



MINUTES UNIONVILLE SUBCOMMITTEE / VARLEY VILLAGE INFILL

September 27, 2011

York Room

Members

Councillor Don Hamilton

Councillor Alan Ho

Regrets

Regional Councillor Jim Jones

Staff

Jim Baird, Commissioner of Development Services

Biju Karumanchery, Senior Development Manager

David Miller, Senior Project Coordinator

Tom Villela, Senior Project Coordinator

Kitty Bavington, Council/Committee Coordinator

Guests

Graham Badun

Christine Bergauer-Jason

James Clarke

David Huntley

Jason McCauley

Jeff Morris

Barry Raine

Pam Scarrow

David Wakeham

Elaine Wilton

The Unionville Subcommittee meeting convened at 3:05 PM in the York Room with Councillor Don Hamilton in the Chair.

DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST – None Disclosed

1. Varley Village Infill

The meeting began with an introduction of the participants.

David Miller provided an overview of the Varley Village study area; the proposed infill zoning by-law provisions; and background on the process to date. It was explained that infill zoning by-law are additional controls on the re-development of residential properties in established neighbourhoods. They are intended to allow development while preserving and protecting the character of the neighbourhood.

The Committee discussed in depth the various provisions and appropriate restrictions. Tree preservation and removal of power lines were identified as other issues of interest. Staff explained the provisions of the tree-by-law with respect to redevelopment. The residents suggested that perhaps enforcement of current driveway and tree by-law regulations, and restriction of zoning by-law variances would provide more protection against inappropriate development than a new zoning by-law would. Staff advised that

architectural control and site plan control are somewhat effective tools, but zoning is the ultimate means of regulating development.

The Committee discussed the study process and public consultation to date, and suggested that the proposed by-law be kept simple to avoid confusion.

Six additional provisions are being proposed and were discussed at length:

1. Maximum Floor Area – 48% to 55 %
2. Maximum Building Depth – 55 ft. (16.8m)
3. Maximum Number of Storeys – 2
4. Maximum garage projection - without porch – 4.9 ft. (1.5m)
- with porch – 6.9 ft. (2.1m)
5. Maximum Garage Width - lot frontage less than 70 ft. (21.3m) – 25.3 ft. (7.7m)
- lot frontage more than 70 ft. (21.3m) – 32.8 ft. (10m)
6. No Reverse Slope Driveways

Comments and discussions:

- Garage width calculation needs to be reworked.
- Question: how many houses in the last five years would have been prevented under the proposed by-law; how many variances were used; and how would the new by-law prevent more variances?
- Question: is the Varley Village unique and should it be protected?
- Consider expanding the boundary of the study area, or delete portions such as Pomander Road.
- Perhaps just provisions for reverse slope and garage projections would be the most productive option.

A draft survey was presented, to be used in determining if there is support for the proposed by-law. The effectiveness of a survey was debated. The Committee indicated support for the survey but the wording will have to be determined.

Jeff Morris, representing the Unionville Ratepayers Association (URA) indicated the majority of their 300 members are in support of an infill by-law.

The Chair discussed the next steps of the Subcommittee, and advised that they will be conveyed to the members once they have been determined.

The Unionville Subcommittee adjourned at 5:30 PM.