Mayor and Councilors,

I am in favour of the coach house by-laws. They represent a step forward in ensuring that smaller houses are retained and preventing more 'monster' houses being built.

I hope that Council will vote in favour of the by-laws.

West Vancouver

Sent from Samsung tablet
From:  
Sent:  
June-11-14 3:19 PM  
To:  
Mayor and Council 
Subject:  
Coach Houses 

Dear Mayor & Council -

Please know that if Coach Houses are approved for West Vancouver it is my opinion that:

1) Basements and Garages be included in the FAR (Floor Area Ratio)  
2) That off-street parking be available for ALL vehicles associated with the property, and furthermore that off-street parking be utilized.  
3) That neighbours within 100 M of the property provide written evidence of support (70% support to move forward)  

Sincerely,  

[Redacted]

West Vancouver
s. 22(1)

From:  
Sent:  
To: 
Subject:  
Follow Up Flag:  
Flag Status:  

June-12-14 9:48 AM  
MayorandCouncil  
yes  
Follow up  
Flagged  

I support coach houses in the community.

West Vancouver
This page intentionally left blank
Mayor Smith and members of Council,
I would like to endorse the proposed by-laws for coach houses in West Vancouver. This is an important initiative and will go some way towards reducing the visual and environmental impact of monster houses - a problem which I know has troubled Council for many years. Smaller houses will have the possibility of being retained if new owners know that they can build a coach house to maximize the value of their lot instead of demolishing and building a new house to the maximum allowable square footage.
I hope Council will vote in favour of these by-laws.
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From: s. 22(1)
Sent: June-14-14 3:23 PM
To: Mayor and Council
Subject: Coach Houses.

Dear Mayor and Council,

With reference to the Public Hearing planned for June 16, 2014 regarding proposed bylaws that would provide for the introduction of coach houses as a new housing type (OCP Plan Bylaw #4360, 2004, Amendment Bylaw #4771, 2014, AND proposed Zoning Bylaw #4662, 2010, Amendment Bylaw #4772, 2014), please consider the following:

- Allowance for coach houses should be decided by individual neighbourhood;
- Basements should be included in total FAR;
- Off-street parking must be available and utilized for every vehicle associated with the property.

Thank you,
This page intentionally left blank
Dear Mayor and Council

I wish to express my support for the amendments proposed regarding allowance coach houses in West Vancouver.

I have been a resident of West Vancouver since 1947, now a senior with a adult disabled daughter. The opportunity to stay in West Vancouver in a smaller residence while maintaining my principal residence is well-suited for my own needs, and the future needs of my children, particularly my disabled daughter.

I own a large flat corner property in my view well suited for the addition of a coach house which my immediate neighbours support.

I am considering applying to build a coach house should the amendments be approved. Thank you for the opportunity to make this submission.

Regards

West Vancouver
Hello Mayor & Council of West Vancouver,

My wife & I sold our single family zoned home several years ago, however my [s. 22(1)] is a very specialized residential architect primarily designing homes in the City of Vancouver so we have a keen interest. Attached are several photos of coach houses in Vancouver designed by others where my [s. 22(1)] took us around the streets and back lanes to show how quickly things can get out of hand.

Here are our thoughts on this issue:

- The initial concept is good however quickly large masses take over on the property.
- Two storey coach houses block sunlight to neighbouring properties. Quickly the neighbours privacy is lost. These should not be permitted.
- Site coverage is too large on the lots & trees with landscaping are lost; storm water thus increases.
- Look at the photos where the cars park. Garages quickly become secondary storage areas & the cars move out onto the street. How can you possibly enforce this in your proposed bylaw? Where are the boats & campers to be stored?
- Take a look at where the trash cans are stored; they fill the back lanes. More people, more trash!
- Vancouver has many properties with back alley ways; West Vancouver has few.
- Taxation needs to be adjusted so these coach houses pay their fair share of the municipal taxes for Fire, Police, Community Centres, Parks & the Translink fees.

We think coach houses should be one storey only and restricted to 900 Sq. feet. Optional housing needs to be affordable.

West Vancouver, BC
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From: s. 22(1)
Sent: June-16-14 3:09 PM
To: Mayor and Council
Subject: Coach houses or detached suites

I understand that Council will be discussing allowing coach houses, carriage houses or the latest descriptive term, detached suites, this evening.

I did attend an Open House sponsored by the municipality probably a month ago at the recreation centre. Before this, I had been receptive to the idea, thinking that when my wife and I reached the age when we couldn’t negotiate a house, stairs etc. a small carriage or coach house on our property would work, with our children looking in on us from time to time. We obviously would not be driving, so no need for parking facilities, a small detached house would not interfere with the privacy or views of the surrounding properties and certainly we would not be breaching any noise bylaws.

However, this plan has made me and my family have a complete change of mind - the devil is obviously in the details. This plan now becomes two houses on one lot. If I read what is proposed correctly, this coach house could be 1200 s.f., have a garage, a basement (not included in the s.f.) and maybe be 2 stories. Well, now we need a driveway, parking facilities, a basement requires blasting in most cases, and removal of the vegetation is a given, despite arguments to the contrary, and perhaps views impacted. So, the home might now have a couple with children, young or teens, so a yard with a fence is preferable and noise level will increase, in close proximity to others. And what about the infrastructure? Water, gas, electricity? Garbage collection?

I understand that if someone submits a proposal to the municipality, the neighbours will be consulted. Having sat through many public meetings discussing issues of increased density, compromised views, traffic i.e. Safeway project, Taylorwood (that will be another issue because I understand that a developer is assembling properties there for another run at it) the 13th -14th Street development, Hollyburn Mews, the Maison project, probably the Masonic Hall development, why cause more dissent in the community? Friends with whom I have spoken say initially this sounds like a good idea. However, they don’t want it anywhere near them. The developers are no doubt salivating at the very idea here.

I don’t understand the need for this type of housing. West Vancouver has coming on stream, the Grosvenor project, Evelyn Drive, Larco Project, H. Y. Louie will be back, the Squamish development ideas for their land on the waterfront, the Masonic Hall proposal, no doubt Taylorwood Place eventually, as well as the rezoning of the Fulton block allowing increased density, maybe the West Van Florist site and the list goes on. We do not need to have two houses on one lot - suites in the homes are allowed and that should be sufficient. If that didn’t work for the municipality, perhaps that should be re-figured somehow. Attached suites should have been the answer. What went wrong?

Thank you for considering my views and the views of my family.

Regards,

s. 22(1)
Dear Mr. Mayor and Council,

My name is [s. 22(1)] My wife, [s. 22(1)] and I live at [s. 22(1)]. I have appeared before council on a number of occasions and expressed my full support for the proposed coach house plans for west Vancouver.

During the last council meeting that we attended, there seemed to be a substantial degree of sympathy with my stated view that Eagle Island residents should not have to go through a full blown rezoning application to be site specific approved for a coach house.

As I recall, the mayor and a majority of councillors were prepared forego the formal rezoning requirement and to provide under 3.1.3 something along the lines of “provide for rental Coach Houses as a detached form of secondary suite in Residential Zone RS-6 subject to site specific review and a development permit under Development Permit Area BF-B 3.1”

My recollection is that the main road block to proceeding with that kind of amendment was that any such change in the wording of the proposed bylaw would delay the schedule for Public Hearings.

Also Mr. Sokol raised the old parking issue. He acknowledged that while we had adequate parking (we currently have 3 off street spaces), he suggested that if we sold, the next owner might not have a dedicated coach house parking space. I would counter that this could be the case with any mainland coach house as well. A mainland property owner with a coach house may decide for many reasons not to make a parking space available to his coach house tenant; such as he needs to park his boat or motor home there, or they need parking for other household members, or they decided to convert it to a vegetable garden or a place for the kid’s swing set, or …..

In our support, the mayor expressed the opinion that a parking place could be rented by Eagle Island residents from other mainland homeowners, or perhaps the coach house residents did not require a parking space as they did not own a car and relied on the available and close by public transit.

The amendment Bylaw No 4772, 2014 Part 4, 4.1(1)(k) requires “one off-street parking space must be provided exclusively for the use of the detached secondary suite”. This is part of the bylaw that everyone with a coach house is required to respect. To presume that Eagle Island residents are somehow predisposed to violating bylaws more so than other West Vancouver residents is unfair at best. However, if this is the case, and it is necessary to prove compliance, I am not opposed to a regulation that coach house owners on Eagle Island must annually advise parking enforcement of the location of their coach house designated off street parking space.

One other approach that I asked about but that has not had any discussion is a streamlined, low-cost rezoning for coach houses on Eagle Island. Under the current fee structure, I understand a rezoning application is $6000 and with all the other drawings, maps, display boards and material, the costs will be well over $10,000. This cost seems particularly unfair, even punitive, in light of the fact that every other residential area resident does not have to go through rezoning.

I believe a site specific approval process in conjunction with a development permit under Development Permit Area BF-B 3.1 will give the District adequate control over coach houses on Eagle Island and provide this opportunity on a fair and equitable basis to Eagle Island residents.
Thank you for your consideration

From: Stephen Mikicich [mailto:smikicich@westvancouver.ca]
Sent: June-09-14 12:37 PM
Subject: Update on Coach Houses

Please note that a Public Hearing on proposed coach house bylaws is scheduled for Monday, June 16th at 7:00pm in the West Vancouver Municipal Hall Council Chamber. To view the Public Hearing agenda for June 16th, please go to: http://westvancouver.ca/government/mayor-council/agendas-minutes

Stephen Mikicich
Manager of Community Planning Planning | District of West Vancouver
t: 604-925-7056 | westvancouver.ca
Coach Houses - Requirement for Site Specific Rezoning on Eagle Island (RS-6)

Dear Mr. Mayor and Council

My name is [Redacted], My wife, [Redacted], and I live at [Redacted]. I have appeared before council on a number of occasions and expressed my full support for the proposed coach house plans for west Vancouver.

During the last council meeting that we attended, there seemed to be a substantial degree of sympathy with my stated view that Eagle Island residents should not have to go through a full blown rezoning application to be site specific approved for a coach house.

As I recall, the mayor and a majority of councillors were prepared forego the formal rezoning requirement and to provide under 3.1.3 something along the lines of “provide for rental Coach Houses as a detached form of secondary suite in Residential Zone RS-6 subject to site specific review and a development permit under Development Permit Area BF-B 3.1”

My recollection is that the main road block to proceeding with that kind of amendment was that any such change in the wording of the proposed bylaw would delay the schedule for Public Hearings.

Also Mr. Sokol raised the old parking issue. He acknowledged that while we had adequate parking (we currently have 3 off street spaces), he suggested that if we sold, the next owner might not have a dedicated coach house parking space. I would counter that this could be the case with any mainland coach house as well. A mainland property owner with a coach house may decide for many reasons not to make a parking space available to his coach house tenant; such as he needs to park his boat or motor home there, or they need parking for other household members, or they decided to convert it to a vegetable garden or a place for the kid’s swing set, or ….
In our support, the mayor expressed the opinion that a parking place could be rented by Eagle Island residents from other mainland homeowners, or perhaps the coach house residents did not require a parking space as they did not own a car and relied on the available and close by public transit.

The amendment Bylaw No 4772, 2014 Part 4, 4.1(1)(k) requires “one off-street parking space must be provided exclusively for the use of the detached secondary suite”. This is part of the bylaw that everyone with a coach house is required to respect. To presume that Eagle Island residents are somehow predisposed to violating bylaws more so than other West Vancouver residents is unfair at best. However, if this is the case, and it is necessary to prove compliance, I am not opposed to a regulation that coach house owners on Eagle Island must annually advise parking enforcement of the location of their coach house designated off street parking space.

One other approach that I asked about but that has not had any discussion is a streamlined, low-cost rezoning for coach houses on Eagle Island. Under the current fee structure, I understand a rezoning application is $6000 and with all the other drawings, maps, display boards and material, the costs will be well over $10,000. This cost seems particularly unfair, even punitive, in light of the fact that every other residential area resident does not have to go through rezoning.

I believe a site specific approval process in conjunction with a development permit under Development Permit Area BF-B 3.1 will give the District adequate control over coach houses on Eagle Island and provide this opportunity on a fair and equitable basis to Eagle Island residents.

Thank you for your consideration