

3. **APPLICATION TO ALTER 132 LISGAR ROAD, A PROPERTY LOCATED IN ROCKCLIFFE PARK HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT, DESIGNATED UNDER PART V OF THE *ONTARIO HERITAGE ACT***
- DEMANDE DE MODIFICATION DU 132, CHEMIN LISGAR, UNE PROPRIÉTÉ SITUÉE DANS LE DISTRICT DE CONSERVATION DU PATRIMOINE DE ROCKCLIFFE PARK ET DÉSIGNÉE EN VERTU DE LA PARTIE V DE LA *LOI SUR LE PATRIMOINE DE L'ONTARIO***

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

That Council:

1. **approve the application to alter the building at 132 Lisgar Road according to plans submitted by Bill Ritcey, architect, received on February 23, 2018;**
2. **approve the landscape plan for 132 Lisgar Road according to plans submitted by Bill Ritcey, architect, received on February 23, 2018;**
3. **delegate authority for minor design changes to the General Manager, Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development; and**
4. **issue the heritage permit with a two-year expiry date from the date of issuance.**

(Note: The statutory 90-day timeline for consideration of this application under the *Ontario Heritage Act* will expire on 24 May 2018.)

(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 COMITÉ

Que le Conseil :

1. approuve la demande de modification du bâtiment situé au 132, chemin Lisgar, conformément aux plans soumis par Bill Ritcey, architecte, et reçus le 23 février 2018;
2. approuve le plan d'aménagement paysager du 132, chemin Lisgar, conformément aux plans soumis par Bill Ritcey, architecte, et reçus le 23 février 2018;
3. délègue au directeur général de Planification, Infrastructure et Développement économique le pouvoir d'effectuer des modifications mineures de conception;
4. délivre un permis en matière de patrimoine d'une validité de deux ans à partir de la date de délivrance.

(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 24 mai 2018.)

(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

1. Manager's Report, Right of Way, Heritage and Urban Design Services, Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development Department dated April 5, 2018 (ACS2018-PIE-RHU-0008)

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 5 avril 2018(ACS2018-PIE-RHU-0008

2. Extract of Minutes, Built Heritage Sub-Committee, 12 April 2018
Extrait du procès-verbal, Sous-comité du patrimoine bâti, le 12 avril 2018
3. Extract of draft Minutes, Planning Committee, 24 April 2018
Extrait de l'ébauche du procès-verbal, Comité de l'urbanisme, le 24 avril 2018

**Report to
Rapport au:**

**Built Heritage Sub-Committee / Sous-comité du patrimoine bâti
April 12, 2018 / 12 avril 2018**

and / et

**Planning Committee / Comité de l'urbanisme
April 24, 2018 / 24 avril 2018**

**and Council / et au Conseil
May 9, 2018 / 9 mai 2018**

**Submitted on April 5, 2018
Soumis le 5 avril 2018**

**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:

**Ashley Kotarba, Heritage Planner / Planificatrice, Right of Way, Heritage and
Urban Design / Services des emprises, du patrimoine et du design urbain /
Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development | Urbanisme, infrastructure
et développement économique**

(613) 580-2424, 23582, Ashley.Kotarba@ottawa.ca

Ward: RIDEAU-ROCKCLIFFE (13) File Number: ACS2018-PIE-RHU-0008

SUBJECT: Application to Alter 132 Lisgar Road, a property located in Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District, designated under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*

OBJET: Demande de modification du 132, chemin Lisgar, une propriété située dans le district de conservation du patrimoine de Rockcliffe Park et désignée en vertu de la partie V de la *Loi sur le patrimoine de l'Ontario*

REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Built Heritage Sub-Committee recommend that Planning Committee recommend that Council:

1. Approve the application to alter the building at 132 Lisgar Road according to plans submitted by Bill Ritcey, architect, received on February 23, 2018;
2. Approve the landscape plan for 132 Lisgar Road according to plans submitted by Bill Ritcey, architect, received on February 23, 2018;
3. Delegate authority for minor design changes to the General Manager, Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development; and
4. Issue the heritage permit with a two-year expiry date from the date of issuance.

(Note: The statutory 90-day timeline for consideration of this application under the *Ontario Heritage Act* will expire on 24 May 2018.)

(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 Comité de l'urbanisme de recommander à son tour au Conseil :

1. **D'approuver la demande de modification du bâtiment situé au 132, chemin Lisgar, conformément aux plans soumis par Bill Ritcey, architecte, et reçus le 23 février 2018;**
2. **D'approuver le plan d'aménagement paysager du 132, chemin Lisgar, conformément aux plans soumis par Bill Ritcey, architecte, et reçus le 23 février 2018;**
3. **De déléguer au directeur général de Planification, Infrastructure et Développement économique le pouvoir d'effectuer des modifications mineures de conception;**
4. **De délivrer un permis en matière de patrimoine d'une validité de deux ans à partir de la date de délivrance.**

(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 24 mai 2018.)

(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 132 Lisgar Road (c.1940) is a two-storey building with rectangular plan, and a medium pitched, side-gable roof. The entire building is clad in horizontal siding and sits on a concrete foundation. The upper storey features four identical evenly spaced rectangular windows. The house is simple in design and has a centre hall plan, with the entrance centered between bay windows and flanked by sidelights and decorated with posts and a lintel. These classical motifs are found throughout the neighbourhood. The property features a large front lawn, with a number of perennial beds and shrubs. A straight driveway runs from the street to the garage at the side of the house and is met by a curved stair pathway leading to the front door (Documents 1 and 2).

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 objective of the Rockcliffe Park HCD Plan is to assist property owners, community associations, architects, designers and municipal staff to manage change in the HCD by retaining, conserving and enhancing the qualities that contribute to the cultural heritage values of the HCD. These include the unique park-like character of the neighbourhood, the Grade I buildings and their natural features, the use of natural materials, as well as the natural landscaping.

This report has been prepared because the alteration to a property in a HCD designated under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act* requires the approval of City Council.

DISCUSSION

The application is to alter the property at 132 Lisgar Road, which is located in the Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District (RPHCD). The original Rockcliffe Park Plan had guidelines regarding the management of change in the heritage conservation district.

In March 2016, City Council approved a new HCD 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 recently approved Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District Plan (RPHCDP), each property in the district was researched and evaluated and scored for its Environment, History and Architecture. After review and evaluations, the property was classified as a Grade I building (see Document 3).

The house at 132 Lisgar Road is a good example of a mid 20th century residence within the 1911 subdivision of the Thomas Keefer estate. The house is distinguished by its generous front yard, which at approximately 26 metres deep, is unusual within the context of the entire district. The proposal includes a second floor addition over an existing screened porch (north façade), as well as a two-storey addition to the south.

The north façade addition will be clad in a similar cementitious horizontal cladding to match the existing house, and will be topped with a side gable roof with cedar shingles. The addition will slightly overhang the lower floor, which echoes the second floor

cantilever of the existing building. The addition will feature a window that matches the windows on the second floor of the existing house in terms of size, muntin bars, and shutters.

The new addition to the south is a two-car, single door garage with living space above. Since the grade of the lot changes dramatically at this point, the second floor of this addition will be in line with the first floor of the existing house. The addition will have a flat roof, and be clad in the same cementitious horizontal cladding as the proposed north addition. The new windows will be in line with the windows on the first floor of the existing house. The addition will be set back considerably from the street and the front of the house, and will be topped by a simple cornice.

The side yard setback of the garage requires a variance from 3.5 metres as required by the zoning by-law to 1.5-metres (Documents 4-6). A key heritage attribute of the RPHCDP is the “generous spacing and setbacks of the buildings” and the plan’s guidelines speak in general to preserving landscaped setbacks. In this instance, Heritage staff can support the variance sought as it will not have an adverse impact on the totality of the landscaped character of the lot, which is defined by its large front yard setback on the streetscape.

Recommendation 1

The City of Ottawa approved the adoption of a new HCD plan for Rockcliffe Park in 2016, but this plan is currently under appeal. Until the resolution of the appeal, the City is using this document as policy in addition to the guidelines of the former Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District Study.

The Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation Study

The Study completed for the initial designation of the former Village of Rockcliffe Park as a heritage conservation district had policies regarding additions to buildings within the Heritage Conservation District.

iv) Buildings

2) Any alteration to alter an existing building, which is listed on the Inventory of Heritage Resources should be reviewed, with consideration of the impact of the proposed alteration on the heritage character of the building and its setting.

Alterations should be recommended for approval only where the change protects

and enhances the existing historical and architectural quality of the building and the site.

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 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 additions are set back from the front façade and will not impact the heritage attributes of the building. The siting, form and materials are sympathetic to the natural environment, as the large front yard with its perennial flower beds and sloping grades will be maintained in its entirety, and the hedge along the lot line will continue to provide a visual buffer for the neighbouring property.

Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District Plan

Guidelines for Existing Buildings and Landscapes, Conservation and Maintenance

As a Grade I building, 132 Lisgar Road is subject to Section 7.3.2, "Guidelines for Existing Buildings and Landscapes". This section addresses issues such as maintenance, chimneys, masonry, paint colour etc. The current project will preserve the existing house in terms of windows, chimney location, cladding and landscaping.

7.4.1 Alterations and Additions to Existing Buildings (Document 7)

Section 7.4.1 of the RPHCDP has general guidelines for additions to buildings in the HCD. These guidelines reflect accepted heritage practice and emphasize that additions should have a lower roof than the building to which they are attached, use natural materials and have garages located to the rear, unless setback considerably from the front façade.

The proposed interventions, described above, respect the guidelines of both the original 1997 study and the Council-approved document. Each addition is lower than the original building and use a horizontal cladding that imitates the original in terms of size and

colour. The new window openings will maintain the same size, position and scale as the existing windows, and the heritage attributes of the house will not be obstructed. The garage will be attached to the south façade of the house, however, it will be set back from the front façade and the front property line, respecting the guidelines regarding garages. The generous front yard, its landscaping, and the grade change together create a noteworthy property. Although a variance is required for the side yard setback, its impact is mitigated by the siting and design of the proposal, which maintains the distinctive front yard in its entirety, and a large portion of the property's soft landscaping to the rear, including the space between the garage and its neighbour at 128 Lisgar Road.

There are also guidelines that speak to additions on Grade I building. Additions shall:

- Be subordinate to and distinguishable from, and compatible to in terms of massing, façade proportion and rooflines;
- Maintain the integrity of the roofline of the original house;
- Be compatible to the character of the streetscape;
- Have windows that complement the original windows;
- Not result in the obstruction of the building;
- Have sympathetic cladding materials.

The proposal will be subordinate to, distinguishable from and compatible to the existing house in that the roof will be lower, set back from the front façade, use a similar material and will not obstruct the heritage attributes. The setback of the south addition will maintain the character of the streetscape with large front lots. New windows will reflect the character of the existing.

Heritage staff have no objections to the proposed additions to the building located at 132 Lisgar Road. The additions are lower than the existing building, the south addition is set well back from the front façade in order to allow the existing building to retain its primacy on the lot, clad in materials that reflect the character of the original house and are typical of the area. Although similar in expression, the additions are distinguishable from the original house as they are stepped back from the façades and lower than the roof, providing a visual break between old and new.

Recommendation 2

The proposed landscape plan (see Document 4) includes the retention of the existing expansive front lawn. The Tree Disclosure Report submitted with the application states that there are no mature trees to be removed from the property; however, two are identified on the neighbouring property that are to be preserved and protected during construction.

There are guidelines associated with conserving the heritage landscape in the 1997 Village of Rockcliffe Park Plan:

1. The dominance of soft landscape over hard landscape should be recognized as an essential feature of the past history and present character of the Village.
2. New buildings, fences and other landscape features or alterations and additions to existing buildings and features should be designed and sited so as to protect and enhance significant qualities of the existing landscape.

Section 7.4.3 of the RPHCDP also has guidelines regarding the landscape (Document 7). They specify that additions shall respect the heritage attributes of the lot's existing hard and soft landscaping, that new additions be sited in a location that respects the established landscaped character of the streetscape, that the existing landscaped character of the lot be preserved, and that the continuity and dominance of soft landscaping will continue. There are also guidelines concerning the siting of new buildings, the relocation of driveways and the removal of mature trees.

The setback on the southern side of the property will be reduced and will provide a landscaped buffer that is less than typically desired by the guidelines. Staff have determined that this impact is mitigated by the character-defining large front lawn which will remain in its entirety, as well as the hedges, flower beds and pathways, landscaping features that establish the character of the lot. While the additions will increase lot coverage, the lot coverage will remain low, the prevalence of soft landscaping will remain, and the established character of the streetscape will be respected. The existing grades of the property are to be maintained, and no mature trees will be removed.

Recommendation 3

The *Ontario Heritage Act* does not provide any timelines for the expiry of heritage permits. In this instance, a two-year expiry date, unless otherwise extended by Council, is recommended to ensure that the project is completed in a timely fashion.

Recommendation 4

Minor changes to a building sometimes emerge during the working drawing phase. This recommendation is included to allow the General Manager of Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development to approve these changes.

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. Heritage staff also considers this document in assessing any heritage application. The applicable Standards for the application are:

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

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 new additions are physically compatible with, distinguishable from and sympathetic to the character of the historic building. The large landscaped front lawn will be retained. Overall, the project meets the Guidelines in the Rockcliffe Park HCD Plan and the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada.

Section 4.3.1 has guidelines that are applicable to preservation, rehabilitation and restoration. Guidelines 1 and 13 to 15 recommend the following:

- Understand the exterior form and how it contributes to the heritage value of the historic building.
- Select the location for the addition that ensures that the heritage value of the place is maintained.
- Design a new addition in a manner that draws a clear distinction between what is historic and what is new.

- Design an addition that is compatible in terms of materials and massing with the exterior form of the historic building and its setting.

The new additions are physically compatible with, distinguishable from and sympathetic to the character of the historic building. They are lower than the existing house and are in a location that will not impact the heritage character of the historic place.

The alterations to the historic building are appropriate and conserve the heritage value of the building and the HCD. Overall, the project meets the Guidelines in the Rockcliffe Park HCD Plan and the Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada.

Conclusion

Staff in Right of Way, Heritage and Urban Design (ROWHUD) have no objection to the proposed alterations to the property located at 132 Lisgar Road. The addition is consistent with Guidelines in the Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District. The new addition will fit into the existing streetscape in terms of height and massing.

RURAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no rural implications associated with this report.

CONSULTATION

Heritage Ottawa was notified of the application.

The Rockcliffe Park Residents Association is aware of the application and has provided comments (Document 8).

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

COMMENTS BY THE WARD COUNCILLOR

The Ward Councillor is aware of the application.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no legal implications associated with implementing the recommendations contained within this report.

RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

There are no risk management implications association with the recommendations in this report.

ASSET MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

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

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no direct financial implications.

ACCESSIBILITY IMPACTS

There are no accessibility implications 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 Priorities:

HC4 – Support Arts, Heritage and Culture

GP - 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 photograph

Document 3 Heritage Survey Form

Document 4 Site Plan and Landscape Plan

Document 5 Proposed Elevations

Document 6 Renderings

Document 7 Rockcliffe Park HCD Plan Guidelines




Document 8 Rockcliffe Park Residents Association Comments

DISPOSITION

City Clerk and Solicitor Department, Legislative 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



		LOCATION MAP / PLAN DE LOCALISATION HERITAGE / PATRIMOINE  132 chemin Lisgar Road
D09-01-LISG	18-0246-A	
I:\COI\2017\Heritage\Lisgar\132		
©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		
©Les données de parcelles appartient à Teranet Enterprises Inc. et à ses fournisseurs. Tous droits réservés. Ne peut être reproduit sans autorisation. CECI N'EST PAS UN PLAN D'ARPENTAGE		
REVISION / RÉVISION - 2018/02/03		 <small>NOT TO SCALE</small>

Document 2 – Current Photograph



Document 3 – Heritage Survey Form



HERITAGE SURVEY AND EVALUATION FORM							
Municipal Address	132 Lisgar Road	Building or Property Name		042230004			
Legal Description	PLAN M33 LOT 138 LOT 139 PT	Lot	138	Block		Plan	M33
Date of Original Lot Development		Date of current structure		1940			
Additions	1982: rear addition 1983: Greenhouse	Original owner		Mr Peter Aylen and Muriel Aylen			



Main Building

Garden / Landscape / Environment	Prepared by: Brittney Bos / Heather Perrault
	Month/Year: July 2010
Heritage Conservation District name	Rockcliffe Park

Character of Existing Streetscape

This section of Rockcliffe was primarily developed following the First World War. The land was acquired from the expansive Thomas Keefer estate (subsequently owned by Clarke) and divided into evenly sized lots. Due to this planned development and modest lot sizes, this section of Rockcliffe is one of the most uniform and compact. These elements combined with the grid-like street configuration give this section of the neighbourhood a “village within a village” character. For the most part, the buildings in this section date from either the interwar period or the 1950s and thus relate to one another in terms of their design, planning and setback. The landscape elements within this area use the limited lot sizes to create a variety of small scaled

landscapes. The result is a multitude of related elements combining to enhance the uniform qualities of this discernable section of Rockcliffe.

Lisgar Road runs from Maple to the Ottawa River, thereby forming the western boundary of Rockcliffe Park. The street curves slightly in various directions on this southern end, creating a variety of ever-changing streetscape views. There are no sidewalks or curbs on either side of the street; however, there is a small gravel shoulder on both sides that informally separates pedestrians and car traffic. The western side of Lisgar (outside of Rockcliffe's boundary) consists of the expansive grounds of Rideau Hall on the south and a forested area with walking paths on the north. The buildings along this stretch were constructed during a variety of time periods and consist of multiple landscape elements. The variety of both architecture and landscape characterizes this section of Lisgar.

Character of Existing Property

This property is typical of the landscape of Lisgar Road. The property is slightly inclined and therefore the house sits higher than street level. The front yard consists primarily of lawn dotted with a number of curved perennial and shrub gardens interspersed with rocks. There are a variety of additional plantings contained a garden bed against the house. A straight driveway runs from the street to the garage at the side of the house and it is met by a curved stair pathway leading to the front door. Deciduous trees and bushes define both side property lines, and a metal fence further marks the north line.

Contribution of Property to Heritage Environs

Landscape / Open Space

This property is consistent with the overall landscape elements of Lisgar Road. Defined by its diversity and ever-changing streetscape views, Lisgar Road features a variety of landscape elements unified by their informal configurations and similar character. This property contributes to the characterization of these qualities, especially through its front garden and larger setback.

Architecture / Built Space

The properties along Lisgar Road date from a variety of time periods and architectural styles. Consistent with this diversity, this building dates from mid 20th century period of

development but is nonetheless related to its neighbours by its property defining elements, forming a coherent streetscape of ever-changing views.	
Landmark Status	
This property is situated at the intersection of Lisgar Road and Princess, and across the street is the northeast corner of Rideau Hall.	
Summary / Comments on Environmental Significance	
The landscape features of this property are typical and are consistent with those of its neighbours along Lisgar Road. Characterized by its diversity of configurations, ever-changing streetscapes and variety of architectural styles, this property and others along the street form a diverse yet coherent streetscape.	
History	Prepared by: Brittney Bos / Heather Perrault
	Month/Year: July 2010
Date of Current Building(s)	1940
Trends	
<p>In the early to mid 20th century, there was an influx of families to Rockcliffe Park as a result of higher-density development and crowding in downtown Ottawa. With its scenic location and relative isolation from the city, the Village of Rockcliffe Park became a fashionable neighbourhood, perceived to be a more healthy and peaceful residential environment.</p> <p>In 1911, the Keefer Estate was divided into a subdivision called Connaught Commons after the Duke of Connaught. The area was bounded by Lisgar Road, Mariposa Avenue, Springfield Road, and Maple Lane. The prized apple orchard and extensive greenery of the estate was presented as a selling feature to potential buyer. Most purchased more than one 50-foot lot; this was done, at least in part, to accommodate a septic tank. As sewers were installed, the extra lots were sold off as it became possible to build on them.</p>	


Events	
The Ayles' house was featured in Canadian Homes and Gardens in the January-February Issue for 1941. (Vol 18, Nos. 1-2)	
Persons / Institutions	
1940-1945 : Mr Peter Ayles and Muriel Ayles : Peter Ayles was the program liaison officer for the CBC	
Summary / Comments on Historical Significance	
The historical significance of this property is due to its age, constructed in 1940, its role in the residential development of the Keefer Estate and Lisgar Road, its associations with Hazelgrove and Mills Architects as well as Mr. Peter Ayles.	
Historical Sources	
<p>City of Ottawa File</p> <p>Rockcliffe LACAC file</p> <p>Edmond, Martha. <i>Rockcliffe Park: A History of the Village</i>. Ottawa : The Friends of the Village of Rockcliffe Park Foundation, 2005.</p> <p><i>Village of Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District Study</i>, 1997.</p> <p><i>Village of Rockcliffe Park LACAC Survey of Houses</i>, 1988</p> <p>Carver, Humphrey. <i>The Cultural Landscape of Rockcliffe Park Village</i>. Village of Rockcliffe Park, 1985.</p> <p>Might's Directory of the City of Ottawa</p> <p><i>Canadian Homes and Gardens</i> (Vol 18, Nos. 1-2) p. 16-17</p>	
Architecture	Prepared by: Brittney Bos / Heather Perrault
	Month/Year: July, 2010
Architectural Design (plan, storeys, roof, windows, style, material, details, etc.)	
This two storey building is rectangular in plan with a rear extension and is capped with	

<p>a medium pitched side gabled roof. The entire exterior is clad in siding and raised on a cement foundation. The upper storey features four identical evenly spaced rectangular windows, each with shutters. The lower storey is organized into three symmetrical bays. The outer bays feature a three sided bay window with large rectangular windows covered by the small overhang of the upper storey. Centered between these windows is the entranceway, flanked by sidelights and decorated with posts and a lintel. On the north faced, there is a two storey stucco chimney. Against this chimney is a one storey extension with a flat roof serving as a balcony for the upper storey.</p>
Architectural Style
Designer / Builder / Architect / Landscape Architect
<p>Hazelgrove & Mills 1936-1940: (MILLS, Andrew Kaye (1901-1973 graduated from the School of Architecture at McGill University in 1926 and trained under J. Albert Ewart, a leading architect in Ottawa, from 1926 to 1928, he worked for P. Roy Wilson in Montreal, and returned to Ottawa to serve as assistant to Cecil Burgess in 1929. Mills worked under his own name (1932-35), and in late 1935 was invited to form a partnership by A.J. Hazelgrove. After the dissolution of their firm in 1940 Mills continued to work under his own name until his retirement in 1968. A.J HAZELGROVE began working for C.P. Meredith in 1909, and went on to form a series of partnerships until the 1960s. Some of his partners include Burrit, Burgess, Lithwick, Mills and Lambert. Hazelgrove practiced on his own between 1928-1935, and 1943-1945. Hazelgrove served as the president of the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada between 1948-1950.</p> <p>Greenhouse: Talback Construction Ltd.</p>
Architectural Integrity
<p>The only major addition is at the rear.</p>
Outbuildings
Other


Summary / Comments on Architectural Significance					
<p>This is a good example of a mid 20th century residence within the 1911 subdivision of the Thomas Keefer estate. Its architectural features, style, and character (specifically its rectangular plan, symmetrical massing, rectangular windows, and classical motifs including the entranceway) relates this building to others in this subdivision and throughout Rockcliffe that were also classically inspired. These classic motifs are found throughout the neighbourhood and relate buildings of various scales and time periods to one another.</p>					
PHASE TWO EVALUATION					
ENVIRONMENT CATEGORY	E	G	F	P	SCORE
1. Character of Existing Streetscape	X				30/30
2. Character of Existing Property	X				30/30
3. Contribution to Heritage Environs	X				30/30
4. Landmark Status		X			7/10
Environment total					97/100
HISTORY	E	G	F	P	SCORE
1. Construction Date		X			23/35
2. Trends			X		11/35
3. Events/ Persons/Institutions				X	0/30
History total					34/100

ARCHITECTURE CATEGORY	E	G	F	P	SCORE
1. Design		X			27/40
2. Style		X			17/25
3. Designer/Builder		X			17/25
4. Architectural Integrity	X				10/10
Architecture total					71/100
RANGES	EXCELLENT	GOOD	GOOD	FAIR	POOR
	Pre-1908	1908 to 1925	1926 to 1948	1949 to 1972	After 1972
Category	Phase Two Score, Heritage District				
Environment	97 x 45% = 43.65				
History	34 x 20% = 6.8				
Architecture	71 x 35% = 24.85				
Phase Two Total Score	75.3/100				
PHASE TWO EVALUATION SUMMARY					
Phase Two Score	Above	to	to	Below	
Group					

Document 4 – Site Plan and Landscape Plan



ZONING : R3C
SITE AREA : 1380.20 sqm
LOT COVERAGE : 13.76% (33% MAX. COVERAGE)
PROPOSED USE : RESIDENTIAL- 2 STOREY
 PARKING GARAGE FOR 2 CARS



SET BACKS	REQUIRED
FRONT YARD	4.5 m
SIDE YARDS	3.5 m
SIDE YARDS	3.5 m
REAR YARD	11.0 m

FOOTPRINT	EXIST.	PROPOSED	TOTAL PROPOSED
	145.06 sqm	44.87 sqm	189.93 sqm

EXISTING GFA:
 EXISTING GRD. FLR.- 1575 sq.ft.
 EXISTING 2ND. FLR.- 1276 sq.ft.
 EXISTING OUT BLDG.(2)- 184.0 sq.ft.
 EXISTING GAZEBO- 5552 sq.ft.

EXISTING GFA TOTAL: 3090.52 sq.ft.



PROPOSED GFA:
 EXISTING GRD. FLR.- 1575 sq.ft.
 EXISTING 2ND. FLR.- 1276 sq.ft.
 PROPOSED GARAGE ADDITION- 483 sq.ft.
 PROPOSED GRD. FLR. ADDITION- 511 sq.ft.
 PROPOSED 2ND. FLR. ADDITION- 256 sq.ft.
 EXISTING OUT BLDG. (2)- 184.0 sq.ft.
 EXISTING GAZEBO- 5552 sq.ft.


PROPOSED GFA TOTAL: 4340.52 sq.ft. 403.23 sqm

PSI:	REQUIRED	PROPOSED
	0.4 (max)	0.29
	REQUIRED	PROVIDED

2 STOREY RESIDENCE: 11 m (max) PROPOSED LESS THAN EXIST.
BUILDING HT.

Document 5 – Proposed Elevations





Document 6 – Renderings





Document 7 – Rockcliffe Park Heritage Conservation District Plan Guidelines

7.4.1 ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO EXISTING BUILDINGS

General Guidelines

1. Property owners are encouraged to retain an architect, designer and/or heritage professional when designing an addition to an existing building.
2. Additions to existing buildings should be of their own time and are not required to replicate an historic architectural style. If a property owner wishes to recreate an historic style, care should be taken to ensure that the proposed addition is an accurate interpretation.
3. The height of any addition to an existing building should normally not exceed the height of the existing roof. If an application is made to alter the roof, the new roof profile should be compatible with that of its neighbours.
4. 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 permitted.
5. Brick and stone cladding will extend to all facades.
6. 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.
7. 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 on the character of the surrounding cultural heritage landscape.
8. New garages shall not normally be attached to the front or side facades of existing buildings, but may be attached to the rear of the building. Exceptions may be made for attached garages set back significantly from the front facade

in order to reduce their impact on the cultural heritage value of the associated streetscape.

9. The use of modern materials such as plastic or fiberglass to replicate architectural details such as columns, balusters or bargeboard is not acceptable and will not be permitted.

Guidelines for Grade I Buildings

1. All additions to Grade I buildings shall be complementary to the existing building, subordinate to and distinguishable from the original and compatible in terms of massing, facade proportion, and rooflines.
2. In planning alterations and additions to Grade I buildings, the integrity of the rooflines of the original house (gable, hip, gambrel, flat etc.) shall be respected.
3. Alterations and additions to Grade I buildings shall be designed to be compatible with the historic character of buildings in the associated streetscape, in terms of scale, massing, height, setback, entry level, and materials.
4. Windows in new additions should complement the building's original windows. Windows may be wood, metal clad wood, steel or other materials as appropriate. Multi-paned windows should have appropriate muntin bars.
5. New additions shall not result in the obstruction or removal of heritage attributes of the building or the HCD.
6. Cladding materials for additions to Grade I buildings will be sympathetic to the existing building. For instance, an addition to a brick building could be clad in wood board and batten siding. Natural materials are preferred

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.

2. New buildings and additions will be sited on a property to respect the established landscaped character of the streetscape.
3. The existing landscaped character of a lot will be preserved, when new buildings and additions are constructed.
4. The front lawns and side yards of new buildings shall protect the continuity and dominance of the soft landscape within the HCD.
5. If a driveway must be moved, the new driveway will be established in conformity with these Guidelines, the *Zoning By-law*, and the *Private Approach By-Law*.
6. To ensure landscape continuity, new buildings shall be sited on generally the same footprint and oriented in the same direction as the buildings they replace to ensure that the existing character of the lot, its associated landscape and the streetscape are preserved.
7. Setbacks, topography and existing grades, trees, pathways and special features, such as stone walls and front walks shall be preserved.
8. All applications for new construction shall be accompanied by a detailed landscape plan. The plan must clearly indicated 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.
9. The removal of mature trees is strongly discouraged and all applications will be subject to the appropriate bylaw 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.
10. Existing grades shall be maintained.
11. Artificial turf shall not be permitted in front and side yards.

Document 8 - Rockcliffe Park Residents Association Comments

132 Lisgar Road, Rockcliffe Park

Advice of the Heritage Committee of the Rockcliffe Park Residents Association

BHSC – April 12, 2018

Planning Committee – April 24, 2018

City Council – May 9, 2018

Key issue:

With the addition of a two-car garage, the house will be set back from the sideyard property line by only 4.9 feet (1.5 meters).

1. This fails to meet the requirement of the Rockcliffe Park Heritage Plan for “generous spacing between buildings”.
2. It fails to meet the Rockcliffe Park Secondary Plan’s explicit call for the protection of the spatial relationships between buildings.
3. It fails to accord with the zoning by-law: it is a fraction of the 11.5 feet (3.5 metres) side-yard set back that is required.
4. It fails to accord with the decision of the Committee of Adjustment in the case of 320 Hillcrest Avenue. The CoA rejected the application because it would have placed a garage similarly close to the property line. It stated that this does not accord with the requirement for generous spacing between buildings in Rockcliffe Park. Decision of March 24, 2017 – Case D08-02-16/A-00407.

(City staff had supported the 320 Hillcrest application. It subsequently undermined the CoA decision when, using delegated authority, it approved a garage that was even closer to the property line than the one rejected by the CoA. We have protested this.)

Exceptional circumstance/recommendation:

The side-yard set-back is not in accord with the Rockcliffe Park Heritage Plan and other requirements. However, the house at 132 Lisgar is set back from the road by some 80 feet. This is truly exceptional. The front-yard set-back provides a long vista to the house, mitigating the impact of the proposed much-reduced sideyard.

For this reason, we recommend that City Council clearly state that this application does not meet the provisions of the Rockcliffe Park Heritage Plan, the Rockcliffe Park Secondary Plan, and of the Committee of Adjustment decision, but nonetheless approve this application given this exceptional circumstance.

We also note that the neighbour affected by this much-reduced sideyard does not object to it.

Work with City's heritage staff:

We have had detailed exchanges with the City's heritage staff on this application. We had hoped to come to an agreement on the rationale for recommending approval of the reduced side-yard setback, based on a shared understanding of the Rockcliffe Park Heritage Plan and other requirements. We do not seem to have achieved this.

While we have not seen the staff report at the time of writing, we reject any claim that staff may make that the much-reduced side-yard setback is in accord with the Rockcliffe Park Heritage Plan and other requirements.

Staff has suggested, among other things, that the fact that there may be one or two other houses with reduced sideyard set-backs in part of the very irregular block in which 132 Lisgar is located is somehow grounds for having another. This argument is unacceptable.

These other houses themselves do not meet the provisions of the Heritage Plan and other requirements. They pre-date the Heritage Plan, likely the Secondary Plan, and certainly the Committee of Adjustment decision. Their existence cannot justify disregarding the "generous spacing" required today.

There are doubtless a number of other cases in Rockcliffe Park where there is unusually close spacing between buildings. They cannot justify more of the same if the heritage character of Rockcliffe Park is to be protected.

Similarly, there are instances of oversize houses and undersize lots in various streetscapes in Rockcliffe Park. If they were used to justify more oversize houses and undersize lots, the heritage character of Rockcliffe Park likewise could not be protected.

In short, we reject an approach that identifies examples of existing situations that do not accord with the Heritage Plan and other requirements and argues that this paves the

way to more.

We note that this approach was advocated by the city planner with respect to 320 Hillcrest – the planner pointed to two or three properties with reduced setbacks and argued that this justified more. This reasoning was rejected by the CoA. In refusing the application, the CoA confirmed that the requirement for generous spacing between buildings in Rockcliffe Park is important to its heritage character and must be respected.