings, with the potential of moving the stairs to the exterior of the garage.

The DRP was favourable of Elevation 3 provided, as it gave the visual impression that the dwelling was lower and provided a more balanced fenestration architecturally. The agent advised that stone and/or brick were planned for the facades, with some stucco or cement work product and various treatments, and they were happy to employ a mix of materials. The Panel also suggested pushing the garages of Units 1 and/or 3 to the outside of each lot, to provide for separation from neighbouring properties and provide an interior amenity space for the units.

The DRP was supportive of the proposed severance and house designs, subject to some of the recommendations provided.

Moved by R. Baker:

That the DRP supports the proposed lot creation, subject to the following design considerations for the new dwellings:

- a) That Elevation 3 is preferred because it provides a visual impression that the dwelling is lower and more balanced fenestration architecturally; and,
- b) Consideration be given to use at least one or both of the garages to help open up interior rear amenity area and provide a separation from adjacent properties.

CARRIED

11. **Date of Next Meeting**
April 30, 2019

12. **Motion to Adjourn**
Moved by: C. Miller

CARRIED