2. Application for Demolition and New Construction at 518 Mariposa Crescent, a Property Designated under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* and located in the Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District

Demande de démolition et de nouvelle construction au 518, croissant Mariposa, une propriété désignée en vertu de la partie V de la *Loi sur le patrimoine de l'Ontario* et située dans le District de conservation du patrimoine de Rockcliffe Park

#### Sub-Committee Recommendations

That Council:

- 1. Approve the application to demolish the building at 518 Mariposa Crescent, received on January 7, 2019;
- 2. Approve the application to construct a new building at 518 Mariposa Crescent according to plans prepared by Andre Godin, dated December 20, 2018 and received January 7, 2019;
- 3. Approve the landscape design for the property at 518 Mariposa Crescent according to plans prepared by Gino Aiello, Landscape Architect, dated December 19, 2018 and received January 7, 2019;
- 4. Delegate authority for minor design changes to the General Manager, Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development Department;
- 5. Issue the heritage permit with a two-year expiry date from the date of issuance unless extended by Council prior to expiry.

(Note: The statutory 90-day timeline for consideration of this application under the *Ontario Heritage Act* will expire on April 7 2019.)

(Note: Approval to alter this property under the *Ontario Heritage Act* must not be construed to meet the requirements for the issuance of a building permit.)

Sous-comité du patrimoine bâti Rapport 1 Le 27 mars 2019

#### Recommandations du sous-comité

Que le Conseil :

- 1. approuve la demande de démolition du bâtiment situé au 518, croissant Mariposa, reçue le 7 janvier 2019;
- approuve la demande de construction d'un nouveau bâtiment au 518, croissant Mariposa, conformément aux plans élaborés par Andre Godin, datés du 20 décembre 2018 et reçus le 7 janvier 2019;
- approuve la conception paysagère de la propriété située au 518, croissant Mariposa, conformément aux plans élaborés par Gino Aiello, architecte paysagiste, datés du 19 décembre 2018 et reçus le 7 janvier 2019;
- 4. délègue au directeur général de Planification, Infrastructure et Développement économique le pouvoir d'effectuer des modifications mineures de conception;
- 5. délivre un permis en matière de patrimoine d'une validité de deux ans à partir de la date de délivrance, sauf si le permis est prolongé par le Conseil municipal avant sa date d'échéance.

(Nota : 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 7 avril 2019.)

(Nota : L'approbation de la demande de modification aux termes de la *Loi sur le patrimoine de l'Ontario* ne signifie pas pour autant qu'elle satisfait aux conditions de délivrance d'un permis de construire.)

#### Documentation/Documentation

 Manager's report, Right of Way, Heritage and Urban Design Services, Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development Department, dated February 26, 2019 (ACS2019-PIE-RHU-0005)

Rapport du Gestionnaire, Services des emprises, du patrimoine et du design urbain, Direction générale de la planification, de l'Infrastructure et du développement économique, daté le 26 février 2019 (ACS2019-PIE-RHU-0005)

2. Extract of draft Minutes, Built Heritage Sub-Committee, March 12, 2019.

23

Extrait de l'ébauche du procès-verbal, Sous-comité du patrimoine bâti, le 12 mars 2019.

## Report to Rapport au:

## Built Heritage Sub-Committee / Sous-comité du patrimoine bâti March 12, 2019 / 12 mars 2019

and Council / et au Conseil March 27, 2019 / 27 mars 2019

Submitted on February 26, 2019 Soumis le 26 février 2019

> Submitted by Soumis par: Court Curry, Manager / Gestionnaire,

Right of Way, Heritage and Urban Design Services / Services des emprises, du patrimoine et du design urbain

Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development Department / Direction générale de la planification, de l'Infrastructure et du développement économique

**Contact Person** 

Personne ressource:

Sally Coutts, Senior Heritage Planner / Planificatrice principale de la conservation du patrimoine, Heritage Services Section / Section des Services du Patrimoine 613-580-2424, 13474, Sally.Coutts@ottawa.ca

Ward: RIDEAU-ROCKCLIFFE (13) File Number: ACS2019-PIE-RHU-0005

- SUBJECT: Application for Demolition and New Construction at 518 Mariposa Crescent, a Property Designated under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* and located in the Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District
- OBJET: Demande de démolition et de nouvelle construction au 518, croissant Mariposa, une propriété désignée en vertu de la partie V de la *Loi sur*

*le patrimoine de l'Ontario* et située dans le District de conservation du patrimoine de Rockcliffe Park

#### **REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS**

That the Built Heritage Sub-Committee recommend that Council:

- 1. Approve the application to demolish the building at 518 Mariposa Crescent, received on January 7, 2019;
- Approve the application to construct a new building at 518 Mariposa
  Crescent according to plans prepared by Andre Godin, dated December 20, 2018 and received January 7, 2019;
- 3. Approve the landscape design for the property at 518 Mariposa Crescent according to plans prepared by Gino Aiello, Landscape Architect, dated December 19, 2018 and received January 7, 2019;
- 4. Delegate authority for minor design changes to the General Manager, Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development Department;
- 5. Issue the heritage permit with a two-year expiry date from the date of issuance unless extended by Council prior to expiry.

(Note: The statutory 90-day timeline for consideration of this application under the *Ontario Heritage Act* will expire on April 7 2019.)

(Note: Approval to alter this property under the *Ontario Heritage Act* must not be construed to meet the requirements for the issuance of a building permit.)

#### **RECOMMANDATIONS DU RAPPORT**

Que le Sous-comité du patrimoine bâti recommande au Conseil :

- 1. d'approuver la demande de démolition du bâtiment situé au 518, croissant Mariposa, reçue le 7 janvier 2019;
- 2. d'approuver la demande de construction d'un nouveau bâtiment au 518, croissant Mariposa, conformément aux plans élaborés par Andre Godin, datés du 20 décembre 2018 et reçus le 7 janvier 2019;

- d'approuver la conception paysagère de la propriété située au 518, croissant Mariposa, conformément aux plans élaborés par Gino Aiello, architecte paysagiste, datés du 19 décembre 2018 et reçus le 7 janvier 2019;
- 4. de déléguer au directeur général de Planification, Infrastructure et Développement économique le pouvoir d'effectuer des modifications mineures de conception;
- 5. de délivrer un permis en matière de patrimoine d'une validité de deux ans à partir de la date de délivrance, sauf si le permis est prolongé par le Conseil municipal avant sa date d'échéance.

(Nota : 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 7 avril 2019.)

(Nota : L'approbation de la demande de modification aux termes de la *Loi sur le patrimoine de l'Ontario* ne signifie pas pour autant qu'elle satisfait aux conditions de délivrance d'un permis de construire.)

## BACKGROUND

The house at 518 Mariposa Crescent (1954) is a one-storey, bungalow with a small two storey gable-roofed addition at its north east corner, resulting in L-shaped plan. There is a wide driveway to the west of the property. Its backyard is heavily treed, and the landscaping in the front yard is limited to two evergreens located immediately adjacent to the house, a lawn and a simple stone sidewalk. Mariposa Crescent was created in the 1950s, and features a small island at its centre (see Location Map, Document 1 and Current Photographs, Document 2). There are three houses facing the crescent, all of which were built in the early 1950s. They were evaluated as part of the Rockcliffe Park heritage conservation district plan process and are all Category II buildings (see Heritage Survey Form, Document 3).

The Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District (HCD) was designated in 1997 for its cultural heritage value as an early planned residential community first laid out by Thomas Keefer in 1864. The district is also important for its historical associations with Keefer and his father-in-law, Thomas MacKay, the founder of New Edinburgh and the original owner of Rideau Hall. The picturesque nature of the village also contributes

significantly to its cultural heritage value. The "Statement of Heritage Character" notes that today the Village of Rockcliffe Park is a distinctive community of private homes and related institutional properties within a park setting.

The application is to demolish the existing house at 518 Mariposa Crescent and construct a new building. This report has been prepared because demolition and new construction in heritage conservation districts designated under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* require the approval of City Council.

#### DISCUSSION

#### **Recommendation 1**

In 1997, the former Village of Rockcliffe Park was designated under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act.* The original Rockcliffe Park had Guidelines regarding the management of change in the heritage conservation district, including some regarding demolition and new construction.

In March 2016, City Council approved a new heritage conservation district plan for the Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District, which is currently under appeal. Since then, heritage staff have used this plan as policy, and also have regard to the 1997 Heritage District plan when assessing applications.

As part of the process leading up to the 2016 Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District Plan (RPHCDP), each property in the district was researched and evaluated and scored for its Environment, History and Architecture. The property received a low score overall and is a Grade II building (Document 3).

#### Demolition

Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District Study (1997)

The 1997 Rockcliffe Park HCD Guidelines discuss the demolition of buildings in Section IV, Buildings:

1. Any application to demolish an existing building should be reviewed with consideration of its historical and architectural significance, its contribution to its streetscape, and the appropriateness of the proposed redevelopment. Demolition should be recommended for approval only where the existing building is of little

significance and the proposed redevelopment is sympathetic to the surrounding environment.

28

The 2016 RPHCDP also discusses demolitions:

1. Any application to demolish an existing Grade II 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 be permitted only where the existing building is of little significance and the proposed building is sympathetic to the traditional surrounding natural and cultural environment. All new construction will comply with the relevant Guidelines contained within this plan.

The existing building at 518 Mariposa Crescent is a split level structure with a cross gable roof and an L-shape plan. In 2011 a building permit was issued to construct an addition to the west, containing a garage which was completed. At the same time, the entire building was clad in stucco. Access to the garage is by a wide driveway. The building in its current form does not make a significant contribution to the cultural heritage value of the Rockcliffe Park HCD.

Both the 1997 Rockcliffe Guidelines and the 2016 RPHCDP anticipate that buildings in the heritage conservation district may be demolished and replaced. Staff have no objection to the demolition of this structure, given its limited cultural heritage value and low overall score.

#### Recommendation 2

The applicant proposes to replace the existing structure with a two-storey structure, clad in smooth and rough cut stone. It has an irregular plan and a truncated hipped roof. The front entrance is located in the centre of the front façade, and is surrounded by smooth dressed stone. The front façade also features two projecting bays also with a hipped rooflines. The house will be 9.3 metres in height, below the 11 metres permitted in the Zoning By-law, and lower than its neighbour to the east. It will be stepped down towards the one-storey structure to the west, to minimize its impact upon that structure. The proposed dwelling will be located generally on the same footprint, and with the same front yard setback, as the dwelling to be removed but will extend farther into the rear yard, by less than two metres. The current building has a non-conforming east side

Sous-comité du patrimoine bâti Rapport 1 Le 27 mars 2019

yard and the new building will be brought into conformity with the Zoning By-law (for elevations, see Documents 4 - 7).

29

#### **Design Evolution**

In the autumn of 2017, the applicant solicited comments on preliminary plans from heritage staff. Staff, while acknowledging that the existing building could be demolished, had some initials concerns with the plans and asked the applicant to:

- Move the building back from Mariposa Crescent so that its front yard setback reflects that of the building to be demolished.
- Remove the dormer windows, as they were for decorative purposes only.
- Lower the roof in height and slope.
- Simplify the design through the removal of elements such as keystones, decorative windows, etc.
- Simplify the entrance.
- Verify compliance with the zoning bylaw by including the eligible spaces in the attic, which must be counted even if the space is not intended to be occupied.

The architect implemented all of the changes requested by staff (see Document 8, Rendering Original Proposal and Document 9, Rendering, Revised Proposal).

The Rockcliffe Park Heritage Committee also reviewed the plans and asked the applicant to:

- Retain the two storey portion of the existing house and its adjacent trees.
- Move the garage and driveway to the east side of the house.

To address the RPRA's request, the designer assessed the feasibility of retaining the two storey wing and the trees beside it by relocating the garage to the other side of the house. He decided that the current proposal was more respectful of the HCD plan's guidelines as it brings the building into compliance with the Zoning By-law by increasing the easterly side yard setback, it improves the lot's landscaping, and takes advantage of the slope of the street to permit the garage to be in the basement, rather than at grade,

which reduces the height of the building. Furthermore, moving the driveway improves the streetscape, which is currently dominated by driveways.

The 1997 Guidelines are applicable to this application are:

- iv) Buildings
  - 4. Any application to construct a new building or addition should be reviewed with consideration of its potential to enhance the heritage character of the Village. New construction should be recommended for approval only where the siting, form, materials and detailing are sympathetic to the surrounding natural and cultural environment.
  - 5. New buildings and additions should be of their own time, but should also harmonize with the existing cultural landscape. They should be sited and designed so as to retain the existing topography. The use of natural materials should be encouraged.

The proposed house is consistent with these guidelines. The new building will have a hipped roof, rectangular plan, and use stone as the primary exterior cladding material. It will have the same setback as the existing building, and its design expression reflects the wide range of building forms and types found within the HCD.

Section 7.4.2, "Guidelines for new buildings" also addresses replacement buildings, stating that new buildings shall contribute to, and not detract from the heritage character of the HCD and its attributes, that new buildings should be compatible with Grade I heritage buildings in the associated landscape, that buildings should be of their own time, that integral garages should be located in a manner that respects the streetscape, and that existing grades should be maintained. Further applicable Guidelines encourage the use of natural materials and may be either wood or metal clad wood.

The proposed building respects these Guidelines. The orientation, height and massing of the building are compatible with the mixed, 1950s character of Mariposa Crescent. The building has been designed to take advantage of the slope of the crescent and the height of the proposed building is lower than its adjacent neighbour to the east, and steps towards its neighbour to the west. Its front façade is similar in length to its predecessor and, although it extends further into the rear yard, the trees there will be conserved and no rear yard variance is required. The new building maintains the

setback of the existing building and maintains the relationship of the buildings facing Mariposa Crescent. No minor variances are required as the building meets the heights, setbacks, coverage, and floor space index for the zone (for Site Plan/Zoning Chart, see Document 10).

#### **Recommendation 3**

The proposed landscape plan will introduce landscape elements typical of Rockcliffe Park that do not currently exist on the property. The front yard will feature the existing flagstone walkway, and a new 3.05 metres wide driveway. It will be paved in a combination of asphalt and pavers. The new driveway will improve the current situation on the crescent in which the driveways for 518 and 522 Mariposa sit immediately adjacent to one another, creating between them a roughly eight-metre driveway (see Document 13, Current Driveways).

The proposed landscape plan includes the retention of the existing trees in the rear yard, which make a significant contribution to the landscaped character of the crescent. Two evergreens, immediately adjacent to the existing house will be removed. Further proposed changes to the landscape include additional deciduous trees in the front yard, including a red maple and a pin oak, which when fully grown will cast considerable shade and contribute to the character of Mariposa Crescent. In addition, a red maple will be planted at the eastern edge of the property and other trees and shrubs will be planted in the front yard and along the property lines. These trees, and the existing red maple trees in the rear yard will ensure that the wooded character of the lot continues to contribute to Rockcliffe Park's cultural heritage landscape (see Document 12, Arborist's Report).

Section V of the 1997 Rockcliffe Park HCD Guidelines addresses landscape conservation, encouraging the dominance of soft over hard landscapes, the preservation of existing trees and shrubs, and the sensitive siting of new buildings to protect landscape character.

Section 7.5.3 of the 2016 RPHCDP, also has guidelines to encourage the conservation and enhancement of the existing cultural heritage landscape. These include an emphasis on soft over hard landscaping, tree preservation, the location of driveways, and the preservation of existing landscape character.

The significant qualities of the landscape including the mature trees in the back yard and existing grade are to be retained and the trees and shrubs along the perimeter of the lot on the north and east lawns will remain unchanged and provide a buffer for its neighbours.

#### **Cultural Heritage Impact Statement (CHIS)**

A CHIS was not required for this project as it was determined that, because the proposed architectural and landscape plans respected both the 1997 Guidelines and the 2016 RPHCDP, the project did not have the potential to adversely affect the cultural heritage value of the HCD.

#### **Provincial Policy Statement**

Staff have reviewed this proposal and have determined that it is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014.

#### **Standards and Guidelines**

City Council adopted the "Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada" in 2008. The applicable standard for the applications are:

Standard 1: Conserve the heritage value of an historic place.

The proposal conserves the cultural heritage value of the RPHCD. The existing house, of little architectural significance, will be replaced by a new structure that respects the guidelines for new construction in both the 1997 and 2016 plans. The improvements to the landscape, including the removal of the non-complying driveway, the introduction of new trees and the retention of the majority of the existing trees will improve the quality of the streetscape.

#### Conclusion

Staff in Right of Way, Heritage and Urban Design support the proposed demolition and construction project. The new building in its landscaped setting is consistent with both the 1997 and 2016 Guidelines. The proposed house and its associated landscape will improve Mariposa Crescent by reducing hard surfaces and increasing overall tree cover and the proposed house is compatible with the two other buildings on the crescent, which are Grade II buildings constructed in the 1950s.

#### **RURAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no rural implications associated with this report.

#### CONSULTATION

The Rockcliffe Park Residents Association heritage committee met with the designer in November 2018 as part of its process for the review of applications under the *Ontario Heritage Act*. The Committee requested that the two storey east pavilion and the trees adjacent to it be conserved, and that the project be redesigned to accommodate this change. The revised plans were circulated to the Heritage Committee in January 2019.

City heritage staff received the following comment on the project fin February 2019:

1. The Rockcliffe Park Heritage Committee requested the mature trees in front to the east be preserved. This would have required modification to the design. This concern is rooted in heritage and environmental aspirations for Rockcliffe Park.

#### Response

The roots of the two trees in question are adjacent to the building's foundation and have the potential to damage the building. City heritage staff does not think that it is reasonable for the applicant to incorporate a portion of the 1950s building to save these trees when the majority of the mature trees on the property will be retained. In addition, the design of the house that follows the natural slope of Mariposa Crescent means that the garage can be in the basement, with its doors facing east, not north to the street. In addition, having the garage in the basement allows the height of the building to be 9.3 metres.

The landscape plan submitted for approval shows additional deciduous trees in the front yard, including a red maple and a pin oak, which when fully grown will cast considerable shade and contribute to the character of Mariposa Crescent. In addition, other trees, will be planted in the front yard, improving the landscaped character of the street. These trees, and the existing mature trees in the rear yard will ensure that the wooded character of the lot continues to contribute to Rockcliffe's cultural heritage landscape. Elsewhere on the lot, new planting beds will be introduced. City staff believes that the proposed landscape plan, with its emphasis on new trees and shrubs and its retention of all but two of the existing

mature trees on the lot offsets the loss of the two evergreens proposed for removal (see Document 13 for existing driveways on Mariposa Crescent).

2. The Committee is worried, based on inaccurate outcomes on other properties, about the accuracy of the perspective image provided. We are worried that what has been provided may be smaller, narrower and/ or lower than the eventual/ built outcome. Are you persuaded that, when built, the 'after' construction/ and the as-built photograph will match the proposed development image, and neither be larger, wider and/ or higher? Does the City have all ridge line and eaves line heights of the proposed building and of those of neighbours to guarantee this, and has this been verified as part of the City's due diligence?

#### Response

The City has received the perspective image and an elevation of the proposed house within its setting. The perspective image is intended for information purposes and is not to scale but when it is read in conjunction with the scaled drawings, we are confident that the proposed building, when complete, will reflect the drawings. The City does not have all ridge line and eaves line heights of adjacent buildings and we do not require that an applicant supply them (see Document 14, Streetscape elevations).

Heritage Ottawa was circulated the application.

## COMMENTS BY THE WARD COUNCILLORS

Councillors Fleury and Cloutier are aware of the report recommendation.

City Council on January 30, 2019 delegated authority to Councillors Fleury and Cloutier for the provision of Councillor Comments on staff reports related to Ward 13, until such time that a new Ward 13 Councillor takes Office.

#### LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

With respect to this application, the City may issue the permit under the Heritage Act, issue the permit with conditions, or refuse the permit application. If the City does not do any of the foregoing within 90 days, the application is deemed to be approved. Should the City issue the permit with conditions, or refuse to issue the permit, the owner of the property may appeal to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal.

#### **RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

There are no risk management implications associated with this report.

#### ASSET MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

There are no asset management implications associated with the recommendations of this report.

35

#### FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no direct financial implications.

#### ACCESSIBILITY IMPACTS

There are no accessibility impacts associated with this report.

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no environmental implications associated with this report.

#### **TERM OF COUNCIL PRIORITIES**

This project addresses the following Term of Council Priority:

• Governance, Planning and Decision Making

#### **APPLICATION PROCESS TIMELINE STATUS**

The application was processed within the 90 day statutory requirement under the *Ontario Heritage Act.* 

#### SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

- Document 1 Location Map
- Document 2 Current Photographs
- Document 3 Heritage Survey Form (Distributed separately and held on file with the City Clerk)
- Document 4 Front Elevation

- Document 5 East Elevation
- Document 6 Rear Elevation
- Document 7 West Elevation
- Document 8 Rendering, Original Submission
- Document 9 Rendering, Revised Submission
- Document 10 Site Plan/Zoning Chart
- Document 11 Landscape Plan and Plant List
- Document 12 Arborist's Report (Distributed separately and held on file with the City Clerk)
- Document 13 Current driveways
- Document 14 Streetscape showing neighbours

#### DISPOSITION

City Clerk and Solicitor Department, Legislative Services, to notify the property owner and the Ontario Heritage Trust (10 Adelaide Street East, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor, Toronto, Ontario, M5C 1J3) of Council's decision.

Sous-comité du patrimoine bâti Rapport 1 Le 27 mars 2019

## **Document 1 – Location Map**



Sous-comité du patrimoine bâti Rapport 1 Le 27 mars 2019

# Document 2 – Current Photographs





Sous-comité du patrimoine bâti Rapport 1 Le 27 mars 2019

> CEPTIONAL O 1 5

## **Document 4 – Front Elevation**



PROPOSED #518 MARIPOSA SCALE- 1275 DECEMBER 20/2018

Sous-comité du patrimoine bâti Rapport 1 Le 27 mars 2019

**Document 5 – East Elevation** 



PROPOSED LEFT SIDE ELEVATION "B"



PROPOSED #518 MARIPOSA

Sous-comité du patrimoine bâti Rapport 1 Le 27 mars 2019

> EXCEPTIONAL E O M E 5 ANDRODINENCION

## **Document 6 – Rear Elevation**



P R O P O S E D # 5 1 8 M A R I P O S A SCAIT= 175 D D CTITIBR 2020 8

Sous-comité du patrimoine bâti Rapport 1 Le 27 mars 2019

**Document 7 – West Elevation** 



PROPOSED RIGHT SIDE ELEVATION "B"



PROPOSED #518 MARIPOSA

Sous-comité du patrimoine bâti Rapport 1 Le 27 mars 2019

## Document 8 – Rendering, Original Proposal



Sous-comité du patrimoine bâti Rapport 1 Le 27 mars 2019

#### Document 9 – Rendering, Revised Proposal



Sous-comité du patrimoine bâti Rapport 1 Le 27 mars 2019



## Document 10 – Site Plan/Zoning Chart

Sous-comité du patrimoine bâti Rapport 1 Le 27 mars 2019



#### Document 11 – Landscape Plan and Plant List

Code	Qty.	rees - <u>518 MARIPOSA</u> Botanical Name	Common Name	Size	Condition
AC	cay.	Amelanchier canadensis	Tree Serviceberry	60mm cal	B + B specimen
AR	<u> </u>	Acer rubrum	Red Maple	60mm cal	B + B specimen
AS		Acer saccharum	Sugar Maple	60mm cal	B + B specimen
CA	<u> </u>	Cornus alternifolia	Pagoda Dogwood	60mm cal	B + B specimen
0	<u> </u>	Celtis occidentalis	Common Hackberry	60mm cal	B + B specimen
CR		Comus racemosa	Grey Dogwood	60mm cal	B + B specimen
IN		Juglans nigra	Black Walnut	60mm cal	
QM		Quercus macrocarpa	Burr Oak	60mm cal	B + B specimen
OP	<u> </u>	Quercus macrocarpa Quercus palustris	Pin Oak	60mm cal	
		Quercus parustris Quercus rubra	Red Oak	60mm cal	B + B specimen
	<u> </u>	Viburnum lentago	Nannyberry	60mm cal	B + B specimen
VL		Viburium rentago	Indiniyoeriy	oomin car	b + b specifien
AB		Abies balsamea	Balsam Fir	1.5m Ht.	B + B specimen
AC	<u> </u>	Abies concolor	Silver Fir	1.5m Ht.	B + B specimen
<u>IV</u>	<u> </u>	Juniperus virginiana	Eastern Red Cedar	1.5m Ht.	B + B specimen
11	<u> </u>	Larix laricina	Eastern Larch / Tamarack	1.5m Ht.	B + B specimen
PAr	<u> </u>	Pinus aristata	Bristlecone Pine	1.5m Ht.	B + B specimen
PC		Pinus cembra	Swiss Stone Pine	1.5m Ht.	B + B specimen
PF		Pinus flexilus	Limber Pine	1.5m Ht.	B + B specimen
PG		Picea glauca	White Spruce	1.5m Ht.	B + B specimen
		<u> </u>			
PO		Picea omorika	Serbian Spruce	1.5m Ht.	B + B specimen
PR		Pinus resinosa	Red Pine	1.5m Ht.	B + B specimen
PS		Pinus strobus	White Pine	1.5m Ht.	B + B specimen
тс		Tsuga canadensis	Canadian Hemlock	60mm cal	B + B specimen
то		Thuja occidentalis arborvitae	White Cedar, nursery grown	60mm cal	B + B specimen
		hrubs - <u>518 MARIPOSA</u>			
Code	Qty.		Common Name	Size	Condition
AC		Amelanchier canadensis	Serviceberry	80cm Ht.	Pot
AU		Arctostaphylos Uva Ursi	Bearberry	90cm Ht.	Pot
CA		Cornus alternifolia	Pagoda Dogwood	60mm cal	B + B specimen
CR		Cornus racemosa	Grey Dogwood	80cm Ht.	Pot
НК		Hypericum kalmianum	St. John's Wort	40cm Ht.	Pot
RP		Rosa palustris	Swamp Rose	50cm Ht.	Pot
SAo		Symphoricarpos albus	Snowberry	60cm Ht.	Pot
SA		Spiraea alba	Meadowsweet	60cm Ht.	Pot
VL		Viburnum lentago	Nannyberry	80cm Ht.	Pot
JV		Juniperus virginiana	Eastern Red Cedar	1.5m Ht.	Pot
Plant	List - G	Groundcovers - <u>518 MARIPOSA</u>			
Code		Botanical Name	Common Name	Condition	
AU		Arctostaphylos uva ursi	Bearberry	9cm Pot	
		Calamagrostis acutifulia 'Overdam'	Feather Reed Grass	9cm Pot	
CAc		Geranium macrorrhizum	Bigroot Geranium	9cm Pot	
GM		Geranium psilostemon 'Gerwat'	Rozanne Geranium	9	cm Pot
CAc GM GP PAr		Geranium psilostemon 'Gerwat' Parthenocissus	Rozanne Geranium Virginia Creeper		cm Pot cm Pot

Sous-comité du patrimoine bâti Rapport 1 Le 27 mars 2019

## **Document 13 – Current Driveways**



Sous-comité du patrimoine bâti Rapport 1 Le 27 mars 2019

## **Document 14 – Streetscape showing neighbours**



ANDRÉ GODIN DESIGN

PROPOSED #518 MARIPOSA scale-1050(3432+10) DSCP4966470.8