



**MINUTES**  
**UNIONVILLE SUB-COMMITTEE**  
**October 4, 2011**  
**Ontario Room**

**Meeting # 2, Hughson Drive Working Group**

---

**Members/Council**

Regional Councillor Jim Jones  
Councillor Don Hamilton  
Councillor Alan Ho

**Members/Constituent Representatives**

Michael Baranowsky (20 Hughson Drive)  
Sam Jouri (43 Hughson Drive)  
Al Ladha (10 Hughson Drive)  
Ulisse Torelli (27 Hughson Drive)

**Staff**

Anna Henriques, Senior Planner – Zoning & Special Projects  
Richard Kendall, Development Manager – Central District  
Tom Villella, Senior Project Coordinator – Zoning & Special Projects  
Marina Antonoglou, Assistant to Councillors Ho and Hamilton  
Kitty Bavington, Council/Committee Coordinator

---

The Unionville Sub-Committee convened at 3:05 p.m. with Councillor Alan Ho in the Chair. There were no disclosures of interest.

Mr. Baranowsky challenged Councillor Ho as Chair. The Committee and Mr. Baranowski resolved in-camera to discuss personal matters.

**IN-CAMERA MATTER**

Moved by: Councillor Don Hamilton  
Seconded by: Regional Councillor Jim Jones

That, in accordance with Section 239 (2) (b) of the *Municipal Act*, The Unionville Subcommittee resolve into an in-camera session to discuss the following confidential matter:

- 1) Personal matters about an identifiable individual.

**CARRIED**

Moved by: Councillor Don Hamilton  
Seconded by: Regional Councillor Jim Jones

That the Committee rise from the in-camera session.  
**CARRIED**

When the Committee reconvened, it was agreed that in the interest of moving the meeting forward, and WITHOUT PREJUDICE, Regional Councillor Jim Jones would assume the Chair.

## **1. Introduction and Minutes**

Introductions of those in attendance were made.

Moved by: Councillor Don Hamilton

Seconded by: Councillor Alan Ho

That the Minutes of the Unionville Subcommittee meeting dated September 20, 2011, be adopted.

CARRIED

The agenda was approved without amendments.

## **2. Summary of Previous Meeting**

Staff summarized discussions from the previous meeting with respect to key issues of neighbourhood character, vision, and zoning standards. The vision of the neighbourhood for the next 10-20 years included single-family dwellings, privacy, mature trees and vegetation. Other locational items such as close proximity to city amenities, transit, highways, and shopping were noted, however, cannot be regulated with a zoning by-law

With respect to zoning standards, consensus was reached on:

- Front yard setback of 9m (30 ft.)
- Rear yards setback of 10m (32.8 ft.)

## **3. Consideration of Zoning Standards** (continuation from previous meeting)

Community meetings have been held and the residents have been both in favour and in opposition to the proposed zoning by-law. It was noted that there may have been confusion in the presentation of the proposal, as some people appear to have changed their minds throughout the process. The importance of ensuring the residents are aware of the facts was emphasised and it was suggested that a door-to-door survey be done, or a letter from the Town be sent.

Lengthy discussions included:

- the investment of home owners on current large properties to maintain the unique nature of the existing lots
- the inability to reach a consensus with all the property owners regarding lot severance
- respecting individual property owners' rights and values
- whether the minimum setbacks and lot frontages are desirable in this unique neighbourhood or are they more appropriate in a subdivision setting
- a neighbourhood with a variety of lots sizes and frontages was discussed
- architectural and facade control, and tree preservation measures were supported
- the intention is not to put unnecessary hardship on the owner

### **INTERIOR SIDE YARD**

With the current side yard standards of 3m and the agreed rear and front yard setbacks, a building footprint of 768.5m<sup>2</sup> (8,272 ft<sup>2</sup>) with a building depth of 29m and a width of 26.5m on a 32.5m (107ft) typical lot frontage would be permitted. The footprint would be half that size for a severed lot that is half the typical lot size.

Example photos were displayed of houses within the neighbourhood with various side yard setbacks on wider lots, as well as houses on 50 and 60 ft. lots.

Typical Town side yard standards are:

- 1.2m/4 ft. (one storey) & 1.8m/6 ft. (two storeys)
- 3m/10 ft. (one & two storey)

Side yards as a percentage of lot frontage, ranging from 13 to 24% is the typical town standard. In this neighbourhood, the current standard is 3.m/10 ft. (1 and 2 storey) = 20 % (80% buildable). Comparable setbacks in Cachet and other neighbourhoods were questioned.

The Committee decided on an **interior side yard setback of 3m** (for an unsevered lot) but agreed this provision may be revisited later.

### **EXTERIOR SIDE YARD**

This neighbourhood averages a 19 ft. municipal boulevard. It was noted that if sidewalks are ever installed, it would impact the yard substantially. The Town average exterior side yard setback is between 3m and 4.5m.

The Committee agreed on an **exterior side yard setback of 3m.**

### **GARAGE PROJECTION**

The Committee agreed with the proposed **maximum garage projection of 2.1m (7 ft.)** from the main building.

### **BUILDING DEPTH**

This issue relates to privacy within the rear yard, and controls massing and built form. The proposed provision is 16.8m (55 ft.)

The Committee agreed with a **maximum building depth of 22m**, including a 2.1m bump-out.

### **NUMBER OF STOREYS**

A question was posed as to whether a 2.5 storey dwelling would be permitted if ½ storey completely contained within roof structure. Staff advised they would look into this matter.

The Committee agreed with a **maximum of 2 (two) storeys**.

### **HEIGHT**

There are two ways to measure the height: from the crown of the road to the peak of the dwelling (typical for infill development); or, to measure from the established grade to the mid-point between the ridge and eaves.

The Committee agreed to a **maximum height of 32 ft. (9.8m) to be measured from the established grade**.

### **4. Next Meeting**

Friday, October 14, at 2:00 p.m.

The Committee recommended a walking tour of the neighbourhood as part of the next meeting. Arrangements will be made through the Clerk's Department.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Unionville Sub-Committee adjourned at 6:00 p.m.