

DECISION/DIRECTION NOTE

Title: Proposed Dwelling
Comprehensive Development Area (CDA) -Signal Hill
164 Signal Hill Road

Date Prepared: January 8, 2020

Report To: Committee of the Whole

Councillor & Role: Councillor Maggie Burton, Planning and Development Lead

Ward: 2

Decision/Direction Required:

Approval for a demo/rebuild of dwelling.

Discussion – Background and Current Status:

Council previously approved the addition of a subsidiary apartment on September 3, 2019 and the applicant has demolished the existing property with a footprint of 69.29 m². The applicant is now proposing a new dwelling with a footprint of 195.92 m². The applicant is also proposing an addition of 1 storey for a maximum height of 7.85 meters.

In accordance with “Appendix C” of the Battery Development Guideline Study, the property at 164 Signal Hill Road has been identified for considerations of a possible one-storey addition for vertical expansion and a horizontal expansion to the left side when viewed from the road. However, Section 8.1 of the study allows for an owner to build more than the Footprint and Height Control Overlay by means of a submission of a Land Use Assessment Report (LUAR) and to demonstrate that the development is acceptable. Planning, Engineering & Regulatory Services has received the LUAR for the subject property and is satisfied with the information provided.

Property owners within the area that could potentially be affected by the proposed development have been notified in writing. There has been one response from the owner of 158 & 162 Signal Hill Road, please see attached for your reference.

The proposed dwelling is comparable in size and scale with other dwellings within the area. Architecturally the only difference with the proposed and the existing dwellings in the area is the roofline of the proposed dwelling, which is to be flat. The property will also be required to meet the Heritage Area 3 requirements.

Key Considerations/Implications:

1. Budget/Financial Implications: Not applicable.

The logo for St. John's features the words "ST. JOHN'S" in a bold, serif font. The letter "O" in "JOHN'S" is replaced by a stylized icon of a signal tower or antenna.

2. Partners or Other Stakeholders: Not applicable.
3. Alignment with Strategic Directions/Adopted Plans:
Battery Guideline Study.
4. Legal or Policy Implications:
Section 10.47.2(c) of the St. John's Development Regulations.
5. Privacy Implications: Not applicable.
6. Engagement and Communications Considerations:
Area property owners have been notified.
7. Human Resource Implications: Not applicable.
8. Procurement Implications: Not applicable.
9. Information Technology Implications: Not applicable.
10. Other Implications: Not applicable.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the application be referred to the Built Heritage Experts Panel for comment on the size of the building.

Prepared by - Date/Signature:

Ashley Murray, Development Officer II

Signature: _____

Approved by - Date/Signature:

Jason Sinyard, P. Eng., MBA Deputy City Manager
Planning, Engineering & Regulatory Services

Signature: _____

AAM/dlm

Attachments: Location Map



MURPHY'S ROW

SUBJECT PROPERTY

160

156

COH

CDA-SIGNAL HILL

CDA-SIGNAL HILL

158

164

162

CDA-SIGNAL HILL

166

174 CDA-SIGNAL HILL

168

DISCLAIMER: This map is based on current information at the date of production.

Subject: File No. 1900165 - 164 Signal Hill road

We have a number of concerns regarding the proposed development of 164 Signal Hill Road as the owner of [REDACTED] Signal hill road. Firstly, from [REDACTED] Signal Hill:

The entire view of the harbour and city is eliminated from the kitchen, living room, both sliding doors, side deck and back deck. (the perspective shown on the diagram is not accurate). - the scale and density of the house, a solid block 7.85 m in height with 2 wings, and at it's closest point being 1.5m from the property line will block sunlight/daylight from my property. From both decks we will now have a view of a 7.85m solid wall. From the perspective drawings the shadow the house will cast is not shown on the [REDACTED] property, it will blanket my home. - The style of the house is not in keeping with any of the existing homes in the area. It is characteristic of a commercial building. - Is the density proposed allowed on the size of lot? I also built my home on [REDACTED] Signal hill and we could only build to a specific ratio of house to lot due to the regulations.

From [REDACTED] Signal Hill:

- the view plane again is not accurate. From my kitchen window, sliding door and deck the entire harbour view will be taken as well as a portion of the city view. I am not opposed to someone building a house that is respectful to the community and neighbours. This house in its current form is not acceptable. It is too large and encroaches on my property. We understand that there is potential for a second storey, but it does not have to be on the entire home. The home also has the feel and aesthetic of a commercial building, from our perspective it looks like an extension of the MUN building. What is the purpose of the CDA guidelines if they are completely ignored? Who will compensate me for my loss of views and privacy and ultimately property value? As a property owner and taxpayer does an adjacent property have the right to build the way they see fit without any regard for its neighbours?

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
Property owners [REDACTED]