



July 22, 2021

61 Roxborough Drive Zoning Analysis

Using the zoning review done by the City of Toronto, our committee has reviewed each variance with an explanation or numeric calculation below.

City-wide Zoning By-law

4. (C) A platform located at or Below the First Storey of a Residential Building other than an Apartment Building, at a rear main wall, may be higher than 1.2 metres above the ground at any point below the platform, if any part of the platform floor located 2.5 metres or less from the rear main wall. Proposed rear platform is 3.5 M from the Rear Main Wall of the First Floor. [10.5.40.50 (4) Platforms at or Below the First Storey of a Residential Building other than an Apartment Building]

This speaks to the fact that the deck over the walkout basement is deeper than 2.5m from the rear wall. The existing grade from front to rear of the property makes a natural walkout so that all decks at the rear will be above 1.2m from grade.

5. A) The permitted maximum height of a building or structure is 10.0 metres. The proposed height of the (building/structure) is 11.35 metres. [10.20.40.10.(1) Maximum Height]

The mansard roof proposed creates a taller building than would otherwise appear lower with a 9/12 pitched hipped roof. This allows vertical walls on the third floor without losing any living space as no knee walls are required. NRRA would prefer an overall lower sloped roof in keeping with the majority of North Rosedale homes and scale including the one this is replacing and the neighbour at 59 Roxborough Dr. We do recognize that Roxborough Drive is unusual in that it is along a steeper slope and is home to much more architectural variety. No 67 has a flat roof and all brick façade but uses large side yard setbacks to minimize its volumetric impact on the street. With only 1.5m side yard setbacks this building will be as tall as and wider than 67 Roxborough Dr.

6. B)(ii) The permitted maximum height of all side exterior main walls facing a side lot line is 7.5 metres. The proposed height of the side exterior main walls facing a side lot line is 10.0 metres. [10.20.40.10.(2) Maximum Height of Specified Pairs of Main Walls] NOTE: Roof Slope more than 60 degree is considered as main wall.

If the proposal had a roof with a roof pitch 35-39 degrees or 9/12 – 10/12 the proposed parapet height would be in keeping with the heritage and zoning bylaws

7. A) The permitted maximum number of platforms at or above the second storey located on the (front/rear) wall of a detached house is 1. The proposed number of platforms located on the rear wall is 2. B) The permitted maximum area of each platform at or above the second storey of a detached house is 4.0 square metres. The proposed area of 2nd floor platform at the rear is 6.5 square metres and the proposed area 3rd floor platform at the rear is 17.7 square metres 10.40.40.50.(1) Platforms at or Above the Second Storey of a Detached House]

The platforms on the second and third floor are shown cantilevered without any visible columns. We would ask that the variance be tied to the provided drawings so that less structure is within the ravine area. Privacy screens should be provided between neighbouring buildings. The fact that the backyard is neighbouring a ravine reduces privacy issues



8. The required minimum front yard setback is 4.51 metres. The proposed front yard setback is 3.11 metres for the house above ground, and 0.10 M for the front wall of below ground integral parking. [10.20.40.70.(1) Minimum Front Yard Setback]

Relative to the existing home the setback of the proposed home is quite different. The original building set back the garage for the full height of the building to minimize the volumetric impact of the building. The proposed home only sets back the garage on the ground floor while the second and third floor are continuous across the new front yard setback. From NORTH ROSEDALE HERITAGE CONSERVATION DISTRICT PLAN, 7.3 Guidelines For New Buildings, Alterations And Additions To Unrated buildings, it states in 4. Integral garages and below grade entrances are strongly discouraged. We would request that the front façade over the garage be setback similar to the original building to reduce the impact of the volume of the building along the streetscape. We also advise that the entire new 3 storey, 12.2m wide and 10m high front façade of the house front yard setback be increased to at minimum of 4m. This may partially compensate for the additional width and height of the proposed building.

9. If the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority determines that a shoreline hazard limit or a stable top-of-bank crosses a lot, a building or structure on that lot must be set back a minimum of 10 metres from that shoreline hazard limit or stable top-of-bank. The proposed building is set back 4.0 metres from that shoreline hazard limit or stable top-of-bank. 5.10.40.70.(6) Setback from the Shoreline Hazard Limit or Stable Top-of-Bank]

10. On lands under the jurisdiction of the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority, a building or structure on a lot must be no closer than 10 metres from a shoreline hazard limit or a stable top-of-bank not on that lot. The proposed building or structure is 4.0 metres from a shoreline hazard limit or a stable top-of-bank not on that lot. [5.10.40.80.(1) Separation Distance from the Shoreline Hazard Limit or Stable Top-of-Bank]

With the proposed house having both a basement level and a sub-basement level much of the soil of the ravine behind the house will have to be excavated and removed from the site during construction. We are opposed to this variance as the ravine is currently under stress. If the variance is granted we would like it tied to an ecosystem restoration plan by a landscape architect and as approved by the TRCA.

11. If the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority determines that a shoreline hazard limit or a stable top-of-bank crosses a lot, the portion of the lot below that shoreline hazard limit or stable top-of-bank is not included in the calculation of the floor space index for that lot. The proposed floor space index is 1.4207 times the area of the Stable Top of Bank of the Lot: 448.11 square metres. (The stable top of bank of the Lot is 315.4 m2). 5.10.40.40.(1) Floor Area Calculation Restriction Below a Shoreline Hazard Limit or Stable Top-of-Bank]

NOTE: If the lot was outside of TRCA boundaries, as per the Zoning Label "RD (f15.0; d0.35)" FSI for the whole lot area (968.10 M2) would be as noted here;

The permitted maximum floor space index is 0.35 times the area of the lot: 338.83 square metres. The proposed floor space index is 0.4628 times the area of the lot: 448.11 square metres. [10.20.40.40.(1) Floor Space Index] LOT AREA: 968.10 M2 including the area beyond the Shoreline Hazard Limit as per TRCA.

As per 9 and 10 we request that if the variance is granted it is strictly tied to an ecosystem restoration plan by a landscape architect and as approved by the TRCA.



12. The permitted maximum height of a building is 10.0 metres. The proposed height of the detached house is 11.67 metres.. [4(2) Height Limits] NOTE: By-Law 438-86, proposed height is as measured from the average elevation of the ground on the lowest side to the midpoint of the sloped roof.

Refer to answers above for 5 and 6 with regard to height.

The Rosedale ravine is in decline such that work along this corridor should be under greater scrutiny. The wholesale replacement of homes within the North Rosedale area is discouraged as it is a heritage neighbourhood of some distinction. When unrated homes are replaced, it should be with ones that have a positive impact on both heritage and quality of construction. A reduction in the volumetric impact of the proposed building with regard to overall height would reduce the impact of the full 3 storeys proposed with only 1.5m side yard setbacks.

As a committee we were provided with information from Fairmont Properties about 61 Roxborough Drive including a streetscape elevation. Roxborough Dr. is on a large slope toward the west and this is not reflected in the drawing. There are also some inconsistencies in the heights of the proposed elevations. The elevation of 65 Roxborough Drive does not match our records from an earlier COFA hearing. Owners from 2 of the other homes also noted that their homes were not accurately portrayed in terms of height. We suggest that more precise information be provided as this drawing does not accurately represent the streetscape.

Sincerely,

Terrell Wong
OAA
Chair of the Development Committee for
North Rosedale Residents' Association.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be "Terrell Wong", is written over the printed name and title.