



Report to: Development Services Committee

Report Date: February 21, 2012

SUBJECT: RECOMMENDATION REPORT
Brutto Consulting
Applications to amend the Rouge North Secondary Plan and
Zoning By-laws to facilitate severances at 39 Carolwood
Crescent and 65 and 69 Chatelaine Drive.

File Nos: OP 10 123245, ZA 10 123246 & ZA 10 130075

PREPARED BY: Stacia Muradali, Ext. 2008
Senior Planner, East District

RECOMMENDATION:

- 1) That the report dated February 21, 2012 titled “RECOMMENDATION REPORT, Brutto Consulting, Applications to amend the Rouge North Secondary Plan and Zoning By-laws to facilitate severances at 39 Carolwood Crescent, 65 and 69 Chatelaine Drive (File Nos: OP 10 123245, ZA 10 123246 & ZA 10 130075)”, be received;
- 2) That the record of the Public Meeting held on May 10, 2011 regarding the proposed Secondary Plan and Zoning By-laws amendments be received;
- 3) That the application submitted by Brutto Consulting to amend the Rouge North Secondary Plan (OP 10 123245) for 39 Carolwood Crescent, 65 and 69 Chatelaine Drive, be approved, and that the draft Secondary Plan amendment attached as Appendix ‘C’ be finalized and adopted without further notice;
- 4) That the application submitted by Brutto Consulting to amend Zoning By-law 304-87, as amended, (ZA 10 130075) for 39 Carolwood Crescent, be approved, and that the draft By-law attached as Appendix ‘D’ be finalized and enacted without further notice;
- 5) That the application submitted by Brutto Consulting to amend Zoning By-law 90-81, as amended, (ZA 10 123246) for 65 and 69 Chatelaine Drive, be approved, and that the draft By-law attached as Appendix ‘E’ be finalized and enacted without further notice;
- 6) And that Staff be authorized and directed to do all things necessary to give effect to this resolution.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

Brutto Consulting has submitted applications to amend the Rouge North Secondary Plan and Zoning By-laws 304-87, as amended, and 90-81, as amended, to facilitate severances at 39 Carolwood Crescent and 65 and 69 Chatelaine Drive (the “subject properties”).

The subject properties are located south of Highway 407, east of Markham Road within a large lot “estate” residential area known as the Rouge River Estates. 39 Carolwood Crescent is located within an original residential enclave created in 1960, which is comprised of 30 lots. 65 and 69 Chatelaine Drive are located within a “buffer zone” of large lots which are located around the perimeter of the original enclave.

The Rouge North Secondary Plan (OPA 81) designates 39 Carolwood Crescent “Urban Residential- Special Development Policy Area 1 (SDPA1)” which provides for a minimum lot area of 0.4 ha (1 acre). 65 and 69 Chatelaine are designated “Special Development Policy Area 2 (SDPA2)” which provides for a minimum lot area of 0.3 ha (0.75 acre). 39 Carolwood Crescent is zoned “Rural Residential (RRE)” in Zoning By-law 304-87, as amended, which requires a minimum lot area of 0.4 ha (1 acre) and a minimum lot frontage of 36.5m (120ft). 65 and 69 Chatelaine are zoned “Suburban Residential First Density (SUR1)” which requires a minimum lot area of 0.3ha (0.75 acre) and a minimum lot frontage of 50m (164 ft).

The applicant is proposing to amend the Secondary Plan and Zoning By-laws to allow severances of the subject properties which will result in lot frontages of approximately 29 to 30m (95 to 98 ft) on Chatelaine Drive and lot areas of 0.15 ha (0.375 acre) and 0.2 ha (0.5 acre).

The community information meeting and statutory public meetings were both well attended by neighbouring residents, the majority of whom are opposed to the applications. Numerous written submissions (more than 200) have been received, the majority through signed petitions, and the majority of correspondence oppose the proposed development. Staff have reviewed and considered reports and detailed analyses submitted by adjacent landowners, Residents Associations and planning reports submitted by the applicant and a planning consultant retained by the owner of 61 Chatelaine Drive to oppose the applications. Town staff have also considered and distinguished the current applications from past proposals to sever large residential lots in other neighbourhoods.

Staff recommend approval of the applications because the proposed development will be compatible with existing development and will not detract from the character of the neighbourhood. Policy provision is made in the Secondary Plan to protect the integrity of the existing development and to ensure development complementary to the original residential enclave. The almost 100 foot frontages which are proposed can still be viewed as “estate lots” and can still accommodate a built form which will be respectful of the character of the neighbourhood. The proposed lots at 65 and 69 Chatelaine Drive will still function as appropriate buffers with development which will be complementary to existing development as the Secondary Plan intended. 39 Carolwood Crescent is uniquely positioned at the most northerly edge of Rouge River Estates. The proposed lot which will front onto Chatelaine Drive will not detract from the neighbourhood. All of the zoning by-law development standards except for minimum lot area and lot frontage can still be achieved on the proposed lots and are generous enough to maintain the open, larger lot character of the neighbourhood and will help ensure that the new houses are

sited in a manner that helps preserve the character of the neighbourhood. The proposed development will have limited impact on the original enclave, and will not put the community to be protected (the original enclave) at risk as the majority of the original enclave lots are not well positioned in terms of municipal services, location of existing dwellings and existing lot frontages to seek similar severances.

PURPOSE:

Brutto Consulting (the “applicant”) has submitted applications to amend the Rouge North Secondary Plan (OPA 81) and Zoning By-laws 304-87 and 90-81, as amended, on behalf of the owners of 39 Carolwood Crescent and 65 and 69 Chatelaine Drive. The purpose of this report is to discuss and recommend approval of the applications to amend the Secondary Plan and Zoning By-laws to facilitate severances at 39 Carolwood Crescent, 65 and 69 Chatelaine Drive.

BACKGROUND:**Subject properties and area context**

39 Carolwood Crescent and 65 and 69 Chatelaine Drive (the “subject properties”) are located south of Highway 407, east of Markham Road, within a large lot “estate” residential area (refer to Table 1) known as the Rouge River Estates. The Rouge River abuts the Rouge River Estates to the east (Figure 1).

39 Carolwood Crescent is located at the northeast corner of Carolwood Crescent and Chatelaine Drive within a residential enclave of large lots created through plan of subdivision in 1960. This property has a lot area of 0.4 ha (1 acre) with a frontage of approximately 33m (108 ft) on Carolwood Crescent and a flankage of approximately 60m (197 ft) on Chatelaine Drive. A single family home, which fronts onto Carolwood Crescent, is located on this property which also contains mature vegetation and trees (Figure 3).

65 and 69 Chatelaine Drive are located on the west side of Chatelaine Drive, north of Promelia Court, within a ‘buffer’ zone of large lots which are located around the perimeter of the original enclave. These lots were intended to provide a buffer between the newer residential subdivisions to the west and south, and to provide for complementary development with the original enclave. 65 and 69 Chatelaine Drive have lot areas of 0.3 ha (0.75 acre) and lot frontages of approximately 59m and 60m (193 ft and 197 ft). These lots are vacant without mature trees and vegetation (Figure 3).

The original residential enclave which was created in 1960 is comprised of 30 lots which developed on rural services. The “buffer zone” of large lots which surround the perimeter of the original enclave is comprised of 11 lots. Approximately one-quarter of the lots within the original enclave contain valleylands associated with the Rouge River. The ‘buffer’ lots were created in 1994 and 1995 as part of the newer residential subdivisions which developed around the original enclave (see Table 1 in the Appendices). Municipal services were contemplated for this community when the Rouge North Secondary Plan (OPA 81) was adopted in 1988, and were provided when the

newer subdivisions were developed. Municipal services are available along Chatelaine Drive and Promelia Court but are not available within the original enclave.

Official Plan and Zoning

39 Carolwood Crescent is designated “Urban Residential” in the Town’s Official Plan and “Urban Residential- Special Development Policy Area 1 (SDPA1)” in the Rouge North Secondary Plan (OPA 81) (the “Secondary Plan”). The SDPA1 designation requires a minimum lot area of 0.4 ha (1 acre). 39 Carolwood Crescent is zoned “Rural Residential (RRE)” by zoning by-law 304-87, as amended. The RRE zone requires a minimum lot area of 0.4 ha (1 acre) and a minimum lot frontage of 36.5m (120 ft) (see Figure 2 & Table 2).

65 and 69 Chatelaine Drive are designated “Urban Residential” in the Town’s Official Plan and “Urban Residential- Special Development Policy Area 2 (SDPA2)” in the Secondary Plan. The SDPA2 designation requires a minimum lot area of 0.3 ha (0.75 acre). 65 and 69 Chatelaine Drive are zoned “Suburban Residential First Density (SUR1)” by zoning by-law 90-81, as amended. The SUR1 zone requires a minimum lot area of 0.3 ha (0.75 acre) and a minimum lot frontage of 50m (164 ft) (see Figure 2 & Table 2).

Both the RRE and SUR1 Zones also specify development standards including minimum setback requirements, which apply to the subject properties.

Proposed Secondary Plan and Zoning amendments to facilitate severances

The applicant is proposing to amend the Rouge North Secondary Plan to reduce the lot area and are proposing to amend Zoning By-laws 304-87 and 90-81, as amended, to reduce both the minimum required lot areas and lot frontages (see Table 2). These amendments are intended to facilitate a severance of each of the existing subject properties to create one (1) additional lot each for a total of six (6) lots, where three (3) currently exist (Figure 4). The applicant will comply with all of the other applicable development standards.

There were previous applications and an OMB Decision for 39 Carolwood Crescent

In 1995, the owner of 39 Carolwood Crescent submitted applications to amend the Secondary Plan and Zoning By-law to facilitate a severance of the existing property similar to what is currently proposed at 39 Carolwood Crescent. Town staff, in a report dated April 2, 1996 did not support the applications and Council denied the applications. These applications were not appealed to the OMB.

In 1995 and 1996, the owner of 39 Carolwood Crescent submitted severance and minor variance applications to facilitate a severance and reduce the minimum lot areas and lot frontages similar to what is currently proposed at 39 Carolwood Crescent. The Committee of Adjustment denied the applications and the owner appealed the Committee of Adjustment decisions to the OMB. The OMB denied the severance and minor variance applications in a decision dated March 5, 1997.

Community information meeting held on January 7, 2011

A community information meeting was held on January 7, 2011. There were approximately 60-70 neighbouring residents in attendance. The concerns raised by the residents included:

1. If the applications are approved, the character of the community will no longer be harmonized and will change.
2. The applications if approved, will cause a “cascade effect” and set a precedent for other severances in the neighbourhood.
3. The proposed new house (specifically at 39 Carolwood Crescent) will directly impact the abutting neighbour’s backyard, privacy and property value.
4. The residents chose to move into the neighbourhood because of the large lots, mature vegetation and its unique character.

Statutory public meeting held on May 10, 2011

The statutory public meeting was held on May 10, 2011. The Clerk’s Department advised Committee that 211 written submissions were received in the form of letters and the majority through signed petitions. The majority of the correspondence opposed the proposal. The submissions included, but are not limited to, a letter and signed petition from the Rouge River Estates Association and letters from abutting landowners at 37 Carolwood Crescent and 61 Chatelaine Drive. Neighbouring residents addressed Committee and opposed the applications.

Staff have reviewed and considered all submissions made to the Town

Subsequent to the statutory public meeting, additional correspondence opposing the applications have also been received from the Rouge River Residents Association and the South Markham Residents Association. Staff have reviewed reports and detailed analyses submitted by Scott Burns (a planning consultant retained by the landowner of 61 Chatelaine Drive), a planning justification report prepared by Brutto Consulting on behalf of the applicants, as well as detailed written correspondence from James Jagtoo (the landowner of 37 Carolwood Crescent), as well as submissions provided by various other residents associations and neighbouring residents. Staff have reviewed and considered all of the submissions received by the Town as part of our analysis of the current applications.

OPTIONS/ DISCUSSION:

The proposed development is compatible with existing development

The Secondary Plan, recognizes the Chatelaine Drive area (the original enclave) as a “distinct residential enclave”. “Policy provision is made to protect the Chatelaine Drive area as a distinct residential enclave, and to ensure that new residential development adjoining this area is compatible in character”. Two (2) of the three (3) Special Development Policy Areas in the Secondary Plan relate to the subject properties. These policies require minimum lot sizes to “protect the integrity of the existing development” and “to ensure complementary development”. However, in addition to lot sizes, there are other factors such as lot frontage, setbacks and other development standards and built form which contribute to the streetscape, relate to the character of a neighborhood and help to determine the compatibility of new development.

The applicant is proposing lot frontages from 29.26m to 30m (96 ft to 98 ft). The proposed lot frontages are comparable to the property abutting 39 Carolwood Crescent (37 Carolwood Crescent) which has a lot frontage of 29.2m (95.83 ft). It should be noted that there are a few existing lot frontages within the original enclave, which do not comply with the minimum lot frontage requirements and have lot frontages which are less than the 36.5m (120 ft) required by the By-law. In fact, nine (9) lots (30 % of lots within the original enclave) have frontages which are less than 36.5m (120 ft). Of those nine (9) lots, six (6) lots (20% of the original enclave) have frontages which are less than 33.5m (110ft) .

The applicant has provided conceptual house designs (Appendix 'A') to illustrate that homes similar in size and appearance to some of the existing homes within the community can be achieved on the proposed lots. The applicant has also indicated that all of the development standards, except for the minimum lot area and lot frontage requirements will still be achieved on the proposed new lots. The minimum required side yard setback of 3m (9.8 ft) and a cumulative side yard setback of 9m (29.5 ft) will still be achieved on the proposed lot on Carolwood Crescent. The applicant will also provide a more generous side yard setback than the 3m (9.8 ft) which is required by the by-law on Chatelaine Drive which will enhance the visual streetscape and open character of the neighbourhood. A minimum side yard setback of 3m (9.8 ft) and a cumulative side yard setback of 7m (23 ft) will be provided.

Minimum required rear and front yard setbacks of 7.5m (24.6 ft) on Carolwood Crescent and 8m (26.2 ft) on Chatelaine Drive will also be provided in compliance with the zoning by-law. The zoning by-law setback requirements which can still be achieved on the proposed new lots are generous enough to maintain the open, larger lot character of the neighbourhood, and will help ensure that the new houses are sited in a manner that helps to preserve the character of the neighbourhood. The applicant has also agreed that site plan control will be applied to the new homes to ensure that the proposed development is respectful of the character of the neighbourhood.

The proposed lots at 65 and 69 Chatelaine Drive can function as appropriate buffers with development complementary to the original enclave

The proposed lots at 65 and 69 Chatelaine Drive will still function as an appropriate buffer between the original enclave and the surrounding residential development to the west and south. The proposed lots with frontages of almost 30.48m (100 ft) will be as effective as the existing lots with frontages of almost 60.96m (200 ft) within the 'buffer' zone in achieving development complementary to existing development within the estate area and maintaining the "buffer" function. The proposed amendments maintain the underlying principle of the Secondary Plan which is to ensure that new residential development adjoining this area (the original enclave) is compatible in character. The proposed lot sizes and frontages will still maintain the open, larger lot character of the neighbourhood, and is sympathetic to the existing lots within the original enclave.

Lack of municipal services will limit future severances

The Rouge North Secondary Plan provides that “all new development within the designated area of this Secondary Plan shall be on municipal sanitary sewers and water supply.” Municipal services are available on Chatelaine Drive and Promelia Court. However, municipal services have not been extended within the original enclave. Consequently, the severance potential of existing lots within the original enclave is limited to two (2) existing lots, namely, 58 and 62 Chatelaine Drive. These two (2) lots directly face 65 and 69 Chatelaine Drive and have the most potential to sever as they have similar lot sizes and lot frontages to 65 and 69 Chatelaine Drive and direct access to municipal services. Moreover, the positioning of the existing homes on these lots can facilitate severances without demolition of the existing homes.

The remaining lots within the ‘buffer’ zone all have similar sizes and frontages to 65 and 69 Chatelaine Drive, but are not likely to redevelop through lot creation at this time as they contain newer, large homes which are centrally positioned on the existing lots. Nevertheless, if applications were to be submitted for these lots similar to the current proposals, the resulting development from a frontage perspective will still be respective of the character of the neighbourhood and function as meaningful buffers to the original enclave.

The proposed development will not detract from the neighbourhood

39 Carolwood Crescent is uniquely positioned at the most northerly edge of Rouge River Estates with the existing house fronting onto Carolwood Crescent. The proposed lot which will front onto Chatelaine Drive will not detract from the neighbourhood as the streetscape on Carolwood Crescent will also remain unchanged and therefore any potential impact on the character of the neighbourhood is minimized. The proposed frontage and built form on Chatelaine Drive will be compatible with existing development and will not detract from the neighbourhood.

The development proposed for the subject properties, which will result in lot sizes with frontages of almost 100 feet, can still be viewed as maintaining “estate lots” and will result in lot frontages and development which will be compatible with existing development. The community has an established pattern of existing development which is comprised of lots with varying sizes, frontages and built form which are adjacent to, or face each other (Figure 3). The proposed lots and development will not detract from the aforementioned pattern of development as the enclave will mostly remain intact except for the severance potential at 58 and 62 Chatelaine Drive.

Additionally, site plan control will be applied to the proposed development through a Holding (H) provision in the by-law to ensure that appropriate landscaping, building placement, built form and massing, among other things.

Staff have had regard for recommendations on other proposals to facilitate severances elsewhere in the Town

The Town has in the past received proposals to sever large residential lots in other neighbourhoods, including Cachet Parkway, Hughson Drive, Oakcrest Avenue and Grandview Boulevard.

Cachet Parkway

In 2006, Council denied an application to amend the Official Plan to facilitate a severance of 68 Cachet Parkway. The Cachet Parkway area is designated "Rural Residential" in the Official Plan, whereas, the lands subject to this report are designated "Urban Residential". Staff did not support the application on the basis that the proposed reduction in lot sizes compromised the Official Plan objectives, which provides for sufficiently large lots to retain the rural character of the area. Unlike the current proposal, 68 Cachet Parkway did not have sanitary services available and was located within the Cachet Estate Residential area surrounded by larger lots. The applicant appealed the decisions to the OMB and the Board upheld Council's and the Committee's decisions.

Oakcrest Avenue

The owner of 19 Oakcrest Avenue submitted a zoning amendment application in 2007 to facilitate a severance of the existing lot into two, each with frontages of 19.52m (64 ft) and areas of approximately 0.1 ha (0.25 acre). The applicant appealed the application to the OMB before a staff recommendation report was considered by Development Services Committee and before a land use study for the area was completed. The Town retained Meridian Planning Consultants to attend at the OMB and oppose the zoning by-law amendment application. The OMB approved the zoning by-law amendment application. In part, staff did not support the proposed severance because of the future land severance potential for the majority of lots on Oakcrest Avenue. Staff were also of the opinion that the new zone category and development standards, proposed lot frontage as well as the reduced side yard setback which the applicant was proposing were not appropriate and were not in keeping with the character of the street.

In 2010, staff recommended conditional approval of a zoning by-law amendment application to facilitate a severance of 4 Oakcrest Avenue into two (2) lots with frontages of 21.3m (70 ft) and lot areas of 0.1 ha (0.25 acre). Staff did not support the reduced side yard setback which the applicant was seeking which was not in keeping with the surrounding area.

Hughson Drive

In December 2009, the owner of 10 Hughson Drive submitted applications for severance and minor variance to sever the existing 30.48m (100 ft) lot into two (2) 15.24m (50 ft) lots. The majority of lots within the Hughson Drive/ Lunar Crescent area have frontages of 30.48m (100 ft) or more and are on full municipal services, and most of the lots still contain original homes. The majority of the area would have the ability to apply for similar applications to facilitate severances which would transform the area. The applicant was also seeking reduced side yard setbacks. Staff were of the opinion that the

proposed lot frontage and side yard setbacks were inappropriate and not compatible with the character of the neighbourhood. The severance and minor variance applications were denied by the Committee of Adjustment but approved by the OMB. Council recently approved a zoning by-law amendment for the Hughson Drive/ Lunar Crescent area which would facilitate future severances of the majority of the existing lots within the area.

Grandview Boulevard

In 2011, Town staff did not support consent and minor variance applications to facilitate a severance of 8 Grandview Boulevard into two (2) lots each with areas of 0.06 ha (0.15 acre) and frontages of 15.24m (50ft). Staff were of the opinion that the proposed severance was not appropriate and not compatible with the area, and would act as a catalyst for similar requests to sever other lots on Grandview Blvd. The Committee of Adjustment denied the applications and the Town attended at the OMB to oppose the applications. The OMB denied the applications. The appellant did not provide plans to demonstrate the built form proposed for the new lots and to demonstrate if the built form will be compatible with existing development.

It is Staff's opinion that the current applications for 39 Carolwood Crescent and 65 and 69 Chatelaine Drive are distinct from the aforementioned applications. 39 Carolwood Crescent is a corner lot remotely located at the edge of the community. The frontage will remain unchanged on Carolwood Crescent and therefore will not impact the original enclave. The proposed new lots on Chatelaine Drive will still function as they were intended and that is to ensure complementary development and provide an appropriate buffer between the surrounding more recent subdivisions and the original residential enclave. Unlike the other instances noted above, the proposed lots will be of sufficient size (almost 30.48m / 100ft frontage) to accommodate development which will be compatible with the surrounding area. The proposed new lots will have access to municipal services, will have limited impact on the original enclave, and will not put the community to be protected (the original enclave) at risk as the majority of the original enclave lots are not well positioned (in terms of municipal services, location of existing dwellings and existing frontages) to seek a severance.

CONCLUSION:

The proposed development represents good planning because the type and scale of the proposed lots and development will be compatible with existing development and results in a streetscape which is complementary to the existing development. The intent of the Secondary Plan, which is to protect the integrity of the original enclave and ensure that new development is compatible in character, is maintained through factors other than lot sizes such as compatible lot frontages, built form, streetscape, and setbacks. The proposed development fulfills these conditions and will result in development which will not detract and have limited impact on the Rouge River Estates. Staff therefore recommend approval of the proposed amendments to the Rouge North Secondary Plan and Zoning By-laws 304-87 and 90-81, as amended, to facilitate severances at 39 Carolwood Crescent and 65 and 69 Chatelaine Drive.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS AND TEMPLATE: (external link)

Not applicable.

HUMAN RESOURCES CONSIDERATIONS

Not applicable.


ALIGNMENT WITH STRATEGIC PRIORITIES:


The proposed development aligns with the strategic priority to manage growth in an effective and efficient manner.

BUSINESS UNITS CONSULTED AND AFFECTED:

All comments provided by internal departments and external agencies have been incorporated into this report.

RECOMMENDED BY:


Biju Karumanchery, M.C.I.P., R.P.P.
Senior Development Manager


Rino Mostacci, M.C.I.P., R.P.P.
Director of Planning & Urban Design

ATTACHMENTS:

Figure 1:	Location Map
Figure 2:	Area Context/ Zoning
Figure 3:	Air Photo
Figure 4:	Proposed Severances
Table 1:	Existing Lot Areas and Frontages
Table 2:	Existing and Proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Requirements
Appendix 'A'	Conceptual House Designs for the Proposed Lots (provided by the Applicant).
Appendix 'B'	Planning Justification Report prepared by Brutto Consulting dated November 2010.
Appendix 'C'	Planning Analysis submitted by Scott Burns Planning Consultants
Appendix 'D'	Draft Secondary Plan Amendment
Appendix 'E'	Draft By-law Amendments

APPLICANT/ CONTACT INFORMATION

Attn: Claudio Brutto
Brutto Consulting
999A Edgeley Blvd
Unit 6
Vaughan, ON, L4K 5Z4
Tel: 905-851-1201
Email: cbrutto@bruttoconsulting.ca

File path: Amanda\File 10 123245\Documents\Recommendation Report

**TABLE 1
EXISTING LOT AREAS AND FRONTAGES**

	LOT AREAS	LOT FRONTAGES
ORIGINAL ENCLAVE Designated SPDA1 (30 lots)	0.4 ha (1 acre) to 0.49 ha (1.2 acre)	29m (95 ft) to 60m+ (200ft +)
BUFFER LOTS Designated SPDA2 (11 lots)	0.3 ha (0.75 acre)	55m (180 ft) to 68.5m (225 ft)
PROPOSED LOTS (3 new lots)	0.15 ha (0.375 acre) & 0.2 ha (0.5 acre)	29.26m (96 ft) to 30m (98 ft)

TABLE 2
EXISTING AND PROPOSED SECONDARY PLAN AND ZONING BY-LAW
REQUIREMENTS

	SECONDARY PLAN REQUIREMENTS		ZONING BY-LAW REQUIREMENTS			
	MINIMUM LOT AREA		MINIMUM LOT AREA		MINIMUM LOT FRONTAGE	
	FROM	TO	FROM	TO	FROM	TO
39 CAROLWOOD CRESCENT SDPA1 BY-LAW 304-87 RRE	0.4 ha (1 acre)	0.2 ha (0.5 acre)	0.4 ha (1 acre)	0.2 ha (0.5)	36.5m (120 ft)	29.26m (96 ft)
65 & 69 CHATELAINE DR SDPA2 BY-LAW 90-81 SUR1	0.3 ha (0.75 acre)	0.15 ha (0.375 acre)	0.3 ha (0.75 acre)	0.15 ha (0.375 acre)	50m (164 ft)	29.45m to 30.11m (96.6 ft to 98.78 ft)