Introduction & Context

The Character Area Study for Roseland identifies the characteristics of the neighbourhood, with emphasis on the qualities that make it distinct from other neighbourhoods in the City of Burlington. The study results in recommendations for new and refined policies and tools for the City to support the character of Roseland in response to development pressures. The Character Area Study will help manage development change in Roseland to ensure new development maintains the characteristics most valued by the community and that the distinctiveness of the neighbourhood is protected and enhanced.

1.1 Study Purpose

The purpose of the Character Area Study for Roseland is to:

» Identify the area characteristics of Roseland, with specific emphasis on what makes this area distinct within the City of Burlington.

» Review the merit of establishing defined “Character Areas” in the City’s Official Plan in recognition of the identified area characteristics of Roseland.

» Obtain direction to improve the management of neighbourhood character issues associated with the redevelopment within Roseland.

1.2 What is a Character Area Study?

Neighbourhood character refers to the 'look and feel' of an area. Character areas are areas of a community that have achieved a distinct, recognizable, character that is different from neighbouring areas. A Character Area Study considers the public and private realm components that define the area, including topography, age and style of housing, built environment, land use patterns, landscaping, street patterns, open space, and streetscapes.

The character of a neighbourhood goes beyond a categorization of private and public realm components. The character of the houses and the individual properties in a neighbourhood cannot be viewed in isolation from the character of the street and the context in which they are located. Therefore, a Character Area Study identifies a combination of components that collectively give a neighbourhood its character, quality, and sense of place.

Opposite Page: Roseland dwelling nestled among large, mature trees (Credit - Brook McIlroy).
Map 1: Illustrating the key characteristics of Roseland.
1.3 Roseland Neighbourhood

The Roseland neighbourhood is located east of the Queen Elizabeth Highway on the north shore of Lake Ontario in the City of Burlington. Approximately 115 acres in size, with over 300 homes, the neighbourhood is bordered to the south by Lake Ontario, to the north by New Street, Guelph Line to the west and Pomona Avenue to the east. The neighbourhood is generally laid out on a grid network of streets, intersecting at 200m intervals, with some adjoining crescent streets. Rossmore Boulevard is the primary road running the length of the neighbourhood from New Street to Lakeshore Road, with east/west streets intersecting it at approximately 50m intervals.

1.4 History of Neighbourhood

The Roseland neighbourhood was laid out in part by Ross Hart in 1922 and extended by the Cleaver family in 1924. At this time, only a portion of the lots in the neighbourhood were built on, and due to a lull in residential construction during the Second World War, most of Roseland was not developed until late into the 1940s and early 1950s. While the houses built in the 1920s were substantial and large, those built after the war were generally smaller and single storey. A number of these homes still exist in altered forms in Roseland.

The description of the neighbourhood in the original Roseland Park survey still holds relevancy today:

“There is an atmosphere of distinction coupled with an unusual beauty and refinement which you will sense the moment you set foot upon Roseland Park...It is a spot in which to make a home that will be a home in every sense of the word - where you can enjoy every advantage of a community life of the finest possible type. See Roseland. It tells its own story. You will understand at first glance.”
A detailed review of best practices for protecting and enhancing the character of unique neighbourhoods was undertaken. This review considered local, Canadian, and international precedents at a variety of scales, from neighbourhood-specific studies to broader city-wide policies. Strategies range from research techniques and design guidelines to zoning and policy amendments, and include a variety of approaches that are applicable to Roseland. A selection of precedents are described in greater detail below.

2.1 Baby Point, Toronto

Baby Point is a residential neighbourhood in Toronto, located on the Humber River to the northwest of Bloor West Village. The neighbourhood, a quaint enclave, is situated on a ‘point’ overlooking the Humber River and is surrounded by ravines and parkland. It is characterized by a mix of dwellings with larger homes backing onto the ravine and smaller dwellings near the Jane Street entrance.

A defining feature of Baby Point is the varied location of the dwellings on their property, and in relation to adjacent dwellings, which reflects incremental development over time.

Currently, changes to the zoning bylaw are under consideration to permit a unique approach to zoning for the area that would help to preserve the existing layout of the neighbourhood. The amendment would establish minimum front and side yard setbacks as they exist on the date the amendment is enacted, requiring new builds to maintain the existing relationship of dwelling to property size and the relationship between adjacent properties.

Additions to existing dwellings would be limited to the rear yard (to maintain front and side yard setbacks), but are otherwise only restricted by coverage requirements, maximizing flexibility for property owners looking to expand the size of their dwelling.

Lessons Learned

The approach applied at Baby Point directly addresses a fundamental element of the neighbourhood character (relationship of dwelling to property size and to adjacent properties) while still allowing flexibility for rebuilds or significant rear yard additions. This approach informed the Legacy Zoning outlined in Recommendation # 4.
2.2 Wychwood Park, Toronto

While Ontario has many Heritage Conservation Districts, Toronto’s Wychwood Park is the province’s first residential zone to be granted heritage status. Wychwood Park is located north of Downtown Toronto, to the northwest of Davenport Road and Bathurst Street. Wychwood Park is designated a Heritage Conservation District under the Ontario Heritage Act. This designation recognizes not only the dwellings (all are listed on the City’s heritage register), but also the landscape, the street arrangement, etc. Any alteration, addition, or demolition of a property within Wychwood Park requires a permit from the City, which is subject to the plan for the neighbourhood.

The plan provides a detailed description of the neighbourhood, identifying the key elements that define the character, including a park-like ambiance, large native trees, relationship between trees and dwellings, open spaces around dwellings, etc. Detailed guidelines are provided to ensure that new dwellings, additions, or alterations are consistent with these elements.

Lessons Learned

While Heritage Conservation Districts can be controversial, and are often criticized for limiting the evolution of a neighbourhood, elements from Wychwood Park can be applied to Roseland without adopting a Heritage Conservation District. The guidelines that support the Wychwood Park Heritage Conservation District are rooted in a strong understanding and description of the character and history of the neighbourhood. Recognizing the value of a strong character statement has been applied in the recommendations of this study (see Recommendation # 2).

2.3 Mississauga, Ontario

Mississauga Plan, the City’s Official Plan, provides strong policies for neighbourhood protection at the highest level of planning policy. On Schedule 9: Character Areas, the plan recognizes a number of areas in the City that are unique and require an additional level of consideration.

General policies related to these areas are provided throughout the plan, and Local Area Plans provide more detailed directions and policies for the Downtown Core, Port Credit, Lakeview, and Southdown.

Within the Local Area Plans, each plan area is divided into unique precincts. The character of each precinct is defined, and specific policies are provided to support the elements that define the character.

Lessons learned

Mississauga’s approach to character planning further supports the importance of a strong character statement for each unique area. More importantly, Mississauga demonstrates a comprehensive approach to character planning where broad directions (i.e. Mississauga Plan) are supported by area-specific directions (i.e. Local Area Plans). This approach is reflected in the recommendations for Roseland, where a character statement and policies in the Official Plan (see Recommendation # 1 and 2) support changes to the zoning bylaw (see Recommendation # 4) and urban design guidelines (see Recommendation # 8).
2.4 Oakville, Ontario

The Town of Oakville’s Design Guidelines for Stable Residential Communities provide detailed directions for new detached dwellings (infill and/or rebuilds) and large additions within stable residential areas.

The guidelines build on the broad policies of the Liveable Oakville Plan (the Town’s Official Plan), which call for compatible infill. By providing detailed directions related to height, scale, transitions between properties, rear yard privacy, etc. the guidelines limit the ambiguity of a broad term such as compatibility. The guidelines provide neighbourhood residents with a sense of comfort about future development, provide developers with a clear understanding of Council’s vision for compatible infill, and assist Town staff in evaluating development proposals.

Lessons Learned

The Design Guidelines for Stable Residential Communities further protect the character of stable neighbourhoods in Oakville, addressing more qualitative elements that are not generally covered in zoning bylaws. This provides an additional layer of protection that, combined with the policies of the Official Plan, support a clear and defensible vision for the protection of stable neighbourhoods (and the elements that support this). The recommendations of this report build on this, outlining amendments to the City’s existing Low-Density Residential Guidelines to address the elements that are specific to Roseland’s character.

A number of guidelines will be directly applicable in Roseland, when combined with the recommendations of this report, to help protect the existing scale and character of new development and additions. Sample guidelines include:

» New development with a full second storey is encouraged to incorporate facade articulation and different materials on the upper storey façade to minimize the appearance of greater height.

» New development should be designed to mitigate potential impacts of overshadowing on adjacent properties by avoiding bulky massing close to the shared property line, by stepping down the height of the structure, and/or by increasing the setback(s) from the side and rear property lines.

» New development, which projects beyond the established rear setback of adjacent dwellings, should be designed such that the height and massing of the projection does not cast significant shadows onto amenity space in the rear yards of adjacent properties.

» New development should not include second storey decks and balconies, which may create an undesirable overlook condition onto adjacent properties.

» New development is encouraged to incorporate soft and hard landscaping elements that are commonly found in the character and layout of the cultural landscape of the neighbourhood.
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2.5 Vancouver, Canada

The City of Vancouver protects important neighbourhoods through the preparation of Community Plans, including plans for Marpole, Mount Pleasant, West End, and Norquay Village. Within these larger areas, the plans recognize a number of unique sub-neighbourhoods that have their own character and identity.

Through the creation of a Local Area Profile, Community Plans start by identifying the key elements that define each neighbourhood. This includes a statement of the neighbourhood’s character, as well as a list of the public and private realm elements that support this character. In addition, the Local Area Profiles address the threats that potentially undermine this character.

The Community Plans are supported by policies that are specific to each neighbourhood.

Lessons Learned

Vancouver’s Community Plans reinforce many lessons learned through other precedents, including the value of a strong character statement and area-specific policies. They are unique in that identifying the potential threats to the character results in directions that specifically aim to mitigate these concerns, rather than simply preserving the existing elements. A similar approach was used in Roseland, where the threats to character elements were identified (see Section 3.3) and used to inform the final recommendations.

2.6 Victoria, Australia

In Victoria, ResCode is a design code (Bylaw) that applies to all residential development and makes neighbourhood character the primary criterion for assessing residential development applications in the City. ResCode requires a detailed site analysis for every development proposal to identify the character of the neighbourhood and to demonstrate how the proposed development meets or enhances this character.

To facilitate the retention of neighbourhood character, ResCode provides detailed requirements related to dwelling position, setbacks, height, roof pitch, etc. These are not guidelines, but are mandatory requirements that must be met by all new development.

Lessons Learned

ResCode exemplifies how specific elements of zoning can be used to ensure that the character of an area is protected. While the requirements of ResCode go beyond the recommendations of this report, it demonstrates that even individual elements (i.e. setbacks) can make a big impact on protecting character. Once detailed urban design guidelines are provided (see Recommendation # 8), ResCode could be used as an example of how guidelines can be added to zoning (as appropriate) to enhance character protection.
2.7 Cairns, Australia

To protect the character of unique neighbourhoods in Cairns, the City utilizes many of the same elements that have been discussed in previous precedents. Twenty-three unique cultural heritage precincts have been identified throughout the City, and a character statement and detailed design guidelines have been provided for each. Similar to Vancouver, Cairns also identifies the threats to neighbourhood character and uses this to create guidelines that address issues such as contemporary infill, large dwelling additions, etc.

Where Cairns’ approach is unique is in the appointment of a Regional Urban Design Board. This is a board comprised of the Mayor, the GM of Planning and Environment, and eight industry professionals. The board is called upon, on an as-needed basis, to provide design advice. While the board is involved in a variety of planning contexts, this approach has proven particularly useful in assisting with issues of neighbourhood character.

Lessons Learned
The approach to character protection in Cairns solidifies the lessons learned through previous precedents. However, given the contention and ambiguity that is inherent in matters of neighbourhood character, the Regional Urban Design Board approach is specifically relevant in Roseland and reflected in the recommendations for a Peer Review Process (see Recommendation # 3).

2.8 Boroondara, Australia

In the City of Boroondara, a Neighbourhood Character Study has identified seventy-five unique precincts within the City. To ensure that the character of these precincts is protected as new development occurs, a simple and easily-distributable brochure has been prepared for each area outlining the character, the elements that define this character, and the potential threats to this character (new houses dominating the streetscape, lack of vegetation, loss of large trees, period reproduction styles, etc.). This description of the area is an integral component during the evaluation of development applications within each neighbourhood.

In addition, the City has used the findings of the Neighbourhood Character Study and is currently in the process of implementing new designations within the zoning that address high level character components, while requiring applicants to provide a response to the Neighbourhood Character Study.

Lessons Learned
The creation of additional zoning designations is an extreme example of how a City can implement the key findings following a study of neighbourhood character. However, by simply requiring applicants to prepare a response to the Neighbourhood Character Study, the City has demonstrated the significance of protecting neighbourhood character at two levels of policy, which significantly strengthens the protection measures. A similar approach is recommended in this report, where a character statement and policies in the Official Plan (see Recommendation # 1 and 2) support changes to the zoning bylaw (see Recommendation # 4) and urban design guidelines (see Recommendation # 8).
A four-part consultation program was used to engage the Roseland community, and to develop the final recommendations through a collaborative and iterative process. The first meeting focused on the defining elements of the neighbourhood, while the second meeting introduced the possible tools that could be used to protect these features. For the third meeting, a series of recommended tools were applied throughout the neighbourhood. The workshops encouraged open discussion of each recommendation, with extensive question and answer periods leading to detailed consideration of the on-the-ground implications of each recommendation. The findings of the workshops were used to refine the recommendations throughout the process. An overview of each session is provided below.

Workshop #1 - Visioning
On May 1st, 2013, the first public meeting was held, with approximately 70 people in attendance. The objectives of this meeting were to introduce the study to the community, identify the elements that define Roseland’s character, and develop a preliminary Character Area Statement for Roseland.

The meeting began with a drop-in session, where participants were encouraged to review display boards and interact with the consultant team. A presentation by the consultant team outlined the findings of the background research. Turning Point, a polling technology, was used to elicit feedback throughout the presentation, and distilled the following information:

» The majority of attendees live and own property in the neighbourhood and/or have development interest in the neighbourhood;

» The majority of residents are either long-term (greater than 20 years) or recent (less than 5 years) residents;

» Key features of the neighbourhood include views, privacy, large tree canopy, spacious properties and dwelling scale; and,

» Participants have reservations about policy and planning tools that impact both the public and private realm.

In smaller groups, participants engaged in in-depth discussions using a large map and worksheet for guidance. The meeting concluded with each group sharing their top discussion points with the plenary group.
A wide range of feedback was generated from each of the working groups, with many consistent recommendations for maintaining the character of the Roseland neighbourhood including:

» Ensure that both privately and publicly owned trees in the neighbourhood are protected to maintain the tree canopy.

» Replace trees that are reaching the end of their life expectancy with new trees in proportion to the property and house size.

» Maintain the privacy of the neighbourhood. Ensure through traffic does not interfere with the sense of safety and privacy.

» Ensure new development and additions to existing houses are complementary in character, height, size and scale to others in Roseland.

» Maintain the varied lot patterns with a diversity of lot shapes and sizes.

» Ensure the scale of houses is proportionate to the size of the lot to reinforce the feeling of the spacious lots.

» Support and encourage the eclectic and varied architectural styles of houses in the neighbourhood.

» The landscape design and maintenance of privately owned properties in Roseland should be of a consistently high standard.

» Ensure future development does not impact views and sightlines of distinctive architecture and vistas throughout the neighbourhood.

The key findings of this session were used to refine the tools presented during Workshop # 2.
Workshop # 2 - Potential Tools

On June 25, 2013, the second public meeting was held, with approximately 30 people in attendance. Building on the findings of the first workshop, the second workshop introduced all of the potential policy and process tools that are available to protect Roseland’s identified character elements. Each tool was discussed, and those that were favoured by the community were selected and subsequently refined by the consultant team into draft recommendations.

Working Committee Meeting

On November 26th, 2013, a meeting was held with the project Working Committee, a smaller group comprised of members of the community. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss and refine the draft recommendations prior to the final public workshop. Consensus was not expected from this meeting; rather, the objective was to explore the tools and related implications.

In addition to discussing each tool, the meeting provided the opportunity to talk in detail about the planning and development process in the neighbourhood, and how the recommendations of this study would influence the current process.

Key discussion points included:

» The existing coverage requirements should be maintained (subject to other limitations), or reduced;

» Terminology is important, including the use of ‘shall (required)’ vs. ‘should (recommended),’ and ensuring enough detail to minimize ambiguity in words like compatible, high-quality, etc.

» Revisions to the minor variance process, including:
  - Requiring a joint site plan application for consideration.
  - Increasing the area of notification for minor variance application.

Following this meeting, the draft recommendations were refined to reflect the feedback received.

Spacious properties in Roseland allow for significant landscaping and large mature trees (Credit - Brook McIlroy).
Workshop # 3 - Recommendations

The final public workshop was held on February 11, 2014, with approximately 30 people in attendance. The objective of this workshop was to present and obtain feedback on the draft final recommendations.

Participants were generally in favor of the intent of the recommendations. The majority of the discussion focused on Legacy Zoning, and how it will respond to the unique lots within the neighbourhood. Specific concerns included:

» Should additional setback requirements apply to bungalows near the side property line that are seeking an additional storey?

» Are the rear yard requirements of Legacy Zoning inconsistent with the existing rear yard character?

» How does Legacy Zoning apply to corner lots?

» Should coverage requirements reflect the overall lot size?

It was stressed that ambiguity has been a problem to date and that the final recommendations should be very descriptive about the elements that are being protected.

Following this meeting, the recommendations were refined to reflect the feedback received. These final recommendations can be found in Section 6 of this report.

Unique views and sight lines were identified as a defining character element in Roseland (Credit - Brook McIlroy).
Character Elements

The Roseland neighbourhood has a special character that has developed incrementally since the earliest homes built in the early 20th century. This character is the result of a number of public and private character elements which collectively create a neighbourhood unlike any other in Burlington, making it a distinct and desirable place to live. The following section outlines each of these character elements which have been established as a result of detailed site visits and neighbourhood mapping analysis, precedent review and the feedback gained from the public visioning workshop.

3.1 Private Realm

Spacious Properties
Properties in Roseland have a 'spacious' character with a significant amount of private open space at the front, rear and/or side yards. The reason for this spaciousness varies between properties, but is generally due to one of, or a combination of, the following:

» Large properties with a low lot coverage (i.e. less than 15%). Examples include the south side of Lakeshore Road, the south side of First Street, Princess Boulevard, and properties on the outside of Roseland Crescent.

» Wide side yard setbacks which create a large separation distance between properties. Examples include Princess Boulevard (from Guelph Line to Rossmore Boulevard), First Street, the north side of Lakeshore Road, the outside lots on Rosemore Crescent, and Woodland Park Drive.

» Large front yard setbacks create separation from the street and reinforce a spacious character even where dwellings are located close together. Examples include Woodland Park Drive (just east of Guelph Line), the south side of Princess Boulevard (east of Rossmore Boulevard), and the south side of Lakeshore Road.

This spaciousness is crucial to the look and feel of the neighbourhood. It helps to balance large houses, and results in properties with a generous amount of open space, private landscaping, and large, mature trees.
Varied Lot Pattern
The varied lot patterns in Roseland are a distinctive feature of the neighbourhood and in some cases, still reflect the original housing development patterns of the early 1900s. The properties in Roseland have an open feel, using landscaping in place of fencing, which contributes to the generous amounts of open space and park-like appearance. The lot patterns have also resulted in varied housing orientations on the properties. The inconsistent manner in which the houses are situated in relation to the lot configurations, mature trees and natural land contours gives the architecture of the houses added significance and visual impact.

Height and Scale of Homes
The houses in Roseland have a variety of heights and scales. Houses are predominantly 1.5 to 2.5-storeys, with larger scale houses on Hampton Court, Roseland Crescent and Lakeshore Road. These houses that are of a larger scale and height are balanced by the vast lot sizes and tall, mature trees.

Dwelling Style and Scale
Roseland is characterized by a diverse mix of traditional and modern architectural styles, including the Canadian interpretation of the English Arts and Crafts movement, Neo-Tudor (common among the historic houses), single-storey ranch-style bungalows, and modern dwellings of various styles. Many of the original 1920s and 1930s dwellings have been maintained, and help to reinforce the heritage of the neighbourhood. This variation reflects the incremental development of the neighbourhood over many decades.

Despite a variety of architectural styles, a number of elements are generally consistent throughout the neighbourhood, including:

» A general height of 1.5 to 2.5-storeys with dwellings generally within a half storey height difference compared to directly adjacent properties;
» Pitched roofs;
» Extensive facade articulation that breaks the building into smaller, components that do not appear monolithic or out of human-scale. Vertically, this articulation is achieved through turrets, bay windows, dormers, porches, etc. Horizontally, upper and lower floors are clearly articulated through continuous banding, roofs lines, material changes, etc.
» Use of natural materials, such as wood, brick and stone, which enhances the connection to the surrounding landscapes; and,
» Garages are generally located behind the primary dwelling. Where they are located at the front, and/or incorporated into the dwelling, they are generally subordinate to the primary dwelling in size (i.e. less than 1/3 of the total lot width). Garages are generally designed at a similar level of quality as the primary residence, and in many cases, have useable spaces above the garage; and,
» Dwellings on corner lots generally promote an attractive facade on both street frontages, including porches, bay windows, secondary entrances, landscaping, etc.

These elements, combined with the spaciousness of the properties, help to ensure compatible development between adjacent lots, and throughout the neighbourhood.

Private Landscaping
Private landscaping, gardens and lawns are well-established in Roseland and are prominent features of most front and rear yards. These gardens generally consist of shrubs, lawn, canopy trees, and flower plantings. Many privately owned properties in Roseland have extensive landscaping that is held to a high standard of design and maintenance and that helps to give each property a distinct character. The landscaping also promotes privacy for residents without requiring fencing, further strengthening the spacious qualities of the neighbourhood.

Opposite Page:
The photos illustrate Roseland as a product of a century of evolving architecture and lot patterns (Credits - Google).
3.2 Public Realm

Large, Mature Trees
Among the defining features of the Roseland neighbourhood are the large, mature trees that line the streets and frame properties. The trees are well established and vary in type, but include various pine and maple species. The continuous tree canopy in the neighbourhood is vast, and creates a sense of enclosure in addition to attractive streetscapes. These trees, which are privately and publicly owned, provide privacy for residents and shaded streetscapes. Their maturity signifies the neighbourhood’s age and history. Houses in Roseland are generally well-proportioned with the trees, which contributes to the balance and rhythm within the neighbourhood.

Streets and Streetscapes
The Roseland neighbourhood is positioned adjacent to Lake Ontario with a varied and often winding internal street network and dense, mature tree cover. The combination of winding and crescent streets (i.e. Roseland Crescent, Hampton Crescent) promotes privacy in the neighbourhood with minimal traffic. This street pattern helps to control through traffic and results in a street network that is used primarily by those who live in or are visiting the neighbourhood. As a result of the limited amount of through traffic, the streets in Roseland are generally safe for walking and play. The streets in the neighbourhood are a combination of continuous (Rossmore Boulevard, Lakeshore Road) and winding (Woodland Park Drive, Roseland Crescent) and are typically narrow with a deemed width of either 18 or 20 m (two lanes). Sidewalks in Roseland are also narrow and are typically located on a single side of the street.

On select streets (Rossmore Boulevard, Woodland Park Drive, W. Hart Crescent, and South Drive), traditional-style light standards reflect the early history of the neighbourhood. Key features of the lights include:

» Traditional lantern design integrated into the wooden utility pole;
» Powder-coated metal arm in a black finish;
» A gooseneck-style arm; and,
» A decorative scroll support-arm with a double bend.

On Roseland Crescent and Hampton Crescent, a similar style is used, though it is generally placed on a separate precast concrete pole.

On private properties, a wide variety of lighting complements the high-quality architecture and landscape design.

Parks and Gathering Places
Open space within the public realm is a defining feature of the Roseland neighbourhood. Roseland Park, a large central open space, has a baseball diamond, private tennis courts and the Roseland Park Country Club which is used by the residents as a central community gathering place for passive and active recreation.

Topography
The varied topography within Roseland creates changing views throughout the neighbourhood. The differences in topography, especially along Woodland Park Drive, help to reinforce the transitions between the private and public realm and help to characterize and add identity to streets. The resulting front yard slopes of some of the homes accommodate unique landscape elements including planting beds, garden walls, stairs and walkways.

Opposite Page:
The photos demonstrate some of the public and private realm elements that characterize Roseland (Credits - Google).
Views
Roseland’s location on the north shore of Lake Ontario provides views and/or access to the water to properties along Lakeshore Road (see Map 1, Page 2). Views of the lake also occur from Lakeshore Road at Guelph Line, and between waterfront properties at certain locations. The alignment of Rossmore Boulevard running north-south through the centre of the neighbourhood, creates a continuous neighbourhood vista to the Lake. The large trees, well set-back homes and sloping topography, create sightlines when travelling along the boulevard that are distinct to the Roseland neighbourhood. Terminus views throughout the neighbourhood are also created at certain intersections, with some featuring distinctive houses and sightlines.

3.3 Threats to Character Elements
In the previous sections, the public and private realm elements that define Roseland’s character were presented, building on the findings of the consultation with the community. During this consultation, the elements that have/may threaten this character were also identified and are outlined below.

Inappropriate Severances
Spacious properties are a defining characteristic of Roseland and are responsible for many of the elements that define the character of the neighbourhood, including large setbacks, extensive separation distances between dwellings, and views between properties.

As demonstrated at recent Ontario Municipal Board hearings, the 24m minimum lot width requirement of the existing R1.2 zoning permits wider properties in the neighbourhood to sever into two properties. The resulting properties are not able to maintain the same large setbacks and separation distances that previously characterized the property.

Incompatible Development
Roseland is characterized by a diverse mix of traditional and modern architectural styles, including the Canadian interpretation of the English Arts and Crafts movement, Neo-Tudor (common among the historic houses), single-storey ranch-style bungalows, and modern dwellings of various styles. This eclectic mix of architectural styles was consistently referenced as a defining feature of the neighbourhood. Specifically, it was noted that, while different, the style and scale of adjacent houses are generally compatible and reinforce the spacious properties that characterize the neighbourhood.

Recently, in areas such as the north end of Rossmore Boulevard, new dwellings have been constructed in a manner that is incompatible with the existing architectural character (as outlined on Page 15), and/or detrimental to the elements that support a spacious character (as outlined on Page 16). This has resulted in monolithic buildings that do not support a pedestrian-scale at the street. Similarly, property owners rebuilding their house may seek contemporary style houses. It should be noted that this document does not prohibit such developments, but advocates that they reflect the elements outlined on Pages 15 and 16, to recognize and ensure compatibility with adjacent dwellings.

Loss of Views
The key views in Roseland, which include views to Lake Ontario, unique terminus views (i.e. looking north on Hart Avenue), and general visibility between properties are the result of large separation distances between dwellings and dwellings that are positioned to frame and highlight these views.

Where properties are permitted to sever under the current zoning, reduced separation distances between dwellings would result from the smaller properties. Along Lakeshore Road, this could result in a loss of views to the lake. In the remainder of the neighbourhood, this could greatly reduce visual permeability between properties.
Given the large lot sizes in Roseland, the flexibility afforded by the current zoning could allow a rebuild to locate in a substantially different location on the property further increasing the risk of losing the permeability that currently exists between properties. In addition, where dwellings frame key views, relocating these dwellings could sacrifice these views.

**Loss of Trees**
Roseland’s extensive tree canopy is a definitive characteristic of the neighbourhood. While there is no immediate threat of large-scale loss of this canopy, it can be expected that a number of trees on both public and private property are approaching the end of their life expectancy. The City already has policies in place that address the protection and replacement of trees in the public realm, but no policies/incentives exist for the protection of trees on private property, or to encourage the planting of new trees.

**Loss of Landscaping**
The spacious lots that currently exist in Roseland can accommodate high quality and expansive landscaping. This landscaping provides privacy, contributes to the unique individual character of each property, and enhances the overall aesthetic of the neighbourhood. Reduced lot sizes as a result of inappropriate severances may not provide a similar amount of open space and may not provide the opportunity for adequate outdoor amenity space that presently contributes to the character of the neighbourhood.

**Inconsistent Street Lamps**
Community members noted that street lamps in certain parts of Roseland are not consistent with the character of the neighbourhood, resulting in a less attractive streetscape. It is important to ensure that historically significant street lamps of a consistent standard are used throughout the neighbourhood.

**Top (Inappropriate New Dwelling):** The image represents a new dwelling that would not be appropriate in Roseland. The 2-storey architectural features, and limited horizontal articulation, create a monolithic building that emphasizes the large size of the dwelling.

**Bottom (Appropriate New Dwelling):** The top image demonstrates how a large 2-storey dwelling can be designed to be compatible with the Roseland character. Significant articulation, both horizontal and vertical, results in a dwelling that supports a human-scale at the street, and an appropriate transition to adjacent properties.
Character Area Statement

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 authenticity. 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.

The character area statement for Roseland builds on the character elements, summarizing the qualities that make the neighbourhood distinct from others in the City of Burlington. This statement describes the most important character components in the neighbourhood, and provides direction on how the residents of Roseland would like the neighbourhood to evolve. This statement reflects and builds on the vision statements that community members developed during the community visioning workshop.

Key Terms:

*Mature Trees* - Many trees in Roseland are close to 100 years in age and have a large canopy that shades the streets.

*Strong Historical Character* - The history of the area is reflected through early 1900's architecture, traditional style light standards, and the original street pattern and lot sizes.

*Spacious Lots* - Due to large properties with low coverage, large separation distances, and/or deep front yard setbacks, properties have a significant amount of open space.

*Architectural Authenticity* - Dwellings that reflect their intended style (i.e. Arts and Crafts, Neo-Tudor, etc.), with appropriate articulation and features, as well as high-quality materials.

*Well-proportioned* - Lot coverage is generally less than 30%, with a large number of properties as low as 5-14%.

Opposite Page: Curvilinear streets result in changing views and experiences throughout the neighbourhood (Credit - Google).
Recommendations

To protect and preserve the character of Roseland, nine recommendations have been provided, including Official Plan Amendments, Zoning Bylaw Amendments, and new planning tools. On their own, each of these recommendations protects specific (or multiple) elements of Roseland’s character. Together, they provide a complementary framework across various levels of policy to ensure that future development will strengthen the overall character of the neighbourhood.

Each of the nine recommendations are described in greater detail in the sections that follow, including their impact on the neighbourhood. Where appropriate, typical blocks have been selected to demonstrate how these recommendations will apply on the ground. These typologies do not represent an exhaustive list of all possible applications, but demonstrate many of the property characteristics in Roseland.

Opposite Page: Dwellings are generally characterized by varied roof lines, and high-quality materials, including brick, wood, and stone (Credit - Google).
Recommendation # 1
Create a “Residential – Character Area” designation in the City’s Official Plan

Description
In the current Official Plan, Roseland is designated Low-Density Residential, and is subject to the same policies that apply to all neighborhoods in the City. These policies are broad, and do not recognize the unique characteristics of neighborhoods such as Roseland (i.e. the policies permit 25 units/hectare, while Roseland has approximately 7 units/hectare). Creating a Residential - Character Area designation in the Official Plan will guide the development of unique neighbourhoods, by providing:

» Introductory text that describes what a character area is and why it should be protected.

» General policies that apply to all character areas, including enabling policies that will encourage the protection of the urban tree canopy.

» Enabling policies that will allow for context-specific zoning for character areas (see Recommendation # 4).

» Neighbourhood specific policies that build on the general policies and address the context-specific characteristics of the neighbourhood, including the public and private realm elements outlined in Section 4.0.

» Additional policies related to minor variance and consent to sever applications in areas subject to Legacy Zoning (see Recommendation # 4), including:

- A new subsection c) within Section 4.2: To assist the City in commenting to the Committee of Adjustment on a proposal for minor variances in a Residential - Character Area, a design brief shall be submitted with the application. The design brief will address the policies of the Residential - Character Area designation, and in particular, the implications of the proposed variance on the relationship between the proposed development to the existing adjacent development. The design brief will include information such as elevations and 3D digital modeling to ensure the variance is compatible with the character of adjacent properties, including open space between properties, privacy and overlook, and large front-yard setbacks.

- A new subsection h) within Section 4.4: For lands designated Residential - Character Area, lot creation shall be limited to lots that can satisfy the intent of the policies within the Residential - Character Area designation. To assist the City in commenting to the Committee of Adjustment on a proposal for consent, a design brief shall be submitted with the application. The design brief will address the policies of the Residential - Character Area designation, and in particular, the implications of the proposed consent on the existing and proposed lotting patterns and built form. The design brief will include information such as elevations and 3D digital modeling to demonstrate that the severed parcels are compatible with the character of adjacent properties, including the size and shape of the lots, the lot frontage, and the overall spaciousness of the properties (i.e. lot coverage and open space between properties).

This new designation should be included on Schedule B: Comprehensive Land Use Plan, identifying Roseland as a Residential - Character Area.
Neighbourhood Impact

» Creating a Residential - Character Area designation identifies, at the highest level of municipal policy, that the City recognizes that Roseland is distinct and should be considered independent of the general residential policies.

» Providing neighbourhood-specific policies, including additional criteria for severance and minor variation applications, further reinforces Roseland as a neighbourhood that should be protected from development that is inconsistent with the vision of the neighbourhood.

» The neighbourhood-specific policies will inform and support changes to the zoning bylaw (see Recommendation # 4).

» New development applications will be required to demonstrate that they conform to the Residential - Character Area policies, and the neighbourhood-specific policies.

Sample policies are provided on the following page.

4. Property owners seeking Consent to Sever or Minor Variance shall demonstrate (through a design brief) that new development will maintain the character of Roseland using the following criteria:

a) spacious properties that are consistent with the predominant characteristics of the street, including:
   - low lot coverage;
   - open space between adjacent dwellings; and/or,
   - large, front-yard setbacks.

b) preservation of mature trees;

c) maintain the existing topography;

d) a dwelling height that is within 0.5-storeys of adjacent dwellings on either side; and,

e) architectural authenticity that supports a human scale without monolithic design elements.

6. On Lakeshore Road, views to the Lake should be protected and enhanced.

7. On properties at the end of a terminating street, dwellings should be designed and located to reinforce a unique view.

8. A variety of architectural styles should be provided to support a diverse character. High quality materials (i.e. brick, wood, stone) should be used to reflect and reinforce existing dwellings.

9. Tree protection measures should be implemented during any new development.

Sample Roseland-Specific Official Plan Policies

1. Only single-detached dwellings shall be permitted.

2. New dwellings will maintain a generous ratio of building to lot size consistent with the 25-35% coverage prescribed in the zoning bylaw (and subject to the other recommendations of this study).

3. Dwellings on corner lots should create a strong connection to both streetscapes.
Recommendation # 2  
Describe the vision for Roseland within the new Residential - Character Area designation

Description
Once a new Residential - Character Area designation is established in the Official Plan, and Roseland has been identified as a character area on Schedule B, a detailed vision statement should be provided within the Roseland-specific policies. This statement should outline the elements that define Roseland’s character (see Section 3), including public and private realm features.

Neighbourhood Impact
» Providing a vision statement within the Roseland-specific section of the Official Plan identifies, at the highest level of municipal policy, the public and private realm elements that contribute to Roseland’s character and should be protected and enhanced through future development.

» The vision statement will inform and support changes to the zoning bylaw (see Recommendation # 4).

» The vision statement will be used, in conjunction with Official Plan policies and neighbourhood-specific zoning, to evaluate development applications during the Site Plan Approval process and to ensure that proposals are consistent with the character of the neighbourhood.

Sample character statement (from Section 5): 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 authenticity. 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.
Recommendation # 3
Initiate a peer review process where additional guidance is required

Description
When City Staff require assistance in evaluating a development application to determine if it is consistent with the character of the Roseland neighbourhood, a peer review process should be undertaken.

The peer review process would be completed by an independent party, comprised of qualified persons including planners, urban designers, and/or architects. People with ties to the neighbourhood (i.e. residents or local developers) would not participate in the peer review process.

When combined with the other recommendations in this report, the peer review process should only be required in very limited cases.

Neighbourhood Impact
» Where required, the findings of the peer review process will be used to support the City’s decision on a proposed development.

» The findings of the peer review process will also become part of the overall evaluation package should the City’s decision be appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board.
**Recommendation # 4**  
*Amend the zoning bylaw to support ‘Legacy Zoning’*

**Description**  
The current R1.2 and R2.3 zoning provisions that apply to Roseland do not reflect the existing parcel fabric and instead, provide standardized front and side yard setback requirements that if applied uniformly across the neighbourhood (or even on the majority of properties within a block) risk significantly altering the existing character of the neighbourhood.

The zoning bylaw within Roseland should be amended to support Legacy Zoning. Legacy Zoning establishes front and side yard setbacks, on a lot-by-lot basis, based on the existing setbacks on the date the bylaw is enacted, preserving the relationship between adjacent dwellings, and between dwellings and the street. To allow flexibility, dwellings are permitted to set back further from the front yard setback line, up to 2m, which will allow additional space for landscaping, porches, etc. while maintaining the existing connection to the street.

This approach inherently addresses unique blocks within the neighbourhood (i.e. Roseland Crescent, Lakeshore Road), without having to determine setback requirements on a lot-by-lot, or street-by-street basis.

**Neighbourhood Impacts**  
» The impact on neighbourhood properties would vary from lot to lot, based on existing conditions, as demonstrated in the diagram on the opposite page.

» Legacy Zoning would not preclude property owners from demolishing and rebuilding their dwelling, but would require the new dwelling to conform to the front and side yard setbacks established by the existing dwelling.

» Legacy Zoning will ensure that new dwellings and additions to existing dwellings, will:
  - Protect the varied location of dwellings on their property, and a diversity in front yard setbacks.
  - Reinforce spacious properties with a reasonable dwelling-to-lot-size ratio.
  - Maintain the existing separation distance between dwellings on adjacent properties.
  - Protect views between adjacent properties where they currently exist.

» Maintaining the existing front and side yard setbacks would generally eliminate opportunities to sever properties as applicants would not be able to sever their property and maintain existing side yard setbacks. On rare occasions (i.e. particularly large lots), it may be possible to demonstrate that a severed property can accommodate new dwellings that maintain the intent of the Legacy Zoning (i.e. wide separation distances, large setbacks, etc.). Such applications may be candidates for the Peer Review Process outlined in Recommendation # 3.

» Where dwellings are located at the rear of the property, with a setback less than or equal to the required 9m (see Recommendation # 5), Legacy Zoning may result in a very restricted development envelope (depending on the footprint of the original dwelling). A Minor Variance to the Legacy Zoning may be considered if it can be demonstrated that the variance meets the criteria outlined in Recommendation # 1.
How This Recommendation Applies On the Ground:

» Under the existing zoning, if the above property owners demolish and rebuild, a 9m minimum front yard setback would be required. This may encourage dwellings to be located uniformly at the front property line. Side yard setbacks would be 10% of the property width (with a 3m minimum on one side). Reductions in either setback would require a minor variance.

» Under the Legacy Zoning, the front and side yard setback shown above would apply to any new dwelling on a property-by-property basis reinforcing the varied layout of the existing properties. For example, Property C would require a large setback (35m), and Property D would require a small setback (9m).

» As a corner lot, the front yard of Property A would be determined by the lesser of the two frontages (i.e. Hart Avenue). Therefore, the front yard setback for Property A would be 10m.

» Under the Legacy Zoning, if Property E were to demolish and rebuild, the new dwelling would have to conform to the front and side yard setbacks established by the previous dwelling (shown in yellow).

» Under the Legacy Zoning, any additions to the above properties would be contained to the rear yard (to preserve the front and side yard setbacks) and would be subject to all other requirements outlined in this report (i.e. total lot coverage, rear yard setbacks).
Recommendation # 5  
Maintain the existing 9m minimum rear yard setback in the current zoning

Description
As proposed, the Legacy Zoning approach (see Recommendation # 4) eliminates the opportunity to expand, or build a new dwelling that extends into the existing front and side yard setbacks. Therefore, it is recommended that the 9m minimum rear yard setback in the existing zoning be maintained to provide greater flexibility for additions and renovations, without compromising the existing character of properties.

While less than the existing rear yard setback for many properties, a depth of 9m ensures a rear yard that is useable for a wide variety of activities.

Neighbourhood Impacts
» The existing 9m minimum rear yard setback creates significant flexibility for a rear yard addition, or for a larger dwelling to be rebuilt on the site. However, these additions would still be subject to lot coverage requirements (see Recommendation # 7).

» Additions to existing dwellings would maintain the same separation distance as the existing dwelling due to the side yard setbacks established through Legacy Zoning.

» Additional policies within the urban design guidelines (see Recommendation # 8) would help to ensure additions are well integrated into the neighbourhood. Considerations may include:
  - A recommended maximum size for a dwelling addition (i.e. no greater than 1/3 of the original dwelling size).
  - Additional setback recommendations to provide appropriate spacing between adjacent properties (i.e. additional setbacks for second-storey additions to minimize overlook where the original building is located at or near the property line).
  - Facade articulation and offset from the primary building to demarcate the new addition from the primary dwelling.
  - A material palette that is consistent with the primary dwelling and the character of the neighbourhood, including high-quality natural materials such as wood, brick and stone.
How This Recommendation Applies On the Ground:

- The rear yards on the properties above range from 8-15m.
- The properties are all single-storey dwellings, allowing a total coverage of 35% (see Recommendation # 7).
- Property A could accommodate a 3m rear yard addition (up to 35% lot coverage).
- Property B could accommodate a 6m rear yard addition (up to 35% lot coverage).
- Property C could accommodate a 2m rear yard addition (up to 35% lot coverage).
- Despite the large 50m lot width, the rebuild of a new dwelling on Property E would be required to maintain the front and side yard setbacks established by the original dwelling (shown in yellow). A rear yard addition would be permitted, however, the property is already at the maximum rear yard setback (9m).
- Properties D and E could not accommodate a rear yard addition as they are already at the maximum rear yard setback (9m).
Recommendation # 6
Retain the maximum 2 to 2.5-storey dwelling height in the current zoning

Description
Dwellings in Roseland are generally 1 to 2-storeys, with some 2.5-storey dwellings along Lakeshore Road. This reflects the current zoning, which permits a maximum height of 2.5-storeys (13m) along Lakeshore Road and 2-storeys (7-10m) in the remainder of the neighbourhood. Within each block, these heights vary from property to property, creating a varied roofline and supporting the incremental neighbourhood character.

The maximum 2 to 2.5-storey heights prescribed in the existing zoning should be maintained to protect the established character of the neighbourhood, while allowing flexibility for additions and renovations that are in keeping with the scale of adjacent dwellings.

All additions must conform to the other recommendations in this document, including the front and side yard setbacks established through Legacy Zoning (see Recommendation # 4), as well as the policies of the urban design guidelines outlined in Recommendation # 5.

Neighbourhood Impacts
» When combined with the new Legacy Zoning and coverage requirements, maintaining the existing maximum height allowances will help to reinforce the generous dwelling-to-lot-size ratio that characterizes the neighbourhood.

» A property owner of a single-storey dwelling may add an additional storey providing that they are within the overall lot coverage requirements (see Recommendation # 7).

» Any property owner seeking to demolish and rebuild their dwelling could do so to a maximum height of 2-storeys (or 2.5-storeys along Lakeshore Road) provided they are within the overall lot coverage requirements (see Recommendation # 7) and the existing front and side yard setbacks (see Recommendation # 4).
How This Recommendation Applies On the Ground:

» The properties above range from 1.5 to 2-storeys.

» Property A could accommodate an additional storey for a total height of 2.5-storeys (the maximum allowance along Lakeshore Road).

» Properties B, C, D and H could accommodate a second-storey addition (where parts of the existing dwelling are 1-storey) up to a maximum lot coverage of 25% (see Recommendation # 7).

» Property E demonstrates an existing single-storey dwelling that has added an additional storey (yellow) for a total height of 2-storeys.

» As a new build, Property F could build up to 2-storeys provided the front and side yard setbacks of the original dwelling (shown in yellow) are maintained.

» Properties G and I could accommodate a rear yard addition up to a total coverage of 25%.

» All property owners could demolish their existing dwelling and rebuild up to 2-storeys (2.5-storeys on Lakeshore Road) subject to the other requirements of this document.
Recommendation # 7
Retain the maximum lot coverage prescribed in the current zoning bylaw

Description
The current zoning in Roseland allows up to 35% lot coverage (27% for the dwelling plus 8% for accessory buildings) for a 1-storey dwelling and 25% lot coverage (17% for the dwelling plus 8% for accessory buildings) for dwellings with more than 1 storey. While this is significantly larger than the coverage of most dwellings in the neighbourhood, it is recommended that this maximum coverage be maintained to provide flexibility and opportunities for additions and redevelopment within the Legacy Zoning requirements.

The overall size of additions or new dwellings would be subject to all other recommendations of this report, including Legacy Zoning, minimum rear yard setback requirements, and urban design guidelines.

Neighbourhood Impacts
» At full build out, a 25-35% lot coverage could result in an addition, or a new dwelling, that is much larger than the existing dwelling. However, Legacy Zoning would require any addition/rebuild to preserve the existing front and side yard setbacks which would ensure that even a larger dwelling maintains the varied layout, separation distances, deep front yards, and wide side yards that currently characterize the neighbourhood.

» Existing properties with a low lot coverage (i.e. 5-15%) are generally characterized by large dwellings on exceptionally large lots. While it would be possible in some instances for these dwellings to more than double in size, it is unlikely given their existing footprint, local market conditions, financial feasibility, etc.
How This Recommendation Applies On the Ground:

» The above properties range from 13-29% lot coverage.

» As single-storey dwellings, they can achieve a total lot coverage of 35% based on the existing zoning.

» Property A is a 1.5-storey dwelling and could not add a rear yard addition without a variance (lot coverage for a one and a half storey dwelling is 25%).

» Property B and C could build a rear yard addition up to 11% of the total property area.

» While under the total coverage allowance, Properties D and F could not accommodate an addition due to rear yard requirements (see Recommendation # 5).

» Despite a low lot coverage, as a new build Property E would be limited to a similar coverage as the existing dwelling (shown in yellow) because it is constrained by both the legacy setbacks and the existing rear yard setback.

» At 25% coverage or less, Properties B, C, and E could build an additional storey as-of-right for a total dwelling height of 2-storeys. Properties A, D and F would require a minor variance to build an additional storey.
Recommendation # 8
Augment the Design Guidelines for Low-Density Residential to ensure new development is complementary to, and sensitive to, the neighbourhood character

Description
Urban design guidelines build on established best practices to provide direction on private and public realm elements that are not generally regulated through other municipal policies (i.e. Official Plans or zoning bylaws). The guidelines place emphasis on the external design of new dwellings, providing design directions to encourage compatibility with the character of Roseland, while providing the flexibility to encourage unique dwellings.

The Site Plan Requirements and Urban Design Guidelines: Low Density Residential Zones and North Aldershot (2009) provide general guidelines for low density residential development. Working with the Roseland neighbourhood, these guidelines should be augmented, through a brief appendix, to provide recommendations that are specific to the Roseland neighbourhood.

The urban design guidelines will be supported through enabling policies in the City’s Official Plan, and will be used in conjunction with the zoning bylaw to review and assess development applications.

Neighbourhood Impacts
» A supporting Design Checklist that outlines the key directions of the guidelines can be provided during the design stages. This puts the onus on the property owner/developer to demonstrate that the proposed dwelling is consistent with the intent of the guidelines and the character of the neighbourhood.

» During Site Plan Review, design guidelines provide City Staff with additional criteria with which to evaluate proposals.

» When combined with Legacy Zoning, and the other recommendations of this report, urban design guidelines will provide a comprehensive framework for future development, helping to ensure a transparent and replicable evaluation process.

» Where appropriate, as the guidelines are developed with the community, select directions can be incorporated into the zoning bylaw to make them requirements for new dwellings.

» The design guidelines further reinforce the elements that define Roseland’s character should the City’s decision be appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board.
Design guidelines can provide additional directions to ensure that additions to existing dwellings are consistent with the character of the neighbourhood (diagram is for illustration purposes only and is not reflect Roseland guidelines).
Recommendation # 9
Provide incentives for new private trees

Description
The large mature trees on both public and private properties play a substantial role in defining the character of Roseland. They provide shaded sidewalks and reduce the urban heat island effect, making for a comfortable place to stroll; they augment private landscaping, creating attractive front and side yards; and, they provide a buffer between the public and private realm, helping to reinforce Roseland as a private enclave.

The City currently has measures in place to protect and preserve trees in the public realm. Additional opportunities should be implemented to encourage the protection of existing trees and the planting of new trees on private property.

Potential opportunities include:

» As part of a larger City-wide initiative, the City could explore opportunities to partially or fully subsidize new trees on private property. An additional study may be required to determine the specific details of such a program (i.e. subsidy amounts, priority areas, tree species, etc.).

» A Full Circle Tree Initiative, similar to a program used in Oakville, where participants are given the opportunity to be involved in various stages of tree growth, from planting to nursing to relocation. Once ready, trees can be replanted throughout the Roseland neighbourhood. This allows an opportunity for interested parties to be directly involved in enhancing the urban tree canopy.

» The City could provide information pamphlets to help educate residents about the importance of the urban tree canopy, and to encourage the planting of new private trees. Considerations could include: why new trees are important; how to plant and maintain trees; what trees are appropriate, etc.

Neighbourhood Impacts
» Encouraging new trees on private property will help to enhance the City’s overall tree canopy, helping to clean the air, reduce greenhouse gases, and conserve energy.

» Property values are regularly shown to be higher in neighbourhoods with a strong tree canopy.

» Initiatives such as the Full Circle Tree Initiative provide educational opportunities for local youth (and adults), and encourage a sense of ownership in the neighbourhood.

» Local tree preservation initiatives could be overseen by a Community Association, providing opportunities for increased involvement in the evolution of the neighbourhood.
Large private trees in the front yard of a dwelling in Roseland (Credit - Google).
This report provides a character statement for Roseland, while outlining a series of Official Plan amendments, zoning amendments, and new planning tools that will help to protect and enhance this character as the neighbourhood evolves. Given the scope of the study, the final recommendations are high level, and a number of additional steps should be undertaken prior to full implementation to ensure the directions of this study are applied successfully. The key next steps are outlined below.

**Finalize Roseland-Specific Policies**

The City of Burlington Official Plan Review is scheduled for completion by late 2015. Subject to approval by Council, this update will include a number of the elements outlined in this report, including a definition of neighbourhood character (see Section 1.2), a detailed character statement for Roseland (see Recommendation # 2), and character area policies, including general policies and Roseland-specific policies.

In Recommendation # 1, sample Roseland-specific policies are provided. These policies may be inserted directly into the updated Official Plan, however, it is recommended that they be reviewed and refined, including further consultation with the neighbourhood as required. These policies are the foundation for many of the other recommendations, and it is important that they are strongly supported by the City and the neighbourhood alike.
Test Lot-by-Lot/Unique Applications
Recommendation # 4 outlines a high level approach to zoning that aims to maintain the existing front and side yard setbacks in the neighbourhood. The approach has been tested on a variety of properties, and should form the basis for future amendments to the zoning bylaw. However, given the variation in lot shapes and sizes within Roseland, as well as the configuration of existing dwellings, the results of Legacy Zoning could vary drastically. This idea was reiterated throughout the public consultation sessions, with specific concerns relating to:

» What are the implications for corner lots?

» How does Legacy Zoning apply to properties that have existing requirements or agreements related to reconstruction (i.e. additional setbacks for sightlines)?

» What approach should be used where single-storey dwellings are located close to the side yard and an additional storey has been proposed? Would Legacy Zoning be appropriate in such a case or should an additional setback be required?

Given the potential for the Legacy Zoning approach to be applied in future character areas, it is recommended that a follow-up exercise be undertaken where Legacy Zoning is applied on a lot-by-lot basis in Roseland to identify all of the unique issues that may arise in future application. The limited number of properties would make this a feasible exercise, while the great variation in properties would identify the majority of conditions that are likely to arise in future neighbourhoods, allowing the City to refine a comprehensive approach prior to implementation.

Prepare Urban Design Guidelines
Recommendation # 8 advocates the creation of an appendix to the Urban Design Guidelines: Low Density Residential Zones and North Aldershot to provide guidelines that are specific to Roseland. This is envisioned as a brief, but comprehensive document that elaborates on the more general directions of the existing guidelines. The guidelines would allow further consideration of elements that were not addressed in great detail through this study. A specific consideration of the guidelines could be more direction related to rear yard additions, to ensure that compatible additions can be achieved within the prescribed lot coverages.

Urban design guidelines would also provide public realm directions to protect and enhance the character of Roseland. Elements such as sidewalks, street lights, signage, etc. were noted at the initial workshop, but not addressed further as discussions shifted to built form implications.

The guidelines would be prepared in consultation with the neighbourhood. As more specific recommendations may result from this study, it should be completed prior to the finalization of the Official Plan review to allow opportunities to add additional policies to the Official Plan or further amendments to the zoning if required.
Ongoing Working Committee Meetings
As part of this study, Working Committee meetings were held with a smaller group of community members, allowing specific items to be discussed in greater detail. The Working Committee approach should continue to be applied during the implementation of the recommendations in this report. Specifically, the Working Committee could be engaged at the following milestones:

» Lot-by-Lot Application - Once the Legacy Zoning is applied on a lot-by-lot basis, workshop sessions with the Working Committee could be held to determine how the Legacy Zoning should be augmented to address each situation.

» Urban Design Guidelines - Throughout the public consultation for this study, discussions have generally focused on high-level design interventions to maintain the character of the neighbourhood (i.e. setbacks, lot coverage). During the preparation of Roseland-specific directions in the design guidelines, ongoing discussions with the Working Committee could help to determine how the more detailed elements of built form and landscaping contribute to Roseland’s character.

» Ongoing Review - Outlined further in the next section, the Working Committee should be involved in ongoing review and monitoring once the recommendations of this report are implemented.

Ongoing Review and Monitoring
The recommendations of this report will result in a significant change in the way the City evaluates development within established neighbourhoods, and will be a learning experience for both the City and the residents. Considering this, the recommendations should not be viewed as a static solution, or the final approach to protecting the character of Roseland.

Should the directions be implemented by Council, in whole or in part, they should be reviewed on a regular basis (i.e. every 2 years) to ensure that new dwellings, and/or additions to existing dwellings, are meeting the intent of the directions. Where it is determined that a specific recommendation, or a component of a recommendation is not having the desired effect, further amendments should be considered. Likewise, if concerns are identified that were not addressed in this study, or if new concerns arise that did not exist during this study, a review process should allow for the exploration of new policies and tools. This will help to ensure that there is a dynamic approach to character protection that can respond to a changing context.

Where new policies and tools are considered, they should be established through further discussions with the community and the Working Committee.