Dear Mayor and Council,

I wanted to thank you for allowing the public to come and speak to you at the Council of the Whole this evening.

You are approving towers at White spot and senior housing on 21st but are concerned about approving little coach houses. If you look at studies, it is far healthier to have ground oriented senior homes. Living in a tower is isolating and the inhabitants sometimes come out only to put out garbage or get groceries. Ground level living provides a garden, patio space with bird feeders and a connection to the community as people walk by. As well, for the first time the needs of our elder citizens is in line with the wants of the new generation that needs only an ipod and iphone a computer and a bed. We need some housing options for this demographic. Smaller. These big SFDs are sorely lacking. It has to stop before its too late. Our community is not large enough to absorb this rate of destruction.

Although I did speak I didn't mention a few points.

1. I would welcome any of you to come and see laneways with me. I can tour you through some completed or in progress projects. I know a number of you did that already but for those that couldn't make it, the offer is extended.

2. Please do not vote in a program that requires neighborhood approval. Make baby steps but cross the water and commit. If approval of neighbors is required, we will get nowhere. Opt instead for a program that doesn't bonus the square footage for a laneway. We don't want spec builders building the biggest house they can build plus a coach house. It should be one or the other. This would limit the eligible homes for a coach house right off bat.

3. Don't make it necessary to have a lane. We have unusual property stock in that there are large estates that would be able to absorb a coach house beautifully but may not be on a lane.

4. Be bold and try a pocket neighborhood. These are wonderful communities where young and old can live on the same property, each owning their own plot with access to a communal park or courtyard or forest. Let's look at surplus lands, the last 4 you sold were zoned SFD and that's what was built. What if you tried to create a pocket neighborhood with community amenity park space in the middle of it all, and sell off the little homes instead. There are many ideas worth pursuing. Make a big step towards staying small. The risk here is not in doing but rather in not doing anything at all. West Vancouver would be beyond recognition in a decade.

Through Tenants in Common ownership I have helped many people build a laneway house or coach house on family property. We create a "de facto" strata whereby their rights are preserved, by contract. Much like the Co-op ownership model of old, there are ways people will make ownership affordable if we can build smaller affordable homes.

Thank you again for taking these bold steps to save our idyllic West Vancouver.

Kind regards,
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Dear Mayor and Council,

I must say I recently really enjoyed watching the council meeting on TV while working out on my stationary bike in my gym. In fact, no other show managed to steal my attention.

First of all, thank you for all of your work on behalf of your fellow citizens and secondly and thank you for upholding our development rules. If I followed correctly, the architect who did not plan for his "outer balcony staircase" to fit within the set-backs - should have, and I was glad that he was not allowed this variance. I am proud that you require people know the rules and expect them to build within the guidelines. If people do not then the expense should be their problem to rectify. I am proud to know council will hold them to it.

Also, kudos especially to Councillor Michael Lewis and Councillor Bill Soprovich for challenging general wording about development goals. I felt these two councillors really safe guard the things that are most important to me as a resident of Dundarave and West Vancouver. I do not want our OCP or development guidelines to allow coach houses and higher than allowed stories on buildings.

I LOVE living in West Vancouver. I don't want the light from the ocean blocked out. It makes me feel happy. I don't want people's views and their enjoyment of space and nature around them, that they have enjoyed for years and years, to suddenly be taken away from them. I like my community the way it is and I don't see why saying so seems be a bad thing or considered 'against development or progress'. Maybe our government has done such a great job of protecting our sacred community all these years and that is just why so many people want to live here!

Our community is NOT suffering. Houses are constantly being built in West Vancouver. More and more tax money will be coming in and I can honestly say I am MORE than happy with the services and everything West Vancouver offers me. People always want more. I say, make the best choices with all the money our city has coming in, run our city lean and efficiently - what we have IS enough.

Finally, of course there is always room for "tweaking". Here are my suggestions:

1. Put in place some rules that will continue to keep our community so peaceful and respectful. Namely, we need some rules about homes using geothermal heating or other technologies that involve generators or other noisy machines running on properties that affect the quality of life of neighbors. Our property is now surrounded by 4 of these noisy machines that hum incessantly or go off and on throughout the day and night, interrupting the quiet enjoyment of our property (and surely their own). Sound barriers or possibly putting these units partially underground or some other solution needs to be implemented.

2. I would like to shop in Ambleside more myself but cannot usually get a parking spot. It tend to keep driving, stopping where I can get a parking spot at Park Royal south (Whole foods area stores) and Lynn Valley (enclosed area of shops by the new library) where I can count on getting an underground parking spot. Ambleside needs some green, friendly gathering places but it needs massive amounts of UNDERGROUND so all of us who ALREADY are prepared to support these shops can do so.
3. I am in full support of council pushing developers to the max (FOR YEARS) to get the maximum benefit from them. Please don't give in. Make them stick to the rules AND require they give maximum benefit to the community (think European piazzas, green spaces, massive community parking). Developers know what a jewel any property is in West Vancouver and will be for years to come. They'll pay if they want it, otherwise, we don't need them.

4. I don't expect every senior or young person will be able to live in West Vancouver. Generally, secondary suites and certain site-by-site developments with approval of West Vancouver citizens seem to be good cautious developments. Those councillors, city planners, and committee people who yell the loudest for higher density and constantly spout off about affordable housing without thoughtful look into the details are dreaming. Who would pay for this and what would it cost us, how would it affect the people who already LIVE here? I would like to see strict guidelines reinforced even more regarding these suites, building variances, and any coach house development as we have had bad experiences with all three.

Sincerely,

West Vancouver, BC
I did not choose to live in West Vancouver so that old people could be warehoused in garages and laneway quarters. You should drop any consideration of Coach Houses for West Vancouver. You will undoubtedly hear from greedy people who want to maximize the building on their lots. You will have Builders and Developers who will tell you how great it is to have a laneway living quarters – all people who live in great large monster homes where the view is not to a garage door across the alley. Just drop consideration of this kind of nonsense.
From: s. 22(1)
Sent: May-25-13 2:17 PM
To: Community Dialogue
Cc: Mayor and Council
Subject: Coach House Questionnaire
Attachments: Coach Houses DWV Questionnaire.pdf
MAY 2013
Coach House Questionnaire

An examination of coach houses is identified in the District’s Housing Action Plan as one of five key actions for addressing limited housing choice and affordability in West Vancouver in 2013. As part of this examination, we would like your input on whether or not coach houses are the ‘right fit’ for West Vancouver. Please ✔ where appropriate and provide your comments on this questionnaire.

Completed questionaires may be submitted up to May 31, 2013: in person or by mail to the Planning Department (3rd Floor), District of West Vancouver, 750 – 17th Street, West Vancouver BC, V7V 3T3. These may also be sent by email: housing@westvancouver.ca or fax: 604-925-6083.

1. Please tell us where you live...

   I am a West Vancouver resident, and I live in the following sub-area of West Vancouver:
   ✔ Eastern: Cedardale, Sentinel Hill, Ambleside, Hollyburn, Dundarave
   □ Central: Caulfeild, Cypress Park, Bayridge, Westmount, Altamont
   □ Western: Eagle Harbour, Gleneagles, Whytecliff, Horseshoe Bay, Sunset Highlands
   □ Above the Upper Levels Highway: British Properties, Glenmore, Chartwell, Canterbury, Panorama, Whitby Estates

   □ I live outside of West Vancouver [please indicate where]

2. Do you think that coach houses could provide an appropriate housing option for West Vancouver residents?

   ✔ Yes   □ No   □ Not sure

   Comments:

   Coach houses could provide an appropriate housing option for West Vancouver residents if restricted to minimum lot size limitations, current neighbourhood density consideration, and one storey height restriction.

3. What concerns (if any) do you have about the possibility of coach houses in your neighbourhood?

   My neighbourhood is zoned to permit duplexes, and also has many smaller 33’ lots. The resulting high number of residences in each block (many include secondary suites) means that on-street parking for visitors is severely restricted. Although most properties currently have fully utilized 2 car garages accessible from rear lanes, the streets are jammed with vehicles each evening making parking very difficult. Adding Coach Houses to this area would significantly increase congestion.

   This crowding and parking congestion would not be an issue in areas that presently have with large lots (75’+ frontages).

4. ‘Fit with established character’ is an important consideration for any new development in West Vancouver.

   (a) Do you think that coach house applications should be subject to a design approval process?

   ✔ Yes   □ No   □ Not sure

   (b) What issues do you think should be addressed through a design approval process?

   - Building design and materials  ✔ Yes   □ No   □ Not sure
   - Landscape design  ✔ Yes   □ No   □ Not sure
   - Privacy  ✔ Yes   □ No   □ Not sure
   - Views  ✔ Yes   □ No   □ Not sure
   - Other [specify below]  ✔ Yes   □ No   □ Not sure

   Comments:

   The PRIVACY and VIEWS items listed above should consider the privacy and views of all adjacent properties. Many WV properties and neighbourhoods are on sloped hills and mountainsides presenting extra challenges in this regard. The addition of a 2 storey Coach House located at the highest level at the rear edge of a lower property, can have a very damaging impact to the view of the property immediately behind and above it. This is not always apparent when looking at individual lot diagrams.

   westvancouver

   (CONTINUED ON BACK...)
5. In some communities, coach houses are permitted either throughout the municipality or only in certain neighbourhoods. If coach houses were introduced in West Vancouver, do you think they should be allowed:

(a) Community-wide – i.e., in all neighbourhoods? ☐ Yes ☑ No ☐ Not sure
(b) Only in certain neighbourhoods or areas of West Vancouver? [specify below] ☑ Yes ☑ No ☐ Not sure
(c) Only on corner lots? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure
(d) Only on lots with rear lane access? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure
(e) Under other conditions [specify below] ☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Many WV neighbourhoods have large lots with wide frontages (British Properties, Chartwell, Caulfield etc.). Coach Houses would have far less visual and negative aesthetic impact in these neighbourhoods.

6. The City of North Vancouver allows for a coach house to be built on a single-family lot as a ‘detached’ alternative to a secondary suite, with no increase in permitted floor area. By contrast, the City of Vancouver allows for a coach house [referred to in Vancouver as a ‘laneway house’] to be built in addition to a secondary suite (up to 3 units on a lot), and an additional floor area of 0.15 x lot area (to a maximum 750 sq.ft.).

If coach houses were allowed in West Vancouver’s single-family neighbourhoods, do you think that:

(a) A coach house should only be permitted as an alternative to a secondary suite? ☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure
(b) A coach house should be permitted in addition to a secondary suite on the same lot? ☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure
(c) The permitted floor area of a coach house should be in addition to that allowed for the principal building on the lot? ☑ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments:

Many homes currently exceed permitted floor area (by illegally enclosing covered outside covered space following issuance of Occupancy Permits). If Coach Houses are allowed to exceed presently permitted floor areas, the new limits will undoubtedly be further stretched as owners continue to “game” the system.

7. In each of the municipalities profiled in the Discussion Paper, coach houses were introduced as a rental housing option in single-family neighbourhoods. In some of these municipalities, there are also examples of ownership coach houses; these are typically strata-titled, larger than 1,000 sq.ft., and located in older neighbourhoods with duplex or other multi-family residential zoning. If coach houses were allowed in West Vancouver, do you think that:

(a) They should be rental only (i.e., not for sale)? ☐ Yes ☑ No ☐ Not sure
(b) Ownership housing should be considered?
   i. In all cases? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure
   ii. In some cases? [specify below] ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure

Comments:

*...older neighbourhoods with duplex or other multi-family residential zoning.* (from 7. above)

These are exactly the areas where Coach Houses should NOT be permitted. They currently have high existing density, crowding, and difficult on-street parking access.

8. Do you have any other questions or concerns that you would like to have addressed as part of this coach house examination? [continue on separate sheet if necessary]

Restricting Coach Houses to only lots with rear lane access (see question 5. (d) above) would automatically ensure that Coach House development would be transferred almost exclusively to those few older, high density, neighbourhoods already subject to intensive pressure for OCP variance applications and maximum footprint lot redevelopments (eg. Ambleside Dundarave).

If you would like to receive periodic updates on West Vancouver’s coach house examination, please provide your email address: s. 22(1)

---

westvancouver
Hello Mayor and Councillors,

We are writing to show our support for the coach house proposal. This community desperately needs this sort of housing alternative/initiative. As you are aware, other communities such as North Vancouver, have already adopted these policies, so you are not reinventing the wheel with this proposal. It makes good sense for the future of this community too.

We look forward to seeing this move ahead from an idea into a council-approved action.

Thank you,

West Vancouver

s. 22(1)
Hello Mayor and Council

I was on the Coach House Committee for the C of NV. When I heard that there was to be public forum last spring for WV I did offer my time but was notified that the people had been picked.

The option of not making these strata units is a good one. The whole matter was to come up with alternate housing that was affordable. Also to allow people to age in place or to have assisted living residing in the coach houses.

What I saw that was presented at the forum on strata coach houses did not make sense at all.

Size, encroachment on neighbors, preserving the older housing stock, maintaining the character of neighborhoods, not adding density at an alarming rate and less demand on infrastructure to name a few.

If any one on council would like to contact me to discuss it, feel free.

Cheers

s. 22(1)
Hello Mayor and Council,

I was on the Coach House Committee for the C of NV. When I heard that there was to be a public forum last spring for WV I did offer my time but was notified that the people had been picked.

The option of not making these strata units is a good one. The whole matter was to come up with alternate housing that was affordable. Also to allow people to age in place or to have assisted living residing on site. The option of family moving in to the main house or the smaller coach house also will allow residents to stay in their homes for longer.

What I saw that was presented at the forum on strata coach houses did not make sense at all.

Size, encroachment on neighbors, preserving the older housing stock, maintaining the character of neighborhoods, not adding density at an alarming rate and less demand on infrastructure to name a few.

Council may want to choose to set up West Vancouver to have its own public committee before moving forward on this matter.

One thing to consider is the lay of the land is very different between C of NV and WV. In the City we did not have to deal with such steep lots. Most are flat. This can greatly change how the layout of coach houses would effect neighbourhoods and make more work for staff to adapt them.

If any one on council would like to contact me to discuss it, feel free.

Cheers
s. 22(1)
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From: Cindy L. Mayne
Sent: October-08-13 3:33 PM
To: Mayor and Council
Cc: s. 22(1)
Subject: Council Correspondence - Drafting of Coach House Policy and Bylaws
Attachments: Scanned from a Xerox multifunction device.pdf

Dear Mayor and Council,

Thank you for your email to Mayor and Council regarding Coach Houses, I have been asked to respond on their behalf. During your comments to Council on July 22nd, you inquired whether there could be an option to have ratepayers’ associations work with Planning staff to draft bylaws. My response to Council was that this was possible, if such direction was given to staff, but I noted that any zoning bylaw amendment would be subject to a Public Hearing and full public input. This was echoed in the remarks from Mayor Smith during the meeting. Formal consideration of the staff report was deferred to a subsequent Council Meeting, given questions from individual Council members about the staff recommendations.

On September 9th, Council directed staff to prepare draft bylaws for rental coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite for Council consideration in fall 2013, as set out in the report dated July 11, 2013. During the Council discussion, preceding this resolution, the Mayor noted the importance of public input on individual coach house applications. When staff report to Council this fall, the proposals under consideration will include administrative procedures for coach house applications – including requirements for neighbour notification and public input to the District.

There will be opportunities for public input on specific coach house policies, regulations, and guidelines when these are presented to Council in ‘draft’ form later this fall. As part of the community consultation process, we would welcome all written submissions and suggestions from West Vancouver residents and community organizations, including the Ambleside-Dundarave Ratepayers’ Association.

I thank you for your interest in West Vancouver’s coach house examination.

Cindy Mayne on behalf of Bob Sokol
Administrative Assistant to the Director of Planning, Land Development & Permits
District of West Vancouver | 750 17th Street, West Vancouver BC V7V 3T3

d: 604-925-7178 | cmayne@westvancouver.ca
Dear Mayor Smith and Council,

I wanted to follow up with my request made at the July 29th meeting on the subject of Coach Houses. After my presentation, I asked the question,

"If Planning is directed by Council to create new bylaws around Coach Houses, can it be mandated that Planning would work with the Ratepayers groups in formulating the bylaws and policy?"

After a brief consultation by the Mayor with Bob Sokol, it seemed this request could be facilitated.

Please confirm this process involving the community in formulating bylaws and policy will be mandated.

Yours truly,
From: Cindy L. Mayne  
Sent: October-10-13 3:42 PM 
To: s. 22(1)  
Cc: Mayor and Council  
Subject: FW: Coach Houses - Eagle Island should be included

Dear s. 22(1),

Thank you for your letter sent to Mayor and Council on September 9, 2013. I have been asked to respond on their behalf. As discussed with Stephen Mikicich, staff has been directed by Council to develop draft policy, regulations and guidelines for the introduction coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite. As part of this process, we will be considering all input received to date, including your coach house concept.

We anticipate reporting to Council in late November, followed by further opportunities for public input on draft policy, regulations, and guidelines – prior to proceeding to the bylaw stage. Your contact information has been added to our email distribution list, and you will be sent periodic updates on our coach house investigation.

Regards,

Cindy Mayne on behalf of Bob Sokol  
Administrative Assistant to the Director of Planning, Land Development & Permits  
District of West Vancouver | 750 17th Street, West Vancouver BC V7V 3T3  
d: 604-225-7178 | cmayne@westvancouver.ca
Dear Mayor Smith and Council,

My wife and I reside at

I have previously expressed my support for coach houses and infill houses in West Vancouver. This approach to providing diversity and affordability of housing has proven popular and successful in many communities.

I was therefore particularly disappointed to learn that my own neighbourhood, that being Eagle Island, was the only single family zoning in West Vancouver not currently considered for this option.

In speaking with Stephan Mikicich, I learned that the RS-6 zone (Eagle Island) had not been included in the original secondary suite zoning over concerns for off street parking, and as the current coach house program was based on that model, the exclusion was maintained.

Currently each resident of Eagle Island using the Eagle Harbour Road dock is allocated one designated parking at the foot of Eagle Harbour Road. However, there are other parking options used by many islanders. In our case we are members of the Eagle Harbour Yacht Club and park one of our cars there. We also rent a parking space from another party. So we have 3 private off street spaces. Other residents have similar arrangements.

There are currently 9 non reserved spots at the foot of Eagle Harbour Road, which potentially could be allocated to coach and infill houses on Eagle Island if needed by those residents. There are also approximately 15 spaces at the side of Eagle Harbour Road in gravelled areas which, except for beach users on hot days, are sparsely used.

Residents of Eagle Island are also quite close to the well-used public transit along Marine Drive. I have used it myself on occasion. It is a five minute walk from the Eagle Island parking area.

The Council Report dated July 11, 2013 proposes several amendments to the existing secondary suites provision which can be easily met by Eagle Island Residents:
- Floor area max 110 sq.m
- Either principal dwelling or suite to be occupied by owner
- Single family zoning
- Minimum lot sizes, building separation
- No increase in allowable floor area
- Arrangement for parking if needed

Expected uses would be in line with those envisaged by the Staff report:
- Owner flexibility for smaller accommodation or extended travel
- For other family members
- Rental accommodation
- Health care or other support when elderly or disabled

In our particular case we have almost a one acre lot – approx. 39,000 sq.ft. Under the current regulations this would allow a single house of over 13,000 sq ft which would be totally out of character on Eagle Island. It makes much more sense for us to maintain our existing home and add an additional smaller building to meet our needs.

Proposed minimum lot size requirements and the topography of many lots precludes any additional building. The likely number of applications for coach houses on Eagle Island would be very limited, but where it is viable, owners should be allowed the full use and enjoyment of their properties in line with other residents of West Vancouver.

Given the size of our property, subdivision or strata title would could be viable. But we are not pursuing that. We request only that the RS-6 zoning be included in this “district wide” initiative.
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Dear Mr. Mayor and Council:

I sincerely hope you have all read the above-mentioned Editorial by [s.22(1)]. It really hits the nail on the head.

West Vancouver, our ‘place of excellence’ is being destroyed.

I urge you, our Mayor and Council, to initiate some strong initiatives to rectify what is happening, you, as well as the rest of us, know what is wrong. Get some strong By-Laws and make them stick. Otherwise, as [s.22(1)] suggests, we will all be hitting the road.

Yours truly,

West Vancouver, B.C.
From: Stephen Mikicih  
Sent: May-02-14 5:27 PM  
To: MayorandCouncil; Bob Sokol  
Cc:  
Subject: FW: Coach House input

Dear s. 22(1),

We acknowledged receipt of your email on March 31st, and your questionnaire comments have been considered as part of the public input we received on proposed coach house policies, regulations, and guidelines.

Please note that our coach house discussion paper provides both a definition of what we mean by the term "coach house" and a discussion of the various terms used to refer to this type of housing in other jurisdictions. To view the discussion paper, go to: http://westvancouver.ca/home-building-property/planning/housing/coach-houses

West Vancouver's Official Community Plan supports a diversity of housing options in the community; and current work on coach houses is identified in the Housing Action Plan (adopted February 2013) as a priority work item for 2013-2014.

A staff report on Coach House implementation will be considered by Council at its meeting on Monday, May 5th. At this meeting, staff will present the results of community engagement on proposed coach house policies, regulations and guidelines, and will present draft bylaws for Council information and review. The draft coach house bylaws would provide for:

1. Rental coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite — i.e., as an option to a suite within the house, in those zones where secondary suites are already permitted. (This means one type of suite only — either attached or detached, but not both).

2. No increase in density — meaning no increase in permitted floor area or number of dwelling units under existing zoning. If a property owner has built a maximum-sized house, they would not be able to add a detached secondary suite.

3. Formal design review via the requirement for a Development Permit. It is proposed that this be a two-phased process: (a) approval for siting of the coach house on the lot, before detailed design; followed by (b) building and landscape design approval. Neighbour notification would be required at each phase.

4. Ownership coach houses in very limited circumstances — i.e., on properties designated in the Official Community Plan for future infill housing (only applies to one block at this time); and as an incentive for heritage conservation (only 15 single-family houses are listed on the Community Heritage Register and eligible for consideration at this time).

Here is the link to the Council meeting agenda page: http://westvancouver.ca/government/mayor-council/agendas-minutes. Click on Item #5 on the May 5th agenda to view the staff report and draft bylaws.

Thank you again for your input.

Regards,
Hi,
I have filled out the questionnaire, but find it based on the assumption that the coach house alternative is going ahead in any case. I feel it necessary to add some thoughts.

The term "Coach house" implies either lane access to a tiny dwelling, or small accommodation over a garage. By definition it is place to house coaches, presumably converted to human use. So stop using this cutesy phrase, please. You are really talking about densification. Whether by infill or by placement elsewhere on a given property, we are dealing with pressure to house increasing numbers in the municipality.
It is not the job of Planning to accommodate every perceived need. But part of the job of Planning is to disallow forms of building and landscape.

The densification of existing properties comes at a huge cost. The problems of 1. lack of infrastructure to support this, 2. denigration of the visual environment, and 3. how to regulate and police the implementation of increased building, are mammoth.
How is the quality of life in West Vancouver, the reasons we have chosen to live here, guaranteed, with changes of the magnitude proposed?

There is no doubt a way to densify the built environment here. But with fuzzy and lax guidelines, no enforcement outside of the Lower Caulfeild/ Tiddleycove area, changing ethnic population, opportunism and crassness blatantly displayed, there is little hope that this "coach house" idea will give us an improved environment. One envisions East Van...sorry but we are trying for something different here.

Also please do not write of "neighbourhood character". There are some neighbourhoods in West Van that have character, but this not across the board. The erosion of the aesthetics of the community is well underway in this once "place of excellence". With this in mind, how can increased and denser housing be monitored?
I suggest a neighbourhood by neighbourhood treatment. Some areas may be more suitable. I suggest a draconian design review panel with great power. I suggest this all be done extremely carefully.

Thank you,
Dear Mayor Smith and Councillors

On Monday, we understand you will receive a staff report on Coach House implementation including proposed coach house policies, regulations, guidelines, and bylaws. As a resident in West Vancouver at [redacted], and as a former member of the Working Group on Neighbourhood Character and Housing, I encourage you to consider and approve the recommendations as presented.

Housing is noted as one of Council's top 5 priorities, and much has been done over the years to research, analyze and discuss with the community (through surveys, focus groups, information sessions, and presentations at council). Consistently, the public has called for a range of tools to help create more diverse housing options that address issues of affordability, size, location, and impacts on neighbourhood character. Coach houses are but one means of addressing these issues. They will not appeal to all nor be appropriate to all sites, but where appropriate, they will be another "tool" in the toolbox for helping achieve a more sustainable housing stock in West Vancouver.

Just like any ecosystem, a healthy sustainable community, is dependent on a diverse citizenry and it should go without saying, a range of housing options to support that citizenry.

Congratulations on the work so far to deliver greater housing diversity in West Vancouver; we cheer you onwards through the coach house program and towards future consideration of additional housing options for our community.

With best regards,
Hi Stephen, further to my telephone message, I wanted to ask you about a few points relating to proposed Coach House bylaws as follows:

1) Has WV Planning considered a minimum threshold for building coach houses, example 33’ wide lot, lot size of 3200 sq. ft.? It would seem a good idea to have a base marker.

   Good suggestion. Minimum lot size (frontage width and lot area) is identified in each of the respective zones. The smallest lot size where secondary suites are now permitted (and potentially detached secondary suites as an alternative to a suite within the house) is the RS9 zone. Minimum lot size in this zone is 371.5 m2 (4000 sq.ft.) and a minimum width of 10 metres (33 feet). The only way that such a lot would be eligible for a coach house is if the existing house is not built to the full size permitted under the zone. Please note that there are few 33-foot wide lots in West Vancouver.

2) North Vancouver City has a two type approval process which requires neighborhood input based on the size of the coach house, ie an "A" and "B" coach house. The type "A" coach house would be the smaller version, one level and requires approval from Planning. The type "B" coach house would be two storey (1.6) and would require council approval. This would seem a more appropriate way of controlling coach house impact into single family neighborhoods. Why would West Vancouver not consider this type of approval process?

   The City of North Vancouver uses a Development Variance Permit process for its Level B coach houses, meaning approval by Council. The District of North Vancouver is proposing this process for all coach houses; and West Vancouver is proposing a form and character Development Permit process, with regulatory provisions embedded in the Zoning Bylaw. Staff are recommending that Development Permit approval be delegated; however, if Council does not choose to delegate, all Development Permit applications would be considered by Council.
If Council advances the proposed implementation bylaws (OCP and Zoning Bylaw amendments), staff would proceed to develop the details of the application process and report back to Council in the fall. As part of this work, we will be looking at how to differentiate between one-level and two-level units from a process perspective.

3) The owner occupancy requirement seems weak in that a property manager can take the place of an owner. This could translate into a full rental property instead of a partial rental. Again changing the nature of single family neighborhoods.

When secondary suites were introduced in West Vancouver in 2010, there was an owner occupancy requirement. That requirement was subsequently amended by Council to allow for local property management as an alternative to owner occupancy. As we are looking at the introduction of coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite, we are following the existing regulation.

I recently learned that the City of North Vancouver is giving serious consideration to allowing secondary suites AND coach houses on a single family lot. There has been a townhall discussion and this may be part of their OCP update. Vancouver City now allows both. As we go forward in West Vancouver, how will we ensure that this will not take place and cause a major shift towards rental and away from characteristics of single family neighborhoods? It is alarming as North Van City introduced coach house bylaws in 2010 and just three years later are pushing more rental units into single family neighborhoods.

Arguably, Vancouver and North Vancouver City are very different from West Vancouver. In the case of Vancouver, there is a push for densification in single-family neighbourhoods based on that city's so-called "greenest city initiative" and prior to that, the "Ecodensity" initiative. In West Vancouver, we are responding to a community wanting greater housing diversity (i.e., choice), but albeit in a much more conservative manner that is appropriate for this community.

By contrast to both Vancouver and North Vancouver City, the West Vancouver proposal is to introduce detached secondary suites without an increase in density (i.e., no increase in permitted floor area or number of dwelling units).

I have mentioned a number of times that ratepayers groups should be part of the process of community input. It is one thing to have a display and polite discussion, to send in survey forms. There needs to be a format, perhaps a workshop, whereby representatives of ratepayers groups could discuss proposed bylaws whether it is on coach houses, infill housing, bulk housing. I note that designers and contractors are given this opportunity but feel residents are held at arms length. This is a suggestion for the future, given West Vancouver is a unique, smaller community in the lower mainland. It is possible for us to come up with unique ideas as we go forward creating for future generations.

During the first phase of coach house consultation, all residents' groups (including ratepayers' associations) were sent information about the coach house examination, and staff offered to meet and make presentations to their membership. We met with the Executive of the Ambleside-Dundarave Ratepayers' Association, and made a presentation at a joint meeting of the Western Residents' Association and Horseshoe Bay Residents' Association. In September 2013, we reported to Council on the findings from the first phase of consultation and presented staff recommendations. At that time, staff was directed to prepare draft bylaws. In November 2013, staff outlined proposed coach house policies, regulations and guidelines; and Council directed that those advance to a second phase of community consultation. This information has been available online since that time, was presented at the Neighbourhoods Fair in February and March, and has been brought to your association's attention via email, and telephone and in-person discussions. All residents and ratepayers' groups have had an opportunity to review this information and provide input.

During the second phase of consultation, staff felt that some external input on proposed policy, regulations, and guidelines would be of benefit – specifically, from:
- Municipal planners in other jurisdictions where coach houses are now permitted re: lessons learned in developing/implementing policy and regulations
- Design and construction professionals re: municipal zoning regulations, design guidelines, and process
- North Shore Advisory Committee on Disability Issues re: adaptable design
If your association has any particular thoughts on the proposed Development Permit process, we would welcome your input.

Thank you for your prompt replies to my previous queries. I look forward to hearing from you.

Regards,
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From: Stephen Mikicich  
Sent: May-23-14 10:32 AM  
To: Mayor&Council;  
Cc: Mayor&Council;  
Subject: Coach Houses - May 26th 1ST Reading

Hello  

The staff report (item 13 on the May 26 Council agenda) speaks to the input received from Council, and how that is being addressed via changes to the draft bylaws and/or developing the application 'process' (work to be undertaken over the summer).

As outlined at the May 5th meeting, the proposal is to have a two-stage development permit process: (1) to approve siting; and (2) detailed building and landscape design. There is a requirement for neighbour notification at both stages, with public input being taken into account in the District's review of the application.

Regards,

Stephen Mikicich  
Manager of Community Planning Planning | District of West Vancouver  
t: 604-928-7056 | westvancouver.ca

From:  
Sent: May-23-14 9:55 AM  
To: Stephen Mikicich  
Cc: Mayor&Council;  
Subject: Coach Houses - May 26th 1ST Reading

Stephen,

I was just reviewing notes from the May 5th meeting where Council discussed the proposed draft bylaws on Coach Houses. A number of concerns were expressed by various Councillors at that time. Mayor Smith summarized the concerns as follows:

- neighbours need to support the project  
- the final product has a chance to go forward  
- one level coach houses favoured .

Have any changes been made to the bylaws to reflect these comments/concerns from Council? If not, do I take it the Public Hearing set for June 16th will allow an opportunity for both the community and Council to provide further input and or direction to Planning with respect to further changes?

I look forward to hearing from you.

Regards,

West Vancouver, B.C.