

**Subject: Application for demolition and new construction at 229, 231, 241, 245
and 247 Beechwood Avenue, properties designated under Part V of
the *Ontario Heritage Act***

File Number: ACS2022-PIE-RHU-0030

Report to Built Heritage Sub-Committee on 23 August 2022

and Planning Committee on 25 August 2022

and Council 31 August 2022

**Submitted on August 10, 2022 by Court Curry, Manager, Right of Way, Heritage
and Urban Design Services, Planning, Real Estate and Economic Development
Department**

Contact Person: MacKenzie Kimm, Planner III, Heritage Planning Branch

613-580-2424,15203, MacKenzie.Kimm@ottawa.ca

Ward: Rideau-Rockcliffe (13)

**Objet : Demande de démolition et de nouvelle construction aux 229, 231,
241, 245 et 247, avenue Beechwood, une propriété désignée en vertu
de la partie V de la *Loi sur le patrimoine de l'Ontario***

Dossier : ACS2022-PIE-RHU-0030

Rapport au Sous-comité du patrimoine bâti le 23 août 2022

et Comité de l'urbanisme le 25 août 2022

et au Conseil le 31 août 2022

**Soumis le 10 août 2022 par Court Curry, Gestionnaire, Services des emprises, du
patrimoine et du design urbain, Direction générale de la planification, de
l'immobilier et du développement économique**

Personne ressource : MacKenzie Kimm, Urbaniste III, Planification du Patrimoine

613-580-2424,15203, MacKenzie.Kimm@ottawa.ca

Quartier : Rideau-Rockcliffe (13)

REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Built Heritage Sub-Committee recommend that Planning Committee recommend that Council refuse the applications for demolition and new construction at 229, 231, 241, 245 and 247 Beechwood Avenue, according to plans prepared by Woodman Architect and Associates Ltd., received on April 1, 2022 and attached as Documents 5, 6 and 7.

RECOMMANDATIONS DU RAPPORT

Que le Sous-comité du patrimoine bâti recommande au Comité de l'urbanisme de recommander à son tour au Conseil de refuser les demandes de démolition et de nouvelle construction aux 229-247, avenue Beechwood, conformément aux plans élaborés par Woodman Architect and Associates Ltd., reçus le 1^{er} avril 2022 et ci-joints en tant que documents 5, 6 et 7.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report recommends that City Council refuse the applications for demolition and new construction at 229-247 Beechwood Avenue, properties that are designated under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* as part of the Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District.

The applicant is proposing to demolish five existing buildings and introduce two, low rise apartment buildings on the consolidated lots on either side of Carsdale Avenue.

In its current form, the proposed development conflicts with the objectives, policies and guidelines of the Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District Plan. Staff are of the opinion that it has not been demonstrated that the cultural heritage values and attributes of the Heritage Conservation District will be conserved through the proposed development.

This report has been prepared because applications for demolition and new construction in heritage conservation districts designated under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* require the approval of City Council.

The statutory 90-day timeline for consideration of this application under the *Ontario Heritage Act* will expire on September 5, 2022.

RÉSUMÉ

Le présent rapport recommande le refus par le Conseil municipal des demandes de démolition et de nouvelle construction aux 229-247, avenue Beechwood, des biens-fonds désignés en vertu de la partie V de la *Loi sur le patrimoine de l'Ontario* et situés dans le district de conservation du patrimoine de Rockcliffe Park.

Le requérant souhaite démolir cinq bâtiments et aménager deux immeubles résidentiels de faible hauteur sur les lots fusionnés de chaque côté de l'avenue Carsdale.

Sous sa forme actuelle, l'aménagement proposé ne respecte pas les objectifs, les politiques et les lignes directrices du plan du district de conservation du patrimoine de Rockcliffe Park. Le personnel estime qu'il n'a pas été démontré que les valeurs et les caractéristiques du patrimoine culturel du district de conservation du patrimoine seraient conservées dans le cadre de l'aménagement proposé.

Le présent rapport a été élaboré parce que les demandes de démolition et de construction de propriétés situées dans les districts de conservation du patrimoine désignés aux termes de la partie V de la *Loi sur le patrimoine de l'Ontario* nécessitent l'approbation du Conseil municipal.

Le délai réglementaire de 90 jours d'examen de cette demande, exigé en vertu de la *Loi sur le patrimoine de l'Ontario*, prendra fin le 5 septembre 2022.

BACKGROUND

Subject Properties

The subject site is located between Green and Corona Avenues within the Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District (RP HCD), on the north side of Beechwood Avenue, which forms the southern boundary of the HCD. The site comprises five existing properties: 229 and 231 located on the west side of Carsdale Avenue and 241, 245 and 247 Beechwood Avenue on the east side of Carsdale Avenue (see Document 1, Location Map). These properties contain several two and three storey houses and are characterized by their narrow, sloped lots with modest yards; 229 Beechwood is atypical for the area as it has an uncharacteristically large side yard. Low stone retaining walls with narrow steps are located in the front yards, which help to distinguish the change in grade between the sidewalk and front lawn. 229 and 231 Beechwood are representative of buildings constructed between 1900-1930 in this area. 241-247 Beechwood are representative examples of post war housing designed and developed by the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. The RP HCD was designated under Part V of the

Ontario Heritage Act in 1997 and an HCD Plan was adopted by Council in 2016, which then came into full force and effect in 2019. All five properties within the boundary of the HCD are designated. As part of the development of the updated HCD Plan, an inventory evaluated each property for its contribution to the cultural heritage value of the HCD. The subject properties were all categorized as Grade 2, or “non-contributing” properties (Document 4, Heritage Survey Forms).

Area Context

The site is located within a portion of the Rockcliffe Park HCD, bounded by Oakhill to the east, Beechwood to the south and Acacia to the west and north known as the “panhandle.” The panhandle is characterized by its narrow lot pattern with modest houses and multi-unit buildings, typically between two and three storeys in height, with side yards that provide “residential-like” gaps in the streetscape. Outside of the HCD boundary on the south side of Beechwood Avenue is a taller mixed-use building that replaced a former gas station in the last ten years. This section of Beechwood functions as a transitional area; to the west of Acacia Avenue is the more commercial main street character of Beechwood Village, to the north and east is the increasingly treed residential character of Rockcliffe Park towards Beechwood Cemetery, and to the south is the residential neighbourhood of Vanier (see Document 2, Current Context). The majority of the properties within the panhandle are Grade 2, with a few exceptions that are mainly located along Acacia Avenue.

The Cultural Heritage Value of the Rockcliffe Park HCD

The Rockcliffe Park HCD has cultural heritage value as an early planned residential community made up of the entirety of the former Village of Rockcliffe Park. The village was first established in 1864 as a series of “park and villa” lots by Thomas Keefer on land purchased by the Crown by his father-in-law Thomas MacKay, founder of New Edinburgh and the original owner of Rideau Hall. Laid out in accordance with the principles of the picturesque tradition, Rockcliffe Park today features a number of residential building types and styles from the 19th century to today, unified by their picturesque, park-like setting. The District also recognizes the multi-unit buildings, small lots and more modest houses in the panhandle as heritage attributes (see Document 3, Statement of Cultural Heritage Value for the Rockcliffe Park HCD).

DISCUSSION

Project Description

In January 2021, the applicant submitted a Site Plan Control application (D07-12-21-0001) to permit two low rise apartment buildings on the site. The site is zoned R4-UC with some site-specific exceptions (Urban Exception 1321) related to height, setbacks, location of entries and openings in the façade, lot dimensions, use and landscape details. Heritage and Planning staff have been working to ensure the conservation of the cultural heritage values of the HCD through the development review process and have raised concerns about the ability to do so given the proposed form of the buildings. A Building Permit under the *Building Code Act* will be required.

Throughout the review of the Site Plan application, the applicant considered several versions of the proposal, some varying slightly in expression, but largely maintaining the general footprint and massing. The current proposal is to consolidate the lots on either side of Carsdale Avenue to construct two low rise apartment buildings; on the west side, the building is proposed to be three-storeys (11.0 metres) in height, while the building on the east side will be four-storeys (12.5 metres), each with a roof top terrace and mechanical room as well as a sunken basement level where the main entrances will be located (Document 5, Site Plan; and Document 6, Architectural Plans). The top floors of each building will be slightly set back from their front façade with approximately 600 square feet of amenity area on the roofs. The buildings will be primarily clad in brick (a mix of red and dark grey/black) with grey metal paneling and glazing, as well as stone for the basement level. Small projecting balconies with glass railings are also proposed. Together, the buildings will provide 94 units; four visitor parking spaces will be provided in each building's underground garage to be accessed off of Beechwood Avenue.

The application is accompanied by a conceptual landscape plan (Document 7). Both proposed buildings will be set into the existing inclining grade of the site, with Beechwood being the lowest point. Some terraced landscaping is proposed as well as some retaining walls in both the front and rear yards. Several mature trees also require removal (see Document 8, Tree Conservation Report) to facilitate the new construction and a number of new trees and other plantings are proposed to assist with visual screening. The landscape treatment of the property is proposed to consist of a combination of soft landscaping, precast concrete pavers and riverstone, as well as some planters at roof level.

Review of Submitted Heritage Permit Applications

The main purpose of the Rockcliffe Park HCD Plan to assist in managing change in the District while conserving it in a manner that respects and enhances the qualities that contribute to its cultural heritage values. In order to achieve that goal, the Plan outlines

objectives, policies, and guidelines that provide direction and guidance for the most common types of alterations to ensure that the District's attributes and cultural heritage values as defined in the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value are protected in the long term. It is impossible for any HCD Plan or planning policy to account for every potential type of alterations. For those types of situations, the Plan provides that applications "will be considered on a case-by-case basis by heritage staff in consultation with the community." In these cases, Heritage staff look to ensure that the intent of the Plan's objectives are being upheld and the cultural heritage value and attributes of the HCD are maintained.

As noted in the Statement of Cultural Heritage Value, Rockcliffe Park is significant as a rare and intact example of estate layout and landscape design, utilizing Picturesque design principles for a series of park and villa lots, with houses, many designed to reflect influences of English country revival styles, set into a park-like landscape. The Plan provides direction and guidance to maintain and protect the estate qualities and park setting originally envisioned by Keefer. It also provides specific guidelines for the conservation of the HCD's public realm, its parks/parklands including the Village Green and Caldwell Carver Conservation Area, views and vistas, and specific guidelines for new and existing institutional buildings like the schools and library. Although the Plan identifies the panhandle area and its multi-unit buildings, it does not provide specific guidelines for new multi-unit development. In the absence of specific guidance for the panhandle, heritage staff have approached this review as a situation not contemplated by the Plan in consultation with the community.

A number of pre-application meetings were held through both the Development Review process and the Heritage Planning Branch's pre-application consultation program, at which staff and the community raised significant concerns with the proposed massing, compatibility with the Beechwood streetscape, lot and development pattern, and the ability to conserve the important park-like setting through soft landscaping on the lots. The applicant has made some revisions to the proposal, however, in the opinion of Heritage staff, the revisions do not adequately address these concerns to conform with the intent of the HCD Plan. Staff advised the applicant of the continued concerns with the proposal and the applicant has indicated that they wish to proceed with the application as presented in this report.

Given the outstanding concerns, staff are unable to support the approval of the applications as presented and thus recommend that they be refused. Detailed analysis of the plans using the Rockcliffe Park HCD Plan and the *Standards Guidelines* is provided below and attached as Documents 9 and 10.

Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District Plan

Applications for demolition and new construction in the Rockcliffe Park HCD are subject to the provisions of the Rockcliffe Park HCD Plan. The following subsections of the Plan are applicable to this proposal:

- 5.0 Statement of Objectives
- 6.0 Statement of Cultural Heritage Value
- 7.1 District Policies
- 7.3.1 Demolition and Relocation
- 7.3.3 Landscape Guidelines
- 7.4.2 Guidelines for New Buildings
- 7.4.3 Landscape Guidelines – New Buildings and Additions

Heritage staff have reviewed the proposal against the applicable sections (see Document 9, HCD Evaluation Chart) and have determined that the proposal is not consistent with the Plan for the following reasons:

- The proposal is inconsistent with the objectives of the HCD Plan as they relate to the conservation and maintenance of the HCD's park-like attributes, qualities and atmosphere, compatibility of the overall design, particularly in terms of massing and setbacks, and the conservation of the pattern of the streetscape.
- The proposed form, mass and side yard setbacks of the buildings result in a two very large rectangular building footprints, leaving very limited areas of soft landscaping throughout the lot, particularly in the side yards.
- The largely unarticulated design and expression of the proposed buildings detracts from Beechwood's distinct fine grained, residential streetscape quality; the buildings are not sensitive to the streetscape's character as a transition zone between the HCD and surrounding neighbourhoods.

These reasons can be generally categorized into two fundamental and intertwined issues-- the provision of soft landscaping, and the ability to do so as a result of the buildings' overall form and mass --which are described below. These fundamental concerns in turn, lead to subsequent issues of design, architectural expression and the overall compatibility of the project in the streetscape.

Soft landscaping

The collection of properties with houses, surrounded by soft landscaping are integral to Rockcliffe's special park-like atmosphere and character. In order to protect this important quality and the original design intention of the District, the HCD Plan guidelines note that "the existing landscaped character of a lot will be preserved when new buildings and additions are constructed", and "the front lawns and side yards of new buildings shall protect the continuity and dominance of soft landscape in the HCD." However, as noted in the Heritage Survey Forms (Document 4) for these properties, the landscape character in the panhandle is different from that of properties in the core of the HCD; the setbacks are shallow, with modest yards, but typically feature gardens, trees, or lawn area that provide breaks in the continuity of the buildings. In this way, the subject properties currently contribute to a gradual transition between the more urban character of Beechwood to the west in New Edinburgh where properties have very little soft landscaping and more continuous buildings, versus to the east, where Beechwood is more like a parkway, lined by more like a parkway, lined by residential properties with an abundance of landscape screening.

The proposed landscape plan (Document 7) shows the building covering nearly the entire the width of the consolidated lots, as well as hard landscaped areas for driveways and amenity space at the rear of the buildings. Additionally, the Tree Conservation Report (Document 8) indicates that the project requires the removal of a number of existing trees and shrubs throughout the site, with some replanting proposed. Although the HCD Plan's landscape guidelines for new buildings require that soft landscaping dominate the property, heritage staff recognize the transitional role the site serves, and accordingly, acknowledge that it would be atypical for properties in the panhandle to provide such an amount of landscaping. However, as properties that define the border of the HCD, the ability to provide a continuity of soft landscaping in way that maintains a gradual transition between properties at the edge of the HCD and those within its core, was critical to the review of these applications. Despite the replanting proposed, given the size of the proposed buildings' large footprints together with the additional hardscaped areas, heritage staff are of the opinion that the amount of soft landscaping proposed will not be in keeping with the character of the panhandle, which will not conserve the important park-like qualities that define the HCD.

Form, Mass and Architectural Expression

The HCD Plan notes that new buildings will only be permitted when their height and mass respect the character of existing buildings and when they do not have a negative

impact on the associated streetscape or cultural heritage value of the HCD. The proposed buildings will be taller than the surrounding buildings on Beechwood, but given the slope of the site, the impact of the proposed height is mitigated. It is acknowledged that some effort has been made to step back the upper floors to provide some massing relief to neighbouring properties and reduce the visibility of the roof top amenity areas, as well incorporate some projecting bays and alternating brick colours to help break up the buildings' width so that they read more as a group of smaller buildings. However, in addition to the ground level landscape concerns above, in staff's opinion the large, mostly unarticulated rectangular mass of the proposed buildings do not respect the fine-grained character buildings in the panhandle, which provide "residential-like" gaps that break up the continuous built form. In staff's opinion, the measures implemented are insufficient in mitigating the negative impact of the proposal on the Beechwood streetscape given their continuous form without meaningful breaks in their mass.

As a result of the overall design of the buildings, staff are concerned that the proposed buildings do not successfully relate to or reference the vertical and horizontal datum lines or patterns of the buildings on the north side of Beechwood Avenue located within the HCD. In particular, the provision of the walk out basement level and underground garage results in the main entrances to the buildings being below grade, and well below the typical entry levels of surrounding buildings in the streetscape. This condition is further exacerbated by the projecting first and second storeys that appear to cantilever above the basement units, which creates an incompatible relationship with the streetscape and context. While the applicant has made modifications to the design of the windows and introduced glass balconies with a more residential quality, staff continue to be of the opinion that the expression of the buildings together with their length have a more commercial character rather than the predominant residential character of the HCD. In these ways, the proposal does not respect the character of the existing buildings and negatively impacts the Beechwood streetscape.

Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada

City Council adopted Parks Canada's Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada (Standards and Guidelines) in 2008. This document establishes a consistent set of conservation principles and guidelines for projects involving heritage resources. Heritage staff consider this document when evaluating applications under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The following Standards are applicable to this proposal:

- Standard 1: Conserve the heritage value of an historic place. Do not remove, replace or substantially alter its intact or repairable character defining elements. Do not move a part of an historic place if its current location is a character-defining element.
- Standard 11: Conserve the heritage value and character-defining elements when creating any new additions to an historic place or any related new construction. Make the new work physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to and distinguishable from the historic place.

Heritage staff have reviewed the proposal and determined that it is not consistent with the applicable *Standards and Guidelines* (see Document 10, Standards and Guidelines Evaluation Chart) as the proposed development does not conserve the park-like attributes that are integral to the cultural heritage value of the Rockcliffe Park HCD, nor the fine-grained character of the panhandle. The current form and design of the buildings are incompatible with the Beechwood streetscape.

Cultural Heritage Impact Statement

Section 4.6.1 of the current Official Plan and Section 4.5.2 (2) of the new Council-adopted Official Plan requires that a Heritage Impact Assessment, previously known as a Cultural Heritage Impact Statement (CHIS) be submitted where a proposed development has the potential to adversely affect the heritage resource. A CHIS was prepared for this proposal by Commonwealth Historic Resource Management and is attached as Document 11. Heritage staff have reviewed the document and have determined that it meets the requirements of the City's Guidelines for Cultural Heritage Impact Statements.

The CHIS concludes that the proposal does not negatively impact the heritage values and character-defining elements of the District, noting its location at the boundary, functioning as a transitional element, that the development is in keeping with the stand alone fine grain pattern of the traditional lot development of the panhandle, and that it reads as a collection of smaller buildings. Further, the CHIS notes "that the development is a fitting inclusion as part of the revitalization of Beechwood Avenue and is respectful of the traditional character of Rockcliffe's panhandle."

Heritage staff do not concur with the findings of the CHIS. As outlined above, the proposal does not meet the intent of the objectives, policies and guidelines of the Rockcliffe Park HCD Plan, particularly as it relates to the conservation of the park-like qualities of the HCD.

Heritage staff respectfully disagree that the plans for new buildings at 229-247 Beechwood Avenue are in keeping with the character defining attributes of the District as they will negatively impact the park-like qualities and atmosphere of the HCD in its bordering lands. While efforts have been made to be more respectful of the character of the panhandle, staff are of the opinion that the mitigation measures are insufficient in offset the impacts on the HCD.

Urban Design Review Panel

The City's Urban Design Review Panel reviewed this project on two occasions in late 2020 and then again in May 2022. The Panel complimented the design of the buildings but provided comments relating to their architectural expression and materiality, public realm and landscape. The Panel recommended that the buildings be better knit with the neighbourhood and more sensitive to the surroundings, given the context of the HCD. They provided specific recommendations to rethink the sunken lower level in favour of providing the ground floor units with individual access to the street, as well as reconsidering the commercial appearance of some portions of the buildings, particularly the balconies. Further improvements were recommended for better integration, such as introducing elements on the façades like porches and windows that would have similar vocabulary to those in the neighborhood and also better reflect the residential scale and vertical rhythm of the street. The Panel also recommended providing additional setbacks on the east and west side for more breathing room to adjacent properties, stepbacks and lighter and/or revised materials for the upper floors and for the corner treatment of the buildings, as well recommendations for increased vegetation. Finally, the Panel suggested utilizing the side street for access to the parking, to allow for a contiguous landscape on Beechwood.

None of these recommendations were incorporated into the final submission. Heritage staff agree with these recommendations and would encourage the applicant to reconsider incorporating them.

Planning Framework

The Official Plan, Provincial Policy Statement and the *Ontario Heritage Act* all provide policy direction related to the conservation and protection of properties designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

Official Plan

In November 2021, City Council approved a new Official Plan. The Plan has been sent for Ministerial approval by the province. Once approved by the province, it will replace the previous Official Plan. Until then, staff have regard to both the current and new Plans.

The following policy from Section 2.5 the current Official Plan is also applicable to this proposal:

9) Where intensification target areas also correspond with Heritage Conservation Districts designated under the Ontario Heritage Act the achievement of intensification targets and minimum density targets will be determined in part by the requirements of the Ontario Heritage Act. Projects that do not meet the relevant Heritage Conservation District guidelines or plan will not be recommended for approval under the Ontario Heritage Act. [Amendment #150, LPAT Decision October 22, 2018] The following policies from the new Official Plan are applicable to this proposal:

Section 4.5.2:

- 1) When reviewing development applications affecting lands and properties on, or adjacent to a designated property, the City will ensure that the proposal is compatible by respecting and conserving the cultural heritage value and attributes of the heritage property, streetscape or Heritage Conservation District as defined by the associated designation by-law or Heritage Conservation District Plan and having regard for the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada.
- 3) Heritage designation is, in part, intended to ensure contextually appropriate development and is not intended to discourage intensification or limit housing choice. Elements of the built form, including height, scale and massing, of such development shall ensure that the defined cultural heritage value and attributes of the property or HCD will be conserved, while balancing the intensification objectives outlined throughout this Plan.

Through the development review process, heritage and planning staff have been working closely with the goal of ensuring that the proposed project would be respectful of the important attributes of the HCD and fit compatibly and appropriately within its context. Given Beechwood's main street character and its existing multi-unit buildings, staff have no objections to the proposed apartment use or increased density in this location. In fact there are several examples in the panhandle that have been supported by staff in recent years under the *Ontario Heritage Act* including the low-rise apartment

buildings at 445 Green Avenue and 455 Green Avenue, as well as the three door row at 259-263 Beechwood Avenue. All three of these projects conserve the cultural heritage value and attributes of the HCD while incorporating more density, reflecting the current zoning. Smaller scale buildings that better reflect the fine-grained lot pattern and landscape character of the HCD would be a more appropriate intervention in this transitional area.

In this instance, staff are not satisfied that the proposed form of the buildings will appropriately conserve the cultural heritage values and attributes of the HCD. Staff are of the opinion that the intensification objectives of this project do not outweigh the impacts on the HCD. As outlined in this report, the proposal does not meet the intent of the Rockcliffe Park HCD Plan, and accordingly, staff are not recommending approval of the applications.

Provincial Policy Statement

The *Planning Act* and the associated Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) guide development in the Province. The *Act* states that municipalities must have regard for matters of provincial interest. Section 2 (d) specifically refers to the “conservation of features of significant architectural, cultural, historical, archaeological or scientific interest.”

Policy 2.6.1 of the PPS directs that “Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.” “Conserved” is defined in the PPS as “the identification, protection, use and/or management of built heritage resources in a manner that ensures their cultural heritage value or interest is retained under the *Ontario Heritage Act*.” For the purposes of PPS, Heritage Conservation Districts are defined as “significant”.

The *Planning Act* requires that City Council’s decisions affecting land use planning matters “be consistent with” the PPS. Staff have reviewed this proposal and have determined that it is not consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2020.

Recommendation 1

The applicant’s proposal has been evaluated against the Rockcliffe Park HCD Plan and the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in *Canada*. Heritage staff are recommending refusal of the both the applications for demolition and for new construction at 229-247 Beechwood Avenue, as the proposal does not conform with the following guidelines:

- 7.3.1, Demolition and Relation, Guidelines 6 and 7;
- 7.3.3, Front Yards, Plant Material, Trees and Walkways, Guidelines 1, 2 and 3;
- 7.4.2 Guidelines for New Buildings, Guidelines 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7;
- 7.4.3 Landscape Guidelines- New Buildings and Additions, Guidelines 1, 2, 3, and 4;
- Standards 1 and 11 of the Standards & Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada. The proposal does not conserve the cultural heritage value or attributes of the HCD and it is incompatible with the existing pattern and character of the streetscape.

Conclusion:

In its current form, the proposed development is inconsistent with the objectives, policies and guidelines within the Rockcliffe Park HCD Plan and the proposed buildings have not been designed to conserve the cultural heritage values, attributes and character of the HCD. Heritage staff are of the opinion that the overall design, particularly the proposed massing and footprint which result in limited areas for soft landscaping on site would harm the visually continuous green setting and park-like atmosphere that is integral the cultural heritage value of the Rockcliffe Park HCD even at its border.

Accordingly, heritage staff are not satisfied that the proposed development meets the Rockcliffe Park HCD Plan or Parks Canada's Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada or the relevant heritage policies of the City's Official Plan. Staff are recommending refusal of the applications for the reasons outlined in this report.

RURAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no rural implications associated with this report.

CONSULTATION

The plans for the heritage permit application were posted on the City's Development Application website in early July 2022.

Heritage Ottawa was notified of this application and offered the opportunity to provide comments.

Neighbours within 30 metres of the property were notified of this application and offered an opportunity to comment at the Built Heritage Sub-Committee meeting.

A number of pre-application meetings have been held through the development review process and through the Heritage Planning Branch's pre-application consultation program for heritage applications. Representatives from the Rockcliffe Park Resident's Association (RPRA) participated in these meetings reviewing versions of the proposal beginning in the spring of 2020 and then again in the fall of 2021. Heritage staff and the RPRA provided shared comments to the applicant, as per the heritage pre-application program guidelines, highlighting that the proposal did not meet the objectives of the HCD Plan, as well potential impacts on Beechwood's streetscape character, compatibility of the mass/footprint, and the ability to provide sufficient areas of soft landscape. Heritage staff have also provided the applicant with comments through the development review process in an effort to bring the proposal closer in line with the intent of the HCD Plan.

The RPRA provided comments on this application as well (attached as Document 12), which reflect largely the same concerns raised through the pre-application process.

COMMENTS BY THE WARD COUNCILLOR

The Ward Councillor provided the following comments on this report:

Ward 13 has two large Heritage Conservation Districts, both of which are unique and critical to the City of Ottawa.

I believe that the distinctiveness and defining character of the Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District must be protected. The Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District is especially unique, since it is acknowledged as the only previous self-governing district in North America that is not only defined by its built heritage, but equally by the unifying character of its unique picturesque landscape, which creates a special sense of place.

In my view, areas immediately at the edge of and adjacent to heritage districts must be given careful consideration concerning new developments to determine their appropriateness to the existing character of the heritage district, as well as for the transition to the neighbouring community. Locating large buildings next to small historical homes without proper transition is inappropriate. Safeguarding our City's heritage conservation districts by only approving proposed built forms that fit the historic

urban design fabric of the street can concurrently allow for appropriate densification while protecting heritage.

In this specific case, in keeping with the remarks of the Urban Design Review Panel, I believe that the development needs a better tie-in with the neighbourhood streetscape, while at the same time affording “breathing room” on either side of the proposed buildings. To better accommodate the streetscape, the top floor needs to be further stepped back and the top levels of the building need to look less flat and commercial or institutional, and using darker materials. The proposed buildings also require augmented landscaping, since the landscaping (as proposed prior to possibly implementing any of the UDRP suggestions) appears to be quite regulated and designed, which is out of character with Rockcliffe’s natural, simple, and informal landscape character.

A balance must be struck between mass and scale, transition within the urban design fabric or “fine grain rhythm” of the streetscape, along with the landscape features which are protected by the Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District Plan. This application falls short of achieving this balance.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

This application is subject to the 90-day timeline under the Ontario Heritage Act, which means that Council must, after consultation with its municipal heritage committee, make a decision or the application will be deemed approved. Should Council refuse the application, the owner has a right of appeal to the Ontario Land Tribunal.

RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

There are no risk implications.

ASSET MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

There are no assessment management implications associated with this report.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no direct financial implications.

ACCESSIBILITY IMPACTS

There are no accessibility implications associated with this report.

TERM OF COUNCIL PRIORITIES

This project addresses the following Term of Council Priorities:

- Thriving Communities: Promote safety, culture, social and physical well-being for our residents.

APPLICATION PROCESS TIMELINE STATUS

The statutory 90-day timeline for consideration of this application under the *Ontario Heritage Act* will expire on September 5, 2022.

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Document 1	Location Map
Document 2	Current Context
Document 3	Statement of Cultural Heritage Value
Document 4	Heritage Survey Forms
Document 5	Site Plan
Document 6	Architectural Plans
Document 7	Landscape Plan
Document 8	Tree Conservation Report
Document 9	HCD Guidelines Evaluation Chart
Document 10	Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada Evaluation Chart
Document 11	Cultural Heritage Impact Statement
Document 12	Comments provided by the RPRA

DISPOSITION

Office of the City Clerk, Council and Committee Services, to notify the property owner and the Ontario Heritage Trust, 10 Adelaide Street East, 3rd Floor, Toronto, Ontario, M5C 1J3) of Council's decision.

Document 1 – Location Map



Document 2 – Current Context

View looking north at 229 and 231 Beechwood Avenue (Google Streetview 2021)



View of the large side yard at 229 Beechwood.



View of 231 Beechwood, looking from the sidewalk.



View from Carsdale Avenue looking south west.



View of 241 Beechwood from Carsdale Avenue, showing the sloping site.



View of 241, 245 and 247 Beechwood Avenue.



View looking west on Beechwood showing the subject properties (Google Streetview, 2016)

Document 3 – Statement of Cultural Heritage Value

6.0 Statement of Cultural Heritage Value

A “Statement of Cultural Heritage Value” is the foundation of all heritage conservation district plans. The statement below is based on the original statement in the 1997 Rockcliffe HCD Study but has been shortened and adapted in consultation with the author of the original Rockcliffe Park study to reflect the current requirements of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

Statement of Cultural Heritage Value and Heritage Attributes

Rockcliffe Park is a rare and significant approach to estate layout and landscape design adapted to Canada’s natural landscape from 18th century English precedents. Originally purchased from the Crown by Thomas McKay, it was laid out according to the principles of the picturesque tradition in a series of “Park and Villa” lots by his son-in-law Thomas Keefer in 1864. The historical associations of the village with the McKay/Keefer family, who were influential in the economic, social, cultural and political development of Ottawa continue and the heritage conservation district is a testament to the ideas and initiatives of various key members of this extended family, and their influence in shaping this area. Rockcliffe Park today is a remarkably consistent reflection of Keefer’s original design intentions. Although development of the residential lots has taken place very gradually, the ideas of estate management, of individual lots as part of a larger whole, of picturesque design, of residential focus, have survived. This continuity of vision is very rare in a community where development has occurred on a relatively large scale over such a long time period.

The preservation of the natural landscape, the deliberately curved roads, lined with mature trees, and without curbs or sidewalks, the careful landscaping of the public spaces and corridors, together with the strong landscaping of the individual properties, create the apparently casual and informal style so integral to the picturesque tradition. The preservation and enhancement of topographical features including the lake and pond, the internal ridges and slopes, and the various rock outcroppings, has reinforced the original design intentions. The views to and from the Ottawa River, the Beechwood escarpment, and the other park areas are integral to the picturesque quality of Rockcliffe Park. Beechwood Cemetery and the Rockeries serve as a compatible landscaped boundary from the earliest period of settlement through to the present. The 20 various border lands create important gateways to the area and help establish its particular character.

The architectural design of the buildings and associated institutional facilities is similarly deliberate and careful and reflects the casual elegance and asymmetry of the English country revival styles, such as the Georgian Revival, Tudor Revival and Arts and Crafts. Many of the houses were designed by architects in these styles. The generosity of space around the houses, and the flow of this space from one property to the next by continuous planting rather than hard fence lines, has maintained the estate qualities and park setting envisioned by Keefer.

Statement of Heritage Attributes

The Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District comprises the entire former village of Rockcliffe Park, an independent municipality until amalgamation with the City of Ottawa in 2001. Section 41.1 (5) c of the *Ontario Heritage Act* requires the Heritage District Plan to include a “description of the heritage attributes of the heritage conservation district and of properties in the district.” A “Heritage Survey Form” outlining the heritage attributes for every property in the HCD has been compiled and evaluated. The forms are held on file with the City of Ottawa.

Description of Heritage Attributes

The attributes of the Rockcliffe Park HCD are:

- The natural features that distinguish the HCD, including McKay lake and its shoreline, the varied terrain, and topography;
- The unobtrusive siting of the houses on streets and the generous spacing relative to the neighbouring buildings;
- The variety of mature street trees and the dense forested character that they create;
- The profusion of trees, hedges, and shrubs on private property; • Varied lot sizes and irregularly shaped lots;
- Generous spacing and setbacks of the buildings;
- Cedar hedges planted to demarcate property lines and to create privacy;
- The dominance of soft landscaping over hard landscaping;
- Wide publicly-owned verges;
- The remaining Villa lots laid out in McKay’s original plan;

- The high concentration of buildings by architect Allan Keefer, including 725 and 741 Acacia, 11 Crescent Road;
- The rich mix of buildings types and styles from all eras, with the Tudor Revival and Georgian Revival styles forming a large proportion of the total building stock;
- The predominance of stucco and stone houses over and the relative rarity of brick buildings;
- The narrow width of many streets, such as McKinnon and Kinzua Roads;
- The historic road pattern that still reflects the original design established by Thomas Keefer; The low, dry stone walls in certain areas of the Village, including around Ashbury College;
- The existing garden features that enhance the public realm and distinguish certain private properties, including the garden gate at 585 Manor Ave, and the white picket fence at 190 Coltrin Road;
- Informal landscape character with simple walkways, driveways, stone retaining walls and flowerbeds;
- The “dog walk,” a public footpath that extends from Old Prospect Road to corner of Lansdowne Road and Mariposa Avenue;
- The public open spaces including the Village Green and its associated Jubilee Garden;
- Institutional and recreational buildings including the three schools, Rockcliffe Park Public School, Ashbury College and Elmwood School for Girls and the Rockcliffe Park Tennis Club;
- The significant amenities of the Caldwell-Carver Conservation Area, McKay Lake and the Pond;
- The multi-unit buildings, small lots, and more modest houses in the area bounded by Oakhill to the east, Beechwood to the south, and Acacia to the west and north, referred to as the “Panhandle,” that characterize the south and west boundaries of the District.
- The regular front yard setbacks on some streets such as Sir Guy Carleton Street, Blenheim Drive and Birch Avenue;

- The irregular front yard setbacks on some streets, such as Mariposa Avenue between Springfield and Lisgar Roads, Crescent Road, Acacia Avenue and Buena Vista between Springfield and Cloverdale Roads;

Document 9 – HCD Plan Evaluation Chart

Section	Applicable Guidelines	Staff comment
5.0 Objectives	“To conserve and enhance Rockcliffe Park’s unique character as a planned and designed 19th century community characterized by its narrow curving roads, without curbs or sidewalks, large lots and gardens, and buildings set within a visually continuous green landscape.”	Although efforts have been made to minimize areas of hardscaping, and while it is recognized that Beechwood does have a different character from any other street in the HCD, the proposed mass and footprint of the buildings on the lots do not allow for the conservation of the visually continuous green landscape that defines the border of the HCD. The proposal does not conserve the original design intentions of buildings set within their landscaped setting.
	“To ensure that the rehabilitation of existing buildings, the construction of additions to existing buildings and new buildings contribute to and enhance the cultural heritage values of the HCD.”	The large, rectangular massing of the buildings, their resulting footprint and their commercial expression detract from the cultural heritage values of the HCD.
	“To maintain the park-like attributes, qualities and atmosphere of the HCD.”	The subject properties are located at the edge of the HCD boundary along Beechwood Avenue. This section of Beechwood serves as a transition between the more urban character of Beechwood Avenue seen in New Edinburgh to the west, the residential character of the core of the HCD to the north, and the parkway-like setting of Beechwood to the east as it

		approaches Beechwood Cemetery. The mass and footprint of the buildings as proposed do not allow for the maintenance of the transitional landscape qualities in this section of Beechwood, as a border to the HCD.
	“To ensure that the original design intentions of Rockcliffe Park as an area characterized by houses located within a visually continuous, rich landscaped setting continue.”	Given the site’s location in the panhandle and its typical pattern of smaller, more dense development, staff are of the opinion that the type of project proposed could be in keeping with the original design intentions in this area of the HCD. However, in their current form, the buildings negatively impact the landscape character of Beechwood as the border of the HCD.
	“To ensure that new house construction is compatible with, sympathetic to and has regard for the height, massing and setbacks of the established heritage character of the streetscape in order to conserve the character and pattern of the associated streetscape, while creating a distinction between new and old.”	While the proposed buildings are to be set into the slope of the site, the underground garage and below grade entrances do not relate to others along Beechwood. The form results in a continuous massing along the edge, whereas existing buildings in the streetscape allow for breaks and gaps typical of residential properties. The configuration of the mass and resulting footprints do not allow for the conservation of the fine-grained development patterns of the panhandle.

	<p>“To ensure the use of natural materials for new construction to reflect the existing character of the area.”</p>	<p>The proposal is generally consistent with this objective. The proposed buildings are to be clad primarily in a mix of red and dark grey coloured brick, with stone cladding for the basement levels and grey metal panels for the top floors. The applicant should consider the use of another light coloured natural material such as stucco or horizontal siding instead.</p>
	<p>“To encourage the retention of existing trees, shrubs, hedges and landscape features on public and private property.”</p>	<p>The proposal requires the removal of many existing trees and shrubs, as well as the removal of the low stone walls that line the front yards of the properties. The applicant has indicated that the stone walls will be replicated and reconstructed as terracing and accent features along the edge of the street. The landscape plan illustrates that the intention would be to replace/replant as far as possible, however the applicant has noted some potential issues with soil volume and depth of the bedrock. Given the size of the buildings’ footprints together with the extent of paved/hard landscaped areas required for retaining walls and driveways, staff are of the opinion that the proposed replanting efforts would not outweigh the loss of the existing soft landscape character of these properties. The proposal is inconsistent with this objective.</p>

	<p>“To encourage the maintenance of existing lot patterns that features smaller and larger lots.”</p>	<p>The lot pattern in the panhandle is characterized by much narrower, smaller lots in comparison to the large, estate lots elsewhere in the HCD. The applicant has made some effort to reflect and reference the existing lot pattern through changes in material and some shallow articulation in front façade of the buildings.</p>
7.1 District Policies	<p>1. “The distinct heritage character of Rockcliffe Park, as defined in the ‘Statement of Cultural Heritage Value’ and ‘Description of Heritage Attributes’ shall be maintained and enhanced.</p>	<p>Rockcliffe Park is defined by its park-like atmosphere. The conservation and maintenance of this quality is integral to the protection of the HCD even at its borders. Staff are of the opinion that the proposal in its current form will detract from that atmosphere. Accordingly, the project does not meet this policy.</p>
7.3.1 Demolition and Relocation	<p>6. “Any application to demolish an existing Grade 2 building will be reviewed with consideration of its historical and architectural significance, its contribution to the historic character of the streetscape and the appropriateness of the proposed redevelopment. Demolition will only be permitted where the existing building is of little significance and the proposed building is sympathetic to the traditional surrounding natural and cultural environment. All new</p>	<p>Staff have reviewed the existing Grade 2 buildings and determined that their removal would not impact cultural heritage value of the HCD. However, as staff have concerns with the appropriateness of the proposed buildings and their potential impacts on the natural and cultural environment of the HCD, the proposal does not meet this guideline.</p>

	construction will comply with the relevant Guidelines contained in this plan.”	
	7. “When a building is proposed for demolition and replacement, the Environment Section of the heritage survey form and existing conditions shall be reviewed to identify significant landscape features to be retained.”	The landscape character of the subject properties are distinct from the typical character of other streets in the HCD. Their smaller landscaped yards with modest gardens and some trees help provide transition between the residential character of the HCD and more urban surrounding neighbourhoods. The subject properties also feature low drystone walls in the front yards. These walls as well as several of the existing mature trees require removal to facilitate the new construction. While the applicant is proposing to reconstruct and incorporate new drystone walls and replant, staff are of the opinion that the proposal does not incorporate sufficient soft landscaped areas to be consistent with existing landscape character in this area. Accordingly, the proposal is inconsistent with this guideline.
7.3.3 Front yards, Plant Material, Walkways	1. “The dominance of soft landscape over hard landscape is an essential heritage attribute of the HCD and shall be retained in order to maintain a green setting for each property.”	The proposal is inconsistent with this guideline. While soft landscaping may not typically dominate properties in the panhandle, the provision of smaller areas of soft landscapes provide a transition along the border of the HCD, defining its edge. The massing and footprints of the buildings as proposed do not permit this

		transitional landscape character along Beechwood to be maintained.
	2. "Landscape projects shall respect the attributes and established character of the associated streetscape and the HCD."	The proposal is inconsistent with this guideline. In staff's opinion, the proposal does not respect the established character or attributes of the Beechwood streetscape, as the project does not allow for enough soft landscaping.
	3. "Front yards shall have a generous area of soft landscaping which may include lawns, shrubs and flower beds, specimen or groupings of trees. The tradition of using native plant material is encouraged. Existing elements such as lawns, flower beds, glades of trees, shrubs, rocks and low stone walls shall be maintained and hard surfacing shall be kept to a minimum."	The proposal is not consistent with this guideline. While the proposed landscape plan appears to show a reasonably large area soft landscaping in the front yard, a significant portion of that area is part of the City's Right of Way. Together with the proposed driveway and the footprints of the buildings, much of the actual front yard area on the lots would be hard surfacing. Staff are concerned that the ability to screen the buildings may be limited in the future should the City pursue a road widening.
	4. "The removal of mature trees is strongly discouraged. Where a tree must be removed to allow for new construction, it will be replaced with a new tree of an appropriate size and species."	The proposal requires the removal of many existing trees and shrubs. The landscape plan illustrates that the intention would be to replace/replant as far as possible. Staff are concerned that replanting could be limited, due to bedrock levels and soil volumes.
	10. "Visual continuity across property lines is strongly encouraged. Where dividing lines are	Staff are of the opinion that the continuous mass of the buildings will interrupt the fine-grained pattern of

	required, hedges are an appropriate alternative to fences.”	properties in the panhandle, which impacts the visual continuity in this area.
7.3.3 Driveways, Landscape Features and Lighting	1. “Driveway design that minimizes the amount of asphalt and other paving materials is encouraged. Consideration should be given to the use of porous materials such as turfstone.”	The applicant has indicated that the proposed driveways are at the minimum width permitted by the zoning by-law. However, staff are concerned about the impact of the amount of hard surfaces together with the size of building’ footprint on site.
7.3.3 Fences	1. “The use of fences to delineate lots was not typical for much of the history of the HCD. The continuation of soft borders between lots is encouraged. When fences are required for safety, they shall not be located in the front yard, and shall comply with the City’s Fence by-law.”	The proposal is consistent with this guideline as the chain link fence will be located away in the rear yard.
7.3.3 Lot Sizes	1. “The retention of existing lots, large and small, is important to the preservation of the character of the HCD. New lots created through severance or by joining smaller lots together shall be consistent with the general lots sizes within the associated streetscape and the zoning by-law in force at the time in order to respect the character of the associated streetscape.”	<p>The proposal is generally consistent with this guideline as staff are of the opinion that the size of the consolidated lots will not have an impact on the overall character of the HCD.</p> <p>However, the proposed large rectangular massing of the buildings with shallow projections and large resulting footprints do not respect the fine-grained character of the Beechwood streetscape. The expression of the buildings appear more office-like in character than residential.</p>

	4. "All lots will be large enough to provide generous open space around buildings, thus protecting the continuity and dominance of the soft landscape."	The mass, footprint and side setbacks of the proposed buildings do not allow for appropriate space or landscaping between neighbours.
7.4.2 Guidelines for New Buildings	2. "New buildings shall contribute to and not detract from the heritage character of the HCD and its attributes."	<p>The building has been designed generally to be set within the inclining slope of the site. The applicant has indicated that hard surfacing has been minimized as far as possible and the proposed materials are generally in keeping with the natural materials that characterize the HCD.</p> <p>However, the proposed large rectangular massing of the buildings with only shallow projections and the large resulting footprint do not allow for the retention of soft landscaping throughout the lots, which detracts from the character of the panhandle and the border lands of the Rockcliffe Park HCD. The expression of the buildings appear more office-like in character than residential and do not reflect or contribute to the fine-grained streetscape of Beechwood Avenue. In these ways, the proposal is inconsistent with this guideline.</p>
	3. "Construction of new buildings will only be permitted when the new building does not detract from the historic landscape characteristics of the associated streetscape, the height and mass of the new building are	There are no Grade 1 buildings in the associated streetscape. The buildings are generally rectangular, and their mass is organized in the middle of the consolidated lots, similarly to others in the panhandle. However, given the consolidated lots, this results in

	<p>consistent with the Grade I buildings in the associated streetscape, and the siting and materials of the new building are compatible with the Grade I buildings in the associated streetscape. Where there are no Grade 1 buildings in the associated streetscape, the height and mass of the new building shall respect the character of the existing buildings and not have a negative impact on the associated streetscape or cultural heritage value of the HCD. These situations will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis in consultation with the community in accordance with Section 4.1 of this Plan.”</p>	<p>buildings of considerable width and scale, adjacent to the neighbouring properties, with very little side yard landscaping to help provide a buffer. While effort has been made to step back the top floors as well as introduce some façade articulation with projecting bays and balconies, these measures insufficiently mitigate the width and scale of the buildings, nor do they meaningfully reflect the fine-grained development pattern on Beechwood Avenue. The proposal does not respect the character of the existing buildings and detracts from the landscape character in the Beechwood streetscape. The proposal is inconsistent with this guideline.</p>
	<p>4. “New buildings shall be of their own time but sympathetic to the character of their historic neighbours in terms of massing, height and materials. New buildings are not required to replicate historical styles.”</p>	<p>The proposed buildings have been designed to be contemporary in style, and of their own time. There are no neighbouring Grade 1 properties, however the proposal is not sympathetic to the character of the buildings in the panhandle in terms of their massing and their architectural expression. The proposal is inconsistent with this guideline.</p>
	<p>5. “Integral garages shall be located in a manner that respects the cultural heritage value of the streetscape.”</p>	<p>Each proposed building will provide four visitor parking spaces in a basement level garage. The garages are to be accessed off of Beechwood Avenue. While the sunken lower level allows for the building to be set into</p>

		<p>the slope of the site and appear lower in height, it results in the entrances to the buildings being below grade from Beechwood, where typically Beechwood would be the lowest point of the hill. This creates an incompatible relationship to the streetscape.</p> <p>Further, the required driveways to the garages result in a large area of hard surfacing in the front yards, which, together with the footprint of the buildings do not respect the park-like qualities and atmosphere of the HCD that are integral to the conservation of its cultural heritage value. The proposal is inconsistent with this guideline.</p>
	6. "Existing grades shall be maintained."	<p>The intent of this guideline is to conserve the contextual relationship of buildings in the streetscape, particularly in terms of heights, post construction. The buildings will be set into the slope of the site. This will mitigate the height of the proposed buildings, as they will be slightly taller than those in the immediate surroundings. However, staff have concerns with the below ground garage off of Beechwood Avenue, as it contributes to the buildings commercial expression and results in datum lines that do not relate to the surrounding buildings.</p>
	7. "In order to protect the expansive front lawns, and the generous spacing and setbacks	<p>The intention of this guideline is typically to ensure that new construction is sensitively located in relation</p>

	<p>of the buildings, identified as heritage attributes of the HCD, the following Guidelines shall be used when determining the location of new houses on their lots: (a) “New buildings on interior lots shall be sensitively sited in relation to adjacent buildings. Unless a new building maintains the front yard setback of a building it is replacing, the front yard setback of the new building shall be consistent with that of the adjacent building that is set closest to the street. A new building may be set back further from the street than adjacent buildings.”</p> <p>b) In general, unless a new building on a corner lot maintains the setbacks of the buildings it is replacing, the new building shall not be closer to the street than both adjacent buildings. The new building may be setback further from both streets than the adjacent building. If the front yard setbacks of the adjacent buildings cannot reasonably be used to determine the front yard and exterior side yard setbacks of a new building, the new building shall be sensitively sited in relation to adjacent building on both streets.</p>	<p>to adjacent properties. Given the consolidation of lots, both buildings will be located on corner properties. The proposed buildings will generally be aligned with each other and with the adjacent buildings on Beechwood, however they will be closer to Carsdale than those that front on Black Maple Private to the north. Staff believe this deviation has little impact given Beechwood’s character. Staff are however concerned about the side yard setbacks, as the proposed buildings will cover nearly the entire width of the consolidated lots, leaving very little room soft landscaped area in those yards. In this way, the proposal has not been sensitively sited in relation to neighbouring properties.</p>
--	--	--

	8. "Windows may be wood, metal clad wood, steel or other materials as appropriate. Multipaned windows should have appropriate muntin bars."	The proposal is generally consistent with this guideline. Aluminium framed windows with multiple divisions are proposed.
	9. "The use of natural materials, such as stone, real stucco, brick and wood is an important attribute of the HCD, and the use of materials such as vinyl siding, aluminium soffits, synthetic stucco, and manufactured stone will not be supported."	The proposal is generally consistent with this guideline. Most of the materials are typical and consistent with those of the HCD.
	10. "Terraces on the top storey of buildings do not form part of the heritage character of the HCD, however, a terrace on the top storey may be permitted if it is set back from the roof edge, it and its fixtures are not visible from the surrounding public realm and the terrace does not have a negative effect on the character of the surrounding cultural heritage landscape."	The proposal is generally consistent with this guideline. The proposed roof top terraces on both buildings are set back away from the sides of the building. Given the change in grade from Beechwood and their location in the centre of the roof, they will not be readily visible from the surrounding public realm. The proposed plantings at the roof level will provide privacy and a buffer to mitigate impacts on the surrounding cultural heritage landscape.
	11. "Terraces and balconies below the top storey (for example, on a garage roof, or one storey addition) may be recommended for approval if they do not have a negative effect	Small balconies are proposed at the front and rear façades. The railings are proposed to be glass which will reduce the visual impacts. Balconies and porches are typical for buildings in the HCD and in this location

	on the character of the surrounding cultural heritage landscape.”	on Beechwood. The proposal is consistent with this guideline.
	12. “If brick and stone cladding is proposed, it will extend to all façades and not be used solely on the front façade. Other cladding materials may be appropriate.”	The proposal is consistent with this guideline. Brick and stone are proposed on all sides of the building.
7.4.3 Landscape Guidelines- New Buildings and Additions	1. “New buildings and additions to existing buildings shall respect the heritage attributes of the lot’s existing hard and soft landscape, including but not limited to trees, hedges and flowerbeds, pathways, setbacks and yards. Soft landscaping will dominate the property.”	The proposal is inconsistent with this guideline. The proposed massing does not allow for the retention of landscape character on lots in the panhandle. Soft landscape area is further reduced by the introduction of the driveways and hard surfaced amenity areas at the rear of the buildings.
	2. “New buildings and additions will be sited on a property to respect the established landscaped character of the streetscape.”	The proposed buildings are generally located in the middle of the consolidated lots, which means that soft landscaping will be mainly in the front yard. The proposed scale and footprint of the buildings does not permit sufficient soft landscaping on all four sides.
	3. “The existing landscaped character of a lot will be preserved, when new buildings and additions are constructed.”	The proposal is inconsistent with this guideline. The proposed buildings do not allow for the existing landscaped character of the narrow side yards and modest gardens in the panhandle to be conserved.
	4. “The front lawns and side yards of new buildings shall protect the continuity and	The proposal is inconsistent with this guideline. The buildings’ footprints, together with the hard surfacing

	dominance of the soft landscape within the HCD.”	as presented, interrupt the continuity of the landscape character in this area.
	7. “Setbacks, topography and existing grades, trees, pathways and special features, such as stone walls and front walks shall be preserved.”	The proposal requires the removal of many mature trees and the existing low stone walls, although replanting is anticipated, as are replication of the walls for terraced planting in the front yards. The buildings are proposed to be set into the existing slope of the side.
	8. “All applications for new construction shall be accompanied by a detailed landscape plan. The plan must clearly indicate the location of all trees, shrubs and landscape features including those to be preserved and those to be removed, and illustrate all changes proposed to the landscape.”	A conceptual landscape plan has been provided.
	9. “The removal of mature trees is strongly discouraged and all applications will be subject to the appropriate by-law and permitting process. Where a tree has to be removed to accommodate new construction, it will be replaced with a new tree of an appropriate size and species elsewhere on the lot with preference given to native species.”	This guideline is intended to support the maintenance of soft landscaping on the lots in the HCD. Several trees and shrubs must be removed to facilitate the proposal. While replanting is proposed, there may be issues with soil volumes and ability to replant sufficiently to meet the intent of this guideline.

	10. "Existing grades shall be maintained."	<p>The intent of this guideline is to conserve the contextual relationship of buildings in the streetscape, particularly in terms of heights, post construction. The buildings will be set into the slope of the site. This will mitigate the height of the proposed buildings, as they will be slightly taller than those in the immediate surroundings. However, staff have concerns with the below ground garage off of Beechwood Avenue, as it contributes to the buildings commercial expression and results in datum lines that do not relate to the surrounding buildings.</p>
--	--	---

Document 10 – Standards and Guidelines Evaluation Chart

Applicable Standards	Proposal	Staff Comment
<p>Standard 1: Conserve the heritage value of an historic place. Do not remove, replace or substantially alter its intact or repairable character defining elements. Do not move a part of an historic place if its current location is a character-defining element.</p>	<p>The proposal is to consolidate five existing lots, demolish the existing buildings and construct two new apartment buildings in their place. The design of the buildings is contemporary in style and have been guided by the guidelines of the HCD Plan. The buildings will be mostly clad natural materials including stone and brick.</p>	<p>The proposal is not consistent with these Standards. The proposal detracts from the heritage value of the Beechwood streetscape as the buildings will be sunken into the grade of the site, which is not consistent or sympathetic to the surrounding context. The proposed massing and footprint do not allow for soft landscaping around the buildings, which interrupt the visual continuity of the park-like qualities that are integral to the conservation of Rockcliffe's cultural heritage value at its border. The office-like expression of the buildings do not conserve or enhance residential character of Rockcliffe Park or the fine-grained character of this part of Beechwood Avenue.</p>
<p>Standard 11: Conserve the heritage value and character-defining elements when creating any new additions to an historic place or any related new construction. Make the new work physically and visually compatible with, subordinate to and distinguishable from the historic place.</p>	<p>The proposed buildings are three and four storeys in height, with a sunken basement level and underground garage. The garages and main entrances are accessed via this sunken level. The proposed mass and resulting footprint of the buildings are large and rectangular in shape, with very minimal articulation in the façades. The applicant has</p>	

	focused efforts for landscaping in the front yards.	
--	---	--