

Individual Item Update

The following is a summary of the status of each individual item, what work has been done to address this item, or how this item could be addressed through future initiatives.

1. Eave and Peak Height Differentiation

While amendments have not been proposed to distinguish between eave and peak height, through this report, administration is proposing that the method for height calculation be changed. This method will also address the initial concern that led to the request for an eave and peak height differentiation as it introduces a chamfer rule. This rule will help address the massing, size and height of buildings, as they are perceived from the public realm, while still allowing flexibility in design and roof patterns. This change will allow for a similar calculation to what is done for developments in the Residential – Grade-Oriented Infill (R-CG) District, which will increase consistency and add transparency.

2. Massing

While the amendments in this report regarding height will have an impact on the massing of new infill development, the rule changes were not specific to massing. Administration does anticipate that the new height calculation will still allow for desirable infill redevelopment, while ensuring that the portion above 7.0 metres (typically two storeys) is stepped back, reducing overall massing and volume.

3. Front porches

This issue was addressed through CPC2018-0888 (Enabling Successful Infill) which amended the Land Use Bylaw to allow for front porches to project 1.8 metres into the required front setback and exemptions from parcel coverage.

4. Subterranean structures extending beyond above-grade footprints

This issue was addressed through CPC2018-0888 (Enabling Successful Infill) which amended the Land Use Bylaw to introduce parameters that would allow subterranean development to extend into the side and rear property but not within the required front setback area.

5. Hardscape coverage

The percentage of hardscaping allowed on a parcel is intricately tied to both the landscaping and tree requirements. It is also related to the amount of parcel coverage and setbacks required for redevelopment. Since there are a number of other decisions that significantly play a role in how redevelopment is designed, administration has chosen not to address this individual item at this time. It is anticipated that through the renew of the Land Use Bylaw, administration will be able to create rules that holistically address the desired outcome for redevelopment, including how all the rules fit together to create different environments.

6. Green landscaping

While amendments in this report don't speak to permeable surface requirements, they do introduce a landscaping requirement for 2 tree plantings for duplex and discretionary single and semi-detached dwellings which will add to the amount of green landscaping on new development. This report further proposes that tree requirements may be conditioned through the discretionary development permit, to be located and maintained off-site. This amendment will help encourage trees of a higher quality that add to a more robust tree canopy adding to the green landscaping in the public realm.

7. Tree retention in the Demolition Permit, Development Permit, and Building Permit stages
While amendments in this report do not require the retention of existing trees, the proposed amendments incentivize the retention of existing trees on site. These amendments add a requirement for 2 tree plantings for duplex and discretionary single and semi-detached dwellings, consistent with requirements for the permitted singles and semi-detached dwellings.

8. Drainage

Given that drainage is handled through the administration of the Drainage and Lot Grading Bylaws, it would be inappropriate to add in requirements to the Land Use Bylaw that could conflict or set differing priorities. Administration is currently working on updates to the Drainage and Lot Grading Bylaws and will continue to work together to align documents. It is anticipated that through future work, this connection will be enhanced.

9. Non-conforming/non-standard lots

Non-conforming or non-standard sized/shaped lots often require a high amount of discretion in order to achieve a design that is suitable given the community context. As such, administration believes that these situations are better handled through either higher-level policy or discretion at the development permit stage. During the renew of the Land Use Bylaw, it is expected that the creation of “How-to-Guides” will help to explain the intent and desired outcomes of both the policy and regulation, and that these guides will particularly help with unique or non-standard lots.

10. Materials

Materials are often considered during the design and application process and as such is not appropriate for regulation. Local area policy can often identify unique materials and characteristics that should be maintained or enhanced in a specific community and as such is more appropriate to be contained in a local area plan, where appropriate.

11. Vehicle loading and storage

While administration is not recommending changes for rules regarding vehicle loading and storage, administration has identified that the deletion of the rule regarding the percentage of new driveways on a blockface could help to encourage a more thoughtful review of access. Administration expects that as more “How-to-Guides” are created, more information would be available to help assist when new driveways should be approved or refused.

The storage of vehicles is a bigger consideration and likely one that has a significant perception and lasting impact. Current parking requirements for vehicle storage on-site are having significant impacts on the possible building forms that are being developed. Building design is often hindered by parking requirements. This concept must be considered through the renew of the Land Use Bylaw and must be done so in a way that allows for built form that aligns with the Municipal Development Plan.

12. Setbacks

Through recent R-CG amendments, some rules regarding setbacks were already modified. While administration is not recommending further changes for setbacks, administration has identified a possible change to the rules in the Land Use Bylaw, should Council wish to implement a change for this issue prior to the implementation of the renewed Land Use Bylaw. The possible amendment would provide more flexibility for new development to be located closer to the street and sidewalk, often enhancing the interaction between the public and private realms. This amendment has the potential to significantly impact community's perception of new development and without understanding the big picture, could lead to many instances where redevelopment is out of context with its neighbours.