

**Report to/Rapport au :**

**Ottawa Built Heritage Advisory Committee  
Comité consultatif sur le patrimoine bâti d'Ottawa**

**and/et**

**Planning Committee  
Comité de l'urbanisme**

**and Council / et au Conseil**

**June 4, 2012**

**4 juin 2012**

**Submitted by/Soumis par : Nancy Schepers, Deputy City Manager/Directrice  
municipale adjointe, Planning and Infrastructure/Urbanisme et Infrastructure**

Contact Person / Personne ressource:

*John Smit, Manager/Gestionnaire, Development Review-Urban Services / Examen des  
projets d'aménagement-Services urbains  
(613) 580-2424 x13866, [John.Smit@ottawa.ca](mailto:John.Smit@ottawa.ca)*

---

Beacon Hill – Cyrville (11)

Ref N°: ACS2012-PAI-PGM-0152

---

**SUBJECT: APPLICATION TO ALTER 19 KINDLE COURT, A PROPERTY  
PROTECTED UNDER THE *ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT* AND LOCATED  
IN THE BRIARCLIFFE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT  
STUDY AREA**

**OBJET : DEMANDE DE MODIFICATION DU 19, COUR KINDLE, PROPRIÉTÉ  
PROTÉGÉE AUX TERMES DE LA *LOI SUR LE PATRIMOINE DE  
L'ONTARIO* ET SITUÉE DANS LA ZONE D'ÉTUDE DU DISTRICT DE  
CONSERVATION DU PATRIMOINE DE BRIARCLIFFE**

**REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS**

**That the Ottawa Built Heritage Advisory Committee recommend that Planning  
Committee recommend that Council:**

- 1. Approve the application for construction of a rear addition as per drawings  
submitted on May 22, 2012 and included as Document 4 subject to the shape**

of the rear addition being changed to rectangular instead of semi-circular and inset 60 cm from the east and west sides of the rear elevation;

2. Refuse the application for a one storey flat roofed addition at the east side of the building included in Document 4;
3. Refuse the application for the new garage as per the drawings attached in Document 5; and
4. Delegate authority for minor design changes to the General Manager, Planning and Growth Management Department.

(Note: The statutory 90-day timeline for consideration of this application under the *Ontario Heritage Act* will expire on August 6, 2012)

(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 Comité consultatif sur le patrimoine bâti d'Ottawa recommande au Comité de l'urbanisme (OR Comité d'agriculture et des affaires rurales) de recommander à son tour au Conseil :

1. Approuver la demande de construction de l'ajout d'une partie à l'arrière tel qu'indiqué sur les plans soumis le 22 mai 2012 et inclus dans le Document 4, sous réserve du changement de la forme de la partie ajoutée à l'arrière, qui passerait de semi-circulaire à rectangulaire, et d'un retrait de 60 cm des côtés est et ouest de la façade arrière;
2. De refuser la demande de construction d'une annexe à toit plat d'un seul niveau du côté est de l'immeuble, cette annexe étant illustrée dans le document 4;
3. De refuser la demande de construction du garage illustré par les dessins faisant l'objet du document 5; et
4. De déléguer le pouvoir d'apporter des modifications mineures à la conception au directeur du Service de l'urbanisme et de la gestion de la croissance.

(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 6 août, 2012.)

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 Duncan House, 19 Kindle Court, is a two storey flat roofed house built in 1966 in the area known as Briarcliffe in the Rothwell Heights neighbourhood of Ottawa (Document 1).

Briarcliffe was designated as a Heritage Conservation District Study Area (HCD Study Area) by City Council in December 2011 through by-law 2011-450. The direction of the by-law was to:

*...undertake a heritage conservation district study in the heritage conservation district study area in accordance with the requirements of the Ontario Heritage Act for the purpose of examining the character of the area to determine if the area or any part thereof should be preserved as a heritage conservation district...*

By-law 2011-450 states that,

*During a period of one year from the date of enactment of this by-law, the approval of City Council is required with respect to:*

- (a) Alteration of property situated in the heritage conservation district study area;*
- (b) The erection, demolition or removal of buildings or structures in the heritage conservation district study area.*

This report has been prepared because the property owner is proposing alterations to the existing building at 19 Kindle Court, and the erection of a new garage on the property.

## **DISCUSSION**

### Context

The post-war period in North America saw incredibly rapid growth in suburban development. In addition to the large developer driven suburbs that prevailed across Canada and the United States, there are examples of experimental suburban developments throughout North America, including Briarcliffe. In 1959, four Ottawa acquaintances, Thaddeus Duncan, Walter Schreier, David Yuille and Ellen Douglas Webber, jointly purchased a 20-acre tract of heavily wooded land in Gloucester under the name of the Briarcliffe Partnership. In an effort to control the quality of the housing, the partnership drew up a set of restrictive covenants to regulate the design of the houses and the size of the lots in the area. In an effort to preserve the natural setting of the area, the lots were restricted to approximately half an acre each and were not permitted to be subdivided. The partnership eventually grew to include 18 partners. The land was divided into 24 lots: of which 18 went to the partnership; and the remaining six were sold to a builder, to provide funds for the construction of Briarcliffe Drive.

The Duncan House, a two-storey house built in 1966, is so named for Thaddeus Duncan, one of the original four members of the Briarcliffe Partnership. It was designed

by Paul Schoeler of the architectural firm of Schoeler, Barkham and Heaton and is an excellent example of mid-century modern residential architecture in Ottawa and represents the trend of architect-designed houses in the post-war period. As a follower of the work of the famous Modernist Mies Van Der Rohe during this period, Schoeler was interested in “refining the dimensions of the simple box as a container for life.”<sup>1</sup> The Duncan House is representative of this work.

The Duncan House is composed of two stacked rectangular boxes, with the larger upper storey cantilevered over the smaller lower storey. The building is clad in simple materials such as cedar and stucco that allow it to blend into its surroundings. The house is on a very large lot (0.8 hectares) in comparison to other lots in the neighbourhood and is set well back from the road. The house blends in well with the heavily treed character of the lot and the HCD study area (Document 2).

<sup>1</sup> Debanné, Janine. “Rothwell Heights: The Modernist House in Ottawa and the Vulnerability of Perfect Dimensions.” Conserving the Modern in Canada Conference Proceedings. Trent University 2005.

The Duncan House is one of the most significant houses in the Briarcliffe HCD Study Area.

### Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada

The Briarcliffe area is currently being studied for consideration as a heritage conservation district. The Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada have been used in the evaluation of this proposal.

The Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada were adopted by City Council in 2008. The applicable standards for this proposal include:

- *Standard 1: Conserve the heritage value of an historic place. Do not remove, replace or substantially alter its intact or repairable character defining elements.*
- *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.*

The applicable guidelines for buildings include:

- *Selecting a location for a new addition that ensures that the heritage value of the place is maintained.*
- *Designing a new addition in a manner that draws a clear distinction between what is historic and what is new.*
- *Designing an addition that is compatible in terms of materials and massing with the exterior form of the historic building and its setting.*

The applicable guidelines for cultural landscapes include:

---

- *Designing a new feature when required by a new use that respects the historic visual relationships in the cultural landscape. This can include matching established proportions and densities, such as maintaining the overall ratio of open space to building mass in an urban heritage district when designing an infill building.*
- *Designing a new built feature when required by a new use to be compatible with the heritage value of the cultural landscape.*

#### Recommendation 1:

The application includes a large addition at the rear (north) of the house. This proposed addition at the rear of the building is a two storey, flat roofed structure that is semi-circular in form. It completely covers the existing rear façade of the house and is proposed to be clad in stucco. The addition has large windows and double doors leading to the rear yard (Documents 2, 3, and 4).

#### Compatibility with the Standards and Guidelines:

The proposed addition meets the guidelines related to the location. Its location at the rear of the building means that it is subservient to the original building. The proposed addition provides a clear distinction between new and old and the choice of materials is compatible with the existing building. However, the proposed semi-circular shape is not compatible with the original house.

The existing house is made up of rectangular forms and the proposed semi-circular addition deviates from this form. The proposed addition does not meet Standards 1 or 11 as noted above because the new addition will alter the character defining elements of the house, and the addition is not physically or visually compatible with or subordinate to the Duncan House.

The Department would support the addition at the rear of the house if it were rectangular in shape, and set in at least 60 cm from each side of the rear of the building. A rectangular addition would be visually compatible with the existing building and setting. Furthermore, setting the addition in at the rear of the building will allow the original house to remain the dominant feature in the landscape. The proposed stucco cladding and large windows are appropriate to the character of the existing building.

#### Recommendation 2:

The application also proposes a one storey addition at the east side of the house. The proposed addition would be located under the overhang of the upper storey and extend out from the lower storey. The addition would be clad in stucco (Document 4).

#### Compatibility with the Standards and Guidelines:

This addition does not meet the Standards or guidelines above because its location and massing compromises two of the character defining elements of the building; the front façade and the void created by the cantilevered upper storey. The east addition will fill

the void and change the proportions of the original building. Furthermore, the proposed addition is flush with the front façade of the existing house and will alter the proportions of the front façade.

The proposed materials are compatible with the existing building.

The Department does not support the east side addition because it does not meet the Standards and Guidelines.

### Recommendation 3:

The proposed flat-roofed, stucco-clad, detached garage has three bays, two single car doors and one large garage door. The proposed garage is approximately 158 square metres in size. The proposed garage would require a minor variance to the Zoning By-law to permit an accessory building of 158 square metres where 55 square metres is permitted. The construction of the garage will result in the cutting of 11 mature deciduous trees (Documents 3, 5, 6)

#### Compatibility with Standards and Guidelines:

The proposed garage does not meet Standard 11 because it is not subordinate to the existing house. While the garage is detached, the building footprint is almost the same as that of the main house.

The proposed garage does not meet the Guidelines for cultural landscapes as noted above because it is not compatible with the character of this lot or the neighbourhood as a whole. Most houses in the HCD Study Area have a single modestly sized carport or garage. Because of its size and the loss of 11 mature trees necessary for its construction, the proposed garage does not meet the Guideline that states that new additions to a cultural landscape should respect historic visual relationships in the cultural landscape. The proposed garage with a flat roof and stucco cladding is compatible in shape and materials but the scale and massing of the building are completely out of the character with the HCD Study Area.

For these reasons, the Department does not support the proposed garage.

### Recommendation 4:

This report recommends approval of the application for a rear addition subject to conditions detailed above. If the applicant makes the recommended changes, this recommendation is included to allow the Planning and Growth Management Department to approve these changes.

## **RURAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no rural implications associated with this report.

### **CONSULTATION**

The Rothwell Heights Property Owner's Association is aware of the application.

Heritage Ottawa is aware of the application

Adjacent property owners were notified by letter of the application and offered the opportunity to make submissions.

### **COMMENTS BY THE WARD COUNCILLOR(S)**

Councillor Tierney is aware of the application.

### **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

This area has been designated as a heritage conservation district study area under By-law 2011-450. Council approval is required for alterations or demolitions during the one-year period that this study contemplates. There is no appeal of Council decisions regarding alterations or demolitions during this period.

### **RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

There are no risk management implications associated with this application.

### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no direct financial implications.

### **ACCESSIBILITY IMPACTS**

There are no accessibility implications associated with this report.

### **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no environment implications associated with this report.

### **TECHNOLOGY IMPLICATIONS**

There are no technology implications associated with this report.

### **TERM OF COUNCIL PRIORITIES**

C1: Contribute to the improvement of my quality of life.

HC4: Improve arts and heritage

**APPLICATION**


This application was completed within the 90-day time period prescribed by the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION**

- Document 1 Location Map
- Document 2 Current Conditions
- Document 3 Site Plan
- Document 4 Building Elevations
- Document 5 Garage Elevations
- Document 6 Landscape Plan

**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.



© Parcel data is owned by Teranet Enterprises Inc. and its suppliers  
All rights reserved. May not be produced without permission  
THIS IS NOT A PLAN OF SURVEY

  
Produced by Infrastructure Services  
and Community Sustainability  
Produit par le Services d'infrastructure  
et Viabilité des collectivités

D09-01-KIND 19	12-0757-L
HCO\2012\Heritage\k indle19	
MAY 29, 2012	
REVISION DATE	DE RÉVISION

**Location Map / Plan de révision  
Heritage / Patrimoine**

 **19 KINDLE COURT**

Échelle  
N.T.S.  
Mètres




Scale  
N.T.S.  
Metres

**CURRENT CONDITIONS**

DOCUMENT 2



Front (south) façade of Duncan House



Front façade of house



North and East facades




West Facade



Aerial view of site

**SITE PLAN**

**DOCUMENT 3**



INDEX	
SHEET #	TITLE
A1.1	SITE PLAN INDEX
A2.1	FOUNDATION PLAN DETAIL
A2.2	GROUND FLOOR PLAN
A2.3	FIRST FLOOR PLAN WALL SECTION
A3.1	PROPOSED SOUTH ELEVATION PROPOSED WEST ELEVATION EXISTING SOUTH ELEVATION EXISTING WEST ELEVATION
A3.2	PROPOSED NORTH ELEVATION PROPOSED EAST ELEVATION EXISTING NORTH ELEVATION EXISTING EAST ELEVATION
A3.3	PROPOSED GARAGE ELEVATIONS PROPOSED CROSS SECTION FOR DETACHED GARAGE PROPOSED ROOF PLAN FOR DETACHED GARAGE
A4.1	WALL SECTION

**GENERAL NOTES**  
1. ALL DIMENSIONS ARE FROM FACE OF FINISH WALL TO FACE OF FINISH WALL.

**ABBREVIATIONS**  
INSUL. INSULATION  
CONCR. CONCRETE

**KEY WALL**  
EXISTING BUILDING  
PROPOSED

**REVISIONS**

NO.	DATE	BY	CHK

**PROJECT**  
RENOVATION & ADDITION  
TO EXISTING COUNTY  
GEODESIC HOME.

**ISSUED FOR**  
SITE PLAN INDEX

**DESIGNED BY**  
PETERSON CONSULTANTS


**SCALE**  
AS SHOWN

**SHEET**  
A1.1

3 SITE PLAN AS.1 SCALE: 1"=60'0"

**BUILDING ELEVATIONS**

DOCUMENT 4





**GARAGE ELEVATIONS**

