Tonight’s Schedule

6:30 – 6:35  City’s Introduction
6:35 – 7:05  Presentation
7:05 – 7:35  Open Group Discussion
7:35 – 8:45  Workshop Exercise and Reporting Back
8:45 – 9:00  Wrap-up and Next Steps
Presentation Outline

1. Character Area Study
2. Project Update
3. Potential Vision Statement
4. Possible Tools
5. Potential Approaches
6. Next Steps
The Project Team and Stakeholders

City of Burlington

Andrea Smith, Manager of Policy and Research
Rosa Bustamante, Project Manager

Brook McIlroy
Anne McIlroy, Principal-in-Charge
Matt Reid, Project Manager/Urban Designer
Maryann Alisch, Planner

Key Stakeholders

Roseland residents and landowners, residents of Burlington, development community, etc.
Roseland Neighbourhood

Original Roseland Study Boundary

Revised Roseland Study Boundary to include St. Clair Avenue
Roseland Neighbourhood

Revised Roseland Study Boundary to include St. Clair Avenue

Why did it change?

Some groups did not modify the original boundary

The houses along St. Clair have similar architectural features to other homes in Roseland

The Centennial Bikeway creates a natural north border

Re-development has occurred along Brookfield and Pomona over the past 5 years which has altered the streetscape

Area east of boundary adjacent to Roseland Creek has its own character
Roseland Neighbourhood

Approximately 115 acres and 300 dwellings

Located east of the QEW on north shore of Lake Ontario

One of the oldest neighbourhoods in the city

Area has cultural heritage significance

Residential Area in Burlington Official Plan

Zoned as Low Density Residential in Burlington Zoning By-Law 2020
What is Neighbourhood Character?

Neighbourhood character refers to the 'look and feel' of an area. Character Areas are areas of the community that have achieved a distinct, recognizable, character that is different from neighbouring areas. These differences may be the result of topography, age and style of housing, built environment, land use patterns, landscaping, street patterns, open space, and streetscapes.
Character Area Study

What is a Character Area Study?

The Roseland Character Area Study is a process that will:

• Identify and define the private and public realm character components of the neighbourhood that distinguish it from other areas of Burlington

• Develop tools to improve the management of neighbourhood character issues related to development applications

• Protect and support the character of the Roseland neighbourhood
Character Area Study

Our Process

Detailed site visits
Background and policy review
Precedent review
Detailed qualitative and quantitative review of neighbourhood mapping
Consultation with community members
Project Update

Jan 2013  Steering Committee Meeting # 1
Mar/Apr  Background and Data Collection
May 1st  Public Consultation # 1
May 30th  Steering Committee Meeting # 2
June 25th  Public Workshop # 2 (Today)
TBD  Roseland Interim Report
Fall 2013  Public Workshop #3
Project Update

What We Have Heard (Priority Directions)

How Can We Protect the Character of Roseland?

1. Encourage and work towards complementary infill.
2. Maintain a variety of lot shapes and sizes.
3. Balance house scale with lot size.
4. Promote varied architectural styles.
5. Encourage attractive public and private landscaping.
6. Preserve and extend the tree canopy.
7. Maintain the privacy of the neighbourhood.
8. Protect and reinforce views throughout the neighbourhood.
Character Area Study Process Map

Your opportunities to be involved and give feedback

Public Workshop 1

Public Workshop 2 (Today)

Public Workshop 3

Development and Infrastructure Meeting
Official Plan Review Process

Your opportunities to be involved and give feedback

**Phase 1: Consultant Work**

Outcome 1 (Spring & Fall 2013)
- The consultants will lead three public workshops and receive input from the community

Outcome 2 (Fall 2013)
- The consultants will prepare a report with recommendations for the area

**Phase 2: City Staff Work**

Outcome 1 (Fall 2013)
- Staff will review the consultants’ report and provide it to City Council with policy directions

Outcome 2 (Winter 2014)
- Staff will prepare draft policies for the Official Plan
- The public can comment on the draft policies

Outcome 3 (Spring 2014)
- Staff will finalize policies for the Official Plan and present them to all of City Council
- The public can provide written comments and/or delegate before Council regarding the policies
Draft Vision Statement

Roseland

Nestled in a garden-like setting with mature trees, Roseland is a distinctive urban neighbourhood with strong historical character where the spacious lots accommodate homes that are varied and unique and are of a high degree of architectural integrity. Dwellings are well proportioned in relation to the property size and reinforce the open space character. Neighbourhood streets with their wide landscaped boulevards and street lamps complement private properties.
Potential Approaches

How can existing policy tools be strengthened and what new policy tools can provide further direction?

| Existing   | Official Plan Policies          |
| Existing   | Regulatory Zoning              |
| Potential? | Contextual Zoning              |
| Potential? | Heritage Designation           |
| Existing   | Public Tree Protection Standards|
| Potential? | Private Landscaping Standards  |
| Potential? | Urban Design Guidelines for Roseland |
| Existing   | Site Plan Control (Process)    |
| Potential? | Design Review Committee (Process) |
Potential Approaches

Option 1: Status quo. Existing planning tools remain the same.

Option 2: Improve the existing planning tools:
- Official Plan policies
- Zoning regulations
- Site Plan Process

Option 3: Implement new planning tools:
- Contextual zoning
- Heritage designations
- Urban design guidelines
- Design Review Committee

Option 4: Improve both existing planning tools and implement new planning tools
Potential Approaches to Protecting Character in Roseland

Official Plan Amendments

All City policy and regulatory documents, and new development must conform to Official Plan.

Currently no specific reference in Official Plan of the Roseland neighbourhood’s distinct character and the City’s interest in preserving and managing that character.

Additional Official Plan policies may include:

- Amendments to Infill Policies
- Additions to Consent criteria
- Refined definitions (i.e. “Compatibility”)

Section 4.1.2

Roseland

Roseland is a welcoming neighbourhood that is valued because of its natural and high-quality architectural setting. Development in Roseland will be well proportioned in relation to existing houses, will strengthen the neighbourhood’s strong historical character, and will contribute to the neighbourhood’s varied architectural styles and large mature trees. The Roseland neighbourhood will retain and extend its substantial tree canopy and established garden character.
Potential Approaches to Protecting Character in Roseland

Official Plan Policy Samples (Residential)

“To require new residential development to be compatible with surrounding properties.”
- Part III, Policy 2.2.1 g)

“In Residential-Low Density areas, single-detached and semi-detached housing units with a density to a maximum of 25 units per net hectare shall be permitted. In addition, other forms of ground oriented housing units with a density to a maximum of 25 units per net hectare may be permitted, provided that these forms are compatible with the scale, urban design and community features of the neighbourhood”
- Part III, Policy 2.2.2 c)

**Area 1:** Approximately 4 units per hectare  
**Area 2:** Approximately 7 units per hectare  
**Area 3:** Approximately 10 units per hectare

These will be tested further with the Neighbourhood Working Group
Potential Approaches to Protecting Character in Roseland

Official Plan Policy Samples (Severance Criteria)

(i) The lot should have a compatible width and area with lots in the immediate vicinity;

(ix) The frontage of new lots intended for building should generally not be less than approximately 40 per cent of the lot depth.”

- Part VI, Policy 4.4 e) (i) – (ix)

**Area 1:** Average Lot Depth 80m (40% = 36m) Existing average frontage = 34m

**Area 2:** Average Lot Depth 50m (40% = 20m) Existing average frontage = 30.4m

**Area 3:** Average Lot Depth 37m (40% = 15m) Existing average frontage = 35.3m
Potential Approaches to Protecting Character in Roseland

Contextual Zoning

Takes averages for a neighbourhood (e.g. side/front/rear yard setbacks, frontages, lot coverages), and provides a potential range of acceptable development.

Currently, Burlington’s Zoning By-Law 2020 includes regulations that apply to residential properties city-wide.

Current proposals meet the By-Law but do not accurately reflect the conditions in the neighbourhood.

Context Zoning Example:

**Area 1 Lot Frontage**

Current Zoning = 24m
Average Lot Frontage = 35.3m
Potential Range = 25-45m
Potential Approaches to Protecting Character in Roseland

**Site Plan Control Process**

Applies to new dwellings and additions

Ensures that development is safe, functional, compatible and meets servicing standards

Process considers:
- location, massing and exterior design of buildings;
- parking, driveway, walkways, grading and drainage;
- new landscaping, servicing, lighting and related site works
- compliance with OP, Zoning regulations, Urban Design guidelines

…but it cannot
- regulate interior (non boundary) trees and vegetation on the site
- supersede existing zoning permissions
Potential Approaches to Protecting Character in Roseland

Heritage Designation

The Ontario Heritage Act enables the council to designate any defined area as a Heritage Conservation District.

Heritage Conservation Districts are often used in neighbourhoods where there are compatibility issues related to development applications and where conventional planning tools do not fully reflect the existing conditions.

The City of Burlington would regulate, by by-law, the demolition, relocation and alteration of all properties in the neighbourhood.
Potential Approaches to Protecting Character in Roseland

**Heritage Designation**

**PROS:**
- High degree of protection for homes that are designated under the Ontario Heritage Act and/or for a Heritage Conservation District
- Clear regulations for what is and is not regulated
- Special recognition from Provincial and Municipal governments

**CONS:**
- Very detail-oriented protections that may be considered too restrictive or too onerous for property owners
Potential Approaches to Protecting Character in Roseland

Private Landscaping Standards

Having common landscaping standards for all properties in Roseland

Private landscaping standards may include requiring landscaping for all visible frontages and/or regulating the types of materials that are used as landscaping.

Example:

“All visible frontages must be Landscaped…”
Potential Approaches to Protecting Character in Roseland

Private Landscaping Standards

PROS:
• Reinforces a high standard of landscaped yards which are already prevalent in Roseland
• Easy to adhere to → property owners are required to landscape visible yard space

CONS:
• Only addresses visible private green spaces in Roseland
• Does not protect or influence buildings
• Difficult to enforce
• There is already a high quality of private lot landscape design
Potential Approaches to Protecting Character in Roseland

Heritage Tree Designation (Public Trees)

Tree protection standards help to preserve significant trees on public property.

Public Tree Protection standards would protect trees on city-owned property over a certain size (e.g. 20cm in diameter).

Examples:

*Heritage Tree Designation* (under Ontario Heritage Act): Individual trees of significance are designated in Roseland, rather than all trees in the neighbourhood.
Potential Approaches to Protecting Character in Roseland

Heritage Tree Designation

PROS:
• Protection for existing City trees
• Protection for significant, landmark trees
• Designated trees receive heritage plaques to celebrate protection of a significant tree

CONS:
• Only addresses trees on public property
• Does not protect or influence buildings
• Tree designations would protect a small number of trees in the community
Potential Approaches to Protecting Character in Roseland

Design Review Committee

A Design Review Committee would assist Burlington City Council in fulfilling Official Plan and Urban Design Guideline objectives by providing City staff with design advice on development in Roseland.

Comprised of municipal and independent professionals

The Committee’s goal would be to ensure development in Roseland is compatible with the existing conditions and vision for the neighbourhood.
Potential Approaches to Protecting Character in Roseland

Design Review Committee

**PROS:**
- Objective review that informs owners early in the process of design criteria

**CONS:**
- May increase time of development applications
Potential Approaches to Protecting Character in Roseland

Urban Design Guidelines

Established in a City’s Official Plan and are used in conjunction with the municipal Zoning By-Law.

Provide direction on private and public realm elements that can not be regulated through other municipal policy such as the Official Plan or Zoning By-Law.

Place emphasis on the external design of all new buildings to encourage they are compatible with the character of the neighbourhood

Guidelines may include: built form and massing, architectural control, building material recommendations, driveway width, garage setbacks
Potential Approaches to Protecting Character in Roseland

Urban Design Guidelines Examples

2.1.2 Guideline: “Second storey balconies or windows overlooking adjacent properties are discouraged.”

2.2.1 Guideline: “New development shall complement the qualities established by existing neighbouring buildings and the overall character of the setting through the use of common architectural elements and design cues such as rooflines, dormers, porches, fenestration, etc.”

2.5.1 Guideline: “Garages shall be recessed or located behind the main face of the dwelling. Projecting garages will be strongly discouraged.”

2.4.3 Guideline: “The use of two-storey architectural elements is strongly discouraged.”
Potential Approaches to Protecting Character in Roseland

Urban Design Guidelines

PROS:
• Urban design guidelines tailored to Roseland community will be more specific than general urban design guidelines in place
• Ensures more compatible development in Roseland
• Can be supported/strengthened through changes to Zoning and/or the Official Plan
• Provides flexibility in discussions with architect and/or property owner

CONS:
• May increase time of development applications
• May be difficult to generate consensus on what to include in the design guidelines
• May be viewed as restricting a property owner’s design aesthetic
• Not legally enforceable as a law or regulation
Re-Cap of Potential Tools

Existing Planning Tools
- Official Plan policies
- Zoning regulations
- Site Plan process

New Planning Tools
- Heritage designation
- Private landscaping standards
- Heritage Tree Designation
- Urban Design Guidelines for Roseland
- Design Review Committee
Potential Approach
Contextual Zoning Example

Create sub-areas within the neighbourhood

Area Lot Coverages
Area 1: 5-14% lot coverage
Area 2: 15-24% lot coverage
Area 3: 25-30% lot coverage
Potential Approaches to Protecting Character in Roseland

What policies, provisions, and processes can be implemented in a holistic approach to protect the character of Roseland?

The following slides outline 7 physical elements that define the character of Roseland:

1. Lot frontage
2. Building location (side yard, front yard, rear yard setbacks and distance between houses)
3. Lot Coverage
4. Building Height and Massing
5. Building Additions
6. Facade Articulation
7. Private and Public Landscaping
## Contextual Zoning Directions

### Roseland: Sub-Area Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Element</th>
<th>Current R1.2 Zoning</th>
<th>Area 1 sample</th>
<th>Area 2 sample</th>
<th>Area 3 sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverages</td>
<td>40% (1-storey); 35% (2-storey)</td>
<td>5-14%</td>
<td>15-24%</td>
<td>25-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Frontages</td>
<td>24m</td>
<td>34m</td>
<td>30.4m</td>
<td>35.3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard Setbacks</td>
<td>9m</td>
<td>20m</td>
<td>12.7m</td>
<td>7.7m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard Setbacks</td>
<td>10% of lot width; 9m street side yard</td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>5m</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard Setbacks</td>
<td>9m</td>
<td>29m</td>
<td>9.3m</td>
<td>9.3m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Between Houses</td>
<td>Not included in zoning</td>
<td>14m</td>
<td>12m</td>
<td>7.7m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>Peaked – 2 storeys 10m Flat roof - 2 storeys 7m Lakeshore Road: 2.5 storeys 11.5m</td>
<td>2 storeys</td>
<td>2 storeys</td>
<td>1.5 storeys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Approach

1. Lot Frontage

Objectives
Balance house scale with existing lot frontages

Potential Approach

Contextual Zoning

- Determine the average frontage for each sub-area
- Select a proposed range (eliminate anomalies) related to average
Potential Approach

1. Lot Frontage

Area 3 Analysis

Current Zoning: 24m
Average Lot Frontage: 35.3m
Proposed Range: 25-45m
Potential Approach

1. Lot Frontage

Area 3 Demonstration Site
2. Building Location

Objectives
Promote complementary infill and tree canopy.

Potential Approach

Contextual Zoning

- Determine the average setbacks for each sub-area
- Determine average distance between buildings for each area
- Select a proposed range (eliminate anomalies)
Potential Approach

2. Building Location

Area 3 Analysis: Front-Yard Setbacks

Current Zoning: 9m
Average Front-Yard Setback: 7.7m
Proposed Range: 7-10m (Protect existing front-yard setbacks)
Potential Approach

2. Building Location
Area 3 Analysis: Rear-Yard

Setbacks
Current Zoning: 9m (4.5m on corner lot)
Average Rear-Yard Setback: 9.3m
Proposed Range: 9-12m
Potential Approach

2. Building Location

Area 3 Analysis: Side-Yard Setback

Current Zoning: 10% of lot width (3m min. with garage)

Average Side-Yard Setback: 3.5m

Proposed Setback: 2.5m minimum (more may be required if neighbouring side yard is substandard)
Potential Approach

2. Building Location

Area 3 Analysis: Distance Between Buildings

Average Distance Between Buildings: 7.7m

Proposed Distance: 5m minimum (in accordance with a 2.5m minimum side yard)
Potential Approach

2. Building Location

Area 3 Demonstration Site
3. Lot Coverage

Objectives
Balance house scale with lot size

Potential Approach

Contextual Zoning

• Determine the average coverage for each sub-area
• Select a proposed range (eliminate anomalies)
Potential Approach

3. Lot Coverage

Example: Area 3

Current Zoning: 40% (1-storey); 35% (2-storey)

Average Lot Coverage: 26%

Proposed Range: 20-30%

Grandfather existing coverages above or below range

Setbacks could be used instead of lot coverage as another means to control coverage
Potential Approach

3. Lot Coverage

Area 3 Demonstration Site
4. Building Height and Massing

Objective

Balance house scale with lot size and Protect views.

Potential Approach

- **Contextual Zoning**
  - Limit building heights to be compatible with existing heights. For example, permit 3rd storeys if they are integrated within the roof line.
Potential Approach

4. Building Height and Massing

Example: Area 3

Current Average: 1.5 storeys

Proposed Guideline: Limit building heights to be compatible with existing heights. For example, 3rd storeys to be integrated within the roof line.
Potential Approach

4. Building Height

Area 3 Demonstration Site
5. Building Additions

Objective

Balance house scale with lot size and Protect privacy of neighbouring properties

Potential Approach

Contextual Zoning

• Building additions to conform to setback and lot coverage ranges if applicable

Urban Design Guidelines

• “Building additions should maintain existing view corridors”
• “Materials should be consistent with existing building”
6. Façade Articulation

Objective
Promote varied architectural styles, high quality materials and well balanced facades

Potential Approach

Urban Design Guidelines
- Height and Massing
- Projections and Recesses
- Roof Lines
- Architectural Control
Potential Approach

7. Private Landscaping

Objective
Promote attractive landscaping and privacy between neighbours

Potential Approach
Maintain the Status Quo: Owner control
Private landscaping standards (require landscaping for all visible frontages)
7. Private Tree Protection

Objective
Preserve existing and promote private lot tree planting

Potential Approach
Heritage Tree Designation (under OHA)
Tree Planting Incentive Programs
7. Public Tree Protection

Objective

Preserve existing and promote public tree planting

Potential Approach

Heritage Tree Designation (under the Ontario Heritage Act)
Next Steps

**Early-Mid July**
Public Consultation Summary Report

**TBD**
Interim Report

Refine Policy Directions

Prepare Draft Design Guidelines

**Fall 2013**
Public Meeting # 3