MEMORANDUM

Date: June 2, 2014  Our File: 13-2515-02
To: Mayor and Council
From: Stephen Mikicich, Manager of Community Planning
Re: Coach House Implementation Bylaws

Your Worship and Members of Council,

At the Council meeting of May 26, 2014, Council gave first reading to the following proposed bylaws, and set June 16, 2014 as the Public Hearing Date:

- Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4360, 2004, Amendment Bylaw No. 4771, 2014; and

- Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Amendment Bylaw No. 4772, 2014

Subsequent to First Reading, staff have found some minor typographical errors in the bylaws, which do not have a material impact, but have been corrected prior to presentation at the Public Hearing. Specifically, the corrections made are as follows:

Both Bylaws:

- The “Publication of Notice” line has been added.

Proposed Bylaw No. 4771, 2014:

- The date of the bylaw in Section 1.2 under Part 1 Citation has been corrected to read: “4771, 2014” (not 2013).

Proposed Bylaw No. 4772, 2014:

- The word “subsequent” in Section 2.1 under Part 2 Severability has been corrected to read “subsection”.
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District of West Vancouver

Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4360, 2004
Amendment Bylaw No. 4771, 2014

A bylaw to amend the Official Community Plan

WHEREAS the Council of The Corporation of the District of West Vancouver deems it expedient to provide for policy and guidelines for the development of coach houses in existing neighbourhoods;

NOW THEREFORE, the Council of the District of West Vancouver enacts as follows:

Part 1 Citation

1.2 This bylaw may be cited as Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4360, 2004, Amendment Bylaw No. 4771, 2014.

Part 2 Definitions

2.1 In this bylaw:

"Coach House" replaces "Carriage House" and means a detached dwelling unit, which is accessory to, and smaller than a primary dwelling on a residential lot, and may be attached to a garage.

Part 3 Amends Policy Section 3 [Housing]

3.1 Schedule A to Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4360, 2004 is amended as follows:

3.1.2 By adding Policy H 4.2 as follows:

"Provide for rental coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite in all residential zones where secondary suites are a permitted use."
A bylaw to amend the Zoning Bylaw to provide for Detached Secondary Suites

WHEREAS the Council of The Corporation of the District of West Vancouver deems it expedient to provide for amendment of the Zoning Bylaw;

NOW THEREFORE, the Council of the District of West Vancouver enacts as follows:

Part 1 Citation

1.1 This bylaw may be cited as “Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Amendment Bylaw No. 4772, 2014”.

Part 2 Severability

2.1 If a portion of this bylaw is held invalid by a Court of competent jurisdiction, then the invalid portion must be severed and the remainder of this bylaw is deemed to have been adopted without the severed section, subsection, paragraph, subparagraph, clause or phrase.

Part 3 Amends Definitions

3.1 Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Schedule A, Section 110 – Definitions is hereby amended by inserting the following definition in alphabetical order:

“Detached secondary suite means a detached dwelling unit accessory to a single family dwelling use”.

Part 4 Amends General Regulations for Residential Zones and Uses Only

4.1 Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Schedule A, Section 130 – General Regulations for Residential Zones and Uses Only is hereby amended by adding Section 130.051 – Detached Secondary Suites to read as follows:
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COUNCIL REPORT

Date: May 12, 2014

From: Stephen Mikicich, Manager of Community Planning

Subject: Coach House Implementation Bylaws

RECOMMENDED THAT:

1. Opportunities for consultation on a proposed Official Community Plan amendment, with persons, organizations and authorities, as outlined in the report from the Manager of Community Planning dated May 12, 2014, titled "Coach House Implementation Bylaws" be endorsed as sufficient consultation for the purposes of Section 879 of the Local Government Act;


3. Proposed “Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4360, 2004, Amendment Bylaw No. 4771, 2014” has been considered in conjunction with the District’s most recent financial plan and the regional waste management plan;

4. Proposed “Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2012, Amendment Bylaw No. 4772, 2014” be read a first time; and


Purpose

On May 5, 2014, Council provided comments on draft coach house implementation bylaws, in order that these bylaws may be finalized for formal consideration. The purpose of this report is to summarize the comments received from Council, to outline changes made to draft bylaws and/or the proposed Development Permit application process, and to recommend that proposed Official Community Plan (OCP) and zoning amendment bylaws (attached as Appendices ‘A’ and ‘B’ respectively) be read a first time.
1.0 **Background**

1.1 **Prior Resolutions**

At the May 5, 2014 Council Meeting Council passed the following resolution:

THAT Direction on any amendments to draft coach house bylaws, attached as Appendices 'A' and 'B' to the report from the Manager of Community Planning dated April 14, 2014 be provided to staff so that draft bylaws may be finalized for Council's consideration of first reading at its meeting on May 26, 2014.

1.2 **History**

See previous staff report attached as ‘Appendix ‘C’.

2.0 **Policy**

2.1 **Policy**

See Appendix ‘C’.

2.2 **Bylaw**

See Appendix ‘C’.

3.0 **Analysis**

3.1 **Discussion**

At its meeting of May 5, 2014, Council provided staff with comments on the draft implementation bylaws - i.e., proposed OCP and Zoning Bylaw amendments, and on the proposed Development Permit process for detached secondary suites. Key points raised during the Council discussion are outlined below (with the staff response shown in italics).

- There is support for a comprehensive review of the regulations, guidelines and application process for detached secondary suites one year after the program is implemented.
  - Staff would undertake an annual review and report to Council on the number of applications received, issues that have arisen, and bring forward any proposed amendments to policy, regulations and guidelines to address these issues.

---

1 The draft bylaws as presented at the May 5, 2014 meeting of Council are not appended to the report dated April 14, 2014 in Appendix ‘C’, so as not to create confusion for the reader. Proposed bylaws (attached as Appendices ‘A’ and ‘B’ to this report dated May 12, 2014) have been modified based on Council input provided at its meeting of May 5, 2014.
• Concern was expressed that, if there is limited take-up on the opportunity to build a detached secondary suite on one's property, the program might be seen as a failure, and that consideration should be given to 'incentivizing' this new housing type.

  o West Vancouver's approach to detached secondary suites has been guided by community input and a review of 'best practices' in other jurisdictions. This is arguably a conservative approach when compared to the City of Vancouver's Laneway Housing Program, which provides for additional floor area and a total of three dwelling units on a 'single-family' lot.

  o If approved by Council, proposed zoning regulations would provide property owners with the option of building a 'detached' secondary suite, as an alternative to a suite in a house. The intent of the proposed Development Permit process and guidelines is to provide for the successful integration of detached secondary suites in established neighbourhoods.

  o Staff suggests that there will be limited take-up of this opportunity because, without an increase in density, this becomes a matter of personal choice rather than an economic incentive. However, while the community is split on the question of additional density (see Appendix 'C'), it is very clear that West Vancouver residents want greater housing options.

  o Staff continues to receive numerous inquiries from residents interested in coach houses. The draft proposals have been shared with each of these individuals and, in general, they are supportive of the recommended approach.

• More specifically, staff should consider how to incentivize one-level units, which would inherently be more accessible, and would likely have less of an impact on neighbouring properties.

  o Consideration will be given to a streamlined development permit approval process for single level units. Maximum site coverage could also be varied via Development Permit to encourage single level designs.

  o During the first annual review process, consideration could also be given to an increase in density for single-level units, as an incentive for retention of an older, character house.

• Required costs for upgrading infrastructure on some properties (both on- and off-site) may be prohibitive for construction of a detached secondary suite.
Staff will be developing public information materials related to the
development permit process, including a 'feasibility checklist' for
property owners. This will identify possible servicing requirements,
municipal fees and charges, and a list of site-specific issues
property owners will need to consider in planning and budgeting for
a detached secondary suite.

- Would basements be permitted?
  - At this time, no restriction on basements is proposed. Section
    130.08(3)(e) of the Zoning Bylaw provides for the exemption of
    basement floor area in the calculation of floor area ratio.

- Two related questions were asked about the location of a coach house on
  a lot: (1) Could a detached secondary suite be sited on a side yard, in the
  case of a wide, shallow lot? and (2) The reference to "steep lots" in
  proposed Guideline I.b.ii. seems vague – i.e., what is deemed to be a
  'steep' lot?
  - Proposed Guideline I.b.i. states that "the coach house should
generally be located in the rear yard of the lot" – with possible
  variations in the case of 'through' lots (i.e., those lots having two
  'front' yards).
  - In response to these questions, proposed Guideline I.b.ii. has been
    modified to read as follows (see Appendix 'A'):

    "Alternative siting proposals may be considered to avoid
    significant grade alteration and use of retaining walls on
    sloping lots, to encourage retention of natural site features,
    or to address other unique site conditions including shape of
    lot, and location of existing improvements."

- Discussion ensued regarding a requirement for owner occupancy.
  - Draft zoning regulations for detached secondary suites, as
    presented at the May 5, 2014 meeting of Council, provided for an
    alternative to owner occupancy (i.e., local property management),
    based on existing regulations for secondary suites. As the intent
    here is to provide for a new housing type in established
    neighbourhoods (rather than to legalize a pre-existing type of
    dwelling, in the case of secondary suites), the requirement for
    owner occupancy is considered reasonable, and the alternative of
    local property management has been deleted.
  - Based on Council's input, staff have modified section 4.1(1)(i) of the
    proposed Zoning Bylaw (see Appendix 'B') to read as follows:
3.2 Sustainability

See Appendix 'C'.

3.3 Consultation

See Appendix 'C'.

3.4 Communications Process

See Appendix 'C'.

4.0 Options

4.1 Council may

(as recommended)

- Give first reading to proposed coach house implementation bylaws and present these bylaws at a Public Hearing on June 16, 2014;

(or, alternatively)

- Request further information (to be specified).

Author: Stephen Mikicich, Manager of Community Planning

Appendices:
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District of West Vancouver

Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4360, 2004
Amendment Bylaw No. 4771, 2014

A bylaw to amend the Official Community Plan

WHEREAS the Council of The Corporation of the District of West Vancouver deems it expedient to provide for policy and guidelines for the development of coach houses in existing neighbourhoods;

NOW THEREFORE, the Council of the District of West Vancouver enacts as follows:

Part 1 Citation

1.2 This bylaw may be cited as Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4360, 2004, Amendment Bylaw No. 4771, 2013.

Part 2 Definitions

2.1 In this bylaw:

"Coach House" replaces "Carriage House" and means a detached dwelling unit, which is accessory to, and smaller than a primary dwelling on a residential lot, and may be attached to a garage.

Part 3 Amends Policy Section 3 [Housing]

3.1 Schedule A to Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4360, 2004 is amended as follows:

3.1.2 By adding Policy H 4.2 as follows:

"Provide for rental coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite in all residential zones where secondary suites are a permitted use."
3.1.3 By adding Policy H 4.2.1 as follows:

"Consider rental coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite in other residential zones, subject to site-specific rezoning and a development permit under Development Permit Area BF-B 3.1."

3.1.4 By adding Policy H 4.2.2 as follows:

"Consider ownership coach houses on properties designated in the Official Community Plan for future infill housing development, subject to rezoning and a development permit for infill housing."

3.1.5 By adding Policy H 4.2.3 as follows:

"Consider ownership coach houses as an incentive for conservation of properties listed on the Community Heritage Register, subject to a Heritage Revitalization Agreement and municipal heritage designation."

Part 4 Amends Policy Section 4 [Built Form and Neighbourhood Character]

4.1 Schedule A to Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4360, 2004 is amended as follows:

4.1.1 By adding Policy BF-B 3.1 as follows:

"Ensure that coach houses meet a high quality of building and landscape design, and are compatible both with the principal dwelling on the lot, and the built form character of the local neighbourhood."

4.1.2 By adding "Development Permit Area Designation BF-B 3.1" as described in Schedule A to this bylaw.
Part 5  Adds Built Form Guidelines for Coach House Development in Existing Neighbourhoods

5.1  Schedule A to Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4360, 2004 is further amended as follows:

5.1.3  By adding “Guidelines BF-B 3.1” for coach house development in existing neighbourhoods, as described in Schedule B to this bylaw.

Schedules

Schedule A – Development Permit Area Designation BF-B 3.1
Schedule B – Built Form Guidelines BF-B 3.1

READ A FIRST TIME on [Date]
READ A SECOND TIME on [Date]
READ A THIRD TIME on [Date]
ADOPTED by the Council on [Date].

Mayor

Municipal Clerk
## Schedule A – Development Permit Area Designation BF-B 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Local Government Act s. 919.1 (1) (e), (h), (i) and (j)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conditions:</td>
<td>The Development Permit Area designation is warranted to provide for the compatibility of intensive residential development with the established built form character of existing neighbourhoods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Objectives: |  ▪ To provide for the successful integration of coach houses with the built form and landscape character of existing neighbourhoods;  
 ▪ To minimize site alteration and retain natural site features;  
 ▪ To promote a high standard of design, construction and landscaping; and  
 ▪ To promote energy and water conservation and the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. |
| Guidelines Schedule: | Guidelines BF-B 3.1 shall apply. |
| Exemption: | is for a renovation or small addition to a coach house that is considered to have no material change to the external appearance of the premises, meets all requirements of the Zoning Bylaw, and conforms to Guidelines BF-B 3.1. |
| Development may be exempt from the requirement for a Development Permit if the proposal: |
Schedule B – Built Form Guidelines BF-B 3.1

I. Location on the Lot

a. The location of the coach house on the lot should consider the particular site conditions – e.g., corner or mid-block lot, with or without a rear lane, primary frontage on one or two roads, natural site features, topography, etc.

b. The coach house should generally be located in the rear yard of the lot, except that:

i. On through (or double-fronting) lots, with no rear yards, a coach house may be located in either front yard, subject to compatibility with the orientation of and minimum separation from the principal dwelling on the lot, adjacent properties, and the local streetscape character; and

ii. Alternative siting proposals may be considered to avoid significant grade alteration and use of retaining walls on sloping lots, to encourage retention of natural site features, or to address other unique site conditions including shape of lot, and location of existing improvements.

c. Site planning should be sensitive to existing development on adjacent properties to minimize overview and shadowing, and impacts on established views.

II. Site and Landscape Design

a. Alteration of existing grades and natural site features to accommodate a coach house should be minimized.

b. Established vegetation and rock outcrops should be incorporated in new landscaping, where feasible.

c. All areas adjacent to the coach house should be landscaped with low maintenance, drought resistant plant materials; and rainwater collection systems (e.g., rain barrels) should be considered for irrigation purposes.

d. Permeable paving materials should be used for outdoor patios, walkways and driveways.
e. Visual screening for privacy adjacent to a street or lane should be achieved through appropriately-scaled planting and low ornamental fencing, rather than tall solid fences or tall hedges.

f. Outdoor living areas should be defined and screened for privacy with hard and soft landscaping, architectural elements such as trellises and, where appropriate, changes in grade.

g. Where the coach house is set back sufficiently from a rear lane, consideration should be given to more extensive landscaping adjacent to the lane, including shrubbery and modest-size trees.

h. Rainwater runoff from roofs and other hard surface areas should be retained in rain gardens, bioswales, or rock pits to facilitate natural filtration of rainwater into the ground.

i. Areas for waste and recycling containers should be provided on the lot, shared with the principal dwelling, and appropriately screened if visible from the street.

j. External mechanical equipment and utility meters should be located on a side or back wall of the coach house, not facing the street or the principal dwelling on the lot; and any visual or noise impacts on adjacent properties should be avoided where possible, and otherwise mitigated.

III. Building Design

a. Unit Entry

  i. The primary entrance to the coach house should be easily identifiable and be directly accessible from the street via a walkway on the lot.

  ii. On corner lots, the primary entry to the coach house and prominent windows should be oriented to the flanking side street.

  iii. The coach house address should be clearly visible from the street and, where applicable, the rear lane. It should be illuminated at night.

  iv. The front door to the coach house should be set back a minimum 0.6 metre from the exterior building wall or, alternatively, a projecting roof should be provided, to create a weather-protected entry area at least 1.2 metres in depth.
b. Roof Forms and Massing

i. For two-level coach houses, the partial upper storey (no more than 60 percent of the main floor area) should be contained within the massing of a sloped roof.

ii. Where dormers are used to provide interior room height, the exterior face of the dormer should be set back a minimum of 0.6 metre from the exterior wall edge, and 1.2 metres from projecting roof eaves.

iii. Flat roofs may require design mitigation to ensure that coach houses do not have a two storey appearance.

iv. On larger lots, where space permits, the coach house massing should be limited to one storey, with generous setbacks to minimize overview and privacy impacts on neighbours.

c. Architectural Expression

i. The architectural design of the coach house should be respectful of and complementary to the principal dwelling on the lot, and may be expressed in the same or different style, and should be finished in a similar or complementary palette of building materials.

ii. Visual interest should be created through variations in wall height and massing, and articulation of building facades.

iii. A variation of exterior building materials should be considered with more than one type used on all facades. Where a single material is proposed, visual interest should be provided through architectural detailing and use of colour.

d. Windows

i. On smaller lots, coach house orientation and sizing and placement of windows should be sensitive to the relative proximity of neighbouring properties.

ii. Upper level windows should be located in a manner which minimizes overview to existing development on the site and on adjacent properties. Careful attention should be given to window placement, orientation, and sizing. The use of
skylights, clerestory windows, or obscured glazing should also be considered.

iii. Ground-level windows should be minimized on lane-facing walls for privacy and security.

e. Outdoor Living Areas

i. Private outdoor space, that is separate and distinct from that of the principal dwelling, should be provided for the coach house.

ii. Balconies and decks should be located and screened to provide privacy for the coach house and minimize overlook onto adjacent properties.

f. Parking

i. Parking should be provided in the rear yard of the lot:

- Where the lot is served by an open rear lane, direct vehicle access to the coach house should be via the rear lane.

- Where there is no lane, parking access from the street should be via a driveway shared, if possible, with the principal dwelling on the lot.

ii. Garage doors visible from the street should be designed to minimize their visual appearance through sensitive detailing and use of limited glazing.

iii. Permeable driveway surfaces such as 'grasscrete' pavers or narrow wheel lanes with grass planting in between should be used, where feasible.

g. Accessibility / Adaptability

i. Coach house designs should provide for accessibility/adaptability to meet changing household needs over time.

ii. Single-level units are encouraged where coach houses are likely to accommodate older residents or people with limited mobility.
h. 'Green' Building Features

Coach house designs should incorporate 'green' building features for reduced energy consumption and lower greenhouse gas emissions. At minimum, pre-plumbing and pre-wiring should be provided for future installation of such features.
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District of West Vancouver

Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010
Amendment Bylaw No. 4772, 2014

A bylaw to amend the Zoning Bylaw to provide for Detached Secondary Suites

WHEREAS the Council of The Corporation of the District of West Vancouver deems it expedient to provide for amendment of the Zoning Bylaw;

NOW THEREFORE, the Council of the District of West Vancouver enacts as follows:

Part 1  Citation

1.1 This bylaw may be cited as “Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Amendment Bylaw No. 4772, 2014”.

Part 2  Severability

2.1 If a portion of this bylaw is held invalid by a Court of competent jurisdiction, then the invalid portion must be severed and the remainder of this bylaw is deemed to have been adopted without the severed section, subsequent, paragraph, subparagraph, clause or phrase.

Part 3  Amends Definitions

3.1 Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Schedule A, Section 110 – Definitions is hereby amended by inserting the following definition in alphabetical order:

“Detached secondary suite means a detached dwelling unit accessory to a single family dwelling use”.

Part 4  Amends General Regulations for Residential Zones and Uses Only

4.1 Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Schedule A, Section 130 – General Regulations for Residential Zones and Uses Only is hereby amended by adding Section 130.051 – Detached Secondary Suites to read as follows:
(1) Where permitted, a detached secondary suite is subject to compliance with the following regulations:

(a) a maximum of one detached secondary suite is permitted per lot;

(b) the detached secondary suite is not permitted in conjunction with a secondary suite on the same lot;

(c) the detached secondary suite is not permitted in conjunction with a duplex dwelling;

(d) the detached secondary suite shall be set back from the rear property line of the lot as follows:

(i) minimum 1.8 metres to the rear building wall; and

(ii) minimum 1.2 metres for any portion of the building containing an enclosed garage.

(e) the detached secondary suite shall be sited a minimum distance of 4.9 metres away from the principal dwelling on the lot.

(f) the detached secondary suite shall have a maximum of two storeys with maximum building heights as follows:

(i) 4.57 metres if one storey; or

(ii) 6.4 metres if two storeys.

(g) for two-storey dwellings, the upper storey shall have a maximum floor area not exceeding 60% of the main floor area;

(h) the detached secondary suite shall have a maximum floor area not exceeding the lesser of 10% of lot area or 111.5 square metres, whichever is less;

(i) the registered owner of the lot must occupy, as his/her principal place of residence, either the principal dwelling unit or the detached secondary suite;

(j) the keeping of lodgers, a personal care facility, a child care facility, or a bed and breakfast is not permitted on a lot containing a detached secondary suite;
(k) one off-street vehicle parking space must be provided exclusively for the use of the detached secondary suite; and

(l) the detached secondary suite must not be subdivided from the principal dwelling unit under the Land Title Act or the Strata Property Act."

Part 5 Amends Single Family Dwelling Zones and Duplex Dwelling Zones

5.1 Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Schedule A, Section 200 is hereby amended by adding "detached secondary suite" as a permitted use in the RS1, RS2, RS3, RS4, RS5, RS7, RS8, RS9, and RS10 zones.

5.2 Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Schedule A, Section 250 is hereby amended by adding "detached secondary suite" as a permitted use in the RD1 and RD2 zones.

READ A FIRST TIME on [Date]

READ A SECOND TIME on [Date]

READ A THIRD TIME on [Date]

ADOPTED by the Council on [Date].

______________________________
Mayor

______________________________
Municipal Clerk
COUNCIL REPORT

Date: April 14, 2014
From: Stephen Mikicich, Manager of Community Planning
Subject: Results of Community Engagement on Proposed Coach House Policies, Regulations and Guidelines

RECOMMENDED THAT:

1. Direction on any amendments to draft coach house bylaws, attached as Appendices ‘A’ and ‘B’ to the report from the Manager of Community Planning, dated April 14, 2014 be provided to staff so that draft bylaws may be finalized for Council’s consideration of first reading at its meeting on May 26, 2014.

Purpose

Community engagement on proposed coach house policies and development permit guidelines, and proposed zoning regulations for detached secondary suites was completed in early April 2014. The purpose of this report is to present the findings of this consultation process, and to present proposed implementation bylaws for Council’s information and comment, prior to formal consideration of First Reading on May 26, 2014.

1.0 Background

1.1 Prior Resolutions

November 18, 2013 – Council directed staff to seek community input on proposed coach house policies, regulations, and guidelines as described in the report from the Manager of Community Planning dated November 6, 2013; and, upon completion of the community engagement process, to present proposed implementation bylaws for formal consideration by Council.

September 9, 2013 – Council directed staff to prepare draft bylaws to allow for rental coach houses as a detached from of secondary suite for Council consideration in fall 2013.

February 18, 2013 – Council adopted the Housing Action Plan, which provides the framework for the Planning Department’s work on housing during 2013-2014.
1.2 History

The District’s coach house examination began in December 2012 with posting of the Discussion Paper titled, “The Potential for Coach Houses in West Vancouver” on westvancouver.ca. This was followed by a series of public presentations, information displays at District venues, and a moderated panel discussion at the Kay Meek Centre on May 8, 2013. Residents provided formal input on the possibility of coach houses in West Vancouver through:

- Coach House Questionnaire (124 responses: 78% support for coach houses);
- 2013 West Vancouver Community Survey (744 responses; 56% support).

Key findings from the first phase of community engagement (through June 2013), and staff recommendations for the introduction of coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite were presented to Council on September 9, 2013. At this meeting, Council directed staff to prepare draft bylaws.

The contents of these draft bylaws – i.e., proposed policies, regulations and guidelines were presented to Council on November 18, 2013; and staff was directed to undertake a second phase of community consultation, which was completed on March 31, 2014.

2.0 Policy

2.1 Policy

The Official Community Plan (OCP) is founded on eight planning principles for building a sustainable community. Principle #3 is to “provide for a diversity of housing types to accommodate a balanced and diverse population in terms of age, ability, income, and household type.”

The final report and recommendations of the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing (2008) has provided a policy framework for various District initiatives related to housing diversity. These include: new neighbourhoods in the Evelyn Drive and Rodgers Creek areas, a pilot program for examining new housing types (2009), legalization of secondary suites (2010), designation of the 2000-block Esquimalt and Fulton Avenues for future infill housing development (2011), and current work on coach houses and purpose-built rental housing.

Action #2 in the Housing Action Plan (adopted February 2013) is to “consider coach houses following an informed community discussion.”
2.2 Bylaw

The introduction of coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite requires the establishment of a new regulatory framework; specifically amendments to:

- the Official Community Plan – to add new housing policies, and to establish a coach house Development Permit Area, with associated form and character guidelines (see Appendix ‘A’); and

- the Zoning Bylaw – to add regulations for detached secondary suites (see Appendix ‘B’).

In addition, the Development Procedures Bylaw will need to be amended to establish requirements for processing of Development Permit applications for detached secondary suites, including proposed delegation of permit issuance to staff. And, an amendment to the Fees and Charges Bylaw will be required to establish application fees for Development Permit applications.

Staff is recommending a two-stage approval process, and is proposing to engage a qualified design professional (consultant) to review Development Permit applications for proposed siting of detached secondary suites (stage one), and for compliance with form and character guidelines (stage two). However, more work is required to formalized the application process, and establish an appropriate fee structure to ensure cost recovery for the District.

If Council adopts proposed amendments to the OCP and Zoning Bylaw to allow for detached secondary suites, staff recommends an effective date of October 2014. In accordance with this time-frame, staff will present proposed amendments to the Fees and Charges Bylaw and the Development Procedures Bylaw in September 2014, along with details of the Development Permit process and related public information materials.

3.0 Analysis

3.1 Discussion

As noted below in Section 3.3, the second phase of consultation on the District’s coach house examination was undertaken from January through March 2014. Specifically, staff sought community input on proposed coach house policies, regulations and guidelines as presented to Council in November 2013, with a view to refining these proposals in order to prepare draft implementing bylaws.
3.1.1 Questionnaire Feedback

A total of 102 completed questionnaires\(^1\) were received between February 24 and April 2, 2014, and approximately 27% of these were completed online. Numerical findings and qualitative comments from the questionnaire are provided in Appendix ‘C’ and key findings are summarized below:

**Proposed Coach House Policies**

- 75% of respondents felt that coach houses should be permitted in all zones where secondary suites are now permitted.
- 78% supported consideration of coach houses in other residential zones, subject to Council approval for site-specific rezoning.
- Respondents were asked whether ‘ownership’ coach houses should be considered in the case of properties that are: (a) designated in the OCP for future infill development (63% answered ‘yes’); or (b) listed on the Community Heritage Register and eligible for conservation incentives (51% answered ‘yes’).

These responses are indicative of both community interest in ground-oriented multi-family housing options for future down-sizing; and a heritage conservation program that is still in its infancy – with no completed heritage projects to date\(^2\).

**Proposed Zoning Regulations for Detached Secondary Suites**

- 56% of respondents agreed that a detached suite should be allowed as an alternative to a suite within the house (i.e., one or the other, but not both). Conversely, a significant minority (38%) felt that a detached secondary suite should be permitted in conjunction with a secondary suite – as is the case in the City of Vancouver (where detached suites are referred to as “laneway houses”).
- Respondents were split on whether additional site coverage should be provided for detached secondary suites (i.e., above that permitted for the principal dwelling and accessory structures under current zoning). 49% answered ‘yes’ whereas 51% answered ‘no’ or ‘not sure’. Staff now believes that it would be more prudent to consider site coverage on an individual lot basis, when approving the proposed location of the dwelling on the property.

---

\(^1\) A total of 128 completed questionnaires comprised of: 74 printed questionnaires and 28 submitted online via westvancouverTE.

\(^2\) To date, there have been no approved heritage conservation projects in West Vancouver involving the restoration and legal protection of a private residence, with the application of land use or other incentive tools. However, two applications for a Heritage Revitalization Agreement and Heritage Designation are currently under review: ‘Staples House’ (6985 Islevview Road); and ‘Toby House’ (2055 Queens Avenue).
and providing for any variance to maximum site coverage via the Development Permit process.

- 59% of respondents agreed with maintaining the maximum permitted floor area ratio (FAR) for the lot. Under this scenario, properties already developed to maximum FAR would not be eligible for a detached secondary suite.

- Respondents were split on whether or not basement floor areas should be exempted from calculation of FAR – with 49% answering ‘yes’ and 51% answering ‘no’ or ‘not sure’.

- 55% supported a maximum floor area for detached secondary suite equal to 10 times the lot area, to a maximum 111.5 m² (1,200 sq.ft.); and 27% answered ‘not sure’.

- 59% answered ‘yes’ to exempting 20.5 m² (220 sq.ft.) for one enclosed garage. As garages in many of Vancouver’s laneway houses have subsequently been converted to living space, it may be prudent to include the area of garages in floor area calculations as a disincentive to building enclosed parking (i.e., open parking or carport option).

- Proposed maximum building heights of 4.57 metres for one-storey buildings, and 6.4 metres for two-storey buildings received 67% support; with 64.5% supporting an upper-storey floor area not exceeding 60% of the main floor area.

- 68% supported the parking standard of a minimum one parking space for the exclusive use of the coach house.

- 78% supported the idea of owner occupancy for either the principal dwelling or detached secondary suite; although existing zoning regulations for secondary suites provide for an ‘equivalency’ in owner occupancy in the form of local property management.

- 69% supported ‘no separate title’ – meaning that the property could not be subdivided (strata-titled).  

*Proposed Form and Character (Development Permit) Guidelines*

- Most comments on this section of the questionnaire were general in scope, and not particularly relevant to the proposed guidelines. However, the comments do address typical issues raised in discussions to date – that is, potential neighbour impacts related to views, privacy, sunlight/shade, noise, and parking. The focus of the proposed form and character guidelines is to allow for successful integration of this new housing type in established neighbourhoods, and to reduce or mitigate potential neighbour impacts.
3.1.2 Focus Group Sessions

In March 2014, staff undertook joint consultations with our colleagues at the District of North Vancouver (DNV) to obtain more focused input on our respective coach house proposals. Three sessions were held with:

1. Municipal planners in other jurisdictions that have previously introduced coach houses
   
   - To gain insight on lessons learned elsewhere, and obtain constructive feedback on our coach house proposals.

2. Representatives of the local design and construction communities
   
   - To confirm the ‘workability’ of proposed regulations, and address issues related to optimal unit size, design considerations, sustainability, servicing, and construction costs.

3. The North Shore Advisory Committee on Disability Issues (ACDI)
   
   - To outline our respective coach house proposals and seek direction on design measures to support aging in place, and making these units adaptable for various households.
   
   - If Council is supportive of advancing the coach house bylaws, staff will work with ACDI’s Development and Inclusion Sub-Committee over the summer to develop educational materials related to accessibility in coach house design.

Key findings from these consultations are as follows;

- By not allowing for an increase in density, we are simply providing an option for those property owners wanting a detached suite, rather than a suite within the house. This approach may have a limited take-up in the community but, at the same time, there is also a lot of public interest in this housing type.

- ‘Incentivizing’ coach houses would require an increase in density, which could be applied in certain situations – e.g., where an existing house is retained. Conversely, providing an increase in density without conditions could lead to more demolitions of existing houses, as has been the case in Vancouver.

- We need to strike a balance between ‘downsized-living’ and adequate storage space to support aging in place.

- In terms of optimal unit size, 1,000 to 1,200 square feet would work for a small family; whereas a one or two-person household could live in spaces as
small as 400 square feet, subject to good design and lots of built-in storage space.

- Garages are a key consideration:
  - Exempting floor area for a garage is seen as ‘free’ space, which can easily be converted to living space (as has been the case in Vancouver);
  - By not requiring parking to be attached, the coach house footprint could be sunk into the ground, enabling higher ceiling heights for improved livability in a small space.

- In terms of ‘affordability’:
  - Experience in other communities suggests that coach houses tend to be well-designed and well-appointed, and demand a premium rent;
  - Building a coach house may, however, be a more affordable option to buying a condominium apartment, if someone has a family member with the ‘free’ land to build on – e.g., in their parents’ back yard.

- Concern over ‘neighbour input’ – i.e., do not want to turn consultation into requirement for neighbour approval.

- As massing and overlook into neighbouring properties tend to be the key issues in other communities, consideration should be given to ‘incentivizing’ smaller, single-level units through an expedited approval process. This would also align with design objectives for accessibility and ‘aging in place’.

- The idea of a development ‘feasibility checklist’ would be very helpful for homeowners and designers. Staff would develop this checklist as an information and planning tool, which would be used by potential applicants to determine whether building a detached secondary suite is economically-viable on their property – taking into account unique site conditions, servicing requirements, municipal fees and charges, construction costs, etc.

- No need to establish a minimum floor area for coach houses.

- In most cases, the conversion of existing accessory buildings to coach houses may not be viable due to BC Building Code requirements for rain screening and insulation – e.g., may necessitate structures to be stripped down to foundations.

- On the issue of basements, storage space is considered important; but there was no real consensus on whether or not basements should be permitted. In most cases, the issue is an economic one – i.e., whether or not blasting is required.
• Consider floor area exemptions for bicycle and other storage space.

• In areas with rear lanes, design and landscaping should take into account the impact of coach houses and the changing use and character of the lane – e.g., potential 'mews' character.

3.1.3 Implications for Draft Bylaws

Upon review of the community input received through early April 2014, staff has made minor revisions to the Development Permit Guidelines (e.g., by deleting reference to 'green roofs', and minor text edits); and to proposed zoning regulations for detached secondary suites, specifically related to site coverage, exempted floor areas, and minimum unit size (see Appendix ‘D’).

The proposed Development Permit process is seen as providing for both a thorough review of coach house applications, while not making the process too onerous for property owners. Proposed amendments to the Development Procedures Bylaw in September 2014 will provide for a two-stage Development Permit approval process, and delegation of permit issuance to the Director of Planning, Land Development and Permits.

As with the introduction of secondary suites in 2010, it is recognized that detached secondary suites are a new housing form; and zoning regulations may be further refined over time. If detached secondary suites are introduced in 2014, staff recommends that a review be undertaken after one year to determine whether further regulatory changes would be necessary to address any issues that may arise. Ongoing program monitoring would provide for future refinements on an as-needed basis.

3.2 Sustainability

A diversity of housing supports a balanced and diverse population in terms of age, ability, income, and household type; and is fundamental for building a sustainable community. Coach houses, as a detached form of secondary suite, would provide an attractive housing option for West Vancouver residents wishing to:

• downsize into a smaller housing unit on their own property;

• provide self-contained accommodation for an elderly parent, adult child, or on-site caregiver;

• design a custom housing unit for a family member with a disability (e.g., limited mobility); or

• create a more livable, ground-oriented rental unit, with added privacy for both the principal and accessory dwellings.
3.3 Consultation

The second phase of consultation on the District’s coach house examination was undertaken from January through March 2014, and sought community input on proposed coach house policies, regulations and guidelines as presented to Council in November 2013. Community engagement included:

- Information posted on westvancouver.ca
- Housing and Neighbourhoods Fair (February 24th and March 1st) – advertised in the North Shore News, North Shore Outlook and Palvand newspapers.
- Joint consultation events with the District of North Vancouver\(^3\) as described in Section 3.1.2 above (March 10\(^{th}\) and 13\(^{th}\)).
- Printed and online\(^4\) questionnaires (received from February 24\(^{th}\) through April 2\(^{nd}\)).

3.4 Communications Process

See Section 3.3.

4.0 Options

4.1 Council may

*(as recommended)*

- Provide direction on any amendments to draft coach house bylaws to staff so that these bylaws may be finalized for Council’s consideration of first reading at its meeting on May 26, 2014.

* (or, alternatively)*

- Request further information (to be specified).

Author: Stephen Mikicich, Manager of Community Planning

\(^3\) DWV staff worked jointly with DNV staff to address three target audiences for input on our respective coach house proposals.

\(^4\) Questionnaires could be completed online via westvancouverIITE.
Appendices:


C. Questionnaire Findings and Detailed Comments, April 2014

D. Summary of Changes to Proposed Zoning Regulations, April 2014
Findings from Coach House Questionnaire

This Appendix provides an overview of numerical findings and comments from 102 completed questionnaires. These were received from West Vancouver residents between February 24 and April 2, 2014. Approximately 27% of these were completed online. Note: Percentage values below are based on the number of responses to each individual question.

**QUESTION 1:** Please tell us where you live...

100% of respondents were West Vancouver residents, and from the following sub-areas 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:** British Properties, Glenmore, Chartwell, Canterbury, Panorama, Whitby Estates
QUESTION 2: Do you think that coach houses should be permitted in all zones where secondary suites are now permitted?

Comments from Individuals Answering "Yes" to Question 2

- All zones
- Yes, in fact I feel they are superior to secondary suites in providing affordable, single family residences
- We need more affordable housing
- If they are well and attractively designed similar to those beside the United Church on 21st the church is on 21st but the couch houses nearby.
- How about lane cafes and bike shops?
- all zones
- But the rules should be firm with no discretion - all development should meet the bylaws - the new bylaws should be approved by electors.
- Strongly Yes
- And also there are those areas that could use coach houses where secondary suites are currently not permitted.

Comments from Individuals Answering "No" to Question 2

- The advantage of secondary suites is that home owners can better control noise and other disturbances for the neighbourhood. Better monitoring of parking is required.
- It is better to be permitted accordance with the majority of the size of the lots in the area.
- Each neighbourhood should have opportunity to accept or reject
- On street parking is causing congestion from secondary suite tenants. The proposed size of coach houses (typically bigger than basement suites) would result in more tenants and vehicles worsening parking congestion.
- Only instead of secondary suite.
- Only on level lots with lane access
• I am far from being sold on the concept of coach houses in West Vancouver. There are just too many complicating factors, including concerns over parking and congestion; utility connections; adequate access for service, sanitation and emergency vehicles; loss of privacy for neighbours; loss of trees and other vegetation; and the general loss of community character. While some of these concerns could be addressed, depending upon the location, I don't have confidence that issues of neighbour privacy, vegetation and character will be (even with DP Area guidelines).
• I find this confusing; staff said that all zones permit secondary suites with the exception of Eagle Island.
• Once built, I doubt West Vancouver District will be able to adequately monitor and regulate the use of this type of housing.
• I fear that significant parking issues would not be addressed.

Comments from Individuals Who Did Not Select “Yes”, “No”, or “Not Sure” to Question 2
• Why do you keep pushing this garbage on to us? It will ruin the ambiance of West Van

QUESTION 3: Do you think that coach houses should be considered in other residential zones on a site by site basis (and subject to rezoning approval?)

![Pie chart showing responses](image)

Comments from Individuals Answering “Yes” to Question 3:
• I do not believe in a have/have not policy!
• Densify while maintaining nature - architects
• All zones
• But only with the above conditions.
• Again - with review of approval
• Coach houses should also be permitted in RS6 Zoning (Eagle Island), subject to similar restrictions as in other areas. Parking should be n/a for RS6.
• Definitely. Houses are becoming too large to live in, and for those to buy. Living in the area should not be for privileged.
• The only place they are appropriate is on large properties like those in Altamont or above the Upper Levels HWY.
• Only if parking issues are effectively addressed.

Comments from Individuals Answering “No” to Question 3:

• Why do you penalize those zones where you have already approved secondary suites with additional noise/decreased privacy and congestion, but not apply the same issues to others?
• Close to Marine Dr
• Where you have big houses on small lots adding coach houses is not feasible.

QUESTION 4: Do you think that ownership coach houses should be considered for properties that are:

a) Designated in the Official Community Plan (OCP) for future infill development?

b) [Pie chart showing distribution: No Response 7%, Not Sure 19%, Other 74%]

c) Listed on the Community Heritage Register and eligible for conservation incentives?
Comments from Individuals Answering Question 4 (a) and (b):

- Have you looked seriously at what you are proposing? e.g. up to 1200sqft not including garage, only 1 parking space (vs. 2 for secondary suite), proximity to laneway with doors etc facing other properties, congestion, noise, decreased privacy for adjacent houses, etc. Why so large and why so intrusive?
- I think that there are many properties in WV that could support infill/coach houses, help preserve neighbourhood character and livability. Not sure how it relates to OCP (current) and heritage register.
- (a) I don't know what areas there are; (b) I did not know we had any heritage (residential) properties left
- A 2nd suite makes owner responsible for tenants - purpose is marketed as in-law suite etc - not revenue
- a great tool to protect - and encourage protection - of what little heritage stock we have left
- (c) All zones: Yes
- More rental stock is needed.
- I think coach houses are good anywhere. I am strongly in favour of West Vancouver being open and flexible to coach houses.
- Renting coach houses just makes future infill housing development more difficult and if ownership involved would make resale impossible.
- Should not be a heritage incentive tool; this is a housing capacity policy not a heritage policy.
- (a) I believe so, need to review OCP.
- I am not concerned about increased density in the form of coach houses, as I feel this would be positive for the community. My concern with the ownership option is that I think we need to preserve an adequate supply of rental housing. Heritage conservation is of paramount importance, however.

**QUESTION 5:** Do you agree that a detached secondary suite should not be permitted in conjunction with a secondary suite (within the house)? i.e. one or the other, but not both.
Comments from Individuals Answering "Yes" to Question 5:
- Unless the property is so large that it can accommodate parking, noise, intrusion on neighbours, etc.
- Too much!
- This is very important!
- Parking with 3 dwellings would often be a problem
- In existing single family neighbourhoods, there shouldn't be more secondary living units permitted than principal living units on a lot.

Comments from Individuals Answering "No" to Question 5:
- I see no reason that both shouldn't be able to be provided. I think parking and traffic are the issue.
- Both especially close to shops/services
- If the lot is large enough, I see no reason not to use properties that can take a coach house as well as a suite.
- Living in WV is expensive. Let's keep people in our community by helping them to afford to live here
- If there is room on the lot and it would be allowed if the secondary (basement) suite was not there, what does it matter? If the main house has space for two dwelling units with no additional bulk then who or how many live inside has nothing to do with the detached dwelling.
- Parking is the big issue - never enough
- Too many cars may result with limited parking
- Case by case. Some suites don't add bulk
- Both should be considered to allow younger families to afford W Van housing by suite and coach house revenues.
- More density and more rental units are needed.
- I think both should be permissible.
- I do not think there is a problem to allow both. Lots in West Van are generally big and can't see the disadvantages of having both.
• We are facing affordable housing for children of families in West Vancouver. We need more flexible options.
• Both permitted.

Comments from Individuals Answering “Not Sure” to Question 5:
• Coach houses can become rec rooms for already large houses - not good! rentals ensure diversity and community

Comments from Individuals Who Did Not Select “Yes”, “No”, or “Not Sure” to Question 5:
• Yes to a secondary suite within the house; no to a detached secondary suite. I think that the municipality should continue working to fix the 'bugs' in their contained secondary suite policy - as a way to bringing affordable housing to West Vancouver - before embarking on coach house/detached secondary suite policy.

QUESTION 6: Do you support the following proposals? (a – j)

a) Maximum 10% site coverage, including garage (in addition to the max site coverage for the principal dwelling & accessory structures under existing zoning

b) Maintain maximum FAR for the lot (properties already developed to maximum FAR would not be eligible)
c) Exempt basement from FAR calculation (as per section 130.08 of the Zoning Bylaw)

![Pie chart showing responses]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


d) Maximum floor area 0.1 times lot area to a maximum 111.5 m² (1200 sq.ft)

![Pie chart showing responses]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


e) Floor area exemption of 20.5 m² (220 sq.ft) for one enclosed parking garage

![Pie chart showing responses]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
f) Maximum 4.57m (15ft) for one-storey buildings and maximum 6.4m (22ft) for two-storey buildings

![Pie chart showing distribution]

g) Maximum two storeys and the upper storey shall have a maximum floor area not exceeding 60% of the main floor area

![Pie chart showing distribution]

h) Minimum one parking space for the exclusive use of the coach house

![Pie chart showing distribution]

i) Owner occupancy of either the principal dwelling or the coach house
j) The coach house must not be subdivided from the principal dwelling (no separate title)

Comments from Individuals Answering Question 6:
- Coach houses could be separately owned as in Vancouver
- Re (j) confused - coach house rental/ownership ... if ownership what would the "title" look like for the property?
- For (f) & (g), Yes if privacy is maintained for neighbours.
  I think this is a great way to increase density but I also believe the Muni should have some discretion to disallow or reduce size/height based on the situation (eg access considerations/traffic etc).
- Who is going to monitor noise levels? An owner would hopefully be more cognizant of that. Separate owners would mean no responsibility at all.
- 15% max site coverage. Enhance affordability
- Existing older homes (bungalows) could become the coach house with new build on lot. 22' is too high. Not sure why we should prevent separate title. Also allow for joint tenancy agreements (allows family and friends to benefit from capital investment and principal resident tax/assess ownership)
- (j) Why not?
- Should allow for separate ownership
- I don't know enough about these questions to comment
- (a) 10-12%
No more than 2 parking spaces for coach house 1 for main house
It would be good to look in the future with all this!
(a-e) plain English please. Coach houses shouldn't rent for over $3000 a month as they currently are. Coach houses should not cost over $1 million, as they currently do.
We have visited similar properties in Vancouver and were impressed with their liveability and attractiveness.
(f) no higher anyway; (h) probably address for all residents; Do not increase FAR if anything, lower it.
Coach houses must be able to be sold, otherwise housing costs are less affordable.
(e) Subject to design approval
(h) Only one parking space
(d) Better allocated as a percentage of a lot than an absolute measure like 1200 ft, on the maximum size.
For (a) there should be no consideration for variances - they should meet all setback rules. For (f) and (g) should depend on the new structure taking away privacy for the neighbour.
(a) 10 or in some cases 15-20%; (f) Higher in some select cases
(a) How about a bigger allowance
No separate title is very important.
6. h) is not applicable for Eagle Island, since the Island has no car access
(a) Could permit greater than 10% site coverage where there is sufficient unused site coverage for the principal dwelling under existing zoning; (c) Exempt only if basement is not developed as living space as distinct from storage or utility space; (d) If there is unused FAR with existing principal residence, should be able to bonus coach house FAR; (e) This is only sufficient for a medium sized vehicle - should be increased to provide capacity for storage of recreational items, etc.; (f) Does this include basements if there is one?; (g) Does main floor area include a garage?
(a) Should be slightly higher if 10% of available land; (d) Could be slightly larger; (f) Should be based on site; (g) Should be based on site. Would this not be governed by the design?; (h) What about street parking?; (i) If land requirements permit or are changed subdivision should be allowed.
(a) Too large; (d) Too large - max 750 sqft; (f) Max 15' only.
Floor area is too large - max. 750-800 sq. ft.. Only "laneway" or corner access lots - in backyards of sloped, south-side properties, ANY laneway house would be totally intrusive.
Coach houses will invariably bring in the age of "maximum" - developments invoking the maximum FAR, maximum site coverage, maximum floor area exemptions, maximum building heights, and maximum rock removal/blasting to maximize FAR-free basement space.
When I lived in Calgary 25 years ago, I lived in a 3 bedroom home of 1200 sqft. So, actually what the proposal is, is 2 houses on one lot - nonsense.
RE (f) & (g): 2nd storey should not be allowed if it adversely affects privacy of existing neighbours or blocks their view.
QUESTION 7: The District is proposing Development Permit (DP) Area guidelines to provide for compatibility of a coach house with the principal dwelling and built form character of the local neighbourhood. Please tell us what you think of the proposed guidelines.

• Very pleased to see this kind of forward thinking. The "need" will only become greater as time goes by. Of course you will know that other countries (NZ etc) have had "Granny Suites" for years on the principal property.
• I agree that all development - not just coach houses - should fit with our neighbourhoods. I hope that allowing coach houses will reduce the size of principle dwellings which are grossly oversized relative to lots. i.e. reduce the overall look of bulk.
On another note, I see there is a "good neighbour" bylaw requiring construction sites to be kept neat and tidy. I wish your inspectors would enforce this when they visit sites please. Most sites have garbage and building bits littering the site. The ones that don't truly stand out! It should be the other way around.
• You are allowing for too large a size. The concept of preventing mega houses on small properties by having 2 smaller houses are two separate issues. You can create bylaws to limit a house size without doing this.
Have you considered: narrow size of lanes that near coach houses will be very close to adjacent properties; having doors/windows on the property side not the lane side so other occupants face inwards to the owners and not outside to the neighbours; requiring 2 parking spots on the property; ensuring narrow lanes ways (30' or less) have single storey houses so that the 2nd story doesn't impose on neighbours; 1200 sq feet is very large - this is like subdividing a property without saying so
• There are many of us who are looking for this as we want to downsize but remain in the community.
• Quite good. I think we should retain many of the smaller homes and allow them a coach-house. I am absolutely appalled at the size of the houses the council has approved - look completely top-heavy on the lot - the damage has been done already and only NOW are council addressing it (The Grosvenor Debacle shows the present council). I will certainly not vote for Smith again and hope we have a choice.
• I think that the guidelines seem to be appropriate and thoughtful for this neighbourhood.
• 'Coach Houses' is a nice term for a planner's great idea but would they really result in affordable choices? Or just raise the cost of purchasing a house by another 250,000 because of the cost of the second dwelling? If secondary dwellings are allowed then it should be in every area including the BPs and Caulfield. Not just Ambleside and Dundarave.
• I support the guidelines as proposed. Neighbourhood compatibility and blending for look, feel and visual impact is an important consideration.
• These guidelines are long overdue. Well done!
• Let's try to maintain the original cottage-y feeling of neighbourhoods. Our area (Dundarave) has been ruined by too many huge square boxes.
• I have been (and my family) through a lot of noise from new buildings going up in our neighbourhood: 15.22(1) block Inglewood. We are thinking to build a coach
house for our son. I would hope that we would be allowed a proper basement to the coach house. (extra storage and living space). We feel others should be patient with the process as we have been patient with others through their process of building. I would like to see a balcony over the carport or garage, so the top bedroom would have access to it.

- The ones illustrated look reasonable but have reservations about only 15’ away from main building in one plan.
- Coach houses can be and are a complementary fit with an existing house on an existing lot. Guidelines guided by that thought will be very useful for future development.
- If the house is a McMansion "bulk" then the coach house will match that design? Not a good idea. Once again, look to other communities, such as Paris, for inspiration.
- Guidelines such as these are long overdue as long as they are reasonably set and cannot be decided upon outside 'set guidelines (ie bought).
- I think that it is a wonderful idea and recommend the following: to not mess up and be careful what you do.
- Each neighbourhood should have chance to accept or reject coach houses. Infrastructure should be addressed before density is increased (roads, transit, hospitals etc). More public consultation needed. Personally I reject coach houses and prefer secondary suites.
- Well thought out
- We need to fill in the gaps that sprawl has created. Engage architects as a rule! Thoughtful density over thoughtless isolation. Too many empty McMansions!
- Agreed
- They are acceptable, with the exception of affordability.
- Agree
- How is 'character of the local neighbourhood' defined? I feel most strongly that the character of West Vancouver (not only in my own area of Cypress Park) is slowly being eroded by new buildings that - though built within the current building regulations - are totally jarring to the eye and not at all within the traditional character of the local neighbourhood.
- I think they’re great.
- Makes sense that the two are compatible
- The addition of a coach house should not increase, black top concrete or other non porous servicing than the allowed floor area. No alteration to site grade should be allowed and maximum excavation limit should be set. Site planning should not only be sensitive to existing property (adjacent) no application should be approved if any one neighbour is against it.
- Guidelines are needed and compatibility house-coach house is important. But one can imagine conditions where a traditional house and modern coach house could work. Guidelines and review/approval by a design panel?
- I think coach housing provides a solution for many housing and socio-economic issues facing our society. City of Vancouver has allowed and it is time for West Vancouver to embrace it with as little regulation as possible.
- I like that idea.
- This is important and I think many lots would be impossible to develop this way without losing any aesthetic looks to the property.
• Agree
• The guidelines seem to contemplate a stereotypical lot which is much deeper than is wide. I live in the original British Properties where many lots (including mine) are much wider than they are deep. I couldn't develop a coach house in my backyard or front yard but would have room in my side yard. I think it should be confirmed in the guidelines that the DP Area would provide flexibility to orient a coach quite differently than expressed guidelines. Would setbacks from lanes apply to side streets on corner lots which have no access by lane? I think that the second floor area should not be required to be less than first floor particularly in situations where the main living floor might be best designed on the second floor to take advantage of natural light, sun exposure and views, all enhancing the living experience in the coach house.
• Ok - wish you had this previously - neighbourhood has a monstrosity 2 level carriage house and tenants can see right into my bedroom and liv. rm - I have to keep the blinds closed. Argyle.
• I believe that the proposal is needed and should be imposed. Keeping in mind the greenery of the area that is part of its character. It would not suit to mow down trees for density if sites permit additional coach house application it should be considered.
• Lot location: only on lots with lane access. Only on fairly level lots - otherwise, too intrusive and there is no kind of site planning that is sensitive to impacts on established views!
• I'm not fully confident that the proposed DP Area guidelines will be able to mitigate all coach house development concerns and preserve the character of the neighbourhood. By nature, design concepts are subjective and rarely do they end up in a 'win-win' for the neighbourhood (ie a "balanced scorecard").
• My concern is at present there are too many absentee home owners in West Vancouver, and with additional coach houses will add to the problem. People who are not interested in developing the community.
• I suppose "detached suites" is supposed to sound reassuring - sort of like "conscious uncoupling" instead of divorce. A 1200 sqft home, maybe with a basement, a garage, maybe 2 storey and maybe with a suite in one of the houses, on one lot. No thank you. There will be pressure on the municipal infrastructure, lack of privacy, no room for vegetation, trees etc. I can see a developer buying up several properties, building detached suites, living there for 1 year moving on to the next, increasing property values, traffic nightmares - I think that with Evelyn Drive, Grosvenor's project, Larco towers, the highrise replacing the co-op building on Marine Drive, West Van Florist looking ahead to development, the Masonic Lodge, HY Louie probably taking another run, the Squamish proposals for the W Van waterfront - enough! Thank you.
• There is no room for coach houses on Ambleside lots. If a neighbour builds one on an adjoining property (50x142' lots). I will lose privacy, and therefore my property value will decline; while the developer will gain value at my expense. They could also negatively impact my views and sight lines. I contend that allowing coach houses in Ambleside will only benefit developers and real estate agents at the expense of existing neighbours. The Introduction of coach houses into Ambleside will destroy the character of the neighbourhood. It is naive to think that it will create "affordable" housing as the real estate agents and developers will ensure they are priced for maximum profit, regardless of negative impacts to
neighbouring properties. I wonder where the District staff who created this initiative live? Surely not in Ambleside. There is plenty of "affordable" housing in North Van or Squamish. Why should we allow District of West Van bureaucrats to destroy the character of our neighbourhood under the guise of affordable housing? Ambleside is a beautiful and unique neighbourhood which does not need additional density in the current single family residential neighbourhoods. There is no community benefit to allowing coach houses, as they will not be priced as "affordable" housing. This program is a huge mistake. Please do not let it proceed.

- Our home which we dearly love is one of the few in West Van that can only be accessed via a laneway (s. 22(1)). Therefore that lane is like "our street". We are very concerned that with the inevitable redevelopment of homes that adjoin that lane will result in a very ugly approach to our house especially if coach houses or garages are allowed very close to the lane lot line of those properties. In general, parking issues is a major concern with coach houses.

- I agree with the guidelines for the most part.
  From a self interest perspective I have a corner lot approx 20,000 square feet which would not allow for driveway access via the principal dwelling driveway. Therefore the coach house would require driveway (separate) off the alternate street to the existing driveway to the principal dwelling. Because of the larger size lot would normally by percentage allow for more than max 1,200 square feet. However 1,200 square feet should be adequate.

- Agreed.
- I agree with the proposed guidelines.
- Proposed additions to OCP policy section 3: Housing – YES. Proposed additions to policy section 4: Built Form and Neighbourhood Character – YES.
- 10% site coverage is too high. Floor area is too large and should be no more than approximately 750 sq ft. Maximum height is too high, unless the coach house is actually a "lane way" house on a level lot. For any steeply sloped lot, particularly those on the south side of streets, any extra "house" in a backyard would block established views and intrude on privacy, particularly because people with view properties on the south side of streets literally live in their backyards. FAR for lots is already too high!
- Coach house on the 2nd floor of the garage (separate from main house) structure should be permitted - with the Ground floor for the cars parking space.
- Proposed guidelines provide clear objectives.
- I think by laws as written would guide tasteful and useful provision of more accommodation in West Van for seniors, parents and young families wishing to live close to family but unable or unwilling to commit to a large, expensive home. Good job on writing the bylaws.
- Great to see West Vancouver considering housing options that enable families and community workers to stay in place.
- I think the proposed guidelines have been well thought out. I would like to suggest that there be options to deviate from some of the rules on a site basis as there is a lot of unique lots in West Vancouver on which slight deviations might make sense.
I am very much in favour of the guidelines as detailed. The only concern I have is that in the few areas where rezoning is required the cost of the rezoning application to the owner should be minimal or waived as most residents do not have to rezone and have no such cost. It should be fair to all.

I like site by site review. Access to a back lane is important. Keeping the character of the neighbourhood is NB. It may be ok to have a basement suite plus a coach house in the right circumstances. Subdivision to duplex lots and row houses is a good alternative.

I would allow the FAR to exceed the current maximum by the amount of a typical double car garage. Most homes have that bulk in the rear yard in any case so why not provide a bit more incentive for coach houses to be built given their multiple benefits and generally low impacts.

I think that proposed guidelines are well thought out and will enable eligible homeowners to effectively provide much needed accommodation especially in the Ambleside and Dundarave neighbourhoods.

Please keep them a reasonable size. They are "coach houses" and should not be 3 storey (with basement) structures, 22 feet high, plus a garage!

Off street parking for coach house should not be mandated, especially in areas where there are no parking issues, or near transit corridors. Perhaps have homeowners prove that they can adequately provide existing off street or mandate parking only in front of own property. Owner occupancy in either main or coach buildings should not be mandated, as current laws allow non-owner occupied homes to be rented. The District can assist to resolve any issues with neighbours, as it currently does with rented homes. Allowing possible separate ownership of the coach house would likely lead to a higher percentage of owner occupied coach houses, which leads to less conflicts and a more tightly-knitted community.

West Van should not have coach houses. Whether or not it helps or maintains the growth of the population, coach houses do not suit west van. These will lead to narrow and even more congested roads, especially Ambleside area. Example; north van, east van homes with many tenants = cars parked along both sides of the road.

Each neighbourhood should approve/reject coach house bylaw; FSR must not be increased and should include basements, balconies, garages and coach houses; Services (water, sewer, garbage pickup etc) must be paid on a metered basis rather than a fee per property; Parking must be available on the property (not on the street) for ALL vehicles associated with residence/coach house.

Supportive in general of this initiative. Don't make the parking a requirement but at the owner/applicant option. Additional driveways will take out existing vegetation/landscaping and contribute to extra water runoff into existing WV storm water system.

Generally, I think coach house development is one of the better approaches to increasing the utility of land designated single family which will help improve affordability in West Vancouver for residents and prospective residents. That said, I also think it is important that there are effective design guidelines to ensure that any development is compatible with the neighbourhood in which it occurs.
## REVISIONS TO PROPOSED ZONING REGULATIONS
FOR DETACHED SECONDARY SUITES BASED ON COMMUNITY INPUT
THROUGH APRIL 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PROPOSED REGULATIONS NOV 2013</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
<th>PROPOSED REVISIONS APRIL 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition of &quot;Detached Secondary Suite&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;A detached dwelling unit accessory to a single family dwelling use.&quot;</td>
<td>Distinguishes this type of dwelling from a &quot;secondary suite&quot; (i.e., a suite within the house); and limits it as an accessory use to a single family dwelling use only (see Conditions of Use below).</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Uses</td>
<td>A detached secondary suite would be permitted in all zones that allow for a secondary suite: RS1, RS2, RS3, RS4, RS5, RS7, RS8, RS9, RS10, RD1, and RD2.</td>
<td>In accordance with proposed OCP policy H 4.2.1, a detached secondary suite may also be permitted in the RS6 zone (Eagle Island), subject to site-specific rezoning.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions of Use</td>
<td>A detached secondary suite shall not be permitted in conjunction with a secondary suite.</td>
<td>Either a secondary suite or a detached secondary suite, but not both.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the RD1 and RD2 zones, a detached secondary suite shall only be permitted as accessory to a single-family dwelling.</td>
<td>Properties developed with a duplex would not be eligible for a detached secondary suite.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A detached secondary suite shall be located within the required rear yard.</td>
<td>Siting can be varied through the Development Permit process – i.e., taking into account impact on natural site features, topography, mature vegetation, sunlight, views, and adjacent properties.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Coverage</td>
<td>Maximum 10% of site area, including attached garage.</td>
<td>Site coverage for the detached secondary suite would be in addition to the maximum site.</td>
<td>Do not add a site coverage provision for detached secondary suites. The Development Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>PROPOSED REGULATIONS NOV 2013</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
<td>PROPOSED REVISIONS APRIL 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</td>
<td>Maintain maximum FAR for the lot per existing zoning.</td>
<td>Properties already developed to maximum FAR would not be eligible for a detached secondary suite.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under s.130.08 of the Zoning Bylaw (Floor Area – Single Family Dwelling Zones and Duplex Dwellings), subsection (3)(e), a basement would be exempted from calculation of floor area ratio (FAR).</td>
<td>This would potentially add usable floor area equivalent to the main floor area of the detached secondary suite. Consideration could be given to not allowing basements, or not exempting the area of basements from FAR calculations – if the objective is to minimize site alteration and, potentially, the duration and impacts of site construction.</td>
<td>No change proposed as no definitive direction received via community consultation. Basements may be monitored with a view to reviewing floor area exemptions after the first year of implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area</td>
<td>Maximum floor area shall be 0.1 times lot area to a maximum 111.5 m² (1200 sq.ft.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An additional floor area exemption of 20.5 m² (220 sq.ft.) for one enclosed parking garage would be provided.</td>
<td>The licencing of secondary suites provides for regular inspections, which would ensure that garage areas are not subsequently converted to living space.</td>
<td>Do not provide for a floor area exemption for enclosed garages due to the potential to convert to living space (as has been typical in Vancouver).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Floor Area</td>
<td>37 m² (400 sq.ft.)</td>
<td>Establishing a minimum floor area sets a basic standard for livability in all detached secondary suites.</td>
<td>Do not impose a minimum floor area, as smaller spaces can be well-designed and livable; and less impactful – particularly on smaller lots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Setbacks (Yards)</td>
<td>A minimum setback from the rear property line of 1.8 metres (6 feet) to the detached</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 A minimum floor area 37 m² (400 sq.ft.) falls within the 33 m² to 42 m² (355 to 452 sq.ft.) range established in other jurisdictions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PROPOSED REGULATIONS NOV 2013</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
<th>PROPOSED REVISIONS APRIL 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>secondary suite; and 1.2 metres (4 feet) to the portion of the building occupied by an enclosed garage.</td>
<td>Side yard setbacks may be varied through the Development Permit to encourage a single-level unit, accommodate required parking, or provide for superior siting.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The detached secondary suite shall be subject to the same side yard setbacks as the main house (subject to further staff review).</td>
<td>To provide for a minimum level of privacy between two dwellings sharing the same lot. This is the standard established by the City of Vancouver for its laneway housing regulations.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A minimum separation of 4.9 metres (16 feet) between the principal dwelling and the detached secondary suite.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>Maximum 4.57 metres (15 feet) for one-storey buildings; and maximum 6.4 metres (22 feet) for two-storey buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Storeys</td>
<td>Maximum two storeys</td>
<td>Means two storeys plus basement (unless basements not permitted).</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For two storey dwellings, the upper storey shall have a maximum floor area not exceeding 60 percent of the main floor area.</td>
<td>To reduce the apparent bulk of two storey dwellings.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street Parking</td>
<td>Minimum one parking space for the exclusive use of the detached secondary suite.</td>
<td>Parking space (garage) for the detached secondary suite may not be located within the principal dwelling.</td>
<td>No change, but encourage open parking space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupancy</td>
<td>The registered owner of the lot must occupy, as his/her principal place of residence,</td>
<td>Same requirement as for secondary suites per s. 130.05(d) of the Zoning Bylaw.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>PROPOSED REGULATIONS NOV 2013</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
<td>PROPOSED REVISIONS APRIL 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>either the principal dwelling unit or the detached secondary suite, or alternatively must provide for a property manager to manage tenancies, deal with any complaints from neighbours, and provide contact information to the District.</td>
<td>Detached secondary suites are intended as a form of rental (not ownership) housing.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COUNCIL REPORT

Date: April 14, 2014
From: Stephen Mikicich, Manager of Community Planning
Subject: Results of Community Engagement on Proposed Coach House Policies, Regulations and Guidelines

RECOMMENDED THAT:

1. Direction on any amendments to draft coach house bylaws, attached as Appendices ‘A’ and ‘B’ to the report from the Manager of Community Planning, dated April 14, 2014 be provided to staff so that draft bylaws may be finalized for Council’s consideration of first reading at its meeting on May 26, 2014.

Purpose

Community engagement on proposed coach house policies and development permit guidelines, and proposed zoning regulations for detached secondary suites was completed in early April 2014. The purpose of this report is to present the findings of this consultation process, and to present proposed implementation bylaws for Council’s information and comment, prior to formal consideration of First Reading on May 26, 2014.

1.0 Background

1.1 Prior Resolutions

November 18, 2013 – Council directed staff to seek community input on proposed coach house policies, regulations, and guidelines as described in the report from the Manager of Community Planning dated November 6, 2013; and, upon completion of the community engagement process, to present proposed implementation bylaws for formal consideration by Council.

September 9, 2013 – Council directed staff to prepare draft bylaws to allow for rental coach houses as a detached from of secondary suite for Council consideration in fall 2013.

February 18, 2013 – Council adopted the Housing Action Plan, which provides the framework for the Planning Department’s work on housing during 2013-2014.
1.2 History

The District’s coach house examination began in December 2012 with posting of the Discussion Paper titled, “The Potential for Coach Houses in West Vancouver” on westvancouver.ca. This was followed by a series of public presentations, information displays at District venues, and a moderated panel discussion at the Kay Meek Centre on May 8, 2013. Residents provided formal input on the possibility of coach houses in West Vancouver through:

- Coach House Questionnaire (124 responses: 78% support for coach houses);
- 2013 West Vancouver Community Survey (744 responses; 56% support).

Key findings from the first phase of community engagement (through June 2013), and staff recommendations for the introduction of coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite were presented to Council on September 9, 2013. At this meeting, Council directed staff to prepare draft bylaws.

The contents of these draft bylaws – i.e., proposed policies, regulations and guidelines were presented to Council on November 18, 2013; and staff was directed to undertake a second phase of community consultation, which was completed on March 31, 2014.

2.0 Policy

2.1 Policy

The Official Community Plan (OCP) is founded on eight planning principles for building a sustainable community. Principle #3 is to “provide for a diversity of housing types to accommodate a balanced and diverse population in terms of age, ability, income, and household type.”

The final report and recommendations of the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing (2008) has provided a policy framework for various District initiatives related to housing diversity. These include: new neighbourhoods in the Evelyn Drive and Rodgers Creek areas, a pilot program for examining new housing types (2009), legalization of secondary suites (2010), designation of the 2000-block Esquimalt and Fulton Avenues for future infill housing development (2011), and current work on coach houses and purpose-built rental housing.

Action #2 in the Housing Action Plan (adopted February 2013) is to “consider coach houses following an informed community discussion.”
2.2 Bylaw

The introduction of coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite requires the establishment of a new regulatory framework; specifically amendments to:

- the Official Community Plan – to add new housing policies, and to establish a coach house Development Permit Area, with associated form and character guidelines (see Appendix ‘A’); and

- the Zoning Bylaw – to add regulations for detached secondary suites (see Appendix ‘B’).

In addition, the Development Procedures Bylaw will need to be amended to establish requirements for processing of Development Permit applications for detached secondary suites, including proposed delegation of permit issuance to staff. And, an amendment to the Fees and Charges Bylaw will be required to establish application fees for Development Permit applications.

Staff is recommending a two-stage approval process, and is proposing to engage a qualified design professional (consultant) to review Development Permit applications for proposed siting of detached secondary suites (stage one), and for compliance with form and character guidelines (stage two). However, more work is required to formalized the application process, and establish an appropriate fee structure to ensure cost recovery for the District.

If Council adopts proposed amendments to the OCP and Zoning Bylaw to allow for detached secondary suites, staff recommends an effective date of October 2014. In accordance with this time-frame, staff will present proposed amendments to the Fees and Charges Bylaw and the Development Procedures Bylaw in September 2014, along with details of the Development Permit process and related public information materials.

3.0 Analysis

3.1 Discussion

As noted below in Section 3.3, the second phase of consultation on the District’s coach house examination was undertaken from January through March 2014. Specifically, staff sought community input on proposed coach house policies, regulations and guidelines as presented to Council in November 2013, with a view to refining these proposals in order to prepare draft implementing bylaws.
3.1.1 Questionnaire Feedback

A total of 102 completed questionnaires\(^1\) were received between February 24 and April 2, 2014, and approximately 27% of these were completed online. Numerical findings and qualitative comments from the questionnaire are provided in Appendix ‘C’ and key findings are summarized below:

**Proposed Coach House Policies**

- 75% of respondents felt that coach houses should be permitted in all zones where secondary suites are now permitted.

- 78% supported consideration of coach houses in other residential zones, subject to Council approval for site-specific rezoning.

- Respondents were asked whether ‘ownership’ coach houses should be considered in the case of properties that are: (a) designated in the OCP for future infill development (63% answered ‘yes’); or (b) listed on the Community Heritage Register and eligible for conservation incentives (51% answered ‘yes’).

These responses are indicative of both community interest in ground-oriented multi-family housing options for future down-sizing; and a heritage conservation program that is still in its infancy – with no completed heritage projects to date\(^2\).

**Proposed Zoning Regulations for Detached Secondary Suites**

- 56% of respondents agreed that a detached suite should be allowed as an alternative to a suite within the house (i.e., one or the other, but not both). Conversely, a significant minority (38%) felt that a detached secondary suite should be permitted in conjunction with a secondary suite – as is the case in the City of Vancouver (where detached suites are referred to as “laneway houses”).

- Respondents were split on whether additional site coverage should be provided for detached secondary suites (i.e., above that permitted for the principal dwelling and accessory structures under current zoning). 49% answered ‘yes’ whereas 51% answered ‘no’ or ‘not sure’. Staff now believes that it would be more prudent to consider site coverage on an individual lot basis, when approving the proposed location of the dwelling on the property,

---

\(^1\) A total of 128 completed questionnaires comprised of: 74 printed questionnaires and 28 submitted online via westvancouverITE.

\(^2\) To date, there have been no approved heritage conservation projects in West Vancouver involving the restoration and legal protection of a private residence, with the application of land use or other incentive tools. However, two applications for a Heritage Revitalization Agreement and Heritage Designation are currently under review: ‘Staples House’ (6985 Isleview Road); and ‘Toby House’ (2055 Queens Avenue).
and providing for any variance to maximum site coverage via the Development Permit process.

- 59% of respondents agreed with maintaining the maximum permitted floor area ratio (FAR) for the lot. Under this scenario, properties already developed to maximum FAR would not be eligible for a detached secondary suite.

- Respondents were split on whether or not basement floor areas should be exempted from calculation of FAR – with 49% answering ‘yes’ and 51% answering ‘no’ or ‘not sure’.

- 55% supported a maximum floor area for detached secondary suite equal to 10 times the lot area, to a maximum 111.5 m² (1,200 sq.ft.); and 27% answered ‘not sure’.

- 59% answered ‘yes’ to exempting 20.5 m² (220 sq.ft.) for one enclosed garage. As garages in many of Vancouver’s laneway houses have subsequently been converted to living space, it may be prudent to include the area of garages in floor area calculations as a disincentive to building enclosed parking (i.e., open parking or carport option).

- Proposed maximum building heights of 4.57 metres for one-storey buildings, and 6.4 metres for two-storey buildings received 67% support; with 64.5% supporting an upper-storey floor area not exceeding 60% of the main floor area.

- 68% supported the parking standard of a minimum one parking space for the exclusive use of the coach house.

- 78% supported the idea of owner occupancy for either the principal dwelling or detached secondary suite; although existing zoning regulations for secondary suites provide for an ‘equivalency’ in owner occupancy in the form of local property management.

- 69% supported ‘no separate title’ – meaning that the property could not be subdivided (strata-titled).

Proposed Form and Character (Development Permit) Guidelines

- Most comments on this section of the questionnaire were general in scope, and not particularly relevant to the proposed guidelines. However, the comments do address typical issues raised in discussions to date – that is, potential neighbour impacts related to views, privacy, sunlight/shade, noise, and parking. The focus of the proposed form and character guidelines is to allow for successful integration of this new housing type in established neighbourhoods, and to reduce or mitigate potential neighbour impacts.
3.1.2 Focus Group Sessions

In March 2014, staff undertook joint consultations with our colleagues at the District of North Vancouver (DNV) to obtain more focused input on our respective coach house proposals. Three sessions were held with:

1. Municipal planners in other jurisdictions that have previously introduced coach houses
   - To gain insight on lessons learned elsewhere, and obtain constructive feedback on our coach house proposals.

2. Representatives of the local design and construction communities
   - To confirm the ‘workability’ of proposed regulations, and address issues related to optimal unit size, design considerations, sustainability, servicing, and construction costs.

3. The North Shore Advisory Committee on Disability Issues (ACDI)
   - To outline our respective coach house proposals and seek direction on design measures to support aging in place, and making these units adaptable for various households.
   - If Council is supportive of advancing the coach house bylaws, staff will work with ACDI’s Development and Inclusion Sub-Committee over the summer to develop educational materials related to accessibility in coach house design.

Key findings from these consultations are as follows:

- By not allowing for an increase in density, we are simply providing an option for those property owners wanting a detached suite, rather than a suite within the house. This approach may have a limited take-up in the community but, at the same time, there is also a lot of public interest in this housing type.

- ‘Incentivizing’ coach houses would require an increase in density, which could be applied in certain situations – e.g., where an existing house is retained. Conversely, providing an increase in density without conditions could lead to more demolitions of existing houses, as has been the case in Vancouver.

- We need to strike a balance between ‘downsized-living’ and adequate storage space to support aging in place.

- In terms of optimal unit size, 1,000 to 1,200 square feet would work for a small family; whereas a one or two-person household could live in spaces as
small as 400 square feet, subject to good design and lots of built-in storage space.

- Garages are a key consideration:
  - Exempting floor area for a garage is seen as ‘free’ space, which can easily be converted to living space (as has been the case in Vancouver);
  - By not requiring parking to be attached, the coach house footprint could be sunk into the ground, enabling higher ceiling heights for improved livability in a small space.

- In terms of ‘affordability’:
  - Experience in other communities suggests that coach houses tend to be well-designed and well-appointed, and demand a premium rent;
  - Building a coach house may, however, be a more affordable option to buying a condominium apartment, if someone has a family member with the ‘free’ land to build on – e.g., in their parents’ back yard.

- Concern over ‘neighbour input’ – i.e., do not want to turn consultation into requirement for neighbour approval.

- As massing and overlook into neighbouring properties tend to be the key issues in other communities, consideration should be given to ‘incentivizing’ smaller, single-level units through an expedited approval process. This would also align with design objectives for accessibility and ‘aging in place’.

- The idea of a development ‘feasibility checklist’ would be very helpful for homeowners and designers. Staff would develop this checklist as an information and planning tool, which would be used by potential applicants to determine whether building a detached secondary suite is economically-viable on their property – taking into account unique site conditions, servicing requirements, municipal fees and charges, construction costs, etc.

- No need to establish a minimum floor area for coach houses.

- In most cases, the conversion of existing accessory buildings to coach houses may not be viable due to BC Building Code requirements for rain screening and insulation – e.g., may necessitate structures to be stripped down to foundations.

- On the issue of basements, storage space is considered important; but there was no real consensus on whether or not basements should be permitted. In most cases, the issue is an economic one – i.e., whether or not blasting is required.
Consider floor area exemptions for bicycle and other storage space.

In areas with rear lanes, design and landscaping should take into account the impact of coach houses and the changing use and character of the lane – e.g., potential 'mews' character.

3.1.3 Implications for Draft Bylaws

Upon review of the community input received through early April 2014, staff has made minor revisions to the Development Permit Guidelines (e.g., by deleting reference to 'green roofs', and minor text edits); and to proposed zoning regulations for detached secondary suites, specifically related to site coverage, exempted floor areas, and minimum unit size (see Appendix 'D').

The proposed Development Permit process is seen as providing for both a thorough review of coach house applications, while not making the process too onerous for property owners. Proposed amendments to the Development Procedures Bylaw in September 2014 will provide for a two-stage Development Permit approval process, and delegation of permit issuance to the Director of Planning, Land Development and Permits.

As with the introduction of secondary suites in 2010, it is recognized that detached secondary suites are a new housing form; and zoning regulations may be further refined over time. If detached secondary suites are introduced in 2014, staff recommends that a review be undertaken after one year to determine whether further regulatory changes would be necessary to address any issues that may arise. Ongoing program monitoring would provide for future refinements on an as-needed basis.

3.2 Sustainability

A diversity of housing supports a balanced and diverse population in terms of age, ability, income, and household type; and is fundamental for building a sustainable community. Coach houses, as a detached form of secondary suite, would provide an attractive housing option for West Vancouver residents wishing to:

- downsize into a smaller housing unit on their own property;
- provide self-contained accommodation for an elderly parent, adult child, or on-site caregiver;
- design a custom housing unit for a family member with a disability (e.g., limited mobility); or
- create a more livable, ground-oriented rental unit, with added privacy for both the principal and accessory dwellings.
3.3 Consultation

The second phase of consultation on the District's coach house examination was undertaken from January through March 2014, and sought community input on proposed coach house policies, regulations and guidelines as presented to Council in November 2013. Community engagement included:

- Information posted on westvancouver.ca
- Housing and Neighbourhoods Fair (February 24th and March 1st) – advertised in the North Shore News, North Shore Outlook and Paivand newspapers.
- Joint consultation events with the District of North Vancouver\(^3\) as described in Section 3.1.2 above (March 10\(^{th}\) and 13\(^{th}\)).
- Printed and online\(^4\) questionnaires (received from February 24\(^{th}\) through April 2\(^{nd}\)).

3.4 Communications Process

See Section 3.3.

4.0 Options

4.1 Council may

(\textit{as recommended})

- Provide direction on any amendments to draft coach house bylaws to staff so that these bylaws may be finalized for Council's consideration of first reading at its meeting on May 26, 2014.

\textit{(or, alternatively)}

- Request further information (to be specified).

\underline{Author:} 

Stephen Mikicich, Manager of Community Planning

---

\(^3\) DWV staff worked jointly with DNV staff to address three target audiences for input on our respective coach house proposals.

\(^4\) Questionnaires could be completed online via westvancouverTE.
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District of West Vancouver

Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4360, 2004
Amendment Bylaw No. 4771, 2014

A bylaw to amend the Official Community Plan

WHEREAS the Council of The Corporation of the District of West Vancouver deems it expedient to provide for policy and guidelines for the development of coach houses in existing neighbourhoods;

NOW THEREFORE, the Council of the District of West Vancouver enacts as follows:

Part 1 Citation

1.1 This bylaw may be cited as Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4360, 2004, Amendment Bylaw No. 4771, 2013.

Part 2 Definitions

2.1 In this bylaw:

“Coach House” replaces “Carriage House” and means a detached dwelling unit, which is accessory to, and smaller than a primary dwelling on a residential lot, and may be attached to a garage.

Part 3 Amends Policy Section 3 [Housing]

3.1 Schedule A to Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4360, 2004 is amended as follows:

3.1.1 By adding Policy H 4.2 as follows:

“Provide for rental coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite in all residential zones where secondary suites are a permitted use.”
3.1.2 By adding Policy H 4.2.1 as follows:

“Consider rental coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite in other residential zones, subject to site-specific rezoning and a development permit under Development Permit Area BF-B 3.1.”

3.1.3 By adding Policy H 4.2.2 as follows:

“Consider ownership coach houses on properties designated in the Official Community Plan for future infill housing development, subject to rezoning and a development permit for infill housing.”

3.1.4 By adding Policy H 4.2.3 as follows:

“Consider ownership coach houses as an incentive for conservation of properties listed on the Community Heritage Register, subject to a Heritage Revitalization Agreement and municipal heritage designation.”

Part 4 Amends Policy Section 4 [Built Form and Neighbourhood Character]

4.1 Schedule A to Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4360, 2004 is amended as follows:

4.1.1 By adding Policy BF-B 3.1 as follows:

“Ensure that coach houses meet a high quality of building and landscape design, and are compatible both with the principal dwelling on the lot, and the built form character of the local neighbourhood.”

4.1.2 By adding “Development Permit Area Designation BF-B 3.1” as described in Schedule A to this bylaw.
Part 5  Adds Built Form Guidelines for Coach House Development in Existing Neighbourhoods

5.1 Schedule A to Official Community Plan Bylaw No. 4360, 2004 is further amended as follows:

5.1.3 By adding “Guidelines BF-B 3.1” for coach house development in existing neighbourhoods, as described in Schedule B to this bylaw.

Schedules

Schedule A – Development Permit Area Designation BF-B 3.1
Schedule B – Built Form Guidelines BF-B 3.1

READ A FIRST TIME on [Date]

READ A SECOND TIME on [Date]

READ A THIRD TIME on [Date]

ADOPTED by the Council on [Date].

__________________________
Mayor

__________________________
Municipal Clerk
Schedule A – Development Permit Area Designation BF-B 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Local Government Act s. 919.1 (1) (e), (h), (i) and (j)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conditions:</td>
<td>The Development Permit Area designation is warranted to provide for the compatibility of intensive residential development with the established built form character of existing neighbourhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives:</td>
<td>To provide for the successful integration of coach houses with the built form and landscape character of existing neighbourhoods; To minimize site alteration and retain natural site features; To promote a high standard of design, construction and landscaping; and To promote energy and water conservation and the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines Schedule:</td>
<td>Guidelines BF-B 3.1 shall apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemption:</td>
<td>Development may be exempt from the requirement for a Development Permit if the proposal: is for a renovation or small addition to a coach house that is considered to have no material change to the external appearance of the premises, meets all requirements of the Zoning Bylaw, and conforms to Guidelines BF-B 3.1.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schedule B – Built Form Guidelines BF-B 3.1

I. Location on the Lot

a. The location of the coach house on the lot should consider the particular site conditions – e.g., corner or mid-block lot, with or without a rear lane, primary frontage on one or two roads, natural site features, topography, etc.

b. The coach house should generally be located in the rear yard of the lot, except that:

   i. On through (or double-fronting) lots, with no rear yards, a coach house may be located in either front yard, subject to compatibility with the orientation of and minimum separation from the principal dwelling on the lot, adjacent properties, and the local streetscape character; and

   ii. On steep lots, alternative siting proposals may be considered to avoid significant grade alteration and use of retaining walls.

c. Site planning should be sensitive to existing development on adjacent properties to minimize overview and shadowing, and impacts on established views.

II. Site and Landscape Design

a. Alteration of existing grades and natural site features to accommodate a coach house should be minimized.

b. Established vegetation and rock outcrops should be incorporated in new landscaping, where feasible.

c. All areas adjacent to the coach house should be landscaped with low maintenance, drought resistant plant materials; and rainwater collection systems (e.g., rain barrels) should be considered for irrigation purposes.

d. Permeable paving materials should be used for outdoor patios, walkways and driveways.

e. Visual screening for privacy adjacent to a street or lane should be achieved through appropriately-scaled planting and low ornamental fencing, rather than tall solid fences or tall hedges.
f. Outdoor living areas should be defined and screened for privacy with hard and soft landscaping, architectural elements such as trellises and, where appropriate, changes in grade.

g. Where the coach house is set back sufficiently from a rear lane, consideration should be given to more extensive landscaping adjacent to the lane, including shrubbery and modest-size trees.

h. Rainwater runoff from roofs and other hard surface areas should be retained in rain gardens, bioswales, or rock pits to facilitate natural filtration of rainwater into the ground.

i. Areas for waste and recycling containers should be provided on the lot, shared with the principal dwelling, and appropriately screened if visible from the street.

j. External mechanical equipment and utility meters should be located on a side or back wall of the coach house, not facing the street or the principal dwelling on the lot; and any visual or noise impacts on adjacent properties should be avoided where possible, and otherwise mitigated.

III. Building Design

a. Unit Entry

i. The primary entrance to the coach house should be easily identifiable and be directly accessible from the street via a walkway on the lot.

ii. On corner lots, the primary entry to the coach house and prominent windows should be oriented to the flanking side street.

iii. The coach house address should be clearly visible from the street and, where applicable, the rear lane. It should be illuminated at night.

iv. The front door to the coach house should be set back a minimum 0.6 metre from the exterior building wall or, alternatively, a projecting roof should be provided, to create a weather-protected entry area at least 1.2 metres in depth.
b. Roof Forms and Massing

i. For two-level coach houses, the partial upper storey (no more than 60 percent of the main floor area) should be contained within the massing of a sloped roof.

ii. Where dormers are used to provide interior room height, the exterior face of the dormer should be set back a minimum of 0.6 metre from the exterior wall edge, and 1.2 metres from projecting roof eaves.

iii. Flat roofs may require design mitigation to ensure that coach houses do not have a two storey appearance.

iv. On larger lots, where space permits, the coach house massing should be limited to one storey, with generous setbacks to minimize overview and privacy impacts on neighbours.

c. Architectural Expression

i. The architectural design of the coach house should be respectful of and complementary to the principal dwelling on the lot, and may be expressed in the same or different style, and should be finished in a similar or complementary palette of building materials.

ii. Visual interest should be created through variations in wall height and massing, and articulation of building facades.

iii. A variation of exterior building materials should be considered with more than one type used on all facades. Where a single material is proposed, visual interest should be provided through architectural detailing and use of colour.

d. Windows

i. On smaller lots, coach house orientation and sizing and placement of windows should be sensitive to the relative proximity of neighbouring properties.

ii. Upper level windows should be located in a manner which minimizes overview to existing development on the site and on adjacent properties. Careful attention should be given to window placement, orientation, and sizing. The use of
skylights, clerestory windows, or obscured glazing should also be considered.

iii. Ground-level windows should be minimized on lane-facing walls for privacy and security.

e. Outdoor Living Areas

i. Private outdoor space, that is separate and distinct from that of the principal dwelling, should be provided for the coach house.

ii. Balconies and decks should be located and screened to provide privacy for the coach house and minimize overlook onto adjacent properties.

f. Parking

i. Parking should be provided in the rear yard of the lot:
   - Where the lot is served by an open rear lane, direct vehicle access to the coach house should be via the rear lane.
   - Where there is no lane, parking access from the street should be via a driveway shared, if possible, with the principal dwelling on the lot.

ii. Garage doors visible from the street should be designed to minimize their visual appearance through sensitive detailing and use of limited glazing.

iii. Permeable driveway surfaces such as 'grasscrete' pavers or narrow wheel lanes with grass planting in between should be used, where feasible.

g. Accessibility / Adaptability

i. Coach house designs should provide for accessibility/adaptability to meet changing household needs over time.

ii. Single-level units are encouraged where coach houses are likely to accommodate older residents or people with limited mobility.
h. 'Green' Building Features

Coach house designs should incorporate 'green' building features for reduced energy consumption and lower greenhouse gas emissions. At minimum, pre-plumbing and pre-wiring should be provided for future installation of such features.
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District of West Vancouver

Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010
Amendment Bylaw No. 4772, 2014

A bylaw to amend the Zoning Bylaw to provide for Detached Secondary Suites

WHEREAS the Council of The Corporation of the District of West Vancouver deems it expedient to provide for amendment of the Zoning Bylaw;

NOW THEREFORE, the Council of the District of West Vancouver enacts as follows:

Part 1 Citation

1.1 This bylaw may be cited as "Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Amendment Bylaw No. 4772, 2014".

Part 2 Severability

2.1 If a portion of this bylaw is held invalid by a Court of competent jurisdiction, then the invalid portion must be severed and the remainder of this bylaw is deemed to have been adopted without the severed section, subsequent, paragraph, subparagraph, clause or phrase.

Part 3 Amends Definitions

3.1 Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Schedule A, Section 110 – Definitions is hereby amended by inserting the following definition in alphabetical order:

"Detached secondary suite means a detached dwelling unit accessory to a single family dwelling use".

Part 4 Amends General Regulations for Residential Zones and Uses Only

4.1 Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Schedule A, Section 130 – General Regulations for Residential Zones and Uses Only is hereby amended by adding Section 130.051 – Detached Secondary Suites to read as follows:
“(1) Where permitted, a detached secondary suite is subject to compliance with the following regulations:

(a) a maximum of one detached secondary suite is permitted per lot;

(b) the detached secondary suite is not permitted in conjunction with a secondary suite on the same lot;

(c) the detached secondary suite is not permitted in conjunction with a duplex dwelling;

(d) the detached secondary suite shall be set back from the rear property line of the lot as follows:
   (i) minimum 1.8 metres to the rear building wall; and
   (ii) minimum 1.2 metres for any portion of the building containing an enclosed garage.

(e) the detached secondary suite shall be sited a minimum distance of 4.9 metres away from the principal dwelling on the lot.

(f) the detached secondary suite shall have a maximum of two storeys with maximum building heights as follows:
   (i) 4.57 metres if one storey; or
   (ii) 6.4 metres if two storeys.

(g) for two-storey dwellings, the upper storey shall have a maximum floor area not exceeding 60% of the main floor area;

(h) the detached secondary suite shall have a maximum floor area not exceeding the lesser of 10% of lot area or 111.5 square metres, whichever is less;

(i) the registered owner of the lot must occupy, as his/her principal place of residence, either the principal dwelling unit or the detached secondary suite, or alternatively must:
   (i) identify a property manager with an address within the District of West Vancouver or within the City or District of North Vancouver to
manage tenancies of the principal dwelling unit and the detached secondary suite;

(ii) authorize the property manager to deal with complaints of neighbours or the District arising from the occupancy of the principal dwelling unit or the detached secondary suite including the parking of motor vehicles by the occupants; and

(iii) provide the District the name, address, telephone number and e-mail address of the property manager, and provide written authorization to the District to contact the property manager in the event of such complaints.

(j) the keeping of lodgers, a personal care facility, a child care facility, or a bed and breakfast is not permitted on a lot containing a detached secondary suite;

(k) one off-street vehicle parking space must be provided exclusively for the use of the detached secondary suite; and

(l) the detached secondary suite must not be subdivided from the principal dwelling unit under the Land Title Act or the Strata Property Act.”

Part 5 Amends Single Family Dwelling Zones and Duplex Dwelling Zones

5.1 Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Schedule A, Section 200 is hereby amended by adding “detached secondary suite” as a permitted use in the RS1, RS2, RS3, RS4, RS5, RS7, RS8, RS9, and RS10 zones.

5.2 Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Schedule A, Section 250 is hereby amended by adding “detached secondary suite” as a permitted use in the RD1 and RD2 zones.
Zoning Bylaw No. 4662, 2010, Amendment Bylaw No. 4772, 2014

READ A FIRST TIME on [Date]

READ A SECOND TIME on [Date]

READ A THIRD TIME on [Date]

ADOPTED by the Council on [Date].
Findings from Coach House Questionnaire

This Appendix provides an overview of numerical findings and comments from 102 completed questionnaires. These were received from West Vancouver residents between February 24 and April 2, 2014. Approximately 27% of these were completed online. Note: Percentage values below are based on the number of responses to each individual question.

**QUESTION 1:** Please tell us where you live...

100% of respondents were West Vancouver residents, and from the following sub-areas 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:** British Properties, Glenmore, Chartwell, Canterbury, Panorama, Whitby Estates
QUESTION 2: Do you think that coach houses should be permitted in all zones where secondary suites are now permitted?

[Pie chart showing the following responses: Yes 78%, No 19%, Not Sure 3%, No Response 2%]

Comments from Individuals Answering “Yes” to Question 2
- All zones
- Yes, in fact I feel they are superior to secondary suites in providing affordable, single family residences
- We need more affordable housing
- If they are well and attractively designed similar to those beside the United Church on 21st the church is on 21st but the couch houses nearby.
- How about lane cafes and bike shops?
- all zones
- But the rules should be firm with no discretion - all development should meet the bylaws - the new bylaws should be approved by electors.
- Strongly Yes
- And also there are those areas that could use coach houses where secondary suites are currently not permitted.

Comments from Individuals Answering “No” to Question 2
- The advantage of secondary suites is that home owners can better control noise and other disturbances for the neighbourhood. Better monitoring of parking is required.
- It is better to be permitted accordance with the majority of the size of the lots in the area.
- Each neighbourhood should have opportunity to accept or reject
- On street parking is causing congestion from secondary suite tenants. The proposed size of coach houses (typically bigger than basement suites) would result in more tenants and vehicles worsening parking congestion.
- Only instead of secondary suite.
- Only on level lots with lane access.
• I am far from being sold on the concept of coach houses in West Vancouver. There are just too many complicating factors, including concerns over parking and congestion; utility connections; adequate access for service, sanitation and emergency vehicles; loss of privacy for neighbours; loss of trees and other vegetation; and the general loss of community character. While some of these concerns could be addressed, depending upon the location, I don’t have confidence that issues of neighbour privacy, vegetation and character will be (even with DP Area guidelines).

• I find this confusing; staff said that all zones permit secondary suites with the exception of Eagle Island.

• Once built, I doubt West Vancouver District will be able to adequately monitor and regulate the use of this type of housing.

• I fear that significant parking issues would not be addressed.

Comments from Individuals Who Did Not Select “Yes”, “No”, or “Not Sure” to Question 2

• Why do you keep pushing this garbage on to us? It will ruin the ambiance of West Van

QUESTION 3: Do you think that coach houses should be considered in other residential zones on a site by site basis (and subject to rezoning approval?)

Comments from Individuals Answering “Yes” to Question 3:

• I do not believe in a have/have not policy!

• Densify while maintaining nature - architects

• All zones

• But only with the above conditions.

• Again - with review of approval

• Coach houses should also be permitted in RS6 Zoning (Eagle Island), subject to similar restrictions as in other areas. Parking should be n/a for RS6.
• Definitely. Houses are becoming too large to live in, and for those to buy. Living in the area should not be for privileged.
• The only place they are appropriate is on large properties like those in Altamont or above the Upper Levels HWY.
• Only if parking issues are effectively addressed.

Comments from Individuals Answering “No” to Question 3:

• Why do you penalize those zones where you have already approved secondary suites with additional noise/decreased privacy and congestion, but not apply the same issues to others?
• Close to Marine Dr
• Where you have big houses on small lots adding coach houses is not feasible.

QUESTION 4: Do you think that ownership coach houses should be considered for properties that are:

a) Designated in the Official Community Plan (OCP) for future infill development?

b) 

![Pie Chart]

- No Response: 7%
- No Sure: 19%
- Yes: 38%


c) Listed on the Community Heritage Register and eligible for conservation incentives?
Comments from Individuals Answering Question 4 (a) and (b):

- Have you looked seriously at what you are proposing? e.g. up to 1200sqft not including garage, only 1 parking space (vs. 2 for secondary suite), proximity to laneway with doors etc facing other properties, congestion, noise, decreased privacy for adjacent houses, etc. Why so large and why so intrusive?
- I think that there are many properties in WV that could support infill/coach houses, help preserve neighbourhood character and livability. Not sure how it relates to OCP (current) and heritage register.
- (a) I don’t know what areas there are; (b) I did not know we had any heritage (residential) properties left
- A 2nd suite makes owner responsible for tenants - purpose is marketed as in-law suite etc - not revenue
- a great tool to protect - and encourage protection - of what little heritage stock we have left
- (c) All zones: Yes
- More rental stock is needed.
- I think coach houses are good anywhere. I am strongly in favour of West Vancouver being open and flexible to coach houses.
- Renting coach houses just makes future infill housing development more difficult and if ownership involved would make resale impossible.
- Should not be a heritage incentive tool; this is a housing capacity policy not a heritage policy.
- (a) I believe so, need to review OCP.
- I am not concerned about increased density in the form of coach houses, as I feel this would be positive for the community. My concern with the ownership option is that I think we need to preserve an adequate supply of rental housing. Heritage conservation is of paramount importance, however.

**QUESTION 5:** Do you agree that a detached secondary suite should not be permitted in conjunction with a secondary suite (within the house)? i.e. one or the other, but not both.
Comments from Individuals Answering “Yes” to Question 5:

- Unless the property is so large that it can accommodate parking, noise, intrusion on neighbours, etc.
- Too much!
- This is very important!
- Parking with 3 dwellings would often be a problem
- In existing single family neighbourhoods, there shouldn't be more secondary living units permitted than principal living units on a lot.

Comments from Individuals Answering “No” to Question 5:

- I see no reason that both shouldn't be able to be provided. I think parking and traffic are the issue.
- Both especially close to shops/services
- If the lot is large enough, I see no reason not to use properties that can take a coach house as well as a suite.
- Living in WV is expensive. Let's keep people in our community by helping them to afford to live here
- If there is room on the lot and it would be allowed if the secondary (basement) suite was not there, what does it matter? If the main house has space for two dwelling units with no additional bulk then who or how many live inside has nothing to do with the detached dwelling.
- Parking is the big issue - never enough
- Too many cars may result with limited parking
- Case by case. Some suites don't add bulk
- Both should be considered to allow younger families to afford W Van housing by suite and coach house revenues.
- More density and more rental units are needed.
- I think both should be permissible.
- I do not think there is a problem to allow both. Lots in West Van are generally big and can't see the disadvantages of having both.
• We are facing affordable housing for children of families in West Vancouver. We need more flexible options.
• Both permitted.

Comments from Individuals Answering “Not Sure” to Question 5:
• Coach houses can become rec rooms for already large houses - not good! rentals ensure diversity and community

Comments from Individuals Who Did Not Select “Yes”, “No”, or “Not Sure” to Question 5:
• Yes to a secondary suite within the house; no to a detached secondary suite. I think that the municipality should continue working to fix the ‘bugs’ in their contained secondary suite policy - as a way to bringing affordable housing to West Vancouver - before embarking on coach house/detached secondary suite policy.

QUESTION 6: Do you support the following proposals? (a – j)

a) Maximum 10% site coverage, including garage (in addition to the max site coverage for the principal dwelling & accessory structures under existing zoning)

![Pie chart showing percentage responses]

- No Response 16%
- Not Sure 13%
- Yes 45%
- No 20%

b) Maintain maximum FAR for the lot (properties already developed to maximum FAR would not be eligible)

![Pie chart showing percentage responses]

- No Response 14%
- Not Sure 13%
- Yes 51%
- No 20%
c) Exempt basement from FAR calculation (as per section 130.08 of the Zoning Bylaw)

![Pie chart showing responses to exempting basement from FAR calculation.]

- Yes 73%
- No 20%
- Not Sure 7%
- No Response 12%


d) Maximum floor area 0.1 times lot area to a maximum 111.5 m² (1200 sq.ft)

![Pie chart showing responses to maximum floor area calculation.]

- Yes 48%
- No 42%
- Not Sure 10%
- No Response 13%


e) Floor area exemption of 20.5 m² (220 sq.ft) for one enclosed parking garage

![Pie chart showing responses to floor area exemption for parking garage.]

- Yes 50%
- No 30%
- Not Sure 17%
- No Response 3%
f) Maximum 4.57m (15ft) for one-storey buildings and maximum 6.4m (22ft) for two-storey buildings

![Pie chart showing responses to a question related to building heights.]

No Response 13%
Not Sure 19%
No 16%
Yes 51%


g) Maximum two storeys and the upper storey shall have a maximum floor area not exceeding 60% of the main floor area

![Pie chart showing responses to a question related to floor area.]

No Response 14%
Not Sure 11%
Yes 56%


h) Minimum one parking space for the exclusive use of the coach house

![Pie chart showing responses to a question related to parking.]

No Response 14%
Not Sure 6%


i) Owner occupancy of either the principal dwelling or the coach house
j) The coach house must not be subdivided from the principal dwelling (no separate title)

Comments from Individuals Answering Question 6:
- Coach houses could be separately owned as in Vancouver
- Re (j) confused - coach house rental/ownership ... if ownership what would the "title" look like for the property?
- For (f) & (g), Yes if privacy is maintained for neighbours. I think this is a great way to increase density but I also believe the Muni should have some discretion to disallow or reduce size/height based on the situation (eg access considerations/traffic etc).
- Who is going to monitor noise levels? An owner would hopefully be more cognizant of that. Separate owners would mean no responsibility at all.
- 15% max site coverage. Enhance affordability
- Existing older homes (bungalows) could become the coach house with new build on lot. 22' is too high. Not sure why we should prevent separate title. Also allow for joint tenancy agreements (allows family and friends to benefit from capital investment and principal resident tax/assess ownership)
- (j) Why not?
- Should allow for separate ownership
- I don't know enough about these questions to comment
- (a) 10-12%
• No more than 2 parking spaces for coach house 1 for main house
• It would be good to look in the future with all this!
• (a-e) plain English please. Coach houses shouldn't rent for over $3000 a month as they currently are. Coach houses should not cost over $1 million, as they currently do.
• We have visited similar properties in Vancouver and were impressed with their liveability and attractiveness.
• (f) no higher anyway; (h) probably address for all residents; Do not increase FAR if anything, lower it.
• Coach houses must be able to be sold, otherwise housing costs are less affordable.
• (e) Subject to design approval
• (h) Only one parking space
• (d) Better allocated as a percentage of a lot than an absolute measure like 1200 ft, on the maximum size.
• For (a) there should be no consideration for variances - they should meet all set back rules. For (f) and (g) should depend on the new structure taking away privacy for the neighbour.
• (a) 10 or in some cases 15-20%; (f) Higher in some select cases
• (a) How about a bigger allowance
• No separate title is very important.
• 6. h) is not applicable for Eagle Island, since the Island has no car access
• (a) Could permit greater than 10% site coverage where there is sufficient unused site coverage for the principal dwelling under existing zoning; (c) Exempt only if basement is not developed as living space as distinct from storage or utility space; (d) If there is unused FAR with existing principal residence, should be able to bonus coach house FAR; (e) This is only sufficient for a medium sized vehicle - should be increased to provide capacity for storage of recreational items, etc.; (f) Does this include basements if there is one?; (g) Does main floor area include a garage?
• (a) Should be slightly higher if 10% of available land; (d) Could be slightly larger; (f) Should be based on site; (g) Should be based on site. Would this not be governed by the design?; (h) What about street parking?; (j) If land requirements permit or are changed subdivision should be allowed.
• (a) Too large; (d) Too large - max 750 sqft; (f) Max 15' only.
• Floor area is too large - max. 750-800 sq. ft.. Only "laneway" or corner access lots - in backyards of sloped, south-side properties, ANY laneway house would be totally intrusive.
• Coach houses will invariably bring in the age of "maximum" - developments invoking the maximum FAR, maximum site coverage, maximum floor area exemptions, maximum building heights, and maximum rock removal/blasting to maximize FAR-free basement space.
• When I lived in Calgary 25 years ago, I lived in a 3 bedroom home of 1200 sqft. So, actually what the proposal is, is 2 houses on one lot - nonsense.
• RE (f) & (g): 2nd storey should not be allowed if it adversely affects privacy of existing neighbours or blocks their view.
QUESTION 7: The District is proposing Development Permit (DP) Area guidelines to provide for compatibility of a coach house with the principal dwelling and built form character of the local neighbourhood. Please tell us what you think of the proposed guidelines.

- Very pleased to see this kind of forward thinking. The "need" will only become greater as time goes by. Of course you will know that other countries (NZ etc) have had "Granny Suites" for years on the principal property.
- I agree that all development - not just coach houses - should fit with our neighbourhoods. I hope that allowing coach houses will reduce the size of principle dwellings which are grossly oversized relative to lots. i.e. reduce the overall look of bulk.
  On another note, I see there is a "good neighbour" bylaw requiring construction sites to be kept neat and tidy. I wish your inspectors would enforce this when they visit sites please. Most sites have garbage and building bits littering the site. The ones that don't truly stand out! It should be the other way around.
- You are allowing for too large a size. The concept of preventing mega houses on small properties by having 2 smaller houses are two separate issues. You can create bylaws to limit a house size without doing this.
  Have you considered: narrow size of lanes that near coach houses will be very close to adjacent properties; having doors/windows on the property side not the lane side so other occupants face inwards to the owners and not outside to the neighbours; requiring 2 parking spots on the property; ensuring narrow lane ways (30' or less) have single storey houses so that the 2nd story doesn't impose on neighbours; 1200 sq feet is very large - this is like subdividing a property without saying so.
- There are many of us who are looking for this as we want to downsize but remain in the community.
- Quite good. I think we should retain many of the smaller homes and allow them a coach-house. I am absolutely appalled at the size of the houses the council has approved - look completely top-heavy on the lot - the damage has been done already and only NOW are council addressing it (The Grosvenor Debacle shows the present council). I will certainly not vote for Smith again and hope we have a choice.
- I think that the guidelines seem to be appropriate and thoughtful for this neighbourhood.
- 'Coach Houses' is a nice term for a planner's great idea but would they really result in affordable choices? Or just raise the coast of purchasing a house by another 250,000 because of the cost of the second dwelling? If secondary dwellings are allowed then it should be in every area including the BPs and Caufield. Not just Ambleside and Dundarave.
- I support the guidelines as proposed. Neighbourhood compatibility and blending for look, feel and visual impact is an important consideration.
- These guidelines are long overdue. Well done!
- Let's try to maintain the original cottage-y feeling of neighbourhoods. Our area (Dundarave) has been ruined by too many huge square boxes.
- I have been (and my family) through a lot of noise from new buildings going up in our neighbourhood: s.22(1) block Inglewood. We are thinking to build a coach
house for our son. I would hope that we would be allowed a proper basement to the
couch house. (extra storage and living space). We feel others should be
patient with the process as we have been patient with others through their
process of building. I would like to see a balcony over the carport or garage, so
the top bedroom would have access to it.

- The ones illustrated look reasonable but have reservations about only 15' away
  from main building in one plan.
- Coach houses can be and are a complementary fit with an existing house on an
  existing lot. Guidelines guided by that thought will be very useful for future
development.
- If the house is a McMansion "bulk" then the coach house will match that design?
  Not a good idea. Once again, look to other communities, such as Paris, for
inspiration.
- Guidelines such as these are long overdue as long as they are reasonably set
  and cannot be decided upon outside set guidelines (ie bought).
- I think that it is a wonderful idea and recommend the following: to not mess up
  and be careful what you do.
- Each neighbourhood should have chance to accept or reject coach houses.
  Infrastructure should be addressed before density is increased (roads, transit,
hospitals etc). More public consultation needed. Personally I reject coach
houses and prefer secondary suites.
- Well thought out
- We need to fill in the gaps that sprawl has created. Engage architects as a rule!
  Thoughtful density over thoughtless isolation. Too many empty McMansions!
- Agree
- They are acceptable, with the exception of affordability.
- Agree
- How is 'character of the local neighbourhood' defined? I feel most strongly that
  the character of West Vancouver (not only in my own area of Cypress Park) is
slowly being eroded by new buildings that - though built within the current
building regulations - are totally jarring to the eye and not at all within the
traditional character of the local neighbourhood.
- I think they're great.
- Makes sense that the two are compatible
- The addition of a coach house should not increase, black top concrete or other
  non porous servicing than the allowed floor area. No alteration to site grade
  should be allowed and maximum excavation limit should be set. Site planning
  should not only be sensitive to existing property (adjacent) no application should
  be approved if any one neighbour is against it.
- Guidelines are needed and compatibility house-coach house is important. But
  one can imagine conditions where a traditional house and modern coach house
could work. Guidelines and review/approval by a design panel?
- I think coach housing provides a solution for many housing and socio-economic
  issues facing our society. City of Vancouver has allowed and it is time for West
Vancouver to embrace it with as little regulation as possible.
- I like that idea.
- This is important and I think many lots would be impossible to develop this way
  without losing any aesthetic looks to the property.
• Agree
• The guidelines seem to contemplate a stereotypical lot which is much deeper than is wide. I live in the original British Properties where many lots (including mine) are much wider than they are deep. I couldn't develop a coach house in my backyard or front yard but would have room in my side yard. I think it should be confirmed in the guidelines that the DP Area would provide flexibility to orient a coach quite differently than expressed guidelines. Would setbacks from lanes apply to side streets on corner lots which have no access by lane? I think that the second floor area should not be required to be less than first floor particularly in situations where the main living floor might be best designed on the second floor to take advantage of natural light, sun exposure and views, all enhancing the living experience in the coach house.
• Ok - wish you had this previously - neighbourhood has a monstrosity 2 level carriage house and tenants can see right into my bedroom and liv. rm - I have to keep the blinds closed. Argyle.
• I believe that the proposal is needed and should be imposed. Keeping in mind the greenery of the area that is part of its character. It would not suit to mow down trees for density if sites permit additional coach house application it should be considered.
• Lot location: only on lots with lane access. Only on fairly level lots - otherwise, too intrusive and there is no kind of site planning that is sensitive to impacts on established views!
• I'm not fully confident that the proposed DP Area guidelines will be able to mitigate all coach house development concerns and preserve the character of the neighbourhood. By nature, design concepts are subjective and rarely do they end up in a 'win-win' for the neighbourhood (ie a "balanced scorecard").
• My concern is at present there are too many absentee home owners in West Vancouver, and with additional coach houses will add to the problem. People who are not interested in developing the community.
• I suppose "detached suites" is supposed to sound reassuring - sort of like "conscious uncoupling" instead of divorce. A 1200 sqft home, maybe with a basement, a garage, maybe 2 storey and maybe with a suite in one of the houses, on one lot. No thank you. There will be pressure on the municipal infrastructure, lack of privacy, no room for vegetation, trees etc. I can see a developer buying up several properties, building detached suites, living there for 1 year moving on to the next, increasing property values, traffic nightmares - I think that with Evelyn Drive, Grosvenor's project, Larco towers, the highrise replacing the co-op building on Marine Drive, West Van Florist looking ahead to development, the Masonic Lodge, HY Louie probably taking another run, the Squamish proposals for the W Van waterfront - enough! Thank you.
• There is no room for coach houses on Ambleside lots. If a neighbour builds one on an adjoining property (50x142' lots). I will lose privacy, and therefore my property value will decline; while the developer will gain value at my expense. They could also negatively impact my views and sight lines. I contend that allowing coach houses in Ambleside will only benefit developers and real estate agents at the expense of existing neighbours. The Introduction of coach houses into Ambleside will destroy the character of the neighbourhood. It is naive to think that it will create "affordable" housing as the real estate agents and developers will ensure they are priced for maximum profit, regardless of negative impacts to
neighbouring properties. I wonder where the District staff who created this initiative live? Surely not in Ambleside. There is plenty of "affordable" housing in North Van or Squamish. Why should we allow District of West Van bureaucrats to destroy the character of our neighbourhood under the guise of affordable housing? Ambleside is a beautiful and unique neighbourhood which does not need additional density in the current single family residential neighbourhoods. There is no community benefit to allowing coach houses, as they will not be priced as "affordable" housing. This program is a huge mistake. Please do not let it proceed.

- Our home which we dearly love is one of the few in West Van that can only be accessed via a laneway (s. 22(1)). Therefore that lane is like "our street". We are very concerned that with the inevitable redevelopment of homes that adjoin that lane will result in a very ugly approach to our house especially if coach houses or garages are allowed very close to the lane lot line of those properties. In general, parking issues is a major concern with coach houses.

- I agree with the guidelines for the most part. From a self interest perspective I have a corner lot approx 20,000 square feet which would not allow for driveway access via the principal dwelling driveway. Therefore the coach house would require driveway (separate) off the alternate street to the existing driveway to the principal dwelling. Because of the larger size lot would normally by percentage allow for more than max 1,200 square feet. However 1,200 square feet should be adequate.

- Agreed.

- I agree with the proposed guidelines.

- Proposed additions to OCP policy section 3: Housing – YES. Proposed additions to policy section 4: Built Form and Neighbourhood Character – YES.

- 10% site coverage is too high. Floor area is too large and should be no more than approximately 750 sq ft. Maximum height is too high, unless the coach house is actually a "lane way" house on a level lot. For any steeply sloped lot, particularly those on the south side of streets, any extra "house" in a backyard would block established views and intrude on privacy, particularly because people with view properties on the south side of streets literally live in their backyards. FAR for lots is already too high!

- Coach house on the 2nd floor of the garage (separate from main house) structure should be permitted - with the Ground floor for the cars parking space.

- Proposed guidelines provide clear objectives.

- I think by laws as written would guide tasteful and useful provision of more accommodation in West Van for seniors, parents and young families wishing to live close to family but unable or unwilling to commit to a large, expensive home. Good job on writing the bylaws.

- Great to see West Vancouver considering housing options that enable families and community workers to stay in place.

- I think the proposed guidelines have been well thought out. I would like to suggest that there be options to deviate from some of the rules on a site basis as there is a lot of unique lots in West Vancouver on which slight deviations might make sense.
I am very much in favour of the guidelines as detailed. The only concern I have is that in the few areas where rezoning is required the cost of the rezoning application to the owner should be minimal or waived as most residents do not have to rezone and have no such cost. It should be fair to all.

I like site by site review. Access to a back lane is important. Keeping the character of the neighbourhood is NB. It may be ok to have a basement suite plus a coach house in the right circumstances. Subdivision to duplex lots and row houses is a good alternative.

I would allow the FAR to exceed the current maximum by the amount of a typical double car garage. Most homes have that bulk in the rear yard in any case so why not provide a bit more incentive for coach houses to be built given their multiple benefits and generally low impacts.

I think that proposed guidelines are well thought out and will enable eligible homeowners to effectively provide much needed accommodation especially in the Ambleside and Dundarave neighbourhoods.

Please keep them a reasonable size. They are "coach houses" and should not be 3 storey (with basement) structures, 22 feet high, plus a garage!

Off street parking for coach house should not be mandated, especially in areas where there are no parking issues, or near transit corridors. Perhaps have home owners prove that they can adequately provide existing off street or mandate parking only in front of own property. Owner occupancy in either main or coach buildings should not be mandated, as current laws allow non-owner occupied homes to be rented. The District can assist to resolve any issues with neighbours, as it currently does with rented homes. Allowing possible separate ownership of the coach house would likely lead to a higher percentage of owner occupied coach houses, which leads to less conflicts and a more tightly-knitted community.

West Van should not have coach houses. Whether or not it helps or maintains the growth of the population, coach houses do not suit west van. These will lead to narrow and even more congested roads, especially Ambleside area. Example; north van, east van homes with many tenants = cars parked along both sides of the road.

Each neighbourhood should approve/reject coach house bylaw; FSR must not be increased and should include basements, balconies, garages and coach houses; Services (water, sewer, garbage pickup etc) must be paid on a metered basis rather than a fee per property; Parking must be available on the property (not on the street) for ALL vehicles associated with residence/coach house.

Supportive in general of this initiative. Don't make the parking a requirement but at the owner/applicant option. Additional driveways will take out existing vegetation/landscaping and contribute to extra water runoff into existing WV storm water system.

Generally, I think coach house development is one of the better approaches to increasing the utility of land designated single family which will help improve affordability in West Vancouver for residents and prospective residents. That said, I also think it is important that there are effective design guidelines to ensure that any development is compatible with the neighbourhood in which it occurs.
# APPENDIX ‘D’

## REVISIONS TO PROPOSED ZONING REGULATIONS
FOR DETACHED SECONDARY SUITES BASED ON COMMUNITY INPUT
THROUGH APRIL 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PROPOSED REGULATIONS NOV 2013</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
<th>PROPOSED REVISIONS APRIL 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition of “Detached Secondary Suite”</td>
<td>“A detached dwelling unit accessory to a single family dwelling use.”</td>
<td>Distinguishes this type of dwelling from a “secondary suite” (i.e., a suite within the house); and limits it as an accessory use to a single family dwelling use only (see Conditions of Use below).</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Uses</td>
<td>A detached secondary suite would be permitted in all zones that allow for a secondary suite: RS1, RS2, RS3, RS4, RS5, RS7, RS8, RS9, RS10, RD1, and RD2.</td>
<td>In accordance with proposed OCP policy H 4.2.1, a detached secondary suite may also be permitted in the RS6 zone (Eagle Island), subject to site-specific rezoning.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions of Use</td>
<td>A detached secondary suite shall not be permitted in conjunction with a secondary suite.</td>
<td>Either a secondary suite or a detached secondary suite, but not both.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the RD1 and RD2 zones, a detached secondary suite shall only be permitted as accessory to a single-family dwelling.</td>
<td>Properties developed with a duplex would not be eligible for a detached secondary suite.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A detached secondary suite shall be located within the required rear yard.</td>
<td>Siting can be varied through the Development Permit process — i.e., taking into account impact on natural site features, topography, mature vegetation, sunlight, views, and adjacent properties.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Coverage</td>
<td>Maximum 10% of site area, including attached garage.</td>
<td>Site coverage for the detached secondary suite would be in addition to the maximum site.</td>
<td>Do not add a site coverage provision for detached secondary suites. The Development Permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>PROPOSED REGULATIONS NOV 2013</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
<td>PROPOSED REVISIONS APRIL 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</td>
<td>Maintain maximum FAR for the lot per existing zoning.</td>
<td>Properties already developed to maximum FAR would not be eligible for a detached secondary suite.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under s.130.08 of the Zoning Bylaw (Floor Area – Single Family Dwelling Zones and Duplex Dwellings), subsection (3)(e), a basement would be exempted from calculation of floor area ratio (FAR).</td>
<td>This would potentially add usable floor area equivalent to the main floor area of the detached secondary suite. Consideration could be given to not allowing basements, or not exempting the area of basements from FAR calculations – if the objective is to minimize site alteration and, potentially, the duration and impacts of site construction.</td>
<td>No change proposed as no definitive direction received via community consultation. Basements may be monitored with a view to reviewing floor area exemptions after the first year of implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area</td>
<td>Maximum floor area shall be 0.1 times lot area to a maximum 111.5 m² (1200 sq.ft.)</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An additional floor area exemption of 20.5 m² (220 sq.ft.) for one enclosed parking garage would be provided.</td>
<td>The licencing of secondary suites provides for regular inspections, which would ensure that garage areas are not subsequently converted to living space.</td>
<td>No change for a floor area exemption for enclosed garages due to the potential to convert to living space (as has been typical in Vancouver).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Floor Area</td>
<td>37 m² (400 sq.ft.)</td>
<td>Establishing a minimum floor area sets a basic standard for livability in all detached secondary suites.</td>
<td>Do not impose a minimum floor area, as smaller spaces can be well-designed and livable; and less impactful – particularly on smaller lots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Setbacks (Yards)</td>
<td>A minimum setback from the rear property line of 1.8 metres (6 feet) to the detached</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>PROPOSED REGULATIONS NOV 2013</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
<td>PROPOSED REVISIONS APRIL 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secondary suite; and 1.2 metres (4 feet) to the portion of the building occupied by an enclosed garage.</td>
<td>Side yard setbacks may be varied through the Development Permit to encourage a single-level unit, accommodate required parking, or provide for superior siting.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The detached secondary suite shall be subject to the same side yard setbacks as the main house (subject to further staff review).</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A minimum separation of 4.9 metres (16 feet) between the principal dwelling and the detached secondary suite.</td>
<td>To provide for a minimum level of privacy between two dwellings sharing the same lot. This is the standard established by the City of Vancouver for its laneway housing regulations.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>Maximum 4.57 metres (15 feet) for one-storey buildings; and maximum 6.4 metres (22 feet) for two-storey buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Storeys</td>
<td>Maximum two storeys</td>
<td>Means two storeys plus basement (unless basements not permitted).</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For two storey dwellings, the upper storey shall have a maximum floor area not exceeding 60 percent of the main floor area.</td>
<td>To reduce the apparent bulk of two storey dwellings.</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street Parking</td>
<td>Minimum one parking space for the exclusive use of the detached secondary suite.</td>
<td>Parking space (garage) for the detached secondary suite may not be located within the principal dwelling.</td>
<td>No change, but encourage open parking space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupancy</td>
<td>The registered owner of the lot must occupy, as his/her principal place of residence,</td>
<td>Same requirement as for secondary suites per s. 130.05(d) of the Zoning Bylaw.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>PROPOSED REGULATIONS NOV 2013</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
<td>PROPOSED REVISIONS APRIL 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>either the principal dwelling unit or the detached secondary suite, or alternatively must provide for a property manager to manage tenancies, deal with any complaints from neighbours, and provide contact information to the District.</td>
<td></td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Separate Title</td>
<td>The detached secondary suite must not be subdivided from the principal dwelling unit under the Land Title Act or the Strata Property Act.</td>
<td>Detached secondary suites are intended as a form of rental (not ownership) housing.</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COUNCIL REPORT

Date: January 7, 2014
From: Stephen Mikicich, Manager of Community Planning
Subject: Status of Community Dialogue Implementation

RECOMMENDED THAT:

1. The report from the Manager of Community Planning dated January 7, 2014, titled "Status of Community Dialogue Implementation" be received for information.

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide a status update on various District initiatives originating from or supported by the findings from the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing. These include current work on coach houses, rental housing, and housing bulk. The last comprehensive update on Community Dialogue ‘implementation’ was in the form of a staff presentation to Council at the Committee of the Whole meeting held on January 28, 2013.

1.0 Background

1.1 Prior Resolutions

September 22, 2008 – Council received for information the final report and recommendations of the Community Dialogue Working Group; and directed staff to report back with recommendations for implementing the directions outlined in this report, as part of the District’s 2009 work program.

1.2 History

The Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing was a four-phased community engagement program undertaken during 2007-2008.
2.0 **Policy**

2.1 Policy

The Community Dialogue was guided, in part, by Official Community Plan (OCP) Policy H 1, which is to "engage in further dialogue at both a community and local neighbourhood level to develop a full understanding of community trends, desires and related housing needs and potential policies for addressing them."

2.2 Bylaw

N/A

3.0 **Analysis**

3.1 Discussion

In September 2008, the Community Dialogue Working Group reported that a majority of residents would like to see thoughtful and effective actions undertaken by Council to address real community concerns over housing choice and affordability, and the changing character of West Vancouver's established neighbourhoods. In its final report, the Working Group put forward a number of key recommendations which are summarized as follows:

- Revise District policies, regulations, and processes to achieve the sustainable community that is envisioned in the Official Community Plan (OCP)

- Enhance and protect neighbourhood character by:
  - Articulating the character of distinct neighbourhoods in key District policies
  - Conserving our heritage
  - Encouraging 'designing with nature'
  - Making construction more 'neighbour friendly'

- Increase housing choice and improve housing affordability by:
  - Amending key District policies to recognize alternate housing types
  - Exploring new housing types – through a series of targeted ‘pilot projects’
  - Developing an affordable housing strategy
  - Legitimizing secondary suites in single-family dwellings
  - Encouraging environmentally sustainable housing and landscape design
- Ensure the livability of new and established neighbourhoods through:
  - The creation of additional village service nodes
  - Opportunities for reducing reliance on the private automobile

- Ensure that the ‘Dialogue’ continues through the use of community workshops and other public engagement tools

Since 2009, these recommendations have been implemented through a series of District initiatives related to housing and neighbourhoods. The current status of these initiatives is outlined in the table attached as Appendix ‘A’ to this report. Some key achievements over this period include:

2010  Legalization of Secondary Suites (776 suites approved to year end 2013, with 110 applications pending approval)

2011  “Infill Housing” designation for the 2000-block Esquimalt/Fulton Avenues (OCP amendment and 1st rezoning adopted in July)

Adoption of a series of bylaw amendments related to construction standards, and reducing the impacts of new construction on neighbouring properties (November)

2012  Updated Policies and Guidelines for Lower Caulfeild Heritage Conservation Area (adopted in July)

2013  Housing Action Plan (adopted in February)

Coach House Examination (underway through 2014)

2014  Community Engagement on:
  - Proposed Coach House Policies and Zoning Regulations
  - Purpose-Built Rental Housing
  - Housing Bulk

Review of Boulevard Regulations and Guidelines

3.2  Sustainability

The findings from the Community Dialogue have provided added depth to existing District policies related to land use and development, housing, transportation, and the natural environment, and support the sustainable community that is envisioned in the OCP.
3.3 Consultation

During 2007-2008, the Community Dialogue Working Group guided a year-long consultation process with the residents of West Vancouver on issues related to housing choice and affordability, and neighbourhood character. The Community Dialogue provided a forum for identifying and discussing fundamental issues facing West Vancouver.

Subsequent District initiatives on housing and neighbourhoods have included opportunities for more in-depth consultation on specific issues, and have utilized the various online and ‘face-to-face’ engagement tools developed during the Community Dialogue. Community engagement on purposed coach house policies and zoning regulations, purpose-built rental housing, and housing bulk is planned for February 2014.

3.4 Communications Process

The Working Group's final report and recommendations have provided both a framework for developing District work plans and priorities, and for monitoring the District's progress in addressing housing and neighbourhood issues. Regular updates on Community Dialogue 'implementation' are provided on an annual basis.

4.0 Options

4.1 Council may

(as recommended)

- receive this report for information;

(or, alternatively)

- request further information (to be specified).

Author: Stephen Mikicich, Manager of Community Planning

Appendices:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>PARTICULARS</th>
<th>MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Building a Sustainable Community</td>
<td>Revise District policies, regulations, and processes to achieve the sustainable community that is envisioned in the OCP</td>
<td>Amendments to OCP and other policies and regulatory bylaws, and preparation of strategic plans</td>
<td>Ongoing, on an as-needed basis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.1| Articulating “Neighbourhood Character” | Prepare character statements for individual neighbourhoods to help articulate their character-defining elements, and the community values around these, for inclusion in the OCP                                                 | Adaptation of heritage conservation tools, such as a Statements of Significance (SOS) provides the basis framework for understanding and articulating ‘character’ | Fit with established character is a key consideration in the development application review process  
An SOS was used to inform amendments to OCP policy and guidelines for the Lower Caulfeild Heritage Conservation Area (adopted July 9, 2012)  
Neighbourhood character statements were prepared for:  
   1. 2000-block Esquimalt / Fulton (OCP amended in July 2011 to allow for future infill housing); and  
   2. A small neighbourhood enclave at 26th & Ottawa; where the statement was used to guide the design of the boulevard adjacent to two redeveloped properties |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>PARTICULARS</th>
<th>MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.2 | Integrating New Houses in Established Neighbourhoods                 | Amend single-family zoning regulations to address community concerns over the integration of new houses into established neighbourhoods, in terms of size and apparent building bulk (e.g., floor area, siting, height, and massing) | Zoning Policy Review                                                                       | ▪ October 2013: Discussion Paper titled “Siting, Form and Character Study” completed  
▪ Further review and updating of the District's Zoning policies is planned – e.g., following current work on coach houses, purpose-built rental housing, and housing bulk  
▪ See also #2.3 below                                                                 |
| 2.3 | Making the Construction Process More Neighbourly                     | Review and revise, if necessary, building permit regulations and bylaw enforcement provisions to address resident concerns over negative impacts of new construction – e.g., truck traffic, parking, noise, vibrations, construction debris, blasting, hours of work, etc. | Review of Bylaw Provisions & Enforcement Related to New Construction                      | ▪ November 2011: Council adopted a series of bylaw amendments related to construction standards, and reducing the impacts of new construction on neighbours  
▪ Affected bylaws are: (1) Building Bylaw; (2) Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw; (3) Fees and Charges Bylaw; (4) Soil Removal and Deposit Regulation Bylaw; (5) Traffic and Parking Bylaw |
| 2.4 | Protecting Boulevard and Streetscape Character                       | Review the Boulevard Bylaw and the Boulevard Maintenance and Encroachment Policy, and any related guidelines to address resident concerns over loss of established neighbourhood character... | Amendments to Boulevard Bylaw and related policy(ies)                                     | ▪ 2014: A review and update of the District's Boulevard Bylaw and Guidelines is planned                                                              |
| 2.5 | Minimizing Site Alteration                                            | Prepare regulations, guidelines & incentives to encourage designs that are sympathetic to a site's natural features, and minimize site alteration and loss of trees during new construction | ▪ Lower Caulfield Heritage Conservation Area (Guidelines for Alteration Permits)  
▪ Environmental Development Permits (watercourse protection, development on steep terrain)      | ▪ July 9, 2012: Amendments to Alteration Permit Guidelines for Lower Caulfield, which include site alteration, were approved by Council \n▪ Environmental Development                                                                 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>PARTICULARS</th>
<th>MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Learning How to 'Design with Nature'</td>
<td>In concert with recommendation #2.5, consider a demonstration program for examining how a site's natural features can be retained in new development</td>
<td>Demonstration Program of Pilot Projects</td>
<td>2009: Designing with nature was considered in the review of housing pilot project proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Conserving our Heritage Resources</td>
<td>Develop an incentive program to encourage and support heritage conservation efforts by private property owners</td>
<td>Heritage Strategic Plan, Community Heritage Register, Heritage Revitalization Agreements (HRAs)</td>
<td>June 2009: Council endorsed the use of land use incentives for heritage conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community Heritage Register establishes eligibility for conservation incentives (43 resources have been listed to date; future additions are anticipated in 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council has supported a property tax exemption for the BC Binning House (National Historic Site); and current efforts to ensure that the property remains in the public domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conservation plans have been prepared for Pt. Atkinson Light Station, Hollyburn Lodge, and the Municipal Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Statements of Significance are regularly used to articulate heritage value and character-defining elements of significant buildings and landscapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2014: Staff anticipate that two HRA applications and one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>TOPIC</td>
<td>PARTICULARS</td>
<td>MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>CURRENT STATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>voluntary heritage designation will proceed to Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.1 | Amending OCP Housing Policies       | Amend the OCP, as may be required, to enable consideration of new housing types to meet the current and future needs of West Vancouver residents | ▪ Evaluation of built new housing prototypes via Housing Pilot Program (in 2009) to inform future district policies  
▪ Consideration of the findings and directions from the Community Dialogue in the review of OCP amendment applications (ongoing) | ▪ Action #4 in the Housing Action Plan (adopted February 2013) is to "strengthen OCP policies on housing diversity to provide a framework for consideration of innovative housing proposals" |
| 3.2 | Allowing Secondary Suites           | Develop an implementation program for allowing secondary suites, which would identify issues around suites; recommend a process and criteria for legalizing suites; and provide for amendments to zoning and other bylaws to allow secondary suites | Secondary Suites Review & Implementation Program                                       | ▪ December 2009: Council adopted Zoning Bylaw amendments to legalize secondary suites  
▪ March 2010: Program implementation began  
▪ At year-end 2013: 776 suites have been approved to date, with approval pending for 110 additional suites (new construction) – for a total of 886 units |
| 3.3 | Considering 'Infill' Housing        | Develop policies and criteria to determine under which conditions 'infill' housing would be suitable | OCP Amendment and/or OCP Update  
Review of Development Applications                                                | ▪ July 2011: Council amended the OCP to designate the 2000-block Esquimalt/Fulton for future infill housing development; and approved the 1st rezoning in this block for a 9-unit strata project (Hollyburn Mews), which is now complete and fully-occupied.  
▪ January 2014: A second infill project (3 units) in this block is
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>PARTICULARS</th>
<th>MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstration Program of Pilot Projects</td>
<td>currently under construction (property rezoned in 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Exploring New Housing Types</td>
<td>Consider a demonstration program to enable introduction of new housing types on a limited basis, in advance of new housing policies and regulatory tools being formally adopted...</td>
<td></td>
<td>• December 2009: Council formally selected two pilot projects to start in 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• July 2010: Council amended OCP to provide for Housing Pilot Program (Policy H 4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• 2013-2014: Program has since been re-cast to focus on coach houses as a possible new housing type for West Vancouver – based on a review of lessons learned from other jurisdictions, and a community engagement program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Spring 2014: Staff anticipate reporting back to Council with draft coach house bylaws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Addressing Housing Affordability</td>
<td>Develop a strategy to increase the supply of a range of relatively more affordable market and non-market housing alternatives...</td>
<td>Preparation of a Housing Action Plan per Strategy 4.1 of Metro Vancouver's Regional Growth Strategy (adopted July 29, 2011)</td>
<td>• October 2011: Council approved the Kiwanis project which provides 137 new low-income rental housing units (net increase of 86 units on this site).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• May 2012: DWV participated in Metro Vancouver Study on the Vulnerability of Purpose-Built Rental Housing in the Region, and commissioned a detailed assessment of the vulnerability of West Vancouver's rental housing stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• February 2013: Council adopted the Housing Action Plan to support housing diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>TOPIC</td>
<td>PARTICULARS</td>
<td>MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>CURRENT STATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Utilizing Surplus District-</td>
<td>Examine opportunities for using surplus District-owned lands:</td>
<td>Disposition of Surplus District-Owned Lands:</td>
<td>and affordability. Key initiatives currently underway are an examination of coach houses, and possible District actions to further support purpose-built rental housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Owned Lands</td>
<td>▪ To address identified housing gaps in the community – particularly, limited housing choice and affordability; and</td>
<td>▪ Former Wetmore Motors’ site (long-term land lease for private seniors’ housing project)</td>
<td>▪ November 2013: Discussion Paper titled: “Understanding West Vancouver’s Purpose-Built Rental Housing”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ To meet other social, economic, and environmental sustainability objectives (see #3.7 below)</td>
<td>▪ Proposed sale of District-owned lands in the 1300-block Marine Drive</td>
<td>▪ “The Westerleigh” is now completed and occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Former Horseshoe Bay Firehall site (subdivided into three lots and sold)</td>
<td>▪ March 6, 2012: Council approved execution of Purchase and Sale Agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Creation of new residential lots from surplus road ends and existing lots, with design controls to ensure fit with established character</td>
<td>▪ December 9, 2013: Lands rezoned to CD 50, which allows for 94 apartments and 4 townhouses within a mixed commercial-residential development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>Encouraging ‘Green’ Buildings</td>
<td>Adopt minimum standards for employing sustainable (green) building design and operating</td>
<td>▪ Continue to register green building and energy efficiency requirements (West Vancouver)</td>
<td>▪ Since 2010: Property sales at 26th &amp; Ottawa, 26th &amp; Marine, and Ottabum Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|    |                              |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |                                                                                         | ▪ June 2010: OCP amended to add community greenhouse gas reduction targets and policies,                                                                                                                                
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>PARTICULARS</th>
<th>MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>systems...</td>
<td>Standard on title of District lands to be sold (applies to 3.6 above)</td>
<td>as required by Provincial Bill 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Secure sustainability measures through development approval process</td>
<td>• Council considers home energy performance when considering rezoning, development permits, and development variance permits (OCP Policy H 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Creating 'Village Nodes'</td>
<td>Examine opportunities for creating or enhancing 'village nodes' or neighbourhood service centres through future planning initiatives in both new and established neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Planning for future Cypress Village</td>
<td>Anticipated for 2014-2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Reducing Reliance on the Private Automobile</td>
<td>Make provisions for enhanced pedestrian, cycling, and transit facilities to lessen reliance on the private automobile, enable more sustainable transportation choices, and increase opportunities for community connections</td>
<td>Strategic Transportation Plan</td>
<td>April 2010: Strategic Transportation Plan completed and received by Council for information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2012: Council approved the Cycling Network Implementation Plan report for implementation of cycling routes throughout the District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Ongoing Public Education &amp; Input</td>
<td>Provide opportunities for ongoing public education, awareness, and input on neighbourhood character and housing issues – and related issues such as heritage conservation, sustainable building design and construction practices, etc.</td>
<td>• Review of Development Applications</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Long-range planning initiatives related to housing and neighbourhoods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Community partnerships – e.g., Lionsview Seniors’ Planning Society, Western Residents Association, neighbouring municipalities, etc.</td>
<td>See # 5.3 below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>TOPIC</td>
<td>PARTICULARS</td>
<td>MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>CURRENT STATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Developing Pilot Projects</td>
<td>Develop a selection process and evaluation criteria for consideration of possible 'pilot projects' by Council</td>
<td>Housing Pilot Program (2009)</td>
<td>• See #3.4 above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5.3| Holding Workshops on Key Topics or Issues | Hold future workshops on various topics that require future exploration – e.g., affordable housing, green buildings, and 'designing with nature'. | As needs and opportunities arise        | • March 2012: Staff presentation on "Aging in Place: What we learned from the Community Dialogue" at invitation of Western Residents Association  
• May 2013: District participation in the "Rightsizing Forum", hosted by Lionsview Seniors' Planning Society  
• 2013-2014: Community engagement on coach houses, purpose-built rental housing, and housing bulk |
COUNCIL REPORT

Date: November 6, 2013
File: 13-2515-02
From: Stephen Mikicich, Manager of Community Planning
Subject: Proposed Coach House Implementation

RECOMMENDED THAT:

1. Staff seek community input on proposed coach house policies, regulations, and guidelines, as described in the report from the Manager of Community Planning dated November 6, 2013; and

2. Upon completion of the community engagement process, staff present proposed implementation bylaws for formal consideration by Council in the first quarter of 2014.

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to present draft policies, regulations, and guidelines for the introduction of coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite. Staff is seeking Council direction to consult with the community before preparing implementation bylaws for formal consideration by Council in the first quarter of 2014.

1.0 Background

1.1 Prior Resolutions

September 9, 2013 – Council directed staff to prepare draft bylaws to allow for rental coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite for Council consideration in fall 2013.

February 18, 2013 – Council adopted the Housing Action Plan, which provides the framework for the Planning Department’s work on housing during 2013-2014.

December 10, 2012 – Council resolved that the discussion paper, titled “The Potential for Coach Houses in West Vancouver: A Discussion Paper” provide the basis for community engagement on coach houses; and that staff report back to Council in mid 2013, on the results of the engagement process.
June 25, 2012 – Council established an examination of ‘coach houses’ as the policy focus for the District’s efforts in exploring new housing types during 2012-2013.

1.2 History

The District’s coach house examination began in December 2012 with posting of the Discussion Paper titled, “The Potential for Coach Houses in West Vancouver” on westvancouver.ca. This was followed by a series of public presentations, information displays at District venues, and a moderated panel discussion at the Kay Meek Centre on May 8, 2013. Residents provided formal input on the possibility of coach houses in West Vancouver through:

- Coach House Questionnaire (124 responses; 78% support for coach house);
- 2013 West Vancouver Community Survey (744 responses; 56% support).

Key findings from the engagement process, and staff recommendations for the introduction of coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite were presented to Council on September 9, 2013. At this meeting, Council directed staff to prepare draft bylaws.

2.0 Policy

2.1 Policy

The Official Community Plan (OCP) is founded on eight planning principles for building a sustainable community. Principle #3 is to “provide for a diversity of housing types to accommodate a balanced and diverse population in terms of age, ability, income, and household type.”

The final report and recommendations of the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing (2008) has provided a policy framework for various District initiatives related to housing diversity. These include: new neighbourhoods in the Evelyn Drive and Rodgers Creek areas, a pilot program for examining new housing types (2009), legalization of secondary suites (2010), designation of the 2000-block Esquimalt and Fulton Avenues for future infill housing development (2011), and current work on coach houses.

Action #2 in the Housing Action Plan (adopted February 2013) is to “consider coach houses following an informed community discussion.”

2.2 Bylaw

The introduction of coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite requires the establishment of a new regulatory framework; specifically:
an amendment to the Official Community Plan to add new housing policies, and to establish a coach house Development Permit Area, with associated form and character guidelines; and

- a Zoning Bylaw amendment to add regulations for detached secondary suites.

Amendments to the Development Procedures Bylaw and Fees and Charges Bylaw will also be required.

3.0 Analysis

3.1 Discussion

The proposed OCP Amendment bylaw for coach houses (Appendix ‘A’); and proposed zoning regulations for detached secondary suites (Appendix ‘B’) have been drafted based on: (1) a review of coach house regulations and approval processes implemented in other jurisdictions; and (2) input received from West Vancouver residents during the first half of 2013.

Following further community input on proposed policies, regulations, and guidelines, the draft bylaws will be finalized for formal consideration by Council.

Proposed OCP Amendment (Appendix ‘A’)

Proposed policies, and Development Permit Area designation and guidelines for the development of coach houses in existing West Vancouver neighbourhoods are described in Appendix ‘A’, and summarized below:

- The term “coach house” would replace the term “carriage house” in the OCP Glossary. A “coach house” is defined as:

  “a detached dwelling unit, which is accessory to, and smaller than a primary dwelling on a residential lot, and may be attached to a garage.”

- Proposed amendments to the Housing Policy section provide for rental coach houses as a permitted use in all zones where secondary suites are now permitted; and for consideration of rental coach houses in other residential zones on a site-by-site basis, subject to a site specific rezoning.

- Consideration of ownership coach houses is identified as appropriate for properties designated in the OCP for future infill housing development1, and as an incentive for conservation of properties listed on the Community Heritage Register.

---

1 At present, the only area designated for future infill housing that would include coach houses is the block bounded by 20th Street, Esquimalt Avenue, 21st Street, and Fulton Avenue.
Proposed amendments to the Built Form and Neighbourhood Character section include a new Development Permit Area designation (BF-B 3.1) to provide for the compatibility of a coach house with the principal dwelling on the lot, and the built form character of the local neighbourhood.

Proposed Guidelines BF-B 3.1 for coach house development in existing neighbourhoods address: (1) the location of a coach house on a lot, including sensitivity to development on adjacent properties; (2) site and landscape design; and (3) building design.

When finalized, these proposals will be drafted in bylaw form, for a required amendment to the OCP.

**Zoning Bylaw Amendment (Appendix ‘B’)**

While proposed OCP policies pertain to ‘coach houses’ as a new housing type, proposed zoning regulations are specific to a rental form of coach house described as a ‘detached secondary suite’. Proposed zoning regulations address the following questions:

- Where in the community (i.e., in which zones), and under which conditions will detached secondary suites be permitted?
- Where on the lot can a detached secondary suite be located?
- How large can these dwellings be (i.e., maximum floor area and building height)?
- How big a footprint will be allowed (i.e., maximum site coverage)?
- How much parking will be required?

Proposed zoning regulations for detached secondary suites will be presented for community review and input, and are outlined in the table attached as Appendix ‘B’. Staff will prepare a draft Zoning Bylaw amendment for Council’s consideration, upon completion of the community engagement process.

**Other Bylaw Amendments**

The Development Procedures Bylaw will require an amendment if Council wishes to delegate its powers under s.920(2) of the Local Government Act, to issue development permits under proposed Development Permit Area designation BF-B 3.1.

The Fees and Charges Bylaw will need to be amended to establish an application fee for Coach House Development Permits.
These additional bylaws will be brought forward at time of formal consideration of the proposed OCP and Zoning amendment bylaws.

**Development Permit Application Process**

The primary objective for a Development Permit Area designation is to provide for the successful integration of coach houses (i.e., detached secondary suites) with the built form and landscape character of existing neighbourhoods, while taking into account unique lot features and local context. The review process should provide an opportunity for meaningful neighbour input while, at the same time, not be made too onerous for individual property owners wishing to build a detached secondary suite.

Key characteristics of the proposed Development Permit application process are as follows:

- Delegation of issuance of Development Permits to the Director of Planning, Land Development and Permits

- A two-phased approval process:
  - **Phase I:** Review of proposed coach house siting (i.e., where on the lot the coach house may be built) prior to detailed building design. Applicants would be required to demonstrate that they have informed neighbours about their proposal at this early stage, the issues raise, and how these are proposed to be addressed.
  - **Phase II:** Approval of building and landscape design. At time of Development Permit application, the District would provide formal notification to residents living within 50 metres of the subject property with information about the proposal, how to provide input, and how it will be considered in the review process.

The application process will be detailed in draft form for public review and input, and will be finalized once proposed bylaws are prepared for Council consideration. Information materials will also be prepared for prospective coach house applicants, including eligibility under proposed zoning requirements, and pre-planning considerations such as servicing requirements and feasibility of development.

### 3.2 Sustainability

A diversity of housing supports a balanced and diverse population in terms of age, ability, income, and household type; and is fundamental for building a sustainable community. Coach houses, as a detached form of secondary suite, would provide an attractive housing option for West Vancouver residents wishing to:
downsize into a smaller housing unit on their own property;

- provide self-contained accommodation for an elderly parent, adult child, or on-site caregiver;

- design a custom housing unit for a family member with special needs (e.g., limited mobility); or

- create a more livable, ground-oriented rental unit, with added privacy for both the principal and accessory dwellings.

3.3 Consultation

The next phase of consultation in the District’s coach house examination will seek community input on proposed policies, regulations and guidelines, as outlined in Appendices ‘A’ and ‘B’, and the proposed Development Permit process for detached secondary suites (Appendix ‘C’).

Community engagement will incorporate both traditional methods (information displays, presentations, online information, online and printed questionnaires), and social media tools including: westvancouveriTE, Twitter and Facebook. Explanatory illustrations and photographs will be used in presentation materials for ease of understanding.

In addition to the general public, targeted audiences will include:

- Ratepayers’ associations and other interested groups;

- Architects, designers, and home builders;

- Local realtors;

- Design Review Committee; and

- District staff from various Divisions.

The Community engagement process will be undertaken from late November 2013 through January 2014, as described below:

**November – December 2013**

- Digital materials posted on westvancouver.ca

- Preparation of printed information and display materials

- Information displays at District venues

- Online questionnaire
• Information provided to ratepayers’ associations, other community groups, and interested individuals (email distribution list)

• Inter-Divisional staff review (Planning, Building Permits, Licences, Engineering, Bylaw and Licensing) of proposed Development Permit guidelines, zoning regulations, and application process.

January 2014

• DRC input on proposed Development Permit guidelines

• Focus group session(s) with architects, designers, and home builders for practical input on proposed guidelines, regulations, and process

• “Housing and Neighbourhoods Fair” – a consultation event for various District initiatives related to housing and neighbourhoods including: coach houses, purpose-built rental housing, housing bulk, and boulevards.

February 2014

• Analyze results from community engagement process for report to Council

• Prepare and finalize draft bylaws for Council’s consideration and first reading

March 2014

• Anticipated Public Hearing on proposed bylaw amendments

3.4 Communications Process

Refer to Section 3.3 – Consultation.

4.0 Options

4.1 Council may

(as recommended)

• Direct staff to consult with the community on proposed coach house policies, regulations and guidelines; and, upon completion of community engagement, to present proposed implementation bylaws for Council's consideration.

(or, alternatively)

• As above, but that proposed policies, regulations, and/or guidelines be amended (as specified by Council) prior to advancing to community engagement; or
- Request further information (to be specified).

Author: Stephen Mikicich, Manager of Community Planning

Appendices:

A. Proposed Coach House Policies, Development Permit Area Designation and Guidelines

B. Proposed Zoning Regulations for Detached Secondary Suites
PROPOSED COACH HOUSE POLICIES,
DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AREA DESIGNATION AND GUIDELINES

The following outlines proposed policies, and Development Permit Area designation and guidelines for the development of coach houses in existing West Vancouver neighbourhoods. When finalized, these will be drafted in bylaw form for a required amendment to the Official Community.

PROPOSED ADDITIONS TO OCP POLICY SECTION 3: HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Proposed Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>“Provide for rental coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite in all residential zones where secondary suites are a permitted use.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.1</td>
<td>“Consider rental coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite in other residential zones, subject to site-specific rezoning and a development permit under Development Permit Area BF-B 3.1.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.2</td>
<td>“Consider ownership coach houses on properties designated in the Official Community Plan for future infill housing development, subject to rezoning and a development permit.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.2.3 | “Consider ownership coach houses as an incentive for conservation of properties listed on the Community Heritage Register, subject to a Heritage Revitalization Agreement and municipal heritage designation.”  
(Alternatively, this may be added to the Heritage Policy Section of the OCP) |

PROPOSED ADDITIONS TO POLICY SECTION 4: BUILT FORM & NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy #</th>
<th>Proposed Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BF-B 3.1</td>
<td>“Ensure that coach houses meet a high quality of building and landscape design, and are compatible both with the principal dwelling on the lot, and the built form character of the local neighbourhood.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AREA DESIGNATION BF-B 3.1**
**(COACH HOUSES)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category:</th>
<th>Local Government Act s. 919.1 (1) (e), (h), (i) and (j)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conditions:</td>
<td>The Development Permit Area designation is warranted to provide for the compatibility of intensive residential development with the established built form character of existing neighbourhoods.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Objectives: | - To provide for the successful integration of coach houses with the built form and landscape character of existing neighbourhoods;  
  - To minimize site alteration and retain natural site features;  
  - To promote a high standard of design, construction and landscaping; and  
  - To promote energy and water conservation and the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. |
| Guidelines Schedule: | Guidelines BF-B 3.1 shall apply. |
| Exemption: | is for a renovation or small addition to a coach house that is considered to have no material change to the external appearance of the premises, meets all requirements of the Zoning Bylaw, and conforms to Guidelines BF-B 3.1. |

**PROPOSED BUILT FORM GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPMENT PERMIT AREA BF-B 3.1 (COACH HOUSES)**

I. Location on the Lot

   a. The location of the coach house on the lot should consider the particular site conditions – e.g., corner or mid-block lot, with or without a rear lane, primary frontage on one or two roads, natural site features, topography, etc.

   b. The coach house should generally be located in the rear yard of the lot, except that:

      i. On through (or double-fronting) lots, with no rear yards, a coach house may be located in either front yard, subject to compatibility
with the orientation of and minimum separation from the principal dwelling on the lot, adjacent properties, and the local streetscape character; and

ii. On steep lots, alternative siting proposals may be considered to avoid significant grade alteration and use of retaining walls.

c. Site planning should be sensitive to existing development on adjacent properties to minimize overview and shadowing, and impacts on established views.

II. Site and Landscape Design

a. Alteration of existing grades and natural site features to accommodate a coach house should be minimized.

b. Established vegetation and rock outcrops should be incorporated in new landscaping, where feasible.

c. All areas adjacent to the coach house should be landscaped with low maintenance, drought resistant plant materials; and rainwater collection systems (e.g., rain barrels) should be considered for irrigation purposes.

d. Permeable paving materials should be used for outdoor patios, walkways and driveways.

e. Visual screening for privacy adjacent to a street or lane should be achieved through appropriately-scaled planting and low ornamental fencing, rather than tall solid fences or hedges.

f. Outdoor living areas should be defined and screened for privacy with hard and soft landscaping, architectural elements such as trellises and, where appropriate, changes in grade.

g. Where the coach house is set back sufficiently from a rear lane, consideration should be given to more extensive landscaping adjacent to the lane, including shrubbery and modest-size trees.

h. Rainwater runoff from roofs and other hard surface areas should be retained in rain barrels, rain gardens, bioswales, or rock pits to facilitate natural filtration of rainwater into the ground.

i. For flat-roofed coach houses, consideration should be given to landscaped ‘green’ roofs, where feasible.
j. Areas for waste and recycling containers provided on the lot should be shared with the principal dwelling, and appropriately screened if visible from the street.

k. External mechanical equipment and utility meters should be located inconspicuously on a non-prominent building wall; and any visual or noise impacts on adjacent properties should be avoided where possible, and otherwise mitigated.

III. Building Design

a. Unit Entry

i. The primary entrance to the coach house should be easily identifiable and be directly accessible from the street via a walkway on the lot.

ii. On corner lots, the primary entry to the coach house and prominent windows should be oriented to the side street.

iii. The coach house address should be clearly visible from the street and, where applicable, the rear lane. It should be illuminated at night.

iv. The front door to the coach house should be set back a minimum 0.6 metre from the exterior building wall of the coach house or, alternatively, a projecting roof should be provided, to create a weather-protected entry area at least 1.2 metres in depth.

b. Roof Forms and Massing

i. For two-level coach houses, the partial upper storey (no more than 60 percent of the main floor area) should be contained within the massing of a sloped roof.

ii. Where dormers are used to provide interior room height, the exterior face of the dormer should be set back a minimum of 0.6 metre from the exterior wall edge (1.2 metres from projecting roof eaves).

iii. Flat roofs may require design mitigation to ensure that coach houses do not have a full two storey appearance.
iv. On larger lots, where space permits, the coach house massing should be limited to one storey, with generous setbacks to minimize overview and privacy impacts on neighbours.

c. Architectural Expression

i. The architectural design of the coach house should be respectful of and complementary to the principal dwelling on the lot, may be expressed in the same or different style, and should be finished in a similar or complementary palette of building materials.

ii. Visual interest should be created through variations in wall height and massing, and articulation of building facades.

iii. A variation of exterior building materials should be considered with more than one type used on all facades. Where a single material is proposed, visual interest should be provided through architectural detailing and use of colour.

d. Windows

i. On smaller lots, coach house orientation and sizing and placement of windows should be sensitive to the relative proximity of neighbouring properties.

ii. Upper level windows facing the principal dwelling on the lot and neighbouring properties should be modestly-sized to minimize overview. Skylights, clerestory windows, or obscured glazing should be considered.

iii. Ground-level windows should be minimized on lane-facing walls for privacy and security.

e. Outdoor Living Areas

i. Private outdoor space that is separate and distinct from that of the principal dwelling should be provided for the coach house.

ii. Balconies and decks should be located and screened to provide privacy for the coach house and minimize overlook onto adjacent properties.
f. Parking

i. Parking should be provided in the rear yard of the lot:

- Where the lot is served by an open rear lane, vehicle access to an enclosed garage, carport, or open parking space serving the coach house should be via the rear lane.

- Where there is no lane, parking access from the street should be via a driveway shared with the principal dwelling on the lot.

ii. Garage doors visible from the street should be designed to minimize their visual appearance through sensitive detailing and use of limited glazing.

iii. Permeable driveway surfaces such as ‘grasscrete’ pavers or narrow wheel lanes with grass planting in between should be used, where feasible.

g. Accessibility / Adaptability

i. Coach house designs should provide for accessibility/adaptability to meet changing household needs over time.

ii. Single-level units are encouraged where coach houses are likely to accommodate older residents or people with limited mobility.

h. ‘Green’ Building Features

Coach house designs should incorporate ‘green’ building features for reduced energy consumption and lower greenhouse gas emissions. At minimum, pre-plumbing and pre-wiring should be provided for future installation of such features.
## PROPOSED ZONING REGULATIONS FOR DETACHED SECONDARY SUITES

The following outlines proposed zoning regulations for detached secondary suites. When finalized, these will be drafted in bylaw form for a required Zoning Bylaw amendment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PROPOSED REGULATION</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition of &quot;Detached Secondary Suite&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;A detached dwelling unit accessory to a single family dwelling use.&quot;</td>
<td>Distinguishes this type of dwelling from a &quot;secondary suite&quot; (i.e., a suite within the house); and limits it as an accessory use to a single family dwelling use only (see Conditions of Use below).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Uses</td>
<td>A detached secondary suite would be permitted in all zones that allow for a secondary suite: RS1, RS2, RS3, RS4, RS5, RS7, RS8, RS9, RS10, RD1, and RD2.</td>
<td>In accordance with proposed OCP policy H 4.2.1, a detached secondary suite may also be permitted in the RS6 zone (Eagle Island), subject to site-specific rezoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions of Use</td>
<td>A detached secondary suite shall not be permitted in conjunction with a secondary suite.</td>
<td>Either a secondary suite or a detached secondary suite, but not both.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the RD1 and RD2 zones, a detached secondary suite shall only be permitted as accessory to a single-family dwelling.</td>
<td>Properties developed with a duplex would not be eligible for a detached secondary suite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A detached secondary suite shall be located within the required rear yard.</td>
<td>Siting can be varied through the Development Permit process – i.e., taking into account impact on natural site features, topography, mature vegetation, sunlight, views, and adjacent properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Coverage</td>
<td>Maximum 10% of site area, including attached garage.</td>
<td>Site coverage for the detached secondary suite would be in addition to the maximum site coverage for the principal dwelling and accessory structures under existing zoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</td>
<td>Maintain maximum FAR for the lot per existing zoning.</td>
<td>Properties already developed to maximum FAR would not be eligible for a detached secondary suite.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under s.130.08 of the Zoning Bylaw (Floor Area – Single Family Dwelling)</td>
<td>This would potentially add usable floor area equivalent to the main floor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATEGORY</td>
<td>PROPOSED REGULATION</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area</td>
<td>Maximum floor area shall be 0.1 times lot area to a maximum 111.5 m² (1200 sq.ft.)</td>
<td>The licencing of secondary suites provides for regular inspections, which would ensure that garage areas are not subsequently converted to living space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An additional floor area exemption of 20.5 m² (220 sq.ft.) for one enclosed parking garage would be provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Floor Area</td>
<td>37 m² (400 sq.ft.)</td>
<td>Establishing a minimum floor area sets a basic standard for livability in all detached secondary suites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Setbacks</td>
<td>A minimum setback from the rear property line of 1.8 metres (6 feet) to the detached secondary suite; and 1.2 metres (4 feet) to the portion of the building occupied by an enclosed garage.</td>
<td>Side yard setbacks may be varied through the Development Permit to encourage a single-level unit, accommodate required parking, or provide for superior siting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Yards)</td>
<td>The detached secondary suite shall be subject to the same side yard setbacks as the main house (subject to further staff review).</td>
<td>To provide for a minimum level of privacy between two dwellings sharing the same lot. This is the standard established by the City of Vancouver for its laneway housing regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A minimum separation of 4.9 metres (16 feet) between the principal dwelling and the detached secondary suite.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>Maximum 4.57 metres (15 feet) for one-storey buildings; and maximum 6.4 metres (22 feet) for two-storey buildings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

² A minimum floor area 37 m² (400 sq.ft.) falls within the 33 m² to 42 m² (355 to 452 sq.ft.) range established in other jurisdictions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>PROPOSED REGULATION</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Storeys</td>
<td>Maximum two storeys</td>
<td>Means two storeys plus basement (unless basements not permitted).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For two storey dwellings, the upper storey shall have a maximum floor area not exceeding 60 percent of the main floor area.</td>
<td>To reduce the apparent bulk of two storey dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-Street Parking</td>
<td>Minimum one parking space for the exclusive use of the detached secondary suite.</td>
<td>Parking space (garage) for the detached secondary suite may not be located within the principal dwelling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner Occupancy</td>
<td>The registered owner of the lot must occupy, as his/her principal place of residence, either the principal dwelling unit or the detached secondary suite, or alternatively must provide for a property manager to manage tenancies, deal with any complaints from neighbours, and provide contact information to the District.</td>
<td>Same requirement as for secondary suites per s. 130.05(d) of the Zoning Bylaw.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Separate Title</td>
<td>The detached secondary suite must not be subdivided from the principal dwelling unit under the Land Title Act or the Strata Property Act.</td>
<td>Detached secondary suites are intended as a form of rental (not ownership) housing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COUNCIL REPORT

Date:    July 11, 2013
From:    Stephen Mikicich, Sr. Community Planner
         Geri Boyle, Manager of Community Planning
Subject: West Vancouver’s Coach House Examination

RECOMMENDED THAT:

1. Staff prepare draft bylaws to allow for rental coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite for Council consideration in fall 2013.

Purpose

From January through June 2013, District staff engaged the community in a discussion on coach houses, as a possible new housing type in West Vancouver. This initiative is set out in the Balanced Scorecard and the Housing Action Plan. It also builds on the directions from the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing; specifically, the desire of West Vancouver residents for greater housing options, and new housing types that fit the established character of their neighbourhoods.

The purpose of this report is to present findings from the community engagement process and, as a result of the positive feedback received, recommend a proposed implementation program for coach houses.

1.0 Background

1.1 Prior Resolutions

February 18, 2013 – Council adopted the Housing Action Plan, which provides the framework for the Planning Department’s work on housing during 2013-2014;

December 10, 2012 – Council resolved that the discussion paper, titled “The Potential for Coach Houses in West Vancouver: A Discussion Paper” provide the basis for community engagement on coach houses; and that staff report back to Council in mid 2013, on the results of the engagement process, including possible directions supported by the Community.

June 25, 2012 – Council established an examination of ‘coach houses’ as the policy focus for the District’s efforts in exploring new housing types during 2012-2013.
2.0 Balanced Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC INITIATIVES</th>
<th>MILESTONES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1 Implement the recommendations of the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood</td>
<td>Continue implementation of coach house program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character and Housing Working Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2 Support regional and North Shore planning to advance West Vancouver’s</td>
<td>Commence Regional Context Statement and Housing Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.0 Analysis

3.1 West Vancouver’s Coach House Examination

The coach house examination was undertaken during the first half of 2013. A primary objective was to disseminate background information, and to stimulate public discussion on coach houses as a possible new housing type in West Vancouver. Information and engagement tools used in this program included:

- A discussion paper, titled "The Potential for ‘Coach Houses’ in West Vancouver: A Discussion Paper" (December 2012);
- Background information and program updates at www.westvancouver.ca;
- A moderated panel discussion and public forum held in May 2013 (attended by 200 people);
- Information displays at District venues and public events, including Community Day;
- Presentations to interested residents’ associations (Ambleside-Dundarave Ratepayers’ Association, Western Residents’ Association, Horseshoe Bay Residents Association);
- A coach house questionnaire (printed and online versions); and
- The District’s 2013 community survey, which included two questions related to coach houses.

A project time-line, including community engagement activities, event advertising, and online and media coverage is provided in Appendix ‘A’.

Through printed and online questionnaires, West Vancouver residents provided their input on coach house design, geographic distribution, tenure, density, and potential neighbourhood issues. Findings from 124 completed coach house questionnaires are discussed below in Section 3.2, with detailed findings presented in Appendix ‘B’. Responses to coach house questions in the 2013 Community Survey are provided in Appendix ‘C’.
3.2 Community Input

*Housing Choice and Diversity*

Residents were asked in the coach house questionnaire whether they believe coach houses could provide an appropriate housing option for West Vancouver. 78% of respondents responded ‘Yes’ (see chart below). The same question was asked in the 2013 Community Survey, to which a majority (56%) of respondents also answered ‘Yes’ (see Appendix ‘C’).

![Pie chart showing that 78% of respondents answered 'Yes' to the question of whether coach houses are an appropriate housing option for West Vancouver.]

Specific questionnaire comments echo what staff has been hearing over the past few years – i.e., that coach houses would provide residents with an opportunity to meet their families' housing needs on their own properties; be it for an older parent, adult children, or their own ‘downsizing’ needs (see Appendix ‘B’).

*Geographic Distribution*

Some municipalities have introduced coach houses on a community-wide basis while others have introduced them only in new or redeveloping neighbourhoods. West Vancouver residents were asked whether or not coach houses should be ‘restricted’ geographically:

- 62% of respondents to the coach house questionnaire support the idea of coach houses in all West Vancouver neighbourhoods; and
- 27% of support the idea of limiting coach houses to certain neighbourhoods or areas of West Vancouver.

Findings from the 2013 Community Survey suggest that residents are more split on the issue of District-wide implementation with 43% saying ‘Yes’ and 41% ‘No’¹ (see Appendix ‘C’).

¹ The discrepancy in findings between these survey tools suggests a diverse level of understanding and...

Document # 853390v1
Lot Characteristics

Built examples of coach houses in other communities suggest that certain types of lots are better suited for coach houses. For example, corner lots that provide for a street entry, and lots that provide for vehicle access from a rear lane. The coach house questionnaire delved into the possibility of limiting coach houses to certain types of lots, but a majority of respondents were clearly opposed:

- 74% oppose limiting coach houses to corner lots; and
- 59% oppose limiting coach houses to lots with rear lane access.

Coach House Design

There is strong support for implementing a design approval process for coach houses. 71% of questionnaire respondents feel that coach house applications should be subject to a design approval process (see chart below); more specifically, with respect to privacy (79%), building design and materials (77%), views (73%), and landscape design (64%).

At the same time, respondents caution against making the process too onerous for property owners (see Appendix ‘B’).

Design Approval?

☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Not sure
Density

On the matter of density, the questionnaire results indicate that there is not community consensus:

- 49% of questionnaire respondents feel that coach houses should only be permitted as an alternative to a secondary suite.
- 54% of respondents support an increase in number of dwelling units (i.e., a coach house in addition to a secondary suite); and
- 50% support an increase in permitted floor area.

Tenure

As no assumptions were made about tenure at the outset of the coach house examination, West Vancouver residents were asked in the questionnaire for their input on the question of rental versus ownership:

- 35% feel that coach houses should be rental only, whereas 52% do not agree with limiting these units to rental occupancy.
- 62% feel that ownership housing should be considered.

3.3 Municipal Infrastructure and Servicing Implications

Key servicing considerations for detached secondary suites are the potential requirement for upgrading water service for new construction, and potential upgrading of water mains:

- Under Waterworks Regulation Bylaw No. 4490, 2006, any permit valued over $100,000\(^2\) triggers a review to determine adequacy of existing water service. If the existing service is over 29 years old, it will likely require upgrading to 38mm pipe from the water main to the property line. It is estimated that 1 in every 3 water connections is over 29 years old.
- A minimum 100 mm water main is required to accommodate sprinklering of any new construction. It is estimated that approximately 6% of West Vancouver lots\(^3\) are served by 75 mm water mains. Upgrading of an undersized water main could have significant cost implications for a property owner\(^4\), which in itself could limit the feasibility of building a detached secondary suite versus adding a suite within an existing house.
- Other considerations:
  - Storm water management is required for all new construction.

---

\(^2\) The bylaw states $50,000, but the value has been increased to $100,000 by policy.
\(^3\) Typically on older cul de sacs where there has been no new building construction.
\(^4\) Construction cost is estimated at $1,000 per meter of water main.
- In most West Vancouver neighbourhoods, utilities are located overhead. If a detached secondary suite is proposed within an area that has underground services, undergrounding will be required.
- Other servicing issues may arise on an individual lot basis.

3.4 Staff Recommendations Regarding Implementation of a Coach House Program in West Vancouver

There appears to be significant community support for coach houses to consider allowing this housing type in West Vancouver. In moving forward towards implementation, staff is recommending the following approach:

1. *That coach houses be introduced District-wide as a permitted use in all single-family zones where secondary suites are now permitted:*
   - Residents were asked if they supported coach houses District-wide or only in specific geographic areas. The questionnaire results indicate support for District-wide implementation. This approach is consistent with the approach the District has taken on secondary suites, which are currently allowed in most single-family and duplex zones across West Vancouver. It is important to note, however, that staff is not recommending Coach Houses be allowed in the duplex zones.

2. *That coach houses be provided for without an increase in permitted floor area or number of dwelling units on a lot, over what is currently permitted in single-family zones:*
   - There are longstanding public concerns about maximum-sized new houses being built in West Vancouver, and related building practices that are seen to be eroding established neighbourhood character. Adding density would exacerbate this situation.
   - Staff is not supportive of an increase in permitted density for detached secondary suites, given OCP Policy BF-B 2, which is to "preserve and enhance the valued qualities of existing neighbourhoods". This includes "retaining the zoning density of existing neighbourhoods unless specifically provided for in the OCP" (e.g., as per Policy H 3).
   - Detached secondary suites could provide an opportunity to reduce the bulk of new houses (i.e., to maintain established neighbourhood character), by redistributing a portion of permitted floor area from the principal building to a separate, smaller structure on the lot.
   - While a third dwelling unit (i.e., a coach house in addition to a secondary suite) could perhaps be accommodated on some larger lots, most properties would likely not be able to provide off-street parking for a principal dwelling and two suites.
3. That consideration be given to the introduction of coach houses as a rental housing option in single-family neighbourhoods; specifically, as a detached form of secondary suite:

- The municipalities surveyed as part of the District’s coach house examination have looked to coach houses as a form of rental housing in single-family neighbourhoods and, in most cases, as a detached alternative to a secondary suite.

- In the absence of new purpose-built rental accommodation, secondary suites play a key role in the ‘secondary’ rental housing market. Coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite would add to the supply of these rental units in the community, which presently includes: suites within houses, and strata-titled units such as duplexes, townhouses, and apartments.

- While there are examples of detached strata-titled dwellings that are referred to as ‘coach houses’ in other municipalities (e.g., the Kitsilano and Mount Pleasant areas of Vancouver) and in West Vancouver’s “Infill Housing Block”, these units are developed as a form of higher density, infill housing; not as an accessory dwelling to a single-family house on a single fee simple lot.

Creating separate title for coach houses (either through strata-title or fee simple subdivision) could have significant ‘character’ impacts on West Vancouver’s established neighbourhoods, particularly if considered on a District-wide basis. For this reason, staff recommend that ownership coach houses should be considered under OCP Policy H 3, which provides for consideration of infill housing proposals in limited site-specific situations (see footnote #6).

4. That coach house applications be subject to a form and character Development Permit.

- District-wide implementation of coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite seems to be a reasonable approach, provided a design approval process is implemented to ensure the successful integration of these units within different neighbourhood contexts, and different lot conditions.

---

5 The block bounded by Esquimalt Avenue, 20th Street, Fulton Avenue, and 21st Street was designated in July 2011 for future infill housing development within the context of OCP Policy H 3. This block is also designated as a Development Permit Area to provide for the compatibility of new infill housing units within an established neighbourhood.
5. **That approval of Development Permits be delegated by Council to staff:**

- The community feels that coach houses should be subject to a design approval process, but that this process should not be onerous for individual property owners. In order to balance these two objectives, delegation of Council’s approval authority for “Detached Secondary Suite Development Permits” to the Director of Planning, Land Development and Permits is recommended. Under delegation to staff, applicants are entitled to appeal the Director’s decision to Council. This approval process would be similar to that adopted for Environmental Development Permits.

- Along with other District initiatives on housing as outlined in the Housing Action Plan, staff would report to Council annually on the status of coach house implementation.

3.5 Draft Bylaws

Staff is recommending that consideration be given to the introduction of rental coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite. If Council concurs with this recommendation, staff will proceed to draft three implementing bylaws, along with draft administrative procedures for handling coach house applications, for consideration in fall 2013. The scope of these bylaw amendments is described as follows:

1. **Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw**

   An OCP Amendment is required to establish a clear housing policy for this new housing type; and to provide for the regulation of coach house designs. This will include:

   (a) A new policy under Policy Section 3: Housing

   (b) Establishment of “Detached Secondary Suite Development Permit Area BF-B 3.1” under Policy Section 4: Built Form and Neighbourhood Character, including objectives for:

   - the form and character of intensive residential development (detached secondary suites);
   - promoting energy and water conservation; and
   - promoting the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

2. **Zoning Bylaw Amendment**

   Zoning regulations for Detached Secondary Suites would be modeled in part on Section 130.05 of the Zoning Bylaw (Secondary Suites), specifically:
(a) A maximum of one secondary suite or one detached secondary suite per lot:
   - A maximum floor area between 90 m² (as permitted for secondary suites) and 110 m² to be examined by staff;
   - A detached secondary suite must not be subdivided from the principal dwelling unit under the Land Title Act or the Strata Property Act, and either the principal dwelling or the detached secondary suite must be occupied by the property owner;
   - Off-street vehicle parking: 1 space to be provided exclusively for the detached secondary suite and at least 2 spaces to be provided exclusively for the principal dwelling unit;

(b) A coach house would be a permitted use in the following single-family zones: RS1, RS2, RS3, RS4, RS5, RS7, RS8, RS9, and RS10; but would not be permitted in the RD1 and RD2 duplex zones (which are a form of higher density, multi-family housing, and already subject to a Development Permit with established guidelines) ⁶.

(c) Coach houses would not be restricted to corner lots or lots with rear lane access; but minimum lot area, yards, and separation from the principal building would be established.

(d) No increase in maximum permitted floor area or site coverage under existing single-family zoning. Floor area exemptions for basements would not be permitted, in order to encourage designs that minimize site alteration and disruption.

3. Delegation Bylaw

This bylaw would delegate Council’s approval authority for “Detached Secondary Suite Development Permits” to the Director of Planning, Land Development and Permits. Applicants are entitled to appeal the Director’s decision to Council.

4.0 Options

4.1 Council may...

(as recommended)

- Direct that draft bylaws to allow for rental coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite be prepared for Council consideration in fall 2013.

⁶ “Secondary suites” are a permitted use in the RS1, RS2, RS3, RS4, RS5, RS7, RS8, RS9 and RS10 zones. They are also permitted in the following duplex zones: RD1 and RD2.
(or, alternatively)

- Direct that staff pursue a different course of action (to be specified); or
- Request further information (to be specified).

Authors:

Stephen Mikicich, Sr. Community Planner

Geri Boyle, Manager of Community Planning

Appendices:

A. West Vancouver's Coach House Examination: Community Engagement Activities, Event Advertising, and Online and Media Coverage.

B. Findings from Coach House Questionnaire

C. Coach House Questions in the District's 2013 Community Survey
# APPENDIX ‘A’

## Time-Line for Coach House Examination

*Community Engagement Activities, Event Advertising, and Online and Media Coverage*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct 12/12</td>
<td>Staff-led Council Tour of coach houses in Vancouver and North Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 12/12</td>
<td>NS Outlook Article: “Laneway Living on the North Shore”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 12/12</td>
<td>NS News article: “Coach Houses Cause West Van Council Strife”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 7/13</td>
<td>Web page roll out: <a href="http://www.westvancouver.ca/housing">www.westvancouver.ca/housing</a> with posting of Discussion Paper <em>(with updates at key milestones)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 18/13</td>
<td>Meeting with Board of Directors of Ambleside-Dundarave Ratepayers’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 25/13 to May 5/13</td>
<td>Public Invitation to May 8th Coach House Forum via North Shore Outlook, North Shore News, and Paivand Newspapers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2/13</td>
<td>Notice in ‘The Westerner’ (Newsletter of the Western Residents’ Association and Horseshoe Bay Residents’ Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3/13</td>
<td>NS News article: “WV Seeks Coach House Input: Public Panel Will Look at Feasibility of Alternate Housing”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 8/13</td>
<td>Vancouver Sun article: “West Vancouver Considers Allowing Coach Houses” <em>(also posted on [<a href="http://www.laneliving.ca">www.laneliving.ca</a>; <a href="http://www.allvoices.com">www.allvoices.com</a>](<a href="http://www.laneliving.ca">http://www.laneliving.ca</a>; <a href="http://www.allvoices.com">www.allvoices.com</a>))</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 8/13</td>
<td>Moderated Panel Discussion and Public Forum on Coach Houses at Kay Meek Centre. <em>(Questionnaire available May 8th through June 6th)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 8/13</td>
<td>CBC TV News: Coverage during evening and late night broadcasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 9/13</td>
<td>Michael Geller’s Blog: “Why are we going to let West Vancouver look like North Vancouver?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 10/13</td>
<td>Mention in “Neighbourhood Watch: A weekly roundup of noteworthy news in municipalities across BC” on the website: Spacing Vancouver: Canadian Urbanism Uncovered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 13/13</td>
<td>Mention in “What is a Coach House” on <a href="http://www.melmontgomery.com/blog">www.melmontgomery.com/blog</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16/13</td>
<td>Meeting with Greater Vancouver Real Estate Board (GVREB) – North Shore Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 21/13</td>
<td>Presentation to Western Residents’ Association / Horseshoe Bay Residents’ Association in conjunction with Jake Fry (Smallworks) and Heather Johnston (Place Architects) at Gleneagles Golf Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 22/13</td>
<td>NS Outlook article: “The Great West Van Coach House Debate”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 22/13</td>
<td>Vanessa Ybarra’s blog: “Coach Housing: Coming to a Neighbourhood Near You?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 26/13</td>
<td>NS News article: “Housing Workshop May 29th”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DATE</strong></td>
<td><strong>ACTION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 26/13</td>
<td>NS News article: “Coach Houses Considered”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 29/13</td>
<td>NS Outlook article: “Goodbye North Shore Baby Boomers”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 29/13</td>
<td>Staffed information display at Lionsview’s Rightsizing Forum (Seniors Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 31/13</td>
<td>Questionnaire deadline #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1/13</td>
<td>Staffed information display at Community Day (Ambleside Park)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 4/13</td>
<td>Information session on coach houses for Lower Caulfeild property owners (prior to Lower Caulfield Advisory Committee [LCAC] meeting); owners notified of this session by mail sent on May 21, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 6/13</td>
<td>Questionnaire deadline #2 (extended to follow Community Day and LCAC meeting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 11/13</td>
<td>Follow-up mention in The Westerner (article to follow at end of June)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 17/13</td>
<td>“West Vancouver Mulls Allowing Coach Houses” posted on: <a href="http://www.theyvancouverrealestate.ca">www.theyvancouverrealestate.ca</a>:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 7/13</td>
<td>Article in The Westerner newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 6/13</td>
<td>Globe &amp; Mail article: “Divvying up the single-family lot”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX ‘B’

Findings from Coach House Questionnaire

This Appendix provides an overview of numerical findings and comments from 124 completed questionnaires. These were received from West Vancouver residents between May 7 and June 6, 2013. Approximately 10% of these were completed online. Note: Percentage values below are based on the number of responses to each individual question.

QUESTION 1: Please tell us where you live...

For the purposes of this question, sub-areas of West Vancouver were defined as follows:

- 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 Highway: British Properties, Glenmore, Chartwell, Canterbury, Panorama, Whitby Estates

1. Where Do You Live?

11%
15%
55%
19%

Eastern
Central
Western
Above Hwy

(124 responses)

The geographic distribution of questionnaire responses reflects in part the population distribution within the community.
QUESTION 2: Do you think that coach houses could provide an appropriate housing option for West Vancouver residents?

Responses to Question #2 echo what staff have been hearing over the past few years – i.e., that residents are primarily interested in coach houses as an opportunity to meet their family’s current or future housing needs on their own property. Most commonly, coach houses are identified as appropriate accommodation for an elderly parent, adult children, on-site caregiver.

2. An Appropriate Housing Option for West Van?

- □ Yes
- □ No
- □ Not sure

(124 responses)

Comments from Individuals Answering “Yes” To Question 2

- I live in a modest house on a large corner lot that could easily accommodate a second small house.
- People born in this community and less affluent residents could afford to stay here.
- There is a definite need for both older residents and younger households (more affordable housing option).
- We are selling our house as retirement affords more time for travel. If we were able to do this we’d live in the coach house and rent out the main house (and stay in our neighbourhood).
- We need more affordability.
- I think coach houses are absolutely essential for West Vancouver at this time. The current rate of demolition of modest sized houses and replacement with 5000+ sq.ft. houses is absolutely unsustainable.
- They’re essential... a great way to gently diversity and serve existing and new residents.
- Need to replenish stock of smaller homes, as were traditionally built.
- Good option for land use and mixed densification.
- I think they’re a great idea and long overdue.
- Excellent idea for allowing young families and seniors to live/stay in West Vancouver, close to amenities.
- An increase in density is a small price to pay for aging in place. The devil is in the details.
- I love it. I know it works... It is a lovely housing option for the elderly and for college kids.
- Charming way to provide alternate family accommodation, and rental opportunities.
- It's a perfect option for multi-generational families; as real estate prices become more unattainable for younger generations.
- We need more creative housing options.
- Much better than building mid-rise or high-rise buildings.
- West Van needs more affordable housing options to attract young families and allow seniors to remain here. We need more density to survive as a viable community.
- Why just a detached structure model? If secondary suites and coach houses are OK, why not duplexes or multiple structures on one lot?
- I believe the issue is “infill housing” more than “coach houses”.
- Excellent next step in housing diversification.
- This will help families to care for seniors and maintain independent lives.
- Could stimulate the economy (residential construction), increase property values and government revenues. Supports more affordable living and family growth. Works well in Vancouver, when done right.
- Gives the opportunity for increased density by allowing two (smaller) buildings on a lot rather than one huge building.
- Yes, land is becoming unaffordable for young people. Good option.
- Affordability, as we age, might necessitate leaving the municipality (without appropriate housing options).
- The importance of housing opportunities in this community cannot be overestimated, not only for the wealthy. A diversified neighbourhood of young families and seniors is healthier.
- By allowing coach houses, we will be better able to work with the challenging topography in West Vancouver, and avoid ‘monster homes’.
- Urgently required. Enough talking – need action.
- I think they are a really attractive and versatile housing option for the community and many families.
- I think coach houses are more in scale with the history of this community. They could provide valuable family options for housing teenagers, in-laws, grandparents, and even house guests, where they can live independently but be close for caring. Coach houses could enrich both family and community life.
- With aging parents and the desire to move to a smaller, more manageable above while escaping during the winter, we would very much welcome the opportunity to create a coach house on our property, which could provide several workable alternatives, as well as save our existing Ron Thom designed modern house.
- Provides an alternative for ‘downsizing’. Makes home ownership more affordable (if rented out).
- Higher density makes sense.
- Yes, need options.
- I would like to have some on my street because it means more contact with neighbours, more vitality.
- Coach houses could provide an appropriate housing option for WV residents if restricted to minimum lot size limitations, current neighbourhood density consideration, and one-storey height restriction.
- More housing options are essential for West Vancouver.
- Could provide additional lower cost housing.

**Comments from Individuals Answering “No” To Question 2**

- No. Fundamentally dishonest to the existing neighbours.
- I don’t trust our City to monitor this process. Our neighbours built a coach house beside our lot – it was and still is awful.
- West Vancouver should remain an exclusive area and not be subjected to poor man’s housing (as) it was positioned during the meeting.
- West Vancouver was our home of choice because of the low density / absence of social housing / problems. This Council should not destroy that character.
- I feel this presentation is forcing us and convincing us towards coach houses rather than honestly asking us if we want them in the first place. Prefer people put in suites in their home rather than more density and square footage allowance.
- Absolutely no need for coach houses in West Vancouver.
- Coach houses do not belong in West Vancouver.
- West Vancouver is and must remain an exclusive and mostly single-family zoned area. A change to coach houses would be a massive betrayal to all of us who have spent half a lifetime saving for a home in a quiet, safe and private environment and, most important, low density.
- Coach housing may provide additional housing units for additional residents who want to be in West Vancouver.
- West Vancouver properties (including the British Properties) are too small for coach houses as these would encroach on the space between them and neighbours’ homes, block views, spoil privacy, and create traffic and garbage problems.
- I do not think they are appropriate for West Vancouver. They should not be allowed.
- First give us proper roads to handle traffic, and an expanded hospital to handle increased population.
- One hears …that coach houses are already being built in West Vancouver illegally by getting a permit for a garage that has everything in the infrastructure that a coach house needs… e.g., a stove gets added later.

**Comments from Individuals Answering “Not Sure” To Question 2...**

- Believe that there should be higher density, but access and footprint is important. Agree with looking a same footprint, but splitting the home like a duplex.
- Too general a question. Probably good in some areas, bad in others.
- Yes, if regulated appropriately – i.e., neighbourly designs.
- If the property is large – not on an Ambleside 33-foot lot.
- Possibly in select areas.
- I am not sure because they are supposed to create ‘affordable’ housing which is a joke. Change the description to something realistic – something like ‘less expensive’.
- I regret that DWV has not found an alternative term for ‘coach house’, better reflecting the present day West Vancouver, and not harking back to a class-ridden, bygone era. It’s not too late.

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

**Notes:** Comments for Question #3 are grouped according to the respondents’ answer to Question #2 – i.e., whether or not they believe that coach houses provide an appropriate housing option for West Vancouver residents.

**Comments from Individuals Answering “Yes” To Question 2**
- Absence of rear lanes in several areas.
- My concern is with the planning and permitting process; if this is an alternative to secondary suites, the process and costs should be more in line with that.
- In the 1100-block of Duchess, the lots are narrow and the alleyway gets easily crowded. Should be limited to lots larger than 33 feet; maybe start at 50 feet. Also, limit number per block.
- Quality of design, which also means an appropriate scale and privacy for both tenants and neighbours.
- Parking on side streets should be discouraged; perhaps asking that space for cars be included in coach house planning.
- Fit with neighbourhood views.
- My only concern is that they will not slow down the proliferation of ‘monster homes’. I have no concern about coach houses themselves.
- All in favour... the more design innovation the better; makes for variety, diversity of visual environment, enriching.
- Loss of privacy, increased traffic.
- Scale should be appropriate.
- Should not be larger than 1200 to 1500 sq.ft. (max.). 800 sq.ft. would be better. Should note be car (parking place) restricted.
- Higher taxes, annual fees, parking.
- Design: need to have architectural standards to maintain quality and charm of the village of Ambleside.
- Safety should never be compromised.
- Developers (e.g., in Vancouver) knock down an existing house, build a new house and a coach house, and maximize the square footage for both buildings.
- Density.
- Sufficient parking to allow both secondary suites and coach houses.
- Need for parking, garbage, sewer and water service upgrades.
- Too difficult an approval process or too many restrictions.
- Perceiving natural green spaces, gardens or lawns with coach houses, design requirements.
- Negative effects of density – e.g., crowded neighbourhoods; change to neighbourhood character and demographics (e.g., low-income, transient residents).
- Privacy, green space, views, parking – but recognize benefits of density.
- Maintain reasonable degree of privacy and appropriate landscaping between the coach house and neighbouring houses.
- Traffic, parking.
- I'm concerned about the change in the social character of a neighbourhood resulting from the change in the built form character of the neighbourhood if coach houses were allowed.
- My only concern: need to adjust maximum floor area per lot regardless, with coach houses likely needing further analysis. Other than that, this is taking too long, get on with it!
- None, other than maintaining quality of building and fit with neighbourhood.
- Given large lots in most areas, the existing (modest-sized) houses are older and in many cases 'tear downs.' Could build a coach house larger than the existing house, then max-out on the size of the replacement main house.
- Concerned about existing such buildings built without permits being 'grandfathered'.
- Garbage allowances... will these be charged to accommodate two families?
- Noise caused by densification.
- Should be a limit (on number of units) and a trial period.
- None – provided that local building standards and regulations are met.
- None. Our concerns are about the mega monster houses being built in our area.
- Construction activity, loss of trees.
- Architectural style is important – i.e., West Coast Modern.
- Size and design constraints will be important.
- Coach houses will only be possible on certain properties (not specified).
- Parking and Access: Streets (in Lower Caulfeild) are narrow and made narrower by overhanging vegetation. Streets are also used for public parking to access Caulfeild Park and St. Francis church. Would not like to see additional driveways.

Comments from individuals Answering “No” to Question 2...
- Loss of privacy, “people density”, precedent-setting
- Our neighbours built their front house and a “coach house” and built up the dirt under it so both buildings block our sun
- Over-population and damage to the integrity of the neighbourhood. The “coach house” is OK for owner use only – not for rental or re-sale.
- It would cheapen the neighbourhood, introduce social problems, overload existing infrastructure.
- It is not about 'fit', it is monitoring the rules and respecting the impact on neighbours. More homes will bring more cars. Each home on a property should have to provide two parking spots on the property – not on the street. No second storey period. No increase in square footage.
- We do not need higher density. We do not need more traffic. We want only single-family dwellings.
- Coach houses will destroy the character of our neighbourhood and will create overcrowding, road congestion, excessive noise, destruction of property, vandalism, and loss of privacy.
- Noise, unsafe lanes, rowdy neighbours, intrusion and further congestion thru increased car traffic. A dramatic decline in lifestyle in quiet single-family areas (reference made to 366 Keith Road).
- Fewer trees, less wildlife.
- Coach houses would over-densify our properties and detract from the spacious aspect of the place.
- We are congested now. We live in a fool's paradise... need more people because we need more revenue because we have more people. Crazy dog chasing his tail!
- Adversely changes the character of single-family neighbourhoods. Invasion of privacy and loss of property value for adjacent property owners.
- I do not believe in spot zoning... bought into a single-family neighbourhood 25 years ago, and see no reason for that to change. ...In addition to predominantly single-family homes, our neighbourhood contains some secondary suites, rental houses, and rental and condominium units in Spuraway. We have enough diversity of housing and our quite neighbourhood does not require additional folk who do not share our pride of ownership in their properties.
- It would forever change the look and feel of our neighbourhood in a negative way.
- Too much density, greater possible height of garages, less ability to landscape, loss of privacy, more traffic. Also suggests more transient population.
- Would change the character of the neighbourhood... Lots and make-up of the neighbourhoods don't seem appropriate.

Comments from Individuals Answering “Not Sure” to Question 2...
- Access, parking, footprint.
- Overcrowding and parking.
- View blockage, impairment of privacy, lack of parking.
- Parking, density.
- Change in character, impact on limited amenities.
- Do not allow coach houses on lots below a predetermined lot size, as there is a concern of excessive population density on small lots.
- Crowding and parking congestions would not be an issue in areas that presently have large lots (75 ft. + frontages).
- That designs might overwhelm more subtle, mature homes.
- That they might be put into a highly desirable category, thereby beyond the reach of intended buyers.
- That coach houses might be rental only, therefore no ownership equity for the resident; merely filling coffers of the property owner.
**QUESTION 4(a):** Do you think that coach house applications should be subject to a design approval process?

![Pie chart showing responses to Question 4(a)]

(118 responses)

**QUESTION 4(b):** What issues do you think should be addressed through a design approval process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>% Responding “Yes”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building design and materials (104 responses)</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape design (99 responses)</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy (99 responses)</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views (95 responses)</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (34 responses)</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, specific comments under this question relate to ‘fit’ within local area context, landscape character, and neighbour impacts. There was some discussion about a ‘tiered’ design review, where proposals that meet certain criteria would undergo a less rigorous process and vice versa. Issues related to accessibility, green buildings, and less car dependence (i.e., reduce parking requirement) were also raised.

**Comments:**
- Neighbourhood compatibility.
- If coach houses will be built on a smaller scale than monster houses currently being built, the impact on neighbours should be significantly less.
- Impact on other properties – especially with respect to views.
- Diversity of architecture = variety.
- Don't be too onerous, just ensure some quality is maintained.
- Overall density.
- Design should be consistent with the main house.
- Energy and infrastructure; should not be car dependent – i.e., don’t make permit based on parking.
- Safety.
- Green space.
- Coach house should not be visually intrusive for neighbours.
- There should be design guidelines to make the typical application as easy as possible...
  - Save the (formal) design approval process for ‘atypical’ applications. The process should be easy if we wish to encourage coach houses.
- We don’t address view impacts from construction the main house!
- These issues focus on the built form... We must also address issues related to the social form or consequence of such development.
- Safety, accessibility (does it address the needs of seniors?)
- Style and size must be in keeping with surrounding buildings (context).
- Design approval should be limited, if the coach house matches other building(s) already on the property.
- Tempted to say that the coach house should match the main house, but something completely different may be appropriate in some situations.
- Building height impact on neighbours.
- No tree removal.
- Approval from immediate neighbours should be required
- Flexibility is key to making this work. Not many lots in West Vancouver are square or level, so consideration should be given to fitting into the space, topography, and neighbourhoods. We also find many different styles of housing, from country cottages to modern. I think the coach house should fit with the main house, and within the context of the street. Because of the odd lots flexibility would also be required in terms of setbacks etc. in order to ensure the coach house fits in.
- 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.
- Approval process should not be so restrictive that it makes it impossible or very expensive. I would like to see view and wildlife corridors maintained (for new single-family houses too).
- Following a referendum in which 66 2/3% of District home owners agree to support the Coach House concept, and 75% of sub-area home owners agree to the concept and 100% of the immediately adjacent home owners agree to an individual project and then based upon successful passing a design approval process on the above issues, and based only on use of presently usable land as well as consideration by the District based on a new policy of appropriate, resident safety standards, parking, assessment of additional infrastructure costs such as water, sewer, garbage.
- Overall lane design (if applicable), accessibility, in-unit storage.
- This decision would be fraught with conflict. Architects’ / developers’ voices are too powerful.
**QUESTION 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...

5.(a) In all Neighbourhoods?

- Yes: 13%
- No: 25%
- Not sure: 62%

(114 responses)

Or, should they only be allowed...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.(b) In certain neighbourhoods or areas? (75 responses)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.(c) On corner lots? (72 responses)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.(d) On lots with rear lane access? (81 responses)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.(e) Under other conditions? (37 responses)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments:**

- They should be particularly encouraged in areas close to transit, e.g., near Marine Drive in Ambleside and Dundarave.
- Many West Van properties have land available for coach houses, especially in our neighbourhood, Cedardale.
- Off-street parking stall must be provided.
- Only if the setting is harmonious with the area – i.e., on an alley, corner, with a similar style to the main house.
- Lots of variations will be required given our topography.
- Many larger lots could easily be used to provide much needed housing options within established areas.
- What about a property with driveway access from the street reaching a detached garage at the rear of the property? (e.g., would be appropriate for coach house access)
- Consider neighbourhood ‘look and feel’ – e.g., sufficient space for off-street parking.
- Would support them throughout West Vancouver, but if only certain neighbourhoods are possible... that is better than nothing.
- If they are only allowed in certain places, near Ambleside or Dundarave villages would promote a walkable lifestyle.
- Near public facilities and higher density areas, along public transit routes.
- Overall character of a lot/ neighbourhood should remain consistent.
- Should be encouraged in Ambleside and Dundarave at least.
- West Vancouver should reclaim its lanes for laneway housing opportunities.
- In all scenarios, there must be adequate provision for fire/emergency access.
- Each application should stand on its own merits... might not be suitable in all areas.
- Spread this around... don't expect that high density will only happen in Ambleside.
- Where there are long-standing rail right-of-ways.
- Should implement a process where immediate neighbours have a say, as in Toronto. If majority do not support, then approval not granted.
- Appropriate zoning regulations should apply to all.

**QUESTION 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 density. 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 coach house should be permitted...
6.(b) In Addition to a Secondary Suite?

- Yes: 54%
- No: 37%
- Not sure: 9%

(107 responses)

**QUESTION 6.(c)** Do you think the permitted floor area of a coach house should be in addition to that allowed for the principal building on the lot?

6.(c) Additional Floor Area?

- Yes: 49%
- No: 36%
- Not sure: 15%

(109 responses)

**Comments:**
- Coach house as 'alternative' to a secondary suite, only if it remains within zoning regulations (e.g., FAR).
- Torn on the issues of whether or not to allow for additional floor area... don't want the units to be huge, but want to support some development.
- A big lot could have more than one unit - e.g., some joined to the house, some detached.
- Not in favour of coach houses becoming monster houses.
- Not concerned with this form of density increase... allow more secondary suites and coach houses on all single-family lots.
- Without an increase in density per lot, no one will give up square footage from the main house to allow for a coach house.
- May serve different needs.
- We already have enough over-sized houses in West Vancouver. Maintenance of green space and neighbour's privacy should remain an essential concern.
- If lot is zoned to accommodate an 8,000 sq.ft. house, but is only developed with a 2,500 sq.ft. house, allow another 'cottage' on the same lot.
- Maybe look at age of houses – e.g., pre-1970: allow additional FAR.
- Many houses with existing suites also have room for coach houses, and should not be denied this opportunity.
- 0.5 FAR (e.g., for RS-5 lots under 5,000 sq.ft.) would work well.
- If the lot is small and lacks privacy, don't allow. But, if the lot is suitable, and the 'style' fits, allow without difficulties.
- Due to the number of 'monster' houses being built in West Vancouver, it is critical that coach houses not be in addition to the FAR for that zoning.
- Let's start simple (alternative to a suite) and go from there!
- Maximum floor area of 1000 sq.ft. plus garage. Basements should be allowed.
- They should be small, garage-sized structures.
- West Vancouver does not share Vancouver's goal of increasing density. Our goal is to increase the range of available housing options.

**QUESTION 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 they should be rental only or that ownership housing should be considered?

![Pie chart showing survey results]

7.(a) Rental Only?

- 35%
- 13%
- 52%

☑ Yes
☑ No
☑ Not sure

(102 responses)
Comments:
- Look at the very good example of 3 duplexes on Esquimalt between 20th and 21st Streets with three coach houses behind... a beautiful solution!
- Ownership should remain with original house.
- Ownership should be allowed in conjunction with a simplified method to allow for subdivision. Right now (in Dunderave) there are small, non-conforming lots that suit the neighbourhood.
- Strata-titled units may make sense on larger lots.
- Would prefer strata to rental, because provides home ownership opportunities for younger people. Ownership option would be great.
- Limit to family use.
- We need more rental options, so keep them rental.
- Might help our children build equity if they can take an ownership position in a coach house on our property.
- Should be determined on a case-by-case basis.
- Yes, when strata-title can be accomplished.
- People with create their own 'ownership scenarios (e.g., tenants in common) if you don't allow ownership.
- Only if the lot is subdividable (or almost meets subdivision requirements); otherwise rental only.
- With the legalization of secondary suites, West Vancouver no longer has 'single family' neighbourhoods.
- Would need a District policy re: guidelines for 'ownership'.
- This would be neighbourhood-dependent. In Lower Caulfeild, units should be 'rental only' in an effort to keep the lots to their heritage designation.
- Ownership (separate from the main house) should be mandatory, but the owner should be able to rent it out.
**QUESTION 8:** Do you have any other questions or concerns that you would like to have addressed as part of this coach house examination?

**Comments:**
- We can’t continue to free ride on Vancouver and North Vancouver on densification and offering ‘affordable’ alternatives.
- ‘Age in place’ consideration without densifying the neighbourhood.
- Neighbourhood consultation.
- Consider clustered (attached) units on properties backing onto green space.
- Expedite the planning process... everything takes too long in WV Planning.
- This issue should be moved ahead ASAP so the elderly parents that would like to live there are still alive.
- Should have some flexibility for parking. Units should be large enough to accommodate two bedrooms.
- Coach house size must be kept in line with original lot size/maximum floor area.
- Please also consider dividing the houses themselves (i.e., into two or more units).
- Start soon before we lose our whole stock of small seaside cottages.
- Suites in existing detached structures should be considered.
- Consideration should be given to allow subdivision into smaller lots.
- An excellent idea for families to live near and support each other.
- Coach house living would provide housing for young families and seniors who have lived and want to remain in West Vancouver, but do not want to live in an apartment.
APPENDIX ‘C’

Coach House Questions in 2013 Community Survey

Two 'coach house' questions were included in the District's 2013 Community Survey. The following information is extracted from “District of West Vancouver Community Survey, June 2013”, prepared by Mustel Group Market Research:

**QUESTION #8:** Do you think that coach houses (also sometimes known as laneway houses) could provide an appropriate housing option for West Vancouver residents?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total responses (744)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTION #9:** 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Throughout the district?</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only in certain neighbourhoods or areas of West Van?</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
750 – 17TH STREET, WEST VANCOUVER, BC V7V 3T3

COUNCIL REPORT

Date: August 22, 2013
File: 13-2515-02
From: Stephen Mikicich, Senior Community Planner
Subject: Staff Response to Questions from Council Regarding a Proposed Implementation Program for Coach Houses

RECOMMENDED THAT:

1. The report from the Senior Community Planner, titled “Staff’s Response to Questions from Council Regarding Proposed Implementation Program for Coach Houses”, dated August 22, 2013 be received for information; and

2. Staff prepare draft bylaws to allow 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.

Purpose

On July 22, 2013, Council deferred consideration of a report from the Senior Community Planner and Manager of Community Planning titled “West Vancouver’s Coach House Examination”, dated July 11, 2013, to allow councillors an opportunity to ask specific questions of staff regarding a proposed implementation program for coach houses. Staff’s response to these questions is provided in Appendix ‘A’ to this report.

Author:

Stephen Mikicich, Sr. Community Planner

Appendix A: Staff Response to Questions from Council Regarding a Proposed Implementation Program for Coach Houses

Document # 664352v1
APPENDIX ‘A’

Staff Response to Questions from Council Regarding a Proposed Implementation Program for Coach Houses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION/ COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Support for coach houses: “There is a 22 point difference between the two sources(^1). My concern is that ‘appropriate’ means different things to different people and that any proposal needs to be defined to a point that there is no ambiguity.”</td>
<td>- The following question is included in both the coach house questionnaire and community survey: “Do you think that coach houses could provide an appropriate housing option for West Vancouver residents?” The term ‘appropriate’ is in reference to meeting specific housing needs in the community, as described in the coach house discussion paper, and the reasons provided by West Vancouver residents for their interest in coach houses; specifically:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- to downsize into a smaller housing unit on their own property;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- to provide self-contained accommodation for an elderly parent, adult child or on-site caregiver;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- to design a custom housing unit for a family member with special needs (e.g., limited mobility); or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- to create a detached secondary suite to maintain the privacy of the principal dwelling unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would respondents to the community survey have had the same level of engagement on this topic as respondents to the coach house questionnaire? See discussion in #2 below...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2. What is the rationale for District-wide implementation? “If one takes the position that the Community Survey is better reflective of the views of the community (more time has passed to reflect on issue) then support for ‘everywhere’ has dropped considerably and support for ‘certain’ areas has climbed considerably.” | - Individual coach house inquiries have come from all areas of West Vancouver – i.e., they have not been limited to any one particular neighbourhood. |
| | - If coach houses are implemented as a detached form of secondary suite, it is reasonable to allow for coach houses in all single-family zones\(^2\) where secondary suites are now permitted. |
| | - District-wide implementation is supported by the findings from Coach House Questionnaire, whereas the Community Survey shows a community more split on the issue: |
| | - Individuals completing the coach house questionnaire are more likely to have read the discussion paper, attended an engagement event, or viewed the |

\(^1\) Coach House Questionnaire and 2013 Community Survey. 
\(^2\) Staff is not recommending that coach houses be permitted in the RD1 and RD2 (duplex) zones.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION/ COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>background material online; whereas respondents to the community survey would not necessarily have had the same level of engagement on this topic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- This may be one reason for the different survey findings; drawing the conclusion that support for District-wide implementation has dropped would suggest that the same group of people was asked the same question at two different times.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Staff is recommending that coach house applications be subject to specific site criteria (i.e., zoning regulations and development permit guidelines) rather than locational criteria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. How do we provide for meaningful consultation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- &quot;I am concerned that the bylaws include some neighbourhood involvement. There are lots that would be suitable for coach houses in all areas of West Vancouver, but there are a great many where a coach house would not fit in well. I think that neighbourhood involvement is a must if the program is to work well. There should be a requirement that neighbours' input is sought and considered.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- &quot;My expectation is that it includes a component that allows for neighbour(hood) input up to and including rejection of the application.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Proposed administrative procedures will establish requirements for neighbour notification and define opportunities for input:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The District’s approval authority cannot be delegated to the public, meaning no neighbour(hood) ‘approval’ or ‘veto’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Possible models for public input are as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. In the case of subdivision application in West Vancouver, the applicant is to provide evidence to the Approving Officer that neighbours have been informed of the proposal early in the process; and neighbours have a direct opportunity for input to the Approving Officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The City of North Vancouver has established a ‘neighbour consultation radius’ of 20 metres for Level ‘A’ units (max. one storey, ≤ 800 sq.ft.) and 100 metres for Level ‘B’ units (max 1.6 storeys, ≤ 1000 sq.ft.). Neighbours are given an opportunity to comment on, but not reject, an application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. What is the rationale for delegation of Development Permit approval to staff?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- I cannot support this proposal at the commencement of the initiative but would entertain it later on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Staff is trying to balance community objectives for (1) greater housing diversity; (2) ‘fit’ of new development in established neighbourhoods; and (3) not making the application process too onerous for property owners. Staff is recommending that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the Zoning Bylaw be amended to allow for coach houses as a permitted use in most single-family zones (no individual rezonings would be required);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- that coach house applications be subject to a form and character Development Permit; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- that approval authority for development permits be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION/ COMMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Questions re: specific recommendations pertaining to zoning (see below)…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) “How was maximum floor area determined?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION/ COMMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| b) “By not allowing for an increase in FAR and/or site coverage, aren’t we penalizing owners of newer larger homes (given that other jurisdictions allow for a density increase)?” | - Half of the communities profiled in the coach house discussion paper allow for a density increase, whereas half do not. In the case of the City of Vancouver, for example, the policy drivers behind ‘laneway housing’ are based on sustainability objectives for densifying existing neighbourhoods and increasing the supply of rental housing (initially proposed under that city’s ‘EcoDensity’ initiative).  
- Under the proposed coach house implementation program for West Vancouver, owners of maximum-sized houses would not be able to add a coach house, but would still be able to include a secondary suite (within the house). The owners of these houses are not being ‘penalized’, as they have already chosen to maximize permitted floor area within the principal building.  
- The objective here is to provide for greater housing diversity, in a manner that both fits with the built form character of existing neighbourhoods, and maintains the established density:  
  ▪ By not allowing for additional floor area, the idea is that a coach house provides an opportunity to break up the potential building bulk on a lot between the principal building and a smaller, detached accessory dwelling.  
  ▪ Staff feels that allowing additional density would place a further stress on established neighbourhood character and, as is the case with 2/3 of laneway houses in Vancouver, provide an incentive for demolition and replacement of existing houses. |
| c) “What is the rationale for requiring 3 off-street parking spaces for a house with a suite?” | - Proposed parking regulations for Coach Houses (as Detached Secondary Suites) are based on parking regulations for Secondary Suites:  
  ▪ The Zoning Bylaw requires a minimum one off-street parking space for a single-family dwelling (without a suite); and three off-street parking spaces for a property containing a secondary suite.  
  - The ‘proximity to public transit’ exemption could be applied to detached secondary suites, perhaps with some consideration given to size of unit (i.e., smaller unit exempted, larger one not). |
<p>| d) “What is an exact definition of ‘site coverage’?” | - ‘Site coverage’ is defined in the Zoning Bylaw as “the percentage figure obtained when the total projected area of all buildings and structures is divided by the site area”. Areas excluded from site coverage calculation are |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION/ COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e) “A final concern is a sloping lot where one might want crawlspace storage under the unit—would this be permitted?”</td>
<td>- Staff is recommending no floor area exemptions for basements in coach houses at this time, in order to minimize site alteration to accommodate basement excavations. However, consideration will be given to unit design to ensure provision of storage space, including possible crawlspace storage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6. Infrastructure and Servicing Implications:
- “Are exemptions to bylaws being ‘proposed’ or will the existing regulations be enforced?”

- No exemptions to municipal servicing requirements are being proposed. The discussion on servicing implications, specifically with respect to adequacy of water services, is significant in that:
  - 1 in 3 water connections in West Vancouver is over 29 years old, and would likely require replacement; and
  - for approximately 6% of West Vancouver properties, the potential cost of upgrading water mains to provide adequate flow for sprinklering may be a financial deterrent for coach house development.

### 7. Approvals Process
- See below...

a) “Was consideration given to ‘streamlining’ the approvals process, perhaps through two separate categories (e.g., CNV approach)?”

- The rationale for delegation of development permit approval to staff is to provide for a less onerous, more streamlined process.

- CNV’s two-tiered approach distinguishes between applications that can be approved by staff (max 1-storey, 800 sq.ft.); and those requiring Council approval for a Development Variance Permit (max 1.6 storey units > 800 sq.ft. to max 1000 sq.ft.). Council may wish to consider a similar two-tier process (based on size of unit)—e.g., where units up to 1000 sq.ft. (for example) could be approved by staff, with larger units requiring Council approval.

b) “How can we further incentivize owners/developers to build coach houses, rather than monster houses (e.g., using property taxes, permit fees, premier service, etc.)?”

- With the staff recommendation that there be no increase in density, the floor area of a coach house would be subtracted from the total permitted floor area for the lot, meaning a smaller-sized principal dwelling.

- No consideration has been given to tax incentives for the creation of rental coach houses.

- While permit fees need not be so high as to be a deterrent to development, they should nonetheless provide for cost-recovery for the District.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION/ COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Eligibility</strong></td>
<td>- Processing times for coach house applications will be impacted by volume of applications and staff workloads, and the ability to provide ‘premier service’ would be contingent on sufficient staffing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) “How many lots potentially eligible for this program are there in West Vancouver (lots not already built to max. site coverage)?”</td>
<td>- It would take considerable effort to determine an exact number of properties that would be eligible for coach house development (i.e., where there is excess or unused permitted floor area and site coverage). Anecdotally, however, the Building Department suggests that practically every new house built since the 1980s has maximized permitted floor area. These properties would not have any excess FAR potential to allow for the addition of a coach house; but could accommodate a secondary suite (within the house) up to a maximum 90m² in floor area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) With respect to not limiting coach houses to certain lot types... “I need to see this defined before I can support the proposal. This is one of the ‘devil is in the details’ issues that I do not want to see glossed over now and we end up debating later after the proverbial horse has left the barn.”</td>
<td>- Staff are recommending that coach houses not be restricted to corner lots or lots with rear lane access (given majority opposition to these ideas); but zoning regulations would establish minimum lot area, yards, and separation from the principal building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- While staff are recommending District-wide implementation, development permit guidelines can address development of coach houses under different lot conditions – e.g., corner or mid-block location, lane or driveway access, sloping sites, etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9. Conversion of a Garage to a Coach House / Legalizing Existing Non-Conforming Coach Houses</strong></td>
<td>- Staff do not know how many pre-existing ‘coach houses’ there are in West Vancouver. Some may be historic cottages located on a property with a principal dwelling (pre-dating current zoning). Others may be permitted ‘accessory buildings’ that look like coach houses, but are in fact not self-contained dwellings. Still, others may have been built in the past as nominally attached structures (i.e., connected to the main dwelling by a trellis or similar connection), which was permitted at one time, but not allowed under current zoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Coach house regulations and administrative procedures could provide for: (a) legalizing existing non-confirming units; (b) converting existing accessory buildings into coach houses; and (c) decommissioning illegal units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Property Tax Equity</strong></td>
<td>- See below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) “We have added a considerable number of secondary suites, and could potentially add a considerable number of coach houses over time;”</td>
<td>- Like many other communities, West Vancouver charges property owners for provision of District utilities and services (e.g., water, garbage) based on consumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Other ‘soft’ services may be subject to direct user fees.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION/ COMMENT</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| yet these ‘new’ residents are not contributing to our tax base in spite of their use of the amenities and services provided by the District.” | - In addition property owners are required to register their secondary suites and pay an annual renewal fee to allow inspection by the municipality to ensure safety of occupants; and to provide municipal services to tenants of the suite, including library, community centres, and police and fire services, via registration fees.  
- With a new coach house, the value of the improvements on a property will increase, as will the taxes paid on that property.  
- In addition (see #12 below), an annual fee on coach houses (similar to secondary suites) would contribute towards the cost of providing District services to the residents of the coach house. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. Annual Fees</th>
<th>- See below</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “Those residents without a secondary suite or perhaps a future coach house are being unfairly burdened. While one could have sympathy for the concept of ‘a place for the kids or an opportunity to age in place’ the reality is likely that both secondary suites and coach houses are little more than a revenue source for those property owners (mortgage helpers or whatever).  
One can only reflect on the positive financial benefit to the District if both these housing alternatives made a fair and visible financial contribution to our community. A quick look at rental rates in West Van does not show much under $1,000/month so I question why a ‘fee’ of ‘X’ would not be a step towards the equity I referred to above.” | - An annual licensing fee for coach houses would be outlined in proposed administrative procedures in November 2013. Fees would likely be modeled on those implemented for secondary suites, which are as follows:  
- Registration fee (incl. 1st year’s licence fee) = $450  
- Annual Renewal Fees:  
  - Rented suites in non-owner occupied homes = $450  
  - Rented suites in owner-occupied homes = $350  
  - Unoccupied or for family use = $85 |

| 12. Next Steps? | - If directed by Council, staff would prepare draft implementation bylaws and administration procedures for coach house applications – for further Council and community review in November 2013. |
COUNCIL REPORT

Date: July 11, 2013

From: Stephen Mikicich, Sr. Community Planner
       Geri Boyle, Manager of Community Planning

Subject: West Vancouver's Coach House Examination

RECOMMENDED THAT:

1. Staff prepare draft bylaws to allow for rental coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite for Council consideration in fall 2013.

Purpose

From January through June 2013, District staff engaged the community in a discussion on coach houses, as a possible new housing type in West Vancouver. This initiative is set out in the Balanced Scorecard and the Housing Action Plan. It also builds on the directions from the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing; specifically, the desire of West Vancouver residents for greater housing options, and new housing types that fit the established character of their neighbourhoods.

The purpose of this report is to present findings from the community engagement process and, as a result of the positive feedback received, recommend a proposed implementation program for coach houses.

1.0 Background

1.1 Prior Resolutions

February 18, 2013 – Council adopted the Housing Action Plan, which provides the framework for the Planning Department's work on housing during 2013-2014;

December 10, 2012 – Council resolved that the discussion paper, titled “The Potential for Coach Houses in West Vancouver: A Discussion Paper” provide the basis for community engagement on coach houses; and that staff report back to Council in mid 2013, on the results of the engagement process, including possible directions supported by the Community.

June 25, 2012 – Council established an examination of 'coach houses' as the policy focus for the District's efforts in exploring new housing types during 2012-2013.
2.0 Balanced Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC INITIATIVES</th>
<th>MILESTONES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1 Implement the recommendations of the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing Working Group.</td>
<td>Continue implementation of coach house program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2 Support regional and North Shore planning to advance West Vancouver’s interests</td>
<td>Commence Regional Context Statement and Housing Action Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.0 Analysis

3.1 West Vancouver’s Coach House Examination

The coach house examination was undertaken during the first half of 2013. A primary objective was to disseminate background information, and to stimulate public discussion on coach houses as a possible new housing type in West Vancouver. Information and engagement tools used in this program included:

- A discussion paper, titled “The Potential for ‘Coach Houses’ in West Vancouver: A Discussion Paper” (December 2012);
- Background information and program updates at www.westvancouver.ca;
- A moderated panel discussion and public forum held in May 2013 (attended by 200 people);
- Information displays at District venues and public events, including Community Day;
- Presentations to interested residents’ associations (Ambleside-Dundarave Ratepayers’ Association, Western Residents’ Association, Horseshoe Bay Residents Association);
- A coach house questionnaire (printed and online versions); and
- The District’s 2013 community survey, which included two questions related to coach houses.

A project time-line, including community engagement activities, event advertising, and online and media coverage is provided in Appendix ‘A’.

Through printed and online questionnaires, West Vancouver residents provided their input on coach house design, geographic distribution, tenure, density, and potential neighbourhood issues. Findings from 124 completed coach house questionnaires are discussed below in Section 3.2, with detailed findings presented in Appendix ‘B’. Responses to coach house questions in the 2013 Community Survey are provided in Appendix ‘C’.
3.2 Community Input

Housing Choice and Diversity

Residents were asked in the coach house questionnaire whether they believe coach houses could provide an appropriate housing option for West Vancouver. 78% of respondents responded ‘Yes’ (see chart below). The same question was asked in the 2013 Community Survey, to which a majority (56%) of respondents also answered ‘Yes’ (see Appendix ‘C’).

![Appropriate Housing Option for West Van?](chart)

Specific questionnaire comments echo what staff has been hearing over the past few years – i.e., that coach houses would provide residents with an opportunity to meet their families’ housing needs on their own properties; be it for an older parent, adult children, or their own ‘downsizing’ needs (see Appendix ‘B’).

Geographic Distribution

Some municipalities have introduced coach houses on a community-wide basis while others have introduced them only in new or redeveloping neighbourhoods. West Vancouver residents were asked whether or not coach houses should be ‘restricted’ geographically:

- 62% of respondents to the coach house questionnaire support the idea of coach houses in all West Vancouver neighbourhoods; and
- 27% of support the idea of limiting coach houses to certain neighbourhoods or areas of West Vancouver.

Findings from the 2013 Community Survey suggest that residents are more split on the issue of District-wide implementation with 43% saying ‘Yes’ and 41% ‘No’¹ (see Appendix ‘C’).

¹ The discrepancy in findings between these survey tools suggests a diverse level of understanding and engagement.
Lot Characteristics

Built examples of coach houses in other communities suggest that certain types of lots are better suited for coach houses. For example, corner lots that provide for a street entry, and lots that provide for vehicle access from a rear lane. The coach house questionnaire delved into the possibility of limiting coach houses to certain types of lots, but a majority of respondents were clearly opposed:

- 74% oppose limiting coach houses to corner lots; and
- 59% oppose limiting coach houses to lots with rear lane access.

Coach House Design

There is strong support for implementing a design approval process for coach houses. 71% of questionnaire respondents feel that coach house applications should be subject to a design approval process (see chart below); more specifically, with respect to privacy (79%), building design and materials (77%), views (73%), and landscape design (64%).

At the same time, respondents caution against making the process too onerous for property owners (see Appendix ‘B’).

Design Approval?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

engagement within the community. For example, respondents to the coach house questionnaire would most likely have attended an information event, and/or read the discussion paper or other background material on coach houses; whereas respondents to the Community Survey would not necessarily have had the same opportunity for engagement on this topic.
Density

On the matter of density, the questionnaire results indicate that there is not community consensus:

- 49% of questionnaire respondents feel that coach houses should only be permitted as an alternative to a secondary suite.
- 54% of respondents support an increase in number of dwelling units (i.e., a coach house in addition to a secondary suite); and
- 50% support an increase in permitted floor area.

Tenure

As no assumptions were made about tenure at the outset of the coach house examination, West Vancouver residents were asked in the questionnaire for their input on the question of rental versus ownership:

- 35% feel that coach houses should be rental only, whereas 52% do not agree with limiting these units to rental occupancy.
- 62% feel that ownership housing should be considered.

3.3 Municipal Infrastructure and Servicing Implications

Key servicing considerations for detached secondary suites are the potential requirement for upgrading water service for new construction, and potential upgrading of water mains:

- Under Waterworks Regulation Bylaw No. 4490, 2006, any permit valued over $100,000\(^2\) triggers a review to determine adequacy of existing water service. If the existing service is over 29 years old, it will likely require upgrading to 38mm pipe from the water main to the property line. It is estimated that 1 in every 3 water connections is over 29 years old.

- A minimum 100 mm water main is required to accommodate sprinklering of any new construction. It is estimated that approximately 6% of West Vancouver lots\(^3\) are served by 75 mm water mains. Upgrading of an undersized water main could have significant cost implications for a property owner\(^4\), which in itself could limit the feasibility of building a detached secondary suite versus adding a suite within an existing house.

- Other considerations:
  - Storm water management is required for all new construction.

---

\(^2\) The bylaw states $50,000, but the value has been increased to $100,000 by policy.

\(^3\) Typically on older cul-de-sacs where there has been no new building construction.

\(^4\) Construction cost is estimated at $1000 per meter of water main.
- In most West Vancouver neighbourhoods, utilities are located overhead. If a detached secondary suite is proposed within an area that has underground services, undergrounding will be required.

- Other servicing issues may arise on an individual lot basis.

3.4 Staff Recommendations Regarding Implementation of a Coach House Program in West Vancouver

There appears to be significant community support for coach houses to consider allowing this housing type in West Vancouver. In moving forward towards implementation, staff is recommending the following approach:

1. That coach houses be introduced District-wide as a permitted use in all single-family zones where secondary suites are now permitted:
   - Residents were asked if they supported coach houses District-wide or only in specific geographic areas. The questionnaire results indicate support for District-wide implementation. This approach is consistent with the approach the District has taken on secondary suites, which are currently allowed in most single-family and duplex zones across West Vancouver. It is important to note, however, that staff is not recommending Coach Houses be allowed in the duplex zones.

2. That coach houses be provided for without an increase in permitted floor area or number of dwelling units on a lot, over what is currently permitted in single-family zones:
   - There are longstanding public concerns about maximum-sized new houses being built in West Vancouver, and related building practices that are seen to be eroding established neighbourhood character. Adding density would exacerbate this situation.
   - Staff is not supportive of an increase in permitted density for detached secondary suites, given OCP Policy BF-B 2, which is to "preserve and enhance the valued qualities of existing neighbourhoods". This includes "retaining the zoning density of existing neighbourhoods unless specifically provided for in the OCP" (e.g., as per Policy H 3).
   - Detached secondary suites could provide an opportunity to reduce the bulk of new houses (i.e., to maintain established neighbourhood character), by redistributing a portion of permitted floor area from the principal building to a separate, smaller structure on the lot.
   - While a third dwelling unit (i.e., a coach house in addition to a secondary suite) could perhaps be accommodated on some larger lots, most properties would likely not be able to provide off-street parking for a principal dwelling and two suites.
3. **That consideration be given to the introduction of coach houses as a rental housing option in single-family neighbourhoods; specifically, as a detached form of secondary suite:**

- The municipalities surveyed as part of the District's coach house examination have looked to coach houses as a form of rental housing in single-family neighbourhoods and, in most cases, as a detached alternative to a secondary suite.

- In the absence of new purpose-built rental accommodation, secondary suites play a key role in the 'secondary' rental housing market. Coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite would add to the supply of these rental units in the community, which presently includes: suites within houses, and strata-titled units such as duplexes, townhouses, and apartments.

- While there are examples of detached strata-titled dwellings that are referred to as 'coach houses' in other municipalities (e.g., the Kitsilano and Mount Pleasant areas of Vancouver) and in West Vancouver's "Infill Housing Block"\(^5\), these units are developed as a form of higher density, infill housing; not as an accessory dwelling to a single-family house on a single fee simple lot.

Creating separate title for coach houses (either through strata-title or fee simple subdivision) could have significant 'character' impacts on West Vancouver's established neighbourhoods; particularly if considered on a District-wide basis. For this reason, staff recommend that ownership coach houses should be considered under OCP Policy H 3, which provides for consideration of infill housing proposals in limited site-specific situations (see footnote #6).

4. **That coach house applications be subject to a form and character Development Permit.**

- District-wide implementation of coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite seems to be a reasonable approach, provided a design approval process is implemented to ensure the successful integration of these units within different neighbourhood contexts, and different lot conditions.

---

\(^5\) The block bounded by Esquimalt Avenue, 20th Street, Fulton Avenue, and 21st Street was designated in July 2011 for future infill housing development within the context of OCP Policy H 3. This block is also designated as a Development Permit Area to provide for the compatibility of new infill housing units within an established neighbourhood.
5. That approval of Development Permits be delegated by Council to staff:
   - The community feels that coach houses should be subject to a design approval process, but that this process should not be onerous for individual property owners. In order to balance these two objectives, delegation of Council's approval authority for "Detached Secondary Suite Development Permits" to the Director of Planning, Land Development and Permits is recommended. Under delegation to staff, applicants are entitled to appeal the Director's decision to Council. This approval process would be similar to that adopted for Environmental Development Permits.
   - Along with other District initiatives on housing as outlined in the Housing Action Plan, staff would report to Council annually on the status of coach house implementation.

3.5 Draft Bylaws

Staff is recommending that consideration be given to the introduction of rental coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite. If Council concurs with this recommendation, staff will proceed to draft three implementing bylaws, along with draft administrative procedures for handling coach house applications, for consideration in fall 2013. The scope of these bylaw amendments is described as follows:

1. Official Community Plan Amendment Bylaw

   An OCP Amendment is required to establish a clear housing policy for this new housing type; and to provide for the regulation of coach house designs. This will include:

   (a) A new policy under Policy Section 3: Housing

   (b) Establishment of "Detached Secondary Suite Development Permit Area BF-B 3.1" under Policy Section 4: Built Form and Neighbourhood Character, including objectives for:
   • the form and character of intensive residential development (detached secondary suites);
   • promoting energy and water conservation; and
   • promoting the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions.

2. Zoning Bylaw Amendment

   Zoning regulations for Detached Secondary Suites would be modeled in part on Section 130.05 of the Zoning Bylaw (Secondary Suites), specifically:
(a) A maximum of one secondary suite or one detached secondary suite per lot:
  - A maximum floor area between 90 m² (as permitted for secondary suites) and 110 m² to be examined by staff;
  - A detached secondary suite must not be subdivided from the principal dwelling unit under the Land Title Act or the Strata Property Act, and either the principal dwelling or the detached secondary suite must be occupied by the property owner;
  - Off-street vehicle parking: 1 space to be provided exclusively for the detached secondary suite and at least 2 spaces to be provided exclusively for the principal dwelling unit;

(b) A coach house would be a permitted use in the following single-family zones: RS1, RS2, RS3, RS4, RS5, RS7, RS8, RS9, and RS10; but would not be permitted in the RD1 and RD2 duplex zones (which are a form of higher density, multi-family housing, and already subject to a Development Permit with established guidelines)\(^6\).

(c) Coach houses would not be restricted to corner lots or lots with rear lane access; but minimum lot area, yards, and separation from the principal building would be established.

(d) No increase in maximum permitted floor area or site coverage under existing single-family zoning. Floor area exemptions for basements would not be permitted, in order to encourage designs that minimize site alteration and disruption.

3. Delegation Bylaw

This bylaw would delegate Council’s approval authority for “Detached Secondary Suite Development Permits” to the Director of Planning, Land Development and Permits. Applicants are entitled to appeal the Director’s decision to Council.

4.0 Options

4.1 Council may...

(as recommended)
  - Direct that draft bylaws to allow for rental coach houses as a detached form of secondary suite be prepared for Council consideration in fall 2013.

---

\(^6\) “Secondary suites” are a permitted use in the RS1, RS2, RS3, RS4, RS5, RS7, RS8, RS9 and RS10 zones. They are also permitted in the following duplex zones: RD1 and RD2.
Date: July 11, 2013
From: Stephen Mikicich, Sr. Community Planner
       Geri Boyle, Manager of Community Planning
Subject: West Vancouver's Coach House Examination

(or, alternatively)

- Direct that staff pursue a different course of action (to be specified); or
- Request further information (to be specified).
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Geri Boyle, Manager of Community Planning
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**APPENDIX ‘A’**

**Time-Line for Coach House Examination**
Community Engagement Activities, Event Advertising, and Online and Media Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct 12/12</td>
<td>Staff-led Council Tour of coach houses in Vancouver and North Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct 12/12</td>
<td>NS Outlook Article: “Laneway Living on the North Shore”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 12/12</td>
<td>NS News article: “Coach Houses Cause West Van Council Strife”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan 7/13</td>
<td>Web page roll out: <a href="http://www.westvancouver.ca/housing">www.westvancouver.ca/housing</a> with posting of Discussion Paper (with updates at key milestones)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 18/13</td>
<td>Meeting with Board of Directors of Ambleside-Dundarave Ratepayers’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 25/13</td>
<td>Public Invitation to May 8th Coach House Forum via North Shore Outlook, North Shore News, and Paivand Newspapers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to May 5/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2/13</td>
<td>Notice in ‘The Westemer’ (Newsletter of the Western Residents’ Association and Horseshoe Bay Residents’ Association)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3/13</td>
<td>NS News article: “WV Seeks Coach House Input: Public Panel Will Look at Feasibility of Alternate Housing”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 8/13</td>
<td>Vancouver Sun article: “West Vancouver Considers Allowing Coach Houses” (also posted on <a href="http://www.laneliving.ca">www.laneliving.ca</a>; <a href="http://www.allvoices.com">www.allvoices.com</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 8/13</td>
<td>Moderated Panel Discussion and Public Forum on Coach Houses at Kay Meek Centre. (Questionnaire available May 8th through June 6th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 8/13</td>
<td>CBC TV News: Coverage during evening and late night broadcasts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 9/13</td>
<td>Michael Geller’s Blog: “Why are we going to let West Vancouver look like North Vancouver?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 10/13</td>
<td>Mention in “Neighbourhood Watch: A weekly roundup of noteworthy news in municipalities across BC” on the website: Spacing Vancouver: Canadian Urbanism Uncovered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 13/13</td>
<td>Mention in “What is a Coach House” on <a href="http://www.melmontgomery.com/blog">www.melmontgomery.com/blog</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 16/13</td>
<td>Meeting with Greater Vancouver Real Estate Board (GVREB) – North Shore Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 21/13</td>
<td>Presentation to Western Residents’ Association / Horseshoe Bay Residents’ Association in conjunction with Jake Fry (Smallworks) and Heather Johnston (Place Architects) at Gleneagles Golf Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 22/13</td>
<td>NS Outlook article: “The Great West Van Coach House Debate”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 22/13</td>
<td>Vanessa Ybarra’s blog: “Coach Housing: Coming to a Neighbourhood Near You?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 26/13</td>
<td>NS News article: “Housing Workshop May 29th”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>ACTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 26/13</td>
<td>NS News article: “Coach Houses Considered”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 29/13</td>
<td>NS Outlook article: “Goodbye North Shore Baby Boomers”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 29/13</td>
<td>Staffed information display at Lionsview’s Rightsizing Forum (Seniors Centre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 31/13</td>
<td>Questionnaire deadline #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1/13</td>
<td>Staffed information display at Community Day (Ambleside Park)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 4/13</td>
<td>Information session on coach houses for Lower Caulfeild property owners (prior to Lower Caulfeild Advisory Committee [LCAC] meeting); owners notified of this session by mail sent on May 21, 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 6/13</td>
<td>Questionnaire deadline #2 (extended to follow Community Day and LCAC meeting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 11/13</td>
<td>Follow-up mention in The Westerner (article to follow at end of June)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 17/13</td>
<td>“West Vancouver Mulls Allowing Coach Houses” posted on: <a href="http://www.thewesternrealestate.ca">www.thewesternrealestate.ca</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 7/13</td>
<td>Article in The Westerner newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 6/13</td>
<td>Globe &amp; Mail article: “Divvy up the single-family lot”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX ‘B’

Findings from Coach House Questionnaire

This Appendix provides an overview of numerical findings and comments from 124 completed questionnaires. These were received from West Vancouver residents between May 7 and June 6, 2013. Approximately 10% of these were completed online. **Note:** Percentage values below are based on the number of responses to each individual question.

**QUESTION 1:** Please tell us where you live...

For the purposes of this question, sub-areas of West Vancouver were defined as follows:

- 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 Highway: British Properties, Glenmore, Chartwell, Canterbury, Panorama, Whitby Estates

![1. Where Do You Live?](image)

The geographic distribution of questionnaire responses reflects in part the population distribution within the community.
QUESTION 2: Do you think that coach houses could provide an appropriate housing option for West Vancouver residents?

Responses to Question #2 echo what staff have been hearing over the past few years - i.e., that residents are primarily interested in coach houses as an opportunity to meet their family's current or future housing needs on their own property. Most commonly, coach houses are identified as appropriate accommodation for an elderly parent, adult children, on-site caregiver.

2. An Appropriate Housing Option for West Van?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

(124 responses)

Comments from Individuals Answering “Yes” To Question 2

- I live in a modest house on a large corner lot that could easily accommodate a second small house.
- People born in this community and less affluent residents could afford to stay here.
- There is a definite need for both older residents and younger households (more affordable housing option).
- We are selling our house as retirement affords more time for travel. If we were able to do this we'd live in the coach house and rent out the main house (and stay in our neighbourhood).
- We need more affordability.
- I think coach houses are absolutely essential for West Vancouver at this time. The current rate of demolition of modest sized houses and replacement with 5000+ sq.ft. houses is absolutely unsustainable.
- They're essential... a great way to gently diversity and serve existing and new residents.
- Need to replenish stock of smaller homes, as were traditionally built.
- Good option for land use and mixed densification.
- I think they're a great idea and long overdue.
- Excellent idea for allowing young families and seniors to live/stay in West Vancouver, close to amenities.
- An increase in density is a small price to pay for aging in place. The devil is in the details.
- I love it. I know it works... It is a lovely housing option for the elderly and for college kids.
- Charming way to provide alternate family accommodation, and rental opportunities.
- It’s a perfect option for multi-generational families; as real estate prices become more unattainable for younger generations.
- We need more creative housing options.
- Much better than building mid-rise or high-rise buildings.
- West Van needs more affordable housing options to attract young families and allow seniors to remain here. We need more density to survive as a viable community.
- Why just a detached structure model? If secondary suites and coach houses are OK, why not duplexes or multiple structures on one lot?
- I believe the issue is “infill housing” more than “coach houses”.
- Excellent next step in housing diversification.
- This will help families to care for seniors and maintain independent lives.
- Could stimulate the economy (residential construction), increase property values and government revenues. Supports more affordable living and family growth. Works well in Vancouver, when done right.
- Gives the opportunity for increased density by allowing two (smaller) buildings on a lot rather than one huge building.
- Yes, land is becoming unaffordable for young people. Good option.
- Affordability, as we age, might necessitate leaving the municipality (without appropriate housing options).
- The importance of housing opportunities in this community cannot be overestimated, not only for the wealthy. A diversified neighbourhood of young families and seniors is healthier.
- By allowing coach houses, we will be better able to work with the challenging topography in West Vancouver, and avoid ‘monster homes’.
- Urgently required. Enough talking – need action.
- I think they are a really attractive and versatile housing option for the community and many families.
- I think coach houses are more in scale with the history of this community. They could provide valuable family options for housing teenagers, in-laws, grandparents, and even house guests, where they can live independently but be close for caring. Coach houses could enrich both family and community life.
- With aging parents and the desire to move to a smaller, more manageable above while escaping during the winter, we would very much welcome the opportunity to create a coach house on our property, which could provide several workable alternatives, as well as save our existing Ron Thom designed modern house.
- Provides an alternative for ‘downsizing’. Makes home ownership more affordable (if rented out).
- Higher density makes sense.
- Yes, need options.
- I would like to have some on my street because it means more contact with neighbours, more vitality.
- Coach houses could provide an appropriate housing option for WV residents if restricted to minimum lot size limitations, current neighbourhood density consideration, and one-storey height restriction.
- More housing options are essential for West Vancouver.
- Could provide additional lower cost housing.

**Comments from Individuals Answering “No” To Question 2**

- No. Fundamentally dishonest to the existing neighbours.
- I don't trust our City to monitor this process. Our neighbours built a coach house beside our lot – it was and still is awful.
- West Vancouver should remain an exclusive area and not be subjected to poor man's housing (as) it was positioned during the meeting.
- West Vancouver was our home of choice because of the low density / absence of social housing / problems. This Council should not destroy that character.
- I feel this presentation is forcing us and convincing us towards coach houses rather than honestly asking us if we want them in the first place. Prefer people put in suites in their home rather than more density and square footage allowance.
- Absolutely no need for coach houses in West Vancouver.
- Coach houses do not belong in West Vancouver.
- West Vancouver is and must remain an exclusive and mostly single-family zoned area. A change to coach houses would be a massive betrayal to all of us who have spent half a lifetime saving for a home in a quiet, safe and private environment and, most important, low density.
- Coach housing may provide additional housing units for additional residents who want to be in West Vancouver.
- West Vancouver properties (including the British Properties) are too small for coach houses as these would encroach on the space between them and neighbours' homes, block views, spoil privacy, and create traffic and garbage problems.
- I do not think they are appropriate for West Vancouver. They should not be allowed.
- First give us proper roads to handle traffic, and an expanded hospital to handle increased population.
- One hears … that coach houses are already being built in West Vancouver illegally by getting a permit for a garage that has everything in the infrastructure that a coach house needs... e.g., a stove gets added later.

**Comments from Individuals Answering “Not Sure” To Question 2...**

- Believe that there should be higher density, but access and footprint is important. Agree with looking a same footprint, but splitting the home like a duplex.
- Too general a question. Probably good in some areas, bad in others.
- Yes, if regulated appropriately – i.e., neighbourly designs.
- If the property is large – not on an Ambleside 33-foot lot.
- Possibly in select areas.
- I am not sure because they are supposed to create 'affordable' housing which is a joke. Change the description to something realistic – something like 'less expensive'.
- I regret that DWV has not found an alternative term for 'coach house', better reflecting the present day West Vancouver, and not harking back to a class-ridden, bygone era. It's not too late.

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

**Note:** Comments for Question #3 are grouped according to the respondents' answer to Question #2 – i.e., whether or not they believe that coach houses provide an appropriate housing option for West Vancouver residents.

**Comments from Individuals Answering “Yes” To Question 2**

- Absence of rear lanes in several areas.
- My concern is with the planning and permitting process; if this is an alternative to secondary suites, the process and costs should be more in line with that.
- In the 1100-block of Duchess, the lots are narrow and the alleyway gets easily crowded. Should be limited to lots larger than 33 feet; maybe start at 50 feet. Also, limit number per block.
- Quality of design, which also means an appropriate scale and privacy for both tenants and neighbours.
- Parking on side streets should be discouraged; perhaps asking that space for cars be included in coach house planning.
- Fit with neighbourhood views.
- My only concern is that they will not slow down the proliferation of ‘monster homes’. I have no concern about coach houses themselves.
- All in favour… the more design innovation the better; makes for variety, diversity of visual environment, enriching.
- Loss of privacy, increased traffic.
- Scale should be appropriate.
- Should not be larger than 1200 to 1500 sq.ft. (max). 800 sq.ft. would be better. Should note be car (parking place) restricted.
- Higher taxes, annual fees, parking.
- Design: need to have architectural standards to maintain quality and charm of the village of Ambleside.
- Safety should never be compromised.
- Developers (e.g., in Vancouver) knock down an existing house, build a new house and a coach house, and maximize the square footage for both buildings.
- Density.
- Sufficient parking to allow both secondary suites and coach houses.
- Need for parking, garbage, sewer and water service upgrades.
- Too difficult an approval process or too many restrictions.
- Perceiving natural green spaces, gardens or lawns with coach houses, design requirements.
- Negative effects of density – e.g., crowded neighbourhoods; change to neighbourhood character and demographics (e.g., low-income, transient residents).
- Privacy, green space, views, parking – but recognize benefits of density.
- Maintain reasonable degree of privacy and appropriate landscaping between the coach house and neighbouring houses.
- Traffic, parking.
- I'm concerned about the change in the social character of a neighbourhood resulting from the change in the built form character of the neighbourhood if coach houses were allowed.
- My only concern: need to adjust maximum floor area per lot regardless, with coach houses likely needing further analysis. Other than that, this is taking too long, get on with it!
- None, other than maintaining quality of building and fit with neighbourhood.
- Given large lots in most areas, the existing (modest-sized) houses are older and in many cases 'tear downs.' Could build a coach house larger than the existing house, then max-out on the size of the replacement main house.
- Concerned about existing such buildings built without permits being 'grandfathered'.
- Garbage allowances... will these be charged to accommodate two families?
- Noise caused by densification.
- Should be a limit (on number of units) and a trial period.
- None – provided that local building standards and regulations are met.
- None. Our concerns are about the mega monster houses being built in our area.
- Construction activity, loss of trees.
- Architectural style is important – i.e., West Coast Modern.
- Size and design constraints will be important.
- Coach houses will only be possible on certain properties (not specified).
- Parking and Access: Streets (in Lower Caulfeild) are narrow and made narrower by overhanging vegetation. Streets are also used for public parking to access Caulfeild Park and St. Francis church. Would not like to see additional driveways.

**Comments from Individuals Answering “No” to Question 2...**
- Loss of privacy, “people density”, precedent-setting
- Our neighbours built their front house and a “coach house” and built up the dirt under it so both buildings block our sun
- Over-population and damage to the integrity of the neighbourhood. The “coach house” is OK for owner use only – not for rental or re-sale.
- It would cheapen the neighbourhood, introduce social problems, overload existing infrastructure.
- It is not about ‘fit’, it is monitoring the rules and respecting the impact on neighbours. More homes will bring more cars. Each home on a property should have to provide two parking spots on the property – not on the street. No second storey period. No increase in square footage.
- We do not need higher density. We do not need more traffic. We want only single-family dwellings.
- Coach houses will destroy the character of our neighbourhood and will create overcrowding, road congestion, excessive noise, destruction of property, vandalism, and loss of privacy.
- Noise, unsafe lanes, rowdy neighbours, intrusion and further congestion thru increased car traffic. A dramatic decline in lifestyle in quiet single-family areas (reference made to 366 Keith Road).
- Fewer trees, less wildlife.
- Coach houses would over-densify our properties and detract from the spacious aspect of the place.
- We are congested now. We live in a fool's paradise... need more people because we need more revenue because we have more people. Crazy dog chasing his tail!
- Adversely changes the character of single-family neighbourhoods. Invasion of privacy and loss of property value for adjacent property owners.
- I do not believe in spot zoning... bought into a single-family neighbourhood 25 years ago, and see no reason for that to change. ...In addition to predominantly single-family homes, our neighbourhood contains some secondary suites, rental houses, and rental and condominium units in Spuraway. We have enough diversity of housing and our quite neighbourhood does not require additional folk who do not share our pride of ownership in their properties.
- It would forever change the look and feel of our neighbourhood in a negative way.
- Too much density, greater possible height of garages, less ability to landscape, loss of privacy, more traffic. Also suggests more transient population.
- Would change the character of the neighbourhood... Lots and make-up of the neighbourhoods don't seem appropriate.

Comments from Individuals Answering “Not Sure” to Question 2...

- Access, parking, footprint.
- Overcrowding and parking.
- View blockage, impairment of privacy, lack of parking.
- Parking, density.
- Change in character, impact on limited amenities.
- Do not allow coach houses on lots below a predetermined lot size, as there is a concern of excessive population density on small lots.
- Crowding and parking congestions would not be an issue in areas that presently have large lots (75 ft. + frontages).
- That designs might overwhelm more subtle, mature homes.
- That they might be put into a highly desirable category, thereby beyond the reach of intended buyers.
- That coach houses might be rental only, therefore no ownership equity for the resident; merely filling coffers of the property owner.
QUESTION 4(a): Do you think that coach house applications should be subject to a design approval process?

4.(a) Design Approval Process?

- 15%
- 14%
- Not sure
- Yes
- No

(118 responses)

QUESTION 4(b): What issues do you think should be addressed through a design approval process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>% Responding “Yes”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building design and materials (104 responses)</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape design (99 responses)</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy (99 responses)</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views (95 responses)</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (34 responses)</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, specific comments under this question relate to 'fit' within local area context, landscape character, and neighbour impacts. There was some discussion about a 'tiered' design review, where proposals that meet certain criteria would undergo a less rigorous process and vice versa. Issues related to accessibility, green buildings, and less car dependence (i.e., reduce parking requirement) were also raised.

Comments:
- Neighbourhood compatibility.
- If coach houses will be built on a smaller scale than monster houses currently being built, the impact on neighbours should be significantly less.
- Impact on other properties – especially with respect to views.
- Diversity of architecture = variety.
- Don't be too onerous, just ensure some quality is maintained.
- Overall density.
- Design should be consistent with the main house.
- Energy and infrastructure; should not be car dependent – i.e., don’t make permit based on parking.
- Safety.
- Green space.
- Coach house should not be visually intrusive for neighbours.
- There should be design guidelines to make the typical application as easy as possible...
  Save the (formal) design approval process for ‘atypical’ applications. The process should be easy if we wish to encourage coach houses.
- We don’t address view impacts from construction the main house!
- These issues focus on the built form... We must also address issues related to the social form or consequence of such development.
- Safety, accessibility (does it address the needs of seniors?)
- Style and size must be in keeping with surrounding buildings (context).
- Design approval should be limited, if the coach house matches other building(s) already on the property.
- Tempted to say that the coach house should match the main house, but something completely different may be appropriate in some situations.
- Building height impact on neighbours.
- No tree removal.
- Approval from immediate neighbours should be required
- Flexibility is key to making this work. Not many lots in West Vancouver are square or level, so consideration should be given to fitting into the space, topography, and neighbourhoods. We also find many different styles of housing, from country cottages to modern. I think the coach house should fit with the main house, and within the context of the street. Because of the odd lots flexibility would also be required in terms of setbacks etc. in order to ensure the coach house fits in.
- 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.
- Approval process should not be so restrictive that it makes it impossible or very expensive. I would like to see view and wildlife corridors maintained (for new single-family houses too).
- Following a referendum in which 66 2/3% of District home owners agree to support the Coach House concept, and 75% of sub-area home owners agree to the concept and 100% of the immediately adjacent home owners agree to an individual project and then based upon successful passing a design approval process on the above issues, and based only on use of presently usable land as well as consideration by the District based on a new policy of appropriate, resident safety standards, parking, assessment of additional infrastructure costs such as water, sewer, garbage.
- Overall lane design (if applicable), accessibility, in-unit storage.
- This decision would be fraught with conflict. Architects’ / developers’ voices are too powerful.
QUESTION 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...

5.(a) In all Neighbourhoods?

- Yes 13%
- No 25%
- Not sure

(114 responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Or, should they only be allowed...</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.(b) In certain neighbourhoods or areas? (75 responses)</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.(c) On corner lots? (72 responses)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.(d) On lots with rear lane access? (81 responses)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.(e) Under other conditions? (37 responses)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
- They should be particularly encouraged in areas close to transit, e.g., near Marine Drive in Ambleside and Dundarave.
- Many West Van properties have land available for coach houses, especially in our neighbourhood, Cedardale.
- Off-street parking stall must be provided.
- Only if the setting is harmonious with the area – i.e., on an alley, corner, with a similar style to the main house.
- Lots of variations will be required given our topography.
- Many larger lots could easily be used to provide much needed housing options within established areas.
- What about a property with driveway access from the street reaching a detached garage at the rear of the property? (e.g., would be appropriate for coach house access)
- Consider neighbourhood 'look and feel' – e.g., sufficient space for off-street parking.
- Would support them throughout West Vancouver, but if only certain neighbourhoods are possible... that is better than nothing.
- If they are only allowed in certain places, near Ambleside or Dundarave villages would promote a walkable lifestyle.
- Near public facilities and higher density areas, along public transit routes.
- Overall character of a lot/ neighbourhood should remain consistent.
- Should be encouraged in Ambleside and Dundarave at least.
- West Vancouver should reclaim its lanes for laneway housing opportunities.
- In all scenarios, there must be adequate provision for fire/emergency access.
- Each application should stand on its own merits... might not be suitable in all areas.
- Spread this around... don't expect that high density will only happen in Ambleside.
- Where there are long-standing rail right-of-ways.
- Should implement a process where immediate neighbours have a say, as in Toronto. If majority do not support, then approval not granted.
- Appropriate zoning regulations should apply to all.

**QUESTION 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 density. 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 coach house should be permitted...

![Chart showing 6(a) Only as an Alternative to a Secondary Suite?](chart.png)

*(101 responses)*
QUESTION 6.(c) Do you think the permitted floor area of a coach house should be in addition to that allowed for the principal building on the lot?

Comments:
- Coach house as ‘alternative’ to a secondary suite, only if it remains within zoning regulations (e.g., FAR).
- Torn on the issues of whether or not to allow for additional floor area... don’t want the units to be huge, but want to support some development.
- A big lot could have more than one unit — e.g., some joined to the house, some detached.
- Not in favour of coach houses becoming monster houses.
- Not concerned with this form of density increase... allow more secondary suites and coach houses on all single-family lots.
- Without an increase in density per lot, no one will give up square footage from the main house to allow for a coach house.
- May serve different needs.
- We already have enough over-sized houses in West Vancouver. Maintenance of green space and neighbour's privacy should remain an essential concern.
- If lot is zoned to accommodate an 8,000 sq.ft. house, but is only developed with a 2,500 sq.ft. house, allow another 'cottage' on the same lot.
- Maybe look at age of houses – e.g., pre-1970: allow additional FAR.
- Many houses with existing suites also have room for coach houses, and should not be denied this opportunity.
- 0.5 FAR (e.g., for RS-5 lots under 5,000 sq.ft.) would work well.
- If the lot is small and lacks privacy, don't allow. But, if the lot is suitable, and the 'style' fits, allow without difficulties.
- Due to the number of 'monster' houses being built in West Vancouver, it is critical that coach houses not be in addition to the FAR for that zoning.
- Let's start simple (alternative to a suite) and go from there!
- Maximum floor area of 1000 sq.ft. plus garage. Basements should be allowed.
- They should be small, garage-sized structures.
- West Vancouver does not share Vancouver's goal of increasing density. Our goal is to increase the range of available housing options.

QUESTION 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 they should be rental only or that ownership housing should be considered?

7.(a) Rental Only?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

(102 responses)
Comments:
- Look at the very good example of 3 duplexes on Esquimalt between 20th and 21st Streets with three coach houses behind... a beautiful solution!
- Ownership should remain with original house.
- Ownership should be allowed in conjunction with a simplified method to allow for subdivision. Right now (in Dundarave) there are small, non-conforming lots that suit the neighbourhood.
- Strata-titled units may make sense on larger lots.
- Would prefer strata to rental, because provides home ownership opportunities for younger people. Ownership option would be great.
- Limit to family use.
- We need more rental options, so keep them rental.
- Might help our children build equity if they can take an ownership position in a coach house on our property.
- Should be determined on a case-by-case basis.
- Yes, when strata-title can be accomplished.
- People with create their own 'ownership scenarios (e.g., tenants in common) if you don't allow ownership.
- Only if the lot is subdividable (or almost meets subdivision requirements); otherwise rental only.
- With the legalization of secondary suites, West Vancouver no longer has 'single family' neighbourhoods.
- Would need a District policy re: guidelines for 'ownership'.
- This would be neighbourhood-dependent. In Lower Caulfeild, units should be 'rental only' in an effort to keep the lots to their heritage designation.
- Ownership (separate from the main house) should be mandatory, but the owner should be able to rent it out.
**QUESTION 8:** Do you have any other questions or concerns that you would like to have addressed as part of this coach house examination?

**Comments:**
- We can't continue to free ride on Vancouver and North Vancouver on densification and offering 'affordable' alternatives.
- 'Age in place' consideration without densifying the neighbourhood.
- Neighbourhood consultation.
- Consider clustered (attached) units on properties backing onto green space.
- Expedite the planning process... everything takes too long in WV Planning.
- This issue should be moved ahead ASAP so the elderly parents that would like to live there are still alive.
- Should have some flexibility for parking. Units should be large enough to accommodate two bedrooms.
- Coach house size must be kept in line with original lot size/maximum floor area.
- Please also consider dividing the houses themselves (i.e., into two or more units).
- Start soon before we lose our whole stock of small seaside cottages.
- Suites in existing detached structures should be considered.
- Consideration should be given to allow subdivision into smaller lots.
- An excellent idea for families to live near and support each other.
- Coach house living would provide housing for young families and seniors who have lived and want to remain in West Vancouver, but do not want to live in an apartment.
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APPENDIX 'C'

Coach House Questions in 2013 Community Survey

Two 'coach house' questions were included in the District's 2013 Community Survey. The following information is extracted from "District of West Vancouver Community Survey, June 2013", prepared by Mustel Group Market Research:

**QUESTION #8:** Do you think that coach houses (also sometimes known as laneway houses) could provide an appropriate housing option for West Vancouver residents?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total responses (744)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**QUESTION #9:** 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Throughout the district?</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only in certain neighbourhoods or areas of West Van?</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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COUNCIL REPORT

Date: March 4, 2013

From: Bob Sokol, Director of Planning, Land Development and Permits

Subject: Council Reconsideration of Directions from Committee of the Whole Meeting on Neighbourhood Character and Housing Held on January 28, 2013

RECOMMENDED THAT:

1. The Housing Action Plan dated November 2012 be adopted to provide the framework for the Planning Department's work on housing during 2013-2014; and

2. The District's 2013-2014 departmental work plans include 'housing bulk' and 'boulevards' as priority work items as described in the report dated March 4, 2013.

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to identify revisions to the proposed Planning Department work plan as described in the report dated February 4, 2013 (Appendix A) based upon the availability of additional resources and to receive Council's confirmation that these are the priority actions it would like to see undertaken, in order that departmental work plans for 2013-2014 may be finalized.

1.0 Background

1.1 Prior Resolutions

1.2 February 18, 2013 – Council tabled the staff report titled “Directions from Committee of the Whole Meeting on Neighbourhood Character and Housing Held on January 28, 2013”, dated February 4, 2013, and directed staff to consider Council’s comments and report back at a future meeting with a potentially revised work plan.

2.0 Analysis

2.1 Discussion

Neighbourhood Character and Building Bulk

The Council report dated February 4, 2013 identified that the Department would undertake new work related to 'building bulk' which would include a report discussing
the concept of ‘bulk’ (actual and perceived), a review of how bulk is regulated in other municipalities, and presenting possible approaches to address the issue in West Vancouver. That report described that the ‘backgrounder’ report would be presented to Council in late 2013 and made available to the public, forming the basis of community engagement in early 2014, with a report back to Council in spring 2014. That timing was dictated by the availability of resources to complete this work in conjunction with other priority items in the department’s work plan.

At the Council meeting on February 19, 2013, Council tabled the report dated February 4, 2013, primarily over the issue of the planned timeline for its work related to single family building bulk. Staff was requested to consider revisions to its work program to expedite the building bulk issue for single family homes: Since that time, staff has explored securing additional resources to address this and/or other priority projects. Through a combination of the hiring of a new fulltime planner and utilization of a portion of the 2013 Supplemental Budget (One Time Initiatives) allocated for Strategic Initiative Implementation; additional resources will become available to allow for completion of this work on a more timely basis. With these resources, staff expects to commence this work in April 2013 (as soon as resources become available) with the “back grounder” report to Council by September 2013. Public engagement will take place in fall 2013 with a report back to Council along with proposed bylaw revisions by January 2014.

3.0 Options

3.1 Council may

(as recommended)

- Adopt the Housing Action Plan to provide the framework for the Planning Department’s work on housing during 2013-2014; and

- Direct staff that the District’s 2013-2014 departmental work plans include ‘housing bulk’ and ‘boulevards’ as priority work items as described in the report dated March 4, 2013;

(or, alternatively)

- Direct staff to address other priorities during 2013-2014; or

- Request further information.

Appendices:

A. Council Report Dated February 4, 2013 titled “Council Reconsideration of Directions from Committee of the Whole Meeting on Neighbourhood Character and Housing Held on January 28, 2013"

B. Housing Action Plan Implementation (Revised March 4, 2013)
COUNCIL REPORT

Date: February 4, 2013

File: 13-2515-02

From: Geri Boyle, Manager, Community Planning and Stephen Mikicich, Sr. Community Planner

Subject: Directions from Committee of the Whole Meeting on Neighbourhood Character and Housing Held on January 28, 2013

RECOMMENDED THAT:

1. The Housing Action Plan dated November 2012 be adopted to provide the framework for the Planning Department’s work on housing during 2013-2014; and

2. The District’s 2013-2014 departmental work plans include ‘housing bulk’ and ‘boulevards’ as priority work items as described in the report dated February 4, 2013.

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to outline the key work items related to housing and neighbourhood character, which were identified by Committee members at the Committee of the Whole meeting held on January 28, 2013. Staff is requesting Council’s confirmation that these are the priority actions it would like to see undertaken, in order that departmental work plans for 2013-2014 may be finalized.

1.0 Background

1.1 Prior Resolutions

November 28, 2012 – Council resolved that the Housing Action Plan be made available for community review and comment, and that Council consider the Housing Action Plan, specifically the five recommended actions for addressing housing issues, at a Committee of the Whole meeting in early 2013.

December 10, 2012 – Council resolved that the discussion paper, titled “The Potential for Coach Houses in West Vancouver: A Discussion Paper”, dated November 30, 2012, provide the basis for community engagement on coach houses; and that staff report back to Council at a Committee of the Whole meeting in mid 2013, on the results of the engagement process, including possible directions supported by the Community.
June 25, 2012 — Council received for information the report from the Manager of Community Planning titled "Housing Action Plan", dated June 12, 2012; and the report from the Manager of Community Planning and Senior Community Planner titled "Transitioning to an Investigation of the Potential of Coach Houses in West Vancouver", dated June 11, 2012. Further, Council established an examination of 'coach houses' as the policy focus for the District's efforts in exploring new housing types during 2012-2013.

2.0 **Balanced Scorecard**

| 1.3.1 Implement the recommendations of the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing Working Group | (Continue with additional) Zoning Bylaw policy rewrittes  
| | Evolve Pilot Projects Program to emphasize coach houses  
| | Develop and implement enhanced boulevard program |
| 2.1.2 Support regional and North Shore planning to advance West Vancouver's interests | Commence Regional Context Statement and Housing Action Plan  
| | Continue to participate with Metro Vancouver on regional planning issues |

3.0 **Analysis**

3.1 **Discussion**

3.1.1 **Housing**

The proposed Housing Action Plan sets out five key actions for supporting housing diversity and affordability:

1. Continue established practices for supporting development of seniors' and rental housing, accessible/adaptable housing units, and variations in unit size in new developments;

2. Consider coach houses following an informed community discussion;

3. Identify, consider and engage the community in a discussion of opportunities to retain and add purpose-built rental housing;

4. Strengthen OCP Policies on housing diversity to provide a framework for consideration of innovative housing proposals; and

The Plan was made available for public review and comment through January 2013 and discussed at the Committee of the Whole meeting on January 28, 2013. At the Committee of the Whole meeting, the five key actions for supporting housing diversity and affordability were briefly reviewed by staff, along with:

- The proposed community engagement program for the Coach House examination;
- Current work on purpose-built rental housing; and
- Preliminary information about new applications and proposals under discussion with staff.

On the broader issue of housing diversity, Committee members noted that households in West Vancouver tend to be much larger houses than most people need in order to maximize the value of the property and future return on investment. This is particularly the case in the absence of permitted housing alternatives to the detached, single-family house.

A member of the public pointed to 'infill housing' as necessary for providing greater housing options for West Vancouver seniors.

Revisions to the priorities and actions outlined in the proposed Housing Action Plan were not identified by Committee members. Committee members spoke positively to the coach house investigation (Action #2), noting particular concerns about tenure (rental versus ownership), whether coach houses should be allowed throughout the community or only under certain circumstances, and possible neighbourhood impacts. These issues are addressed in the coach house discussion paper, and will be examined during the upcoming community engagement program.

Conclusion

Staff recommends that the Housing Action Plan be adopted in order to:

- provide the framework for the Planning Department’s work on housing during 2013-2014; and

- fulfill part of the requirements under Strategy 4.1 of Metro Vancouver’s Regional Growth Strategy, which is to “provide diverse and affordable housing choices” – under this strategy, member municipalities are to adopt a Regional Context Statement, and to prepare and Implement a Housing Action Plan.

As summarized at the meeting, public consultation on coach houses will proceed in winter/spring 2013 with a report back to Council in July 2013. (Appendix B) A report on purpose built rental housing will be presented to Council in July 2013 with consultation in the fall and a report back to Council by the end of 2013. Staff will also continue to process development applications for innovative Housing types in West Vancouver throughout the year.
3.1.2 Neighbourhood Character and Building Bulk

At the Committee of the Whole Meeting on January 28, 2013, the Committee was provided with an overview presentation on 'neighbourhood character' in West Vancouver. The presentation spoke to the key components of 'character', and District responses to address the issues from the 1980's to the present. District responses have included zoning and other regulatory changes, and neighbourhood planning initiatives.

**Neighbourhood Character:**

Staff noted that 'neighbourhood character' consists of four key components: (1) land use; (2) building bulk and how a building 'fits' on the land; (3) landscape character; and (4) public realm (i.e., roads and boulevards) character. Neighbourhood character has long been a concern in West Vancouver and, while land use is straightforward, 'Overall neighbourhood character is difficult to articulate'.

Given that the primary 'threat' to established neighbourhood character across West Vancouver is the ongoing construction of large replacement houses (particularly when accompanied by extensive site alteration and changes to abutting boulevards), it is more appropriate to address 'character' issues at a District-wide level.

Staff advised that fit with neighbourhood character is a key consideration in the review of all multi-family development applications, and for any single-family dwelling where a zoning variance is requested. There is no 'character' review associated with the building permit process as it is outside the authority granted by the Province to municipalities within the permitting process. Therefore, issues related to building bulk are typically addressed through zoning regulations, and have the inherent limitation of 'general rules' to cover all situations.

Committee members would like to see greater District control over proposed changes to public boulevards – including strengthening existing guidelines, considering a new boulevard bylaw, and reviewing the approval process for boulevard encroachments.

**Building Bulk:**

The increasing size and perceived bulk of new houses in West Vancouver has been of concern to West Vancouver residents for over 30 years. New houses are seen as 'too big', and the typical construction process can be very long and impactful on neighbouring properties. While a number of actions have been undertaken by the District to address these issues over the years – both through a series of zoning (and other) bylaw amendments and neighbourhood planning initiatives, the 'large house' issue and associated construction practices remain the key threats to established neighbourhood character in 2013.

Committee member comments included:
1. identified a need for clarity on the concept of Floor Area Ratio (FAR) – i.e., how floor area is calculated, and what floor area exemptions are permitted under existing single-family residential zoning;

2. expressed an interested in how West Vancouver’s single-family zoning regulations (related to site coverage, building height and massing) compare with those in other municipalities;

3. requested that basement and deck exemptions be examined in detail; and

4. would like to see recommendations for reducing building bulk and preserving vegetation.

Conclusion

Staff recommends that work on neighbourhood character during 2013-2014 focus on ‘building bulk’ and ‘boulevards’, as described below.

New work related to ‘building bulk’ will include a report discussing the concept of ‘bulk’ (actual and perceived), reviewing how bulk is regulated in other municipalities compared to West Vancouver, and presenting possible approaches to address the issue in West Vancouver. (Appendix B) This ‘backgrounder’ report will be presented to Council in late 2013 and made available to the public, forming the basis of community engagement in early 2014, with a report back to Council in spring 2014.

Staff is recommending that in 2013 the ‘boulevard’ focus be on familiarizing Council and the community with the policies, regulations and processes related to boulevard management – this is particularly important as boulevards have been managed by guidelines (rather than a bylaw) for approximately 10 years. (Appendix B) Issues and opportunities provided by the District’s current approach will be identified. Further, this ‘reporting’ should be undertaken by an inter-divisional team: Planning, Land Development and Permits related to the use and treatment of public boulevards fronting private property; Parks and Community Services related to trees; and Engineering and Transportation related to roads and infrastructure in the municipal right-of-way. This inter-divisional task force will be established in early 2013 and report back to Council in early summer 2013 with some interim recommendations and with further follow up intended for the end of 2013.

3.2 Sustainability

Principle #3 in the OCP’s Framework for Action (for creating a sustainable community in West Vancouver) is to provide for a diversity of housing types to accommodate a balanced and diverse population in terms of age, ability, income, and household types.

3.3 Communications Process

Community engagement on coach houses and rental housing during 2013 will
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provide an ongoing forum for thoughtful examination of: (1) possible new housing types for improving housing diversity and affordability; and (2) a variety of issues related to neighbourhood character, to ensure proper integration of new housing types in established areas.

Information on housing issues and opportunities in West Vancouver, including the directions from the Community Dialogue, and relevant background materials are posted on: www.westvancouver.ca/housing.

A program of community engagement specific to building bulk and boulevards will be determined at a future date.

4.0 Options

4.1 Council may

(as recommended)

- Adopt the Housing Action Plan to provide the framework for the Planning Department's work on housing during 2013-2014; and

- Direct staff to include 'housing bulk' and 'boulevards' as priority work items for inclusion in 2013-2014 departmental work plans;

(or, alternatively)

- Direct staff to address other priorities during 2013-2014; or

- Request further information.
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B. Housing Action Plan Implementation

Note: There is a direct correlation between community objectives for greater housing diversity and the preservation of established neighbourhood character through the ability to regulate the form and character of more intensive residential uses (i.e., duplex, infill, and other multi-family housing types).
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1.0 OVERVIEW

A Housing Action Plan provides a local government framework for developing and implementing strategies to address defined housing issues in the community. West Vancouver’s Housing Action Plan builds on the work undertaken during the 2004 Official Community Plan (OCP) update and the 2007-2008 Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing. The Plan will be used to:

- continue the ‘dialogue’ on housing issues and opportunities in the community;
- clarify West Vancouver’s goals for housing diversity and affordability; and
- identify possible local government actions to address these goals and establish priorities for the District.

The Housing Action Plan outlines the existing policy framework for housing in West Vancouver, the key housing ‘gaps’ based on population and demographic trends and the Community Dialogue discussions, and the District’s current practices related to housing. Finally, it recommends five actions for moving forward on housing issues, as follows:

1. Continue established practices for supporting development of seniors’ and rental housing, accessible/adaptable housing units, and variations in unit size in new developments;
2. Consider coach houses following an informed community discussion;
3. Identify, consider and engage the community in a discussion of opportunities to retain and add purpose-built rental housing;
4. Strengthen OCP Policies on housing diversity to provide a framework for consideration of innovative housing proposals; and
2.0 THE POLICY CONTEXT FOR HOUSING IN WEST VANCOUVER

2.1 Official Community Plan

West Vancouver residents recognize the challenges of managing future change and meeting emerging housing needs, while preserving the highly valued character of West Vancouver’s existing neighbourhoods.

During West Vancouver’s Official Community Plan (OCP) review process (2001-2004), residents identified ‘housing’ as the most important issue for the community. Key concerns included limited housing choice and affordability—particularly for seniors, young adults, and young families. Differing ideas about the underlying issues and how they should be addressed emerged from the OCP review discussion. Consequently, the OCP includes focused and limited policies related to housing choice and affordability; and affirmed the need for more work to understand housing issues and potential actions.

The OCP is founded on eight planning principles for building a sustainable community. Principle #3 is to: “provide for a diversity of housing types to accommodate a balanced and diverse population in terms of age, ability, income, and household type.” Key OCP housing policies are as follows:

Policy H 1 Engage in further dialogue at both a community and local neighbourhood level to develop a full understanding of community trends, desires and related housing needs and potential policies for addressing them.

Policy H 3 (This policy) recognizes that opportunities occur in limited site-specific situations where a housing need may be addressed in a manner that is consistent with the Principles of the OCP. This Plan specifies that applications for such site-specific zoning or OCP amendments within a single-family area should apply in limited circumstances and be subject to Council’s Public Involvement Policy and defined criteria.

Policy H 6 Encourage a variety of housing types in the future neighbourhoods in the Upper Lands.
Policy H8 Support the provision of adaptable design in a variety of housing forms.
  - Consider establishment of adaptable design guidelines.
  - Consider encouraging adaptable design through floor area bonuses.

Policy H9 Support the provision of rental housing.
  - Do not support conversion of rental apartments to strata in buildings greater than four units.
  - Explore mechanisms for recognizing secondary suites.
  - Consider amenity zoning (bonuses) for rental housing.

Policy H10 Support the provision of greater housing options for the District's growing senior population.
  - Examine the potential role of secondary suites in providing additional housing options for seniors.
  - Support the development of home service and assistance programs to allow seniors to remain in their existing homes and neighbourhoods.
  - Support the creation of new senior housing in areas with convenient access to services and transit.

To improve community understanding about housing issues and possible actions, the District undertook two initiatives: (1) the preparation of a series of background reports on demographic and housing trends in West Vancouver, now entitled "Facts and Stats: Our Community by the Numbers"; and (2) a comprehensive public engagement program, called the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing.
2.2 The ‘Community Dialogue’

The Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing was developed and implemented by District staff and a citizens’ working group, and was undertaken over 15 months during 2007-2008. This was a process involving hundreds of West Vancouver residents talking to each other about the future of their neighbourhoods, and issues related to housing choice and affordability. The Community Dialogue provided a forum for engaging the community in developing its own policy directions for housing and neighbourhood character.

Through this process, the District heard that more diverse housing options are needed for:

- Older residents wishing to downsize into smaller, more manageable housing that will allow them to age in place in their own neighbourhoods;
- Younger families and young adults wishing to establish themselves in the community;
- Lower income residents wishing to find more affordable housing options, including rental housing;
- People requiring accessible/adaptable housing, with special features to accommodate their unique requirements; and
- People requiring assisted living and other support to remain in the community.
While not official District policy, the final report and recommendations of the Community Dialogue Working Group (September 2008) provided direction for subsequent District housing initiatives, and new development projects including:

- the examination of possible new ground-oriented housing prototypes through a District-led Housing Pilot Program (per new OCP Policy H 4.1\(^1\));
- the legalization of secondary suites;
- designation of an ‘infill housing’ block at 21st Street and Esquimalt Avenue; and
- the Rodgers Creek development.

Six of the Working Group’s recommendations pertain specifically to housing choice and affordability:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Amend the OCP, as may be required, to enable consideration of new housing types to meet the current and future needs of West Vancouver residents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.2 Develop an implementation program for allowing secondary suites, which would:  
  - identify issues around suites;  
  - recommend a process and criteria for legalizing suites; and  
  - provide for amendments to zoning and other bylaws to allow secondary suites. |
| 3.3 Develop policies and criteria to determine under which conditions ‘infill’ housing would be suitable. |
| 3.4 Consider a demonstration program to enable introduction of new housing types on a limited basis, in advance of new housing policies and regulatory tools being formally adopted. This process would enable ideas and concepts for new housing types to be explored through a community planning and design process that would include:  
  - study of various housing types and tenures using examples from other communities  
  - community design workshops  
  - possible ‘pilot projects’ |
| 3.5 Develop a strategy to increase the supply of a range of relatively more affordable market and non-market housing alternative |
| 3.6 Examine opportunities for using surplus District-owned lands to address identified housing gaps in the community, particularly limited housing choice and affordability |

\(^1\) OCP Policy H 4.1 was adopted in July 2010.
2.3 Metro Vancouver's Regional Growth Strategy

Concurrent with West Vancouver’s efforts to address local housing issues, Metro Vancouver and its member municipalities have increasingly examined what roles they can play to address housing diversity and affordability challenges, both today and in the future. This work evolved into a specific strategy in the new Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy (RGS)²:

“Provide diverse and affordable housing choices”. (RGS Strategy 4.1)

Metro Vancouver’s Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) articulates the respective roles of all four levels of government (i.e., federal, provincial, regional, and municipal) in providing diverse and affordable housing choices within local communities. Federal and Provincial governments and their agencies are called upon to:

- Stimulate private sector investment in rental housing;
- Provide capital funding for low and moderate income housing; and
- Provide capital and operating funding for the development of supportive and transitional housing units.

The RGS identifies a diverse mix of housing types as a fundamental component of ‘complete communities’. This would include a mix of housing types and tenures that respond to an aging population, changing family and household characteristics, and the full range of household incomes and needs across the region.

Under RGS Strategy 4.1, member municipalities are required to prepare and implement a Housing Action Plan, which is to:

- assess local housing market conditions;

---

² Metro Vancouver's Regional Growth Strategy was adopted by the Greater Vancouver Regional District Board on July 29, 2011.
- identify housing priorities;
- identify possible implementation measures to address local housing issues within the jurisdiction and financial capability of the municipality;
- identify possible actions to encourage the supply of new rental housing and where appropriate mitigate or limit the loss of the existing rental housing stock; and
- identify opportunities to participate with other levels of government to secure additional affordable housing to meet housing needs across the affordable housing continuum.

West Vancouver's Housing Action Plan builds on the work undertaken during the 2004 OCP update and the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing, and will be used to:

- continue the 'dialogue' on housing issues and opportunities in the community;
- clarify West Vancouver's goals for housing diversity and affordability; and
- identify possible local government actions to address these goals and establish priorities for the District.
3.0 UNDERSTANDING WEST VANCOUVER

Prior to the 1950s, most homes built in West Vancouver were single-detached dwellings, which reflected a community largely comprised of traditional families living in a low-density, suburban context. Since that time, West Vancouver’s population profile has become more diverse, and is characterized by a greater proportion of seniors, and a trend towards smaller household size.

An informed discussion on housing issues and opportunities in West Vancouver requires a thorough understanding of how the community has changed, and how it will continue to change based on key population and housing trends. This section provides a summary of these trends from the following sources:

- “Facts and Stats: Our Community by the Numbers”, a comprehensive demographic profile of West Vancouver;
- Metro Vancouver’s “Housing Data Book” and “Regional Growth Strategy”; and
- “Metro Vancouver’s Purpose Built Rental Housing: Inventory and Risk Analysis” (Coriolis Consulting Corp., April 2012).

3.1 Population

Compared to several decades ago, West Vancouver has a greater proportion of older residents, and a smaller proportion of young and middle age adults. This is also reflected in the median\(^3\) age of West Vancouver residents. In 2006, the median age was 48 and in 2011 the median age was 50; in contrast to Metro Vancouver with a median age of 40 in both 2006 and 2011.

\(^3\) Median age is the point at which half the population is over that age and half is below.
Census data also tells us that, as of 2011, 25% of West Vancouver residents (10,865 people) were age 65 or older, compared to 13% in Metro Vancouver.

Projected Population Age Distribution in the West Vancouver Local Health Area

---

4 The West Vancouver Local Health Area (WVLHA) includes Bowen Island, Lions Bay and Capilano 5 First Nations Reserve. West Vancouver Municipality represents approximately 85% of the total WVLHA population.
Population projections for the West Vancouver Local Health Area show the following trends over the period 2006 to 2036:

- a decline in the proportion of youth age 10-24
- an increase in the proportion of young adults age 25-39
- a decline in the proportion of middle age adults age 45-64
- continued increase in the proportion of seniors age 65+

The growing proportion of older residents in the community has significant implications for health and social services, recreation, transportation planning, and housing. Access to well-located, low-maintenance, and adaptable/accessible housing that is convenient to community support networks is important to the overall well being and quality of life for many of these residents.

3.2 Housing Mix

In the 1950’s, West Vancouver emerged from a seaside community of summer homes to a growing, residential community characterized by single-detached houses interspersed with parks and schools. During this period of growth, family size and composition were changing; and an ‘urbanization’ trend occurring in Vancouver and surrounding communities. These trends influenced the 1958 OCP policy to allow high-rise apartments in a 50 acre area surrounding the Ambleside commercial centre.

The apartment zoning came into effect in 1959, and close to 1200 new apartment units were built in the 1960’s. This period also saw a significant increase in the number of single detached houses.

In the 1970’s, apartment construction slowed, but approximately 700 units were added during this decade. This was partly due to a reduction in available development sites as well as the cessation of some key federal government rental incentive programs. At the same time, population shifts were occurring, such as decreasing family and household size and shifts in age distribution to fewer school age children and an increasing number of seniors.

Over the last two decades, there has been some change to the distribution of housing by type in West Vancouver. In 1991, the housing mix was 65% single-
detached, 7% duplex/townhouse and 28% apartments; in 2011, the
distribution changed to 58% single detached, 13% duplex/townhouse and
29% apartments. Nevertheless, the basic housing choice has been between a
detached house on its own fee simple lot or an apartment in a multi-family
building. There are few options in between, particularly ground-oriented
housing alternatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-detached house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex or house with suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment, less than five storeys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment, five or more storeys</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3 The Housing Continuum

The housing continuum is a concept used to describe and categorize different
types of housing and related services. On the non-market end of the
continuum are emergency services and transitional housing, which often
require the most public funding, moving towards supportive and subsidized
housing options in the middle of the continuum, and then towards
independent housing options, where housing is provided by the private
market. The continuum implicitly suggests that residents should have the
opportunity to move across the continuum and find the housing that is most
appropriate and best suited to their needs and circumstances.

Increasing the supply and diversity at the higher affordable market end of the
continuum plays an important role in relieving pressure on low cost rental and
subsidized housing, and contributes to overall housing diversity in a
community.

---

5 This change is due in part to changes in Statistics Canada classifications of dwellings. For the
2006 Census, the Structural Type of Dwelling variable was clarified to better identify hard-to-find
dwellings such as basement apartments. As a result, structures that may have been classified in
previous censuses as a single-detached house because there was no outside sign of a second
dwelling unit within the building are more likely to be classified as a duplex in the 2006 and 2011
Census.
In West Vancouver, the housing continuum is represented by:

- 518 non-market seniors-specific units and 32 other non-market housing units (2012 West Vancouver inventory);
- 1,900 purpose-built rental apartments;
- An estimated 1,828 units in the secondary rental market; and
- Based on 2006 Census data, owner occupancy of:
  - 91% of the 9,725 single-detached housing units;
  - 78% of 2,235 ground-oriented multi-family housing units (houses with suites, duplexes and townhouses); and
  - 48% of 4,875 apartments

---

8 The 'secondary' rental market comprises various types of housing that were not specifically built for rental purposes but are being rented out. There are approximately 1,828 secondary rental units in West Vancouver, including: ±826 single-detached houses, ±189 strata units (2009 estimate), and 724 secondary suites (approved as of November 5, 2012).
3.4 Rental Housing

Rental housing in West Vancouver consists of purpose-built rental apartments (the primary rental market) and a secondary rental market comprised of single-detached houses, suites in houses, and rented strata units. This purpose-built rental housing was largely the outcome of a significant rezoning in Ambleside (1959), and federal government incentive programs (1960s-1970s) to support construction of rental housing.

| West Vancouver Existing Purpose Built Rental Inventory by Age of Construction |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **1949 or Older** | **1950-1959** | **1960-1969** | **1970-1979** | **2007** |
| Buildings | Units | Buildings | Units | Buildings | Units | Buildings | Units |
| 1 | 12 | 1 | 4 | 27 | 1149 | 6 | 699 |
| 1 | 16 |

In 2011, Metro Vancouver commissioned Corlolls Consulting Corp. to compile an inventory of purpose-built rental housing in the region; and to identify what portion of the rental stock may be at risk\(^7\) for loss through demolition and redevelopment in six municipalities: Richmond, Surrey, New Westminster, North Vancouver City, North Vancouver District, and West Vancouver. Study findings for West Vancouver indicate that 17% of the total rental stock (309 units in four buildings) is considered currently at risk of loss through redevelopment. This compares to 1.7% (150 units) in New Westminster, 8% (451 units) in Surrey, 23% (1,533 units) in the City of North Vancouver, and 48% (1,078 units) in Richmond\(^8\).

In general, the study found that land values for development sites in West Vancouver are high, which creates redevelopment pressure on the existing

---

\(^7\) 'At risk' in the absence of municipal policies to protect this stock.

\(^8\) Source: "Metro Vancouver Purpose-Built Rental Housing: Inventory and Risk Analysis", Corlolls Consulting Corp., April 2012.
rental housing stock. However, existing rental buildings are generally built to maximum allowable densities which makes the existing buildings valuable, and redevelopment less attractive. The four West Vancouver apartment properties considered currently at risk in West Vancouver are characterized as follows:

- Waterfront rental buildings – the value of waterfront development sites in West Vancouver is very high and the land value exceeds the value of the potential income stream from these rental buildings.
- Rental buildings that are not fully utilizing permitted density will be increasingly at risk if land values for development sites increase at a faster rate than rental building values (as has been the trend).

3.5 Mobility

Data on local population mobility provides insight into whether housing needs in the community are being met through the available housing options, in terms of type, size, and cost. Between 1996 and 2001:

- 79% of younger (age 15-34) and 86% of older (age 55+) residents moving from West Vancouver to elsewhere on the North Shore and Vancouver moved into attached multi-unit housing;
- 70% of residents age 65+ who moved within West Vancouver moved into multi-unit housing.

This suggests that the availability of multi-unit housing such as duplexes, townhouses, and apartments plays a significant role in determining whether young adults and seniors can be accommodated in the community, or must leave to find the right type of housing elsewhere.

3.6 Housing Affordability

Housing affordability\(^9\) is a measure of the cost of housing and the ability for households to meet these costs. According to Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC), housing is affordable if costs do not exceed 30% of a household’s gross income.

\(^9\) Market options are considered "affordable" relative to the typical cost of housing in the community in which they are located.
The discussion of housing affordability in Metro Vancouver municipalities is a challenging one. Given the region’s growing attractiveness as a place to live, a highly constrained supply of land available for development, and high land values in places like West Vancouver, housing is simply not affordable for many residents, particularly in comparison to other Canadian cities.

For West Vancouver, the question is: What can be done to improve relative affordability? Part of the answer lies in increasing the supply and diversity of housing options available along the housing continuum, based on type, size and tenure of housing.

"Core Need” Households

Households in “core need”, as defined by CMHC, occupy housing that is considered inadequate in terms of condition or size, or costs more than 30% of household income; and they are not able to find an affordable alternative.

West Vancouver Households in Core Need, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of Total 15,490 Households in DWV</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of all Renter Households</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of All Owner Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,950</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Metro Vancouver Housing Data Book, 2011

West Vancouver Households in Core Need and Spending at Least Half (INALH)\(^{10}\), 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of total 15,490 Households in DWV</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of all Renter Households</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of All Owner Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Metro Vancouver Housing Data Book, 2011

According to 2006 Census data, approximately half of the West Vancouver households in core need are seniors’ households (65+ years). Further, 53% of households in core need (1,035 households) are considered to have extremely

\(^{10}\) INALH refers to households in core need who are also spending at least half of household income on shelter (INALH)
dire housing circumstances because they are spending at least half of household income on shelter; this group is considered to be at risk of homelessness by Metro Vancouver.

**Housing Costs**

Rental housing costs in West Vancouver are high compared to regional averages, and vacancy rates are among the lowest in Metro Vancouver. The vacancy rate in West Vancouver in 2011 was 0.2% and average monthly rents were $1,478 (for all bedroom types). This compares to 1.4% and $1,027 respectively in Metro Vancouver (CMHC, 2011).

Housing sale prices and construction costs have escalated across the region in recent years. This trend has been particularly pronounced in West Vancouver where the median sale price of a single-detached house was $1,780,000 for the year 2011.

**Income Levels and Housing Costs**

In 2006, West Vancouver's average household income of $155,071 was more than twice the regional average of $73,258. The median household income was $76,893 compared to $55,231 for Metro Vancouver. At the same time,

- one in five West Vancouver households has an annual income less than $30,000 (compared to one in four households in Metro Vancouver);
- 51% of seniors earn less than $30,000 per year; and
- 12% (or 1,510) of families are lone parent families (2011 Census): 79% of these are lone female parents earning half the income of their male counterparts.
- 1,950 or 13% of households in West Vancouver are in "core need" of housing

West Vancouver's high income levels are consistent with its comparatively high rate of home ownership (77% of homes in West Vancouver are owned compared to 65% in the region); and the lower proportion of owners spending 30% or more of household income on housing payments (24% in West Vancouver compared to 27% in the region). However, there is a disparity between income levels and housing costs among West Vancouver tenant
households, 55% of whom spend more than 30% of their household income on rent.

3.7 Summary: Key Housing Challenges

Housing that is appropriate for people of all ages and incomes is an essential component of complete and sustainable communities. Some of the key challenges that the Housing Action Plan for West Vancouver needs to address in order to support housing diversity and affordability in the future include:

1. Addressing Core Housing Need

Most West Vancouver residents are considered well-housed. Nevertheless, Metro Vancouver 2006 data identifies 1,950 households or 13% of all West Vancouver households as being in core need; and approximately half of these are considered to be at risk of homelessness.

Direct provision of housing for core need households is beyond local government resources and is a responsibility rightly vested with the Federal and Provincial Governments. Nevertheless, West Vancouver can play a role in advocating for affordable housing for its most vulnerable households.

2. Housing for Seniors

While many West Vancouver seniors have had to leave West Vancouver to find housing more suitable to their needs, most seniors would like to remain in their community of many years. In order to do so, they need more appropriate housing options to support aging-in-place, and to adapt to changes in their mobility and overall well-being. Appropriate, affordable housing for seniors would include:

- smaller, more manageable housing units
- adaptable design/accessibility features
- rental housing options
- housing that is well-located, in proximity to family, friends, and community services and amenities
3. Housing for Younger and Middle-Aged Households

Past housing initiatives in West Vancouver have been focused on the needs of seniors, and related objectives for accessible / adaptable housing. However, if West Vancouver is to achieve a more balanced social mix, it needs to provide the right size and right type of housing for all residents, including young adults and young families wishing to establish in the community, middle-aged households with or without children, and 'empty-nesters' looking to downsize. Providing a range of affordable, ground-oriented market housing types is central to achieving this.

4. Aging of the Purpose-Built Rental Housing Stock

Retaining West Vancouver’s aging stock of purpose-built rental apartments is critical, as only one purpose-built non-seniors’ rental apartment building (16 units) has been constructed since 1979. The addition of new primary and secondary rental units will be necessary for maintaining a healthy supply of rental housing to support housing choice and relative affordability.

5. Providing New Housing Opportunities in Existing Neighbourhoods

A fundamental challenge for West Vancouver is: How to provide more diverse housing options for residents wishing to remain in their neighbourhoods as their housing needs change over time, while preserving the valued characteristics of those neighbourhoods? This will require a thoughtful examination of various ground-oriented ‘infill’ housing types.
4.0 FROM POLICY TO RECENT ACTIONS

West Vancouver has played a direct role in supporting development of seniors' and rental housing, securing accessible/adaptable housing units, and broadening housing choice through variations in unit size and housing tenure. These actions are described in the following Sections 4.1 through 4.4, both in terms of policy and outcomes.

4.1 Seniors' Housing

*Policy H 10  Support the provision of greater housing options for the District's growing senior population.*

The District of West Vancouver has supported the creation of seniors' housing opportunities through: land acquisition, site assembly, and long-term lease of District-owned lands. Examples include the following:

- Ambleview Place Housing Cooperative (606-14th Street) – 42 units built in 1987 with a 60 year land lease from West Vancouver
- Kiwanis Manor at Kiwanis Garden Village (959-21st Street) – 76 rental units built in 2003 with West Vancouver providing some of the land, and waiving $505,835 in municipal development cost charges
- Hollyburn House (2095 Marine Drive) – 66 rental units built in 1987 with West Vancouver selling part of the site solely for the purpose of seniors housing
- Kiwanis (900 block – 21st Street) – the District waived $818,533 in municipal development cost charges to facilitate two new rental buildings with a net increase of ± 90 units on the Kiwanis site in 2011
- The Westerleigh (725-22nd Street) – 126 rental units (under construction) with a 125 year land lease from West Vancouver

A range of market and non-market housing options exist in West Vancouver for meeting the specific needs of seniors, in terms of housing type, location, services and amenities. These include the following:
Market and Non-Market Housing Options for Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amblesview Place</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Housing Co-op</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capilano Towers</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Subsidized Rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiwanis</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klahanee Park Lodge</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lions Libby Lodge</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyside Manor</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amica Condominiums</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Gardens</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudor Gardens</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiwanis</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Subsidized Rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amica at West Vancouver</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Market Rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollyburn House</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Market Rental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residential Care Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capilano Care Centre</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollyburn House</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inglewood Care Centre</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Vancouver Care Centre</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>563</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Accessible / Adaptable Housing

**Policy H8**  Support the provision of adaptable design in a variety of housing forms.

One quarter of West Vancouver’s population is over 65 years of age, and 15% of the population experiences a physical or health issue which limits their daily activities. A range of housing options that includes adaptable housing, rental, seniors’ specific, and affordable units is essential for ensuring that the overall housing stock supports an age-friendly community.

In addition to seniors’ specific housing, the District has secured adaptable design features (beyond those required by the BC Building Code) in new multi-unit housing developments. Since 2002, this has resulted in 520 new housing
units\textsuperscript{11}, all of which meet the City of Vancouver’s universal accessibility standards, and 430 of which meet the City of North Vancouver’s adaptable design guidelines (either Level 1 or Level 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Pool (5’x8’)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2436 Haywood Avenue</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiwanis (2105-2165 Haywood Avenue)</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerleigh (725 – 22\textsuperscript{nd} Street)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2388 – 2396 Marine Drive</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891 Marine Drive</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6390 Bay Street</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amica at West Vancouver (659 Clyde Avenue)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amica Seniors (605 Clyde Avenue)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiwanis Manor (959 – 21\textsuperscript{st} Street)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water’s Edge (540, 612 and 626 Clyde Avenue)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90 (universal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water’s Edge (540, 612 and 626 Clyde Avenue)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 (Level 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundarave Landing (25\textsuperscript{th} Street &amp; Marine Drive)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Drive (bounded by Park Royal North, Taylor Way and Keith Road)</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>20% of apartments to be Level 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Rental Housing

\textit{Policy H 9} \hspace{1em} Support the provision of rental housing.

- Do not support conversion of rental apartments to strata in buildings greater than four units.
- Explore mechanisms for recognizing secondary suites.
- Consider amenity zoning (bonuses) for rental housing.

Most local governments do not have the financial capability to directly support the development of purpose-built rental housing. However, West Vancouver has utilized the development approval process for larger residential and mixed-use projects to secure a number of new rental housing units; and has enacted measures to protect existing ‘primary’ rental units from

\textsuperscript{11} This total does not include the Evelyn Drive development (not constructed yet).
being converted to strata ownership, and to increase the supply of ‘secondary’ rental units. These actions are described below.

4.3.1 Strata Conversion Policy (1990)

Council is the approving authority for conversion of rental housing to strata. Under section 242(6) of the Strata Property Act, Council must consider a number of factors in reviewing an application for conversion of a previously occupied rental building to strata title, including the priority of rental accommodation over privately owned housing in the community. Where the benefits of privately owned housing or other factors outweigh the potential loss of rental units, it would be reasonable for Council to approve a conversion.

In 1990, the District of West Vancouver adopted a Strata Conversion Policy, which is to “not approve future applications for conversion of existing rental apartments, greater than fourplexes, to non-rental ownership.” This policy enables Council to evaluate potential benefits of strata conversion on a case-by-case basis where the loss of rental units is relatively small, while maintaining a clear policy position on larger buildings which represent more significant losses. No purpose-built rental apartment buildings have been converted to strata-titled ownership since the Strata Conversion Policy was adopted in 1990.

Buildings of four units or less were specifically excluded from the policy, because the 1990 Planning and Land Use Committee of West Vancouver Council considered the apartment conversion issue to be quantitatively and qualitatively different from that of duplexes. Duplex units, albeit small in number, fill a fairly significant need for existing residents who wish to move out of single-detached houses and find alternate forms of housing (regardless of tenure type). However, in 2004, Council did not approve the proposed strata conversion of a duplex, citing concerns over the potential loss of rental housing.

While the Strata Conversion Policy does not address the need for additional rental housing or the potential loss of rental housing through demolition and redevelopment, it has so far prevented conversion of existing rental units to strata ownership.
4.3.2 New Primary Rental Units

Since the OCP was adopted in 2004, new rental housing has been secured as a community benefit in major development projects. These include:

- Dundarave Landing (Marine Drive and 25th Street) – 4 townhouse units to be rental for a period of 10 years from issuance of occupancy permit (built 2007).
- Evelyn Drive (Keith Road and Taylor Way) – 30 rental apartment units in perpetuity (not constructed yet).

4.3.3 Secondary Suites Program (2010)

Secondary suites play a key role in the rental housing market, in the absence of new purpose-built rental accommodation. During the Community Dialogue, there was strong public support for the legalization of secondary suites as a means of improving housing choice and affordability in West Vancouver’s neighbourhoods, without changing the established ‘single-detached’ character.

Under the District’s Secondary Suites Program, which went into effect on March 1st, 2010, property owners are able to legalize an existing suite or construct a new suite. A ‘secondary suite’ is a separate residential unit within a house (usually in the basement); maximum size is the lesser of 968 sq.ft. or 40% of the floor area of the house. In March 2011, the program was expanded to allow for secondary suites in non-owner occupied homes.

Implementation of the secondary suites program has been highly successful. As of November 5, 2012, the District has received a total of 859 applications for legal suites, comprised of: 95 new suites and 764 pre-existing suites. 724 suites have been approved to date. While legalization of existing suites does not increase the rental housing supply; as a result of the legalization process, there is greater assurance of the quality and safety of these units, which is a key objective of this program.
4.4 Housing Diversity

**OCP Principle #3:** “Provide for a diversity of housing types to accommodate a balanced and diverse population in terms of age, ability, income, and household type.”

### 4.4.1 New and Redeveloping Neighbourhoods

**Rodgers Creek Area of the Upper Lands** — The zoning for Rodgers Creek provides for a maximum 736 housing units, with a diversity of housing types to be provided as follows:

- No more than 120 single-family and two-family dwelling units;
- At least 100 cluster or townhouse dwelling units;
- 30% of apartments to be less than 93 m² in size; and
- Apartment units with adaptable design elements are to be included

**Clyde Avenue Area east of Taylor Way** — Under Official Community Plan Policy BF-D 3, a density bonus of up to 0.25 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) may be considered for proposals that provide seniors’ care services, rental accommodations or assisted and congregate care housing. Two projects have been developed under this policy:

- **Amica at West Vancouver** — a seniors market rental supportive housing development of 112 units; and
- **Water’s Edge** — which included 16 rental apartment units in perpetuity in a stand-alone building

**Evelyn Drive Area** — The Evelyn Drive area is centrally located, with Park Royal Shopping Centre to the south, and Taylor Way to the east. The Evelyn Drive Plan and subsequent rezoning to CD1 was undertaken under Official Community Plan Policy H3. This policy provides “that opportunities occur in limited site specific situations where a housing need may be addressed in a manner that is consistent with the Principles of the OCP. This Plan specifies that applications for such site-specific zoning or OCP amendments within a single-family area should apply in limited circumstances and be subject to Council’s Public Involvement Policy and defined criteria.”
The CD1 zoning of the Evelyn Drive Area provides for 56 single-family lots to be redeveloped into 349 housing units, of which at least 210 must be apartments, and 53 must be cluster housing. Further, apartments must have an average size of 93 m², and at least 10% of all apartments must be less than 70 m² in size. Cluster housing units must have an average size of 140 m². In addition, the project will provide for 30 rental units in perpetuity.

4.4.2 Housing Pilot Program

The Community Dialogue confirmed public interest in trying out new ideas through a limited number of ‘pilot projects’. From a housing perspective, this meant an exploration of potential new housing prototypes that would meet community demand for improved housing choice and affordability, and be designed to ‘fit’ with the established character of West Vancouver neighbourhoods.

A citizens’ working group was appointed by Council in 2009, and charged with the task of developing the objectives for the Housing Pilot Program, and undertaking a ‘pilot project’ selection process. In December 2009, Council selected two of four proposals recommended by the working group and staff to proceed as pilot projects in 2010. Both of the selected proposals were put forward by property owners wishing to downsize to a smaller house on their own property. One of these projects has since been withdrawn by the property owner; while the other property owner has yet to finalize a development application.

The Housing Pilot Program has not realized a completed project due, in large part, to uncertainty for participating property owners with regard to: servicing and other construction costs, expectations around the cost of ‘downsizing’, and general uncertainty inherent in the development approval process.

The possibility of future pilot projects should be considered on a case-by-case basis, including whether it may be more feasible to pursue new housing prototypes on surplus District-owned lands, rather than on private property.
4.4.3 Infill Housing Block

On July 4, 2011, Council amended the OCP to establish an ‘infill’ housing designation (future land use) for the 2000-block Esquimalt Avenue (north side) and Fulton Avenue (south side). This block was also designated a Development Permit Area with corresponding form and character guidelines.

Under OCP Policy BF-B13, Council may consider applications for rezoning of individual properties in this block to enable development of ground-oriented infill housing, not exceeding a density of 0.61 Floor Area Ratio (FAR). Infill housing types may include smaller single-family dwellings, coach houses, duplexes, triplexes and combinations thereof.

The first rezoning in this block, approved in tandem with the OCP amendment, is for a mix of duplexes and coach houses (nine units total) on an assembled site of three existing lots on Esquimalt Avenue. This project, known as “Hollyburn Mews” is under construction as of November 2012. A second rezoning application in this block (for a duplex and coach house) has been received and is currently being reviewed by staff.

Rendering of Proposed Coach Houses at “Hollyburn Mews”

While Policy BF-B13 only applies to this single block, development proposals for individual properties will provide opportunities to: consider various types of infill housing; regulate form and character of new development to ensure ‘fit’ within a mixed context of single-detached and multi-unit housing; and further engage the public in a discussion of possible new housing prototypes.
5.0 MOVING FORWARD

West Vancouver has jurisdiction over land use and development within its boundaries, and can implement policy objectives for greater housing diversity through the development approval process. On the larger issue of housing affordability, the District can support the efforts of senior government agencies and non-profit organizations through its land use and development policies, and its approval authority. However, direct provision of housing for core need households is beyond local government resources and is a responsibility rightly vested under the Federal and Provincial Governments.

**Action 1:** Continue established practices for supporting development of seniors' and rental housing, accessible/adaptable housing units, and variations in unit size in new developments

The District of West Vancouver has a long tradition of addressing housing issues in West Vancouver by supporting development of seniors' and rental housing, securing accessible/adaptable housing units, and broadening housing choice through variations in unit size and housing tenure in development projects. It is recommended that these practices be continued as new opportunities arise.

**Action 2:** Consider coach houses following an informed community discussion

District staff receive regular enquiries from residents of all areas of West Vancouver wishing to build a ‘coach house’ on their properties. The common reasons provided by residents are that a coach house would provide them the opportunity to:

- downsize into a smaller housing unit on their own property;
- provide self-contained accommodation for an elderly parent, adult child or on-site caregiver;
- design a custom housing unit for a family member with special needs (e.g., limited mobility); or
- create a detached secondary suite to maintain the privacy of the main dwelling unit.
It is anticipated that a small number of coach houses could be realized in West Vancouver through development proposals in the ‘infill housing block’ (2000-block Esquimalt/Fulton Avenues) and possible pilot projects. In June 2012, Council authorized a broader examination of coach house potential, partly in response to ongoing community interest in this type of housing. This work will include:

- A discussion paper on policy and regulations in other jurisdictions and on lessons learned from the experience of these other jurisdictions – both in Metro Vancouver and communities further afield;
- Community engagement on coach houses; and
- If the engagement program confirms broad public interest in coach houses in West Vancouver, draft policies and regulations would be prepared for Council and community review.

It is anticipated that the discussion paper will be presented to Council in December 2012; followed by community engagement through Spring 2013. Some of the key questions to be considered as part of the coach house examination are:

- What housing gaps could this type of housing fulfill?
- Should coach houses be rental only or should we allow for stratification?
- What would be an appropriate size(s) of unit?
- What are the design considerations?
- What are the potential ‘neighbour’ impacts and how might they be mitigated?
- Should coach houses be allowed…District-wide? Only in certain areas? Or, only under certain conditions?

**Action 3:** Identify, consider and engage the community in a discussion of opportunities to retain and add purpose-built rental housing

Much of West Vancouver’s purpose-built rental housing stock is now 40 to 50 years old, and may become vulnerable to loss through redevelopment.
Council has taken measures to prevent conversion of rental units to strata\textsuperscript{12}, but any of these properties could still be redeveloped under existing zoning. Council has no legal authority to prevent demolition of a rental apartment building, or to require that a redeveloped property remain rental.

An in-depth analysis of West Vancouver’s purpose-built rental housing stock is warranted, and a report to Council is expected in early 2013. This work will:

- Describe West Vancouver’s inventory;
- Review the Metro Vancouver study on the vulnerability of purpose-built rental housing in the region; and
- Identify policy options for retaining the existing rental stock and encouraging development of new purpose-built rental housing.

**Action 4: Strengthen OCP policies on housing diversity to provide a framework for consideration of innovative housing proposals**

The housing policies in the 2004 OCP are focused and limited, in the absence of a comprehensive understanding of housing issues in the community, and residents’ support for various actions to address these. The subsequent 2007-2008 Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing has provided greater depth to the community’s understanding of housing issues and options in West Vancouver.

The District would like to encourage innovative housing proposals that meet defined housing gaps in the community and are sensitive to established neighbourhood character. To provide the necessary framework for considering such proposals, the OCP will need to be amended to clarify and strengthen policies on housing diversity. This policy work would be informed by the findings of the Community Dialogue, along with the District’s past experience in supporting development of seniors’, rental, and accessible/adaptable housing, and new initiatives related to coach houses and purpose-built rental housing.

\textsuperscript{12} 1990 Strata Conversion Policy
**Action 5: Monitor and report annually on the Housing Action Plan**

To maintain awareness of housing issues in West Vancouver and progress being made to improve housing choice and affordability, an annual monitoring report is to be provided. This would provide the basis for any updates of the Housing Action Plan.

Towards this end, staff resources will continue to be allocated to the North Shore Advisory Committee on Disability Issues (ACDI), and to information-gathering and information-sharing (i.e., continuing the ‘dialogue’ on housing).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Action Plan Implementation</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Back to Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report to Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Back to Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Prepare background</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report to Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Back to Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of Staff Task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of Policies/Rules/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Back to Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Follow-Up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Housing Action Plan Implementation (Revised March 4, 2013)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Feb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach Houses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Back to Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose Built Rental Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report to Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Back to Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing Applications for Innovative Housing Proposals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Processing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Bulk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Prepare background Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report to Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Back to Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulevards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of Staff Task Force</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of Policies/Rules/Procedures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Back to Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Follow-Up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COUNCIL REPORT

Date: February 4, 2013
From: Geri Boyle, Manager, Community Planning and Stephen Mikicich, Sr. Community Planner
Subject: Directions from Committee of the Whole Meeting on Neighbourhood Character and Housing Held on January 28, 2013

RECOMMENDED THAT:

1. The Housing Action Plan dated November 2012 be adopted to provide the framework for the Planning Department’s work on housing during 2013-2014; and

2. The District’s 2013-2014 departmental work plans include ‘housing bulk’ and ‘boulevards’ as priority work items as described in the report dated February 4, 2013.

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to outline the key work items related to housing and neighbourhood character, which were identified by Committee members at the Committee of the Whole meeting held on January 28, 2013. Staff is requesting Council’s confirmation that these are the priority actions it would like to see undertaken, in order that departmental work plans for 2013-2014 may be finalized.

1.0 Background

1.1 Prior Resolutions

November 26, 2012 – Council resolved that the Housing Action Plan be made available for community review and comment, and that Council consider the Housing Action Plan, specifically the five recommended actions for addressing housing issues, at a Committee of the Whole meeting in early 2013.

December 10, 2012 – Council resolved that the discussion paper, titled “The Potential for Coach Houses in West Vancouver: A Discussion Paper”, dated November 30, 2012, provide the basis for community engagement on coach houses; and that staff report back to Council at a Committee of the Whole meeting in mid 2013, on the results of the engagement process, including possible directions supported by the Community.
June 25, 2012 — Council received for information the report from the Manager of Community Planning titled “Housing Action Plan”, dated June 12, 2012; and the report from the Manager of Community Planning and Senior Community Planner titled “Transitioning to an Investigation of the Potential of Coach Houses in West Vancouver”, dated June 11, 2012. Further, Council established an examination of ‘coach houses’ as the policy focus for the District’s efforts in exploring new housing types during 2012-2013.

2.0 Balanced Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC INITIATIVES</th>
<th>MILESTONES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.3.1 Implement the recommendations of the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing Working Group | • (Continue with additional) Zoning Bylaw policy rewrites  
• Evolve Pilot Projects Program to emphasize coach houses  
• Develop and implement enhanced boulevard program |
| 2.1.2 Support regional and North Shore planning to advance West Vancouver’s interests | • Commence Regional Context Statement and Housing Action Plan  
• Continue to participate with Metro Vancouver on regional planning issues |

3.0 Analysis

3.1 Discussion

3.1.1 Housing

The proposed Housing Action Plan sets out five key actions for supporting housing diversity and affordability:

1. Continue established practices for supporting development of seniors’ and rental housing, accessible/adaptable housing units, and variations in unit size in new developments;
2. Consider coach houses following an informed community discussion;
3. Identify, consider and engage the community in a discussion of opportunities to retain and add purpose-built rental housing;
4. Strengthen OCP Policies on housing diversity to provide a framework for consideration of innovative housing proposals; and
The Plan was made available for public review and comment through January 2013 and discussed at the Committee of the Whole meeting on January 28, 2013. At the Committee of the Whole meeting, the five key actions for supporting housing diversity and affordability were briefly reviewed by staff, along with:

- The proposed community engagement program for the Coach House examination;
- Current work on purpose-built rental housing; and
- Preliminary information about new applications and proposals under discussion with staff.

On the broader issue of housing diversity, Committee members noted that households in West Vancouver tend to be much larger houses than most people need in order to maximize the value of the property and future return on investment. This is particularly the case in the absence of permitted housing alternatives to the detached, single-family house.

A member of the public pointed to ‘infill housing’ as necessary for providing greater housing options for West Vancouver seniors.

Revisions to the priorities and actions outlined in the proposed Housing Action Plan were not identified by Committee members. Committee members spoke positively to the coach house investigation (Action #2), noting particular concerns about tenure (rental verses ownership), whether coach houses should be allowed throughout the community or only under certain circumstances, and possible neighbourhood impacts. These issues are addressed in the coach house discussion paper, and will be examined during the upcoming community engagement program.

Conclusion

Staff recommends that the Housing Action Plan be adopted in order to:

- provide the framework for the Planning Department’s work on housing during 2013-2014; and
- fulfill part of the requirements under Strategy 4.1 of Metro Vancouver’s Regional Growth Strategy, which is to “provide diverse and affordable housing choices” – under this strategy, member municipalities are to adopt a Regional Context Statement, and to prepare and implement a Housing Action Plan.

As summarized at the meeting, public consultation on coach houses will proceed in winter/spring 2013 with a report back to Council in July 2013. (Appendix B) A report on purpose built rental housing will be presented to Council in July 2013 with consultation in the fall and a report back to Council by the end of 2013. Staff will also continue to process development applications for Innovative Housing types in West Vancouver throughout the year.
3.1.2 Neighbourhood Character and Building Bulk

At the Committee of the Whole Meeting on January 28, 2013, the Committee was provided with an overview presentation on ‘neighbourhood character’ in West Vancouver. The presentation spoke to the key components of ‘character’, and District responses to address the issues from the 1980’s to the present. District responses have included zoning and other regulatory changes, and neighbourhood planning initiatives.

Neighbourhood Character:
Staff noted that ‘neighbourhood character’ consists of four key components: (1) land use; (2) building bulk and how a building ‘fits’ on the land; (3) landscape character; and (4) public realm (i.e., roads and boulevards) character. Neighbourhood character has long been a concern in West Vancouver and, while land use is straightforward, ‘Overall neighbourhood character is difficult to articulate’.

Given that the primary ‘threat’ to established neighbourhood character across West Vancouver is the ongoing construction of large replacement houses (particularly when accompanied by extensive site alteration and changes to abutting boulevards), it is more appropriate to address ‘character’ issues at a District-wide level.

Staff advised that fit with neighbourhood character is a key consideration in the review of all multi-family development applications, and for any single-family dwelling where a zoning variance is requested. There is no ‘character’ review associated with the building permit process as it is outside the authority granted by the Province to municipalities within the permitting process. Therefore, issues related to building bulk are typically addressed through zoning regulations, and have the inherent limitation of ‘general rules’ to cover all situations.

Committee members would like to see greater District control over proposed changes to public boulevards – including strengthening existing guidelines, considering a new boulevard bylaw, and reviewing the approval process for boulevard encroachments.

Building Bulk:
The increasing size and perceived bulk of new houses in West Vancouver has been of concern to West Vancouver residents for over 30 years. New houses are seen as ‘too big’, and the typical construction process can be very long and impactful on neighbouring properties. While a number of actions have been undertaken by the District to address these issues over the years – both through a series of zoning (and other) bylaw amendments and neighbourhood planning initiatives, the ‘large house’ issue and associated construction practices remain the key threats to established neighbourhood character in 2013.

Committee member comments included:
1. identified a need for clarity on the concept of Floor Area Ratio (FAR) — i.e., how floor area is calculated, and what floor area exemptions are permitted under existing single-family residential zoning;

2. expressed an interested in how West Vancouver’s single-family zoning regulations (related to site coverage, building height and massing) compare with those in other municipalities;

3. requested that basement and deck exemptions be examined in detail; and

4. would like to see recommendations for reducing building bulk and preserving vegetation.

Conclusion

Staff recommends that work on neighbourhood character during 2013-2014 focus on ‘building bulk’ and ‘boulevards’, as described below.

New work related to ‘building bulk’ will include a report discussing the concept of ‘bulk’ (actual and perceived), reviewing how bulk is regulated in other municipalities compared to West Vancouver, and presenting possible approaches to address the issue in West Vancouver. (Appendix B) This ‘backgrounder’ report will be presented to Council in late 2013 and made available to the public, forming the basis of community engagement in early 2014, with a report back to Council in spring 2014.

Staff is recommending that in 2013 the ‘boulevard’ focus be on familiarizing Council and the community with the policies, regulations and processes related to boulevard management — this is particularly important as boulevards have been managed by guidelines (rather than a bylaw) for approximately 10 years. (Appendix B) Issues and opportunities provided by the District’s current approach will be identified. Further, this ‘reporting’ should be undertaken by an inter-divisional team: Planning, Land Development and Permits related to the use and treatment of public boulevards fronting private property; Parks and Community Services related to trees; and Engineering and Transportation related to roads and infrastructure in the municipal right-of-way. This inter-divisional task force will be established in early 2013 and report back to Council in early summer 2013 with some interim recommendations and with further follow up intended for the end of 2013.

3.2 Sustainability

Principle #3 in the OCP’s Framework for Action (for creating a sustainable community in West Vancouver) is to provide for a diversity of housing types to accommodate a balanced and diverse population in terms of age, ability, income, and household types.

3.3 Communications Process

Community engagement on coach houses and rental housing during 2013 will
provide an ongoing forum for thoughtful examination of: (1) possible new housing types for improving housing diversity and affordability; and (2) a variety of issues related to neighbourhood character, to ensure proper integration of new housing types in established areas.\(^1\)

Information on housing issues and opportunities in West Vancouver, including the directions from the Community Dialogue, and relevant background materials are posted on: [www.westvancouver.ca/housing](http://www.westvancouver.ca/housing).

A program of community engagement specific to building bulk and boulevards will be determined at a future date.

4.0 **Options**

4.1 Council may

*(as recommended)*

- Adopt the Housing Action Plan to provide the framework for the Planning Department's work on housing during 2013-2014; and

- Direct staff to include 'housing bulk' and 'boulevards' as priority work items for inclusion in 2013-2014 departmental work plans;

*(or, alternatively)*

- Direct staff to address other priorities during 2013-2014; or

- Request further information.

**Author:**

Geri Boyle, Manager, Community Planning

Stephen Mikicich, Senior Community Planner

**Appendices:**

B. Housing Action Plan Implementation

\(^1\) Note: There is a direct correlation between community objectives for greater housing diversity and the preservation of established neighbourhood character through the ability to regulate the form and character of more intensive residential uses (i.e., duplex, infill, and other multi-family housing types).
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1.0 OVERVIEW

A Housing Action Plan provides a local government framework for developing and implementing strategies to address defined housing issues in the community. West Vancouver's Housing Action Plan builds on the work undertaken during the 2004 Official Community Plan (OCP) update and the 2007-2008 Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing. The Plan will be used to:

- continue the 'dialogue' on housing issues and opportunities in the community;
- clarify West Vancouver's goals for housing diversity and affordability; and
- identify possible local government actions to address these goals and establish priorities for the District.

The Housing Action Plan outlines the existing policy framework for housing in West Vancouver, the key housing 'gaps' based on population and demographic trends and the Community Dialogue discussions, and the District's current practices related to housing. Finally, it recommends five actions for moving forward on housing issues, as follows:

1. Continue established practices for supporting development of seniors' and rental housing, accessible/adaptable housing units, and variations in unit size in new developments;
2. Consider coach houses following an informed community discussion;
3. Identify, consider and engage the community in a discussion of opportunities to retain and add purpose-built rental housing;
4. Strengthen OCP Policies on housing diversity to provide a framework for consideration of innovative housing proposals; and
2.0 THE POLICY CONTEXT FOR HOUSING IN WEST VANCOUVER

2.1 Official Community Plan

West Vancouver residents recognize the challenges of managing future change and meeting emerging housing needs, while preserving the highly valued character of West Vancouver’s existing neighbourhoods.

During West Vancouver’s Official Community Plan (OCP) review process (2001-2004), residents identified ‘housing’ as the most important issue for the community. Key concerns included limited housing choice and affordability – particularly for seniors, young adults, and young families. Differing ideas about the underlying issues and how they should be addressed emerged from the OCP review discussion. Consequently, the OCP includes focused and limited policies related to housing choice and affordability; and affirmed the need for more work to understand housing issues and potential actions.

The OCP is founded on eight planning principles for building a sustainable community. Principle #3 is to: “provide for a diversity of housing types to accommodate a balanced and diverse population in terms of age, ability, income, and household type.” Key OCP housing policies are as follows:

Policy H 1 Engage in further dialogue at both a community and local neighbourhood level to develop a full understanding of community trends, desires and related housing needs and potential policies for addressing them.

Policy H 3 (This policy) recognizes that opportunities occur in limited site-specific situations where a housing need may be addressed in a manner that is consistent with the Principles of the OCP. This Plan specifies that applications for such site-specific zoning or OCP amendments within a single-family area should apply in limited circumstances and be subject to Council’s Public Involvement Policy and defined criteria.

Policy H 6 Encourage a variety of housing types in the future neighbourhoods in the Upper Lands.
Policy H8  Support the provision of adaptable design in a variety of housing forms.
  - Consider establishment of adaptable design guidelines.
  - Consider encouraging adaptable design through floor area bonuses.

Policy H9  Support the provision of rental housing.
  - Do not support conversion of rental apartments to strata in buildings greater than four units.
  - Explore mechanisms for recognizing secondary suites.
  - Consider amenity zoning (bonuses) for rental housing.

Policy H10 Support the provision of greater housing options for the District's growing senior population.
  - Examine the potential role of secondary suites in providing additional housing options for seniors.
  - Support the development of home service and assistance programs to allow seniors to remain in their existing homes and neighbourhoods.
  - Support the creation of new senior housing in areas with convenient access to services and transit.

To improve community understanding about housing issues and possible actions, the District undertook two initiatives: (1) the preparation of a series of background reports on demographic and housing trends in West Vancouver, now entitled “Facts and Stats: Our Community by the Numbers”; and (2) a comprehensive public engagement program, called the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing.
2.2 The ‘Community Dialogue’

The Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing was developed and implemented by District staff and a citizens’ working group, and was undertaken over 15 months during 2007-2008. This was a process involving hundreds of West Vancouver residents talking to each other about the future of their neighbourhoods, and issues related to housing choice and affordability. The Community Dialogue provided a forum for engaging the community in developing its own policy directions for housing and neighbourhood character.

Through this process, the District heard that more diverse housing options are needed for:

- Older residents wishing to downsize into smaller, more manageable housing that will allow them to age in place in their own neighbourhoods;
- Younger families and young adults wishing to establish themselves in the community;
- Lower income residents wishing to find more affordable housing options, including rental housing;
- People requiring accessible/adaptable housing, with special features to accommodate their unique requirements; and
- People requiring assisted living and other support to remain in the community.
While not official District policy, the final report and recommendations of the Community Dialogue Working Group (September 2008) provided direction for subsequent District housing initiatives, and new development projects including:

- the examination of possible new ground-oriented housing prototypes through a District-led Housing Pilot Program (per new OCP Policy H 4.1);
- the legalization of secondary suites;
- designation of an ‘infill housing’ block at 21st Street and Esquimalt Avenue; and
- the Rodgers Creek development.

Six of the Working Group’s recommendations pertain specifically to housing choice and affordability:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Amend the OCP, as may be required, to enable consideration of new housing types to meet the current and future needs of West Vancouver residents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.2 | Develop an implementation program for allowing secondary suites, which would:  
  - identify issues around suites;  
  - recommend a process and criteria for legalizing suites; and  
  - provide for amendments to zoning and other bylaws to allow secondary suites. |
| 3.3 | Develop policies and criteria to determine under which conditions ‘infill’ housing would be suitable. |
| 3.4 | Consider a demonstration program to enable introduction of new housing types on a limited basis, in advance of new housing policies and regulatory tools being formally adopted. This process would enable ideas and concepts for new housing types to be explored through a community planning and design process that would include:  
  - study of various housing types and tenures using examples from other communities  
  - community design workshops  
  - possible ‘pilot projects’ |
| 3.5 | Develop a strategy to increase the supply of a range of relatively more affordable market and non-market housing alternative |
| 3.6 | Examine opportunities for using surplus District-owned lands to address identified housing gaps in the community, particularly limited housing choice and affordability |

---

1 OCP Policy H 4.1 was adopted in July 2010.
2.3 Metro Vancouver’s Regional Growth Strategy

Concurrent with West Vancouver’s efforts to address local housing issues, Metro Vancouver and its member municipalities have increasingly examined what roles they can play to address housing diversity and affordability challenges, both today and in the future. This work evolved into a specific strategy in the new Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy (RGS)\(^2\):

"Provide diverse and affordable housing choices". (RGS Strategy 4.1)

Metro Vancouver’s Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) articulates the respective roles of all four levels of government (i.e., federal, provincial, regional, and municipal) in providing diverse and affordable housing choices within local communities. Federal and Provincial governments and their agencies are called upon to:

- Stimulate private sector investment in rental housing;
- Provide capital funding for low and moderate income housing; and
- Provide capital and operating funding for the development of supportive and transitional housing units.

The RGS identifies a diverse mix of housing types as a fundamental component of ‘complete communities’. This would include a mix of housing types and tenures that respond to an aging population, changing family and household characteristics, and the full range of household incomes and needs across the region.

Under RGS Strategy 4.1, member municipalities are required to prepare and implement a Housing Action Plan, which is to:

- assess local housing market conditions;

\(^2\) Metro Vancouver’s Regional Growth Strategy was adopted by the Greater Vancouver Regional District Board on July 29, 2011.
- identify housing priorities;
- identify possible implementation measures to address local housing issues within the jurisdiction and financial capability of the municipality;
- identify possible actions to encourage the supply of new rental housing and where appropriate mitigate or limit the loss of the existing rental housing stock; and
- identify opportunities to participate with other levels of government to secure additional affordable housing to meet housing needs across the affordable housing continuum.

West Vancouver’s Housing Action Plan builds on the work undertaken during the 2004 OCP update and the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing, and will be used to:

- continue the ‘dialogue’ on housing issues and opportunities in the community;
- clarify West Vancouver’s goals for housing diversity and affordability; and
- identify possible local government actions to address these goals and establish priorities for the District.
3.0 UNDERSTANDING WEST VANCOUVER

Prior to the 1950s, most homes built in West Vancouver were single-detached dwellings, which reflected a community largely comprised of traditional families living in a low-density, suburban context. Since that time, West Vancouver’s population profile has become more diverse, and is characterized by a greater proportion of seniors, and a trend towards smaller household size.

An informed discussion on housing issues and opportunities in West Vancouver requires a thorough understanding of how the community has changed, and how it will continue to change based on key population and housing trends. This section provides a summary of these trends from the following sources:

- “Facts and Stats: Our Community by the Numbers”, a comprehensive demographic profile of West Vancouver;
- Metro Vancouver’s “Housing Data Book” and “Regional Growth Strategy”; and
- “Metro Vancouver’s Purpose Built Rental Housing: Inventory and Risk Analysis” (Coriolis Consulting Corp., April 2012).

3.1 Population

Compared to several decades ago, West Vancouver has a greater proportion of older residents, and a smaller proportion of young and middle age adults. This is also reflected in the median\(^3\) age of West Vancouver residents. In 2006, the median age was 48 and in 2011 the median age was 50; in contrast to Metro Vancouver with a median age of 40 in both 2006 and 2011.

\(^3\) Median age is the point at which half the population is over that age and half is below.
Census data also tells us that, as of 2011, 25% of West Vancouver residents (10,865 people) were age 65 or older, compared to 13% in Metro Vancouver.

Projected Population Age Distribution in the West Vancouver Local Health Area\(^4\)

\(^4\) The West Vancouver Local Health Area (WVLHA) includes Bowen Island, Lions Bay and Capilano 5 First Nations Reserve. West Vancouver Municipality represents approximately 85% of the total WVLHA population.
Population projections for the West Vancouver Local Health Area show the following trends over the period 2006 to 2036:

- a decline in the proportion of youth age 10-24
- an increase in the proportion of young adults age 25-39
- a decline in the proportion of middle age adults age 45-64
- continued increase in the proportion of seniors age 65+

The growing proportion of older residents in the community has significant implications for health and social services, recreation, transportation planning, and housing. Access to well-located, low-maintenance, and adaptable/accessible housing that is convenient to community support networks is important to the overall well being and quality of life for many of these residents.

3.2 Housing Mix

In the 1950’s, West Vancouver emerged from a seaside community of summer homes to a growing, residential community characterized by single-detached houses interspersed with parks and schools. During this period of growth, family size and composition were changing; and an ‘urbanization’ trend occurring in Vancouver and surrounding communities. These trends influenced the 1958 OCP policy to allow high-rise apartments in a 50 acre area surrounding the Ambleside commercial centre.

The apartment zoning came into effect in 1959, and close to 1200 new apartment units were built in the 1960’s. This period also saw a significant increase in the number of single detached houses.

In the 1970’s, apartment construction slowed, but approximately 700 units were added during this decade. This was partly due to a reduction in available development sites as well as the cessation of some key federal government rental incentive programs. At the same time, population shifts were occurring, such as decreasing family and household size and shifts in age distribution to fewer school age children and an increasing number of seniors.

Over the last two decades, there has been some change to the distribution of housing by type in West Vancouver. In 1991, the housing mix was 65% single-
detached, 7% duplex/townhouse and 28% apartments; in 2011, the distribution changed to 58% single detached, 13% duplex/townhouse\(^5\) and 29% apartments. Nevertheless, the basic housing choice has been between a detached house on its own fee simple lot or an apartment in a multi-family building. There are few options in between, particularly ground-oriented housing alternatives.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All dwellings</td>
<td>15,130</td>
<td>16,340</td>
<td>16,840</td>
<td>17,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-detached house</td>
<td>9,905</td>
<td>10,290</td>
<td>9,725(^5)</td>
<td>9,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex or house with suite</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1,905(^5)</td>
<td>1,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment, less than five storeys</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>1,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment, five or more storeys</td>
<td>3,205</td>
<td>3,340</td>
<td>3,445</td>
<td>3,445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.3 The Housing Continuum

The housing continuum is a concept used to describe and categorize different types of housing and related services. On the non-market end of the continuum are emergency services and transitional housing, which often require the most public funding, moving towards supportive and subsidized housing options in the middle of the continuum, and then towards independent housing options, where housing is provided by the private market. The continuum implicitly suggests that residents should have the opportunity to move across the continuum and find the housing that is most appropriate and best suited to their needs and circumstances.

Increasing the supply and diversity at the higher affordable market end of the continuum plays an important role in relieving pressure on low cost rental and subsidized housing, and contributes to overall housing diversity in a community.

---

\(^5\) This change is due in part to changes in Statistics Canada classifications of dwellings. For the 2006 Census, the Structural Type of Dwelling variable was clarified to better identify hard-to-find dwellings such as basement apartments. As a result, structures that may have been classified in previous censuses as a single-detached house because there was no outside sign of a second dwelling unit within the building are more likely to be classified as a duplex in the 2006 and 2011 Census.
In West Vancouver, the housing continuum is represented by:

- 518 non-market seniors-specific units and 32 other non-market housing units (2012 West Vancouver inventory);
- 1,900 purpose-built rental apartments;
- An estimated 1,828 units in the secondary rental market\(^6\); and
- Based on 2006 Census data, owner occupancy of:
  - 91% of the 9,725 single-detached housing units;
  - 78% of 2,235 ground-oriented multi-family housing units (houses with suites, duplexes and townhouses); and
  - 48% of 4,875 apartments

---

\(^6\) The 'secondary' rental market comprises various types of housing that were not specifically built for rental purposes but are being rented out. There are approximately 1,828 secondary rental units in West Vancouver, including: ±926 single-detached houses, ±189 strata units (2009 estimate), and 724 secondary suites (approved as of November 5, 2012).
3.4 Rental Housing

Rental housing in West Vancouver consists of purpose-built rental apartments (the primary rental market) and a secondary rental market comprised of single-detached houses, suites in houses, and rented strata units. This purpose-built rental housing was largely the outcome of a significant rezoning in Ambleside (1959), and federal government incentive programs (1960s-1970s) to support construction of rental housing.

West Vancouver Existing Purpose Built Rental Inventory by Age of Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2011, Metro Vancouver commissioned Coriolis Consulting Corp. to compile an inventory of purpose-built rental housing in the region; and to identify what portion of the rental stock may be at risk\(^7\) for loss through demolition and redevelopment in six municipalities: Richmond, Surrey, New Westminster, North Vancouver City, North Vancouver District, and West Vancouver. Study findings for West Vancouver indicate that 17% of the total rental stock (309 units in four buildings) is considered currently at risk of loss through redevelopment. This compares to 1.7% (150 units) in New Westminster, 8% (451 units) in Surrey, 23% (1,533 units) in the City of North Vancouver, and 48% (1,078 units) in Richmond\(^8\).

In general, the study found that land values for development sites in West Vancouver are high, which creates redevelopment pressure on the existing

---

\(^7\) 'At risk' in the absence of municipal policies to protect this stock.

\(^8\) Source: "Metro Vancouver Purpose-Built Rental Housing: Inventory and Risk Analysis", Coriolis Consulting Corp., April 2012.
rental housing stock. However, existing rental buildings are generally built to
maximum allowable densities which makes the existing buildings valuable, and
redevelopment less attractive. The four West Vancouver apartment
properties considered currently at risk in West Vancouver are characterized as
follows:

- Waterfront rental buildings – the value of waterfront development sites
  in West Vancouver is very high and the land value exceeds the value of
  the potential income stream from these rental buildings.
- Rental buildings that are not fully utilizing permitted density will be
  increasingly at risk if land values for development sites increase at a
  faster rate than rental building values (as has been the trend).

3.5 Mobility

Data on local population mobility provides insight into whether housing needs
in the community are being met through the available housing options, in
terms of type, size, and cost. Between 1996 and 2001:

- 79% of younger (age 15-34) and 86% of older (age 55+) residents moving
  from West Vancouver to elsewhere on the North Shore and Vancouver
  moved into attached multi-unit housing;
- 70% of residents age 65+ who moved within West Vancouver moved into
  multi-unit housing.

This suggests that the availability of multi-unit housing such as duplexes,
townhouses, and apartments plays a significant role in determining whether
young adults and seniors can be accommodated in the community, or must
leave to find the right type of housing elsewhere.

3.6 Housing Affordability

Housing affordability⁹ is a measure of the cost of housing and the ability for
households to meet these costs. According to Canada Mortgage and Housing
Corporation (CMHC), housing is affordable if costs do not exceed 30% of a
household’s gross income.

---

⁹ Market options are considered “affordable” relative to the typical cost of housing in the
community in which they are located.
The discussion of housing affordability in Metro Vancouver municipalities is a challenging one. Given the region’s growing attractiveness as a place to live, a highly constrained supply of land available for development, and high land values in places like West Vancouver, housing is simply not affordable for many residents, particularly in comparison to other Canadian cities.

For West Vancouver, the question is: What can be done to improve relative affordability? Part of the answer lies in increasing the supply and diversity of housing options available along the housing continuum, based on type, size and tenure of housing.

"Core Need" Households

Households in "core need", as defined by CMHC, occupy housing that is considered inadequate in terms of condition or size, or costs more than 30% of household income; and they are not able to find an affordable alternative.

**West Vancouver Households in Core Need, 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Households in Core Need in West Vancouver (DWV)</th>
<th>Renter Households in Core Need</th>
<th>Owner Households in Core Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number % of Total 15,490 Households in DWV</td>
<td>Number % of all Renter Households</td>
<td>Number % of All Owner Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,950 13%</td>
<td>1,005 30%</td>
<td>945 8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Metro Vancouver Housing Data Book, 2011

**West Vancouver Households in INALH and Spending at Least Half (INALH)¹⁰, 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Households in INALH in West Vancouver (DWV)</th>
<th>Renter Households in INALH</th>
<th>Owner Households in INALH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number % of total 15,490 Households in DWV</td>
<td>Number % of all Renter Households</td>
<td>Number % of All Owner Households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,035 7%</td>
<td>585 17%</td>
<td>450 4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Metro Vancouver Housing Data Book, 2011

According to 2006 Census data, approximately half of the West Vancouver households in core need are seniors’ households (65+ years). Further, 53% of households in core need (1,035 households) are considered to have extremely

¹⁰ INALH refers to households in core need who are also spending at least half of household income on shelter (INALH)
dire housing circumstances because they are spending at least half of household income on shelter; this group is considered to be at risk of homelessness by Metro Vancouver.

**Housing Costs**

Rental housing costs in West Vancouver are high compared to regional averages, and vacancy rates are among the lowest in Metro Vancouver. The vacancy rate in West Vancouver in 2011 was 0.2% and average monthly rents were $1,478 (for all bedroom types). This compares to 1.4% and $1,027 respectively in Metro Vancouver (CMHC, 2011).

Housing sale prices and construction costs have escalated across the region in recent years. This trend has been particularly pronounced in West Vancouver where the median sale price of a single-detached house was $1,780,000 for the year 2011.

**Income Levels and Housing Costs**

In 2006, West Vancouver’s average household income of $155,071 was more than twice the regional average of $73,258. The median household income was $76,893 compared to $55,231 for Metro Vancouver. At the same time,

- one in five West Vancouver households has an annual income less than $30,000 (compared to one in four households in Metro Vancouver);
- 51% of seniors earn less than $30,000 per year; and
- 12% (or 1,510) of families are lone parent families (2011 Census): 79% of these are lone female parents earning half the income of their male counterparts.
- 1,950 or 13% of households in West Vancouver are in “core need” of housing.

West Vancouver’s high income levels are consistent with its comparatively high rate of home ownership (77% of homes in West Vancouver are owned compared to 65% in the region); and the lower proportion of owners spending 30% or more of household income on housing payments (24% in West Vancouver compared to 27% in the region). However, there is a disparity between income levels and housing costs among West Vancouver tenant
households, 55% of whom spend more than 30% of their household income on rent.

3.7 Summary: Key Housing Challenges

Housing that is appropriate for people of all ages and incomes is an essential component of complete and sustainable communities. Some of the key challenges that the Housing Action Plan for West Vancouver needs to address in order to support housing diversity and affordability in the future include:

1. Addressing Core Housing Need

Most West Vancouver residents are considered well-housed. Nevertheless, Metro Vancouver 2006 data identifies 1,950 households or 13% of all West Vancouver households as being in core need; and approximately half of these are considered to be at risk of homelessness.

Direct provision of housing for core need households is beyond local government resources and is a responsibility rightly vested with the Federal and Provincial Governments. Nevertheless, West Vancouver can play a role in advocating for affordable housing for its most vulnerable households.

2. Housing for Seniors

While many West Vancouver seniors have had to leave West Vancouver to find housing more suitable to their needs, most seniors would like to remain in their community of many years. In order to do so, they need more appropriate housing options to support aging-in-place, and to adapt to changes in their mobility and overall well-being. Appropriate, affordable housing for seniors would include:

- smaller, more manageable housing units
- adaptable design/accessibility features
- rental housing options
- housing that is well-located, in proximity to family, friends, and community services and amenities
• access to in-house or community-based services to support independent living

3. **Housing for Younger and Middle-Aged Households**

Past housing initiatives in West Vancouver have been focused on the needs of seniors, and related objectives for accessible / adaptable housing. However, if West Vancouver is to achieve a more balanced social mix, it needs to provide the right size and right type of housing for all residents, including: young adults and young families wishing to establish in the community, middle-aged households with or without children, and ‘empty-nesters’ looking to downsize. Providing a range of affordable, ground-oriented market housing types is central to achieving this.

4. **Aging of the Purpose-Built Rental Housing Stock**

Retaining West Vancouver’s aging stock of purpose-built rental apartments is critical, as only one purpose-built non-seniors’ rental apartment building (16 units) has been constructed since 1979. The addition of new primary and secondary rental units will be necessary for maintaining a healthy supply of rental housing to support housing choice and relative affordability.

5. **Providing New Housing Opportunities in Existing Neighbourhoods**

A fundamental challenge for West Vancouver is: How to provide more diverse housing options for residents wishing to remain in their neighbourhoods as their housing needs change over time, while preserving the valued characteristics of those neighbourhoods? This will require a thoughtful examination of various ground-oriented ‘infill’ housing types.
4.0 FROM POLICY TO RECENT ACTIONS

West Vancouver has played a direct role in supporting development of seniors’ and rental housing, securing accessible/adaptable housing units, and broadening housing choice through variations in unit size and housing tenure. These actions are described in the following Sections 4.1 through 4.4, both in terms of policy and outcomes.

4.1 Seniors’ Housing

_Policy H 10 Support the provision of greater housing options for the District’s growing senior population._

The District of West Vancouver has supported the creation of seniors’ housing opportunities through: land acquisition, site assembly, and long-term lease of District-owned lands. Examples include the following:

- Ambleview Place Housing Cooperative (606-14<sup>th</sup> Street) – 42 units built in 1987 with a 60 year land lease from West Vancouver
- Kiwanis Manor at Kiwanis Garden Village (959-21<sup>st</sup> Street) – 76 rental units built in 2003 with West Vancouver providing some of the land, and waiving $505,835 in municipal development cost charges
- Hollyburn House (2095 Marine Drive) – 66 rental units built in 1987 with West Vancouver selling part of the site solely for the purpose of seniors housing
- Kiwanis (900 block – 21<sup>st</sup> Street) – the District waived $818,533 in municipal development cost charges to facilitate two new rental buildings with a net increase of ± 90 units on the Kiwanis site in 2011
- The Westerleigh (725-22<sup>nd</sup> Street) – 126 rental units (under construction) with a 125 year land lease from West Vancouver

A range of market and non-market housing options exist in West Vancouver for meeting the specific needs of seniors, in terms of housing type, location, services and amenities. These include the following:
### Market and Non-Market Housing Options for Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambleview Place</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Housing Co-op</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capilano Towers</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Subsidized Rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiwanis</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klahanee Park Lodge</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lions Libby Lodge</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyside Manor</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>442</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amica Condominiums</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Gardens</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudor Gardens</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kiwanis</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Subsidized Rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amica at West Vancouver</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Market Rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollyburn House</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Market Rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>254</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Residential Care Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capilano Care Centre</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollyburn House</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inglewood Care Centre</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Vancouver Care Centre</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>563</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.2 Accessible / Adaptable Housing

**Policy H8**  
*Support the provision of adaptable design in a variety of housing forms.*

One quarter of West Vancouver’s population is over 65 years of age, and 15% of the population experiences a physical or health issue which limits their daily activities. A range of housing options that includes adaptable housing, rental, seniors’ specific, and affordable units is essential for ensuring that the overall housing stock supports an age-friendly community.

In addition to seniors’ specific housing, the District has secured adaptable design features (beyond those required by the BC Building Code) in new multi-unit housing developments. Since 2002, this has resulted in 520 new housing...
units\textsuperscript{11}, all of which meet the City of Vancouver’s universal accessibility standards, and 430 of which meet the City of North Vancouver’s adaptable design guidelines (either Level 1 or Level 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th># of Adaptable / Accessible Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2436 Haywood Avenue</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiwanis (2105-2165 Haywood Avenue)</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerleigh (725 – 22\textsuperscript{nd} Street)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2388 – 2396 Marine Drive</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891 Marine Drive</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6390 Bay Street</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amica at West Vancouver (659 Clyde Avenue)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amica Seniors (605 Clyde Avenue)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiwanis Manor (959 – 21\textsuperscript{st} Street)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water’s Edge (540, 612 and 626 Clyde Avenue)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90 (universal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 (Level 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundarave Landing (25\textsuperscript{th} Street &amp; Marine Drive)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Drive (bounded by Park Royal North, Taylor Way and Keith Road)</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>20% of apartments to be Level 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Rental Housing

Policy H 9  Support the provision of rental housing.

- Do not support conversion of rental apartments to strata in buildings greater than four units.
- Explore mechanisms for recognizing secondary suites.
- Consider amenity zoning (bonuses) for rental housing.

Most local governments do not have the financial capability to directly support the development of purpose-built rental housing. However, West Vancouver has utilized the development approval process for larger residential and mixed-use projects to secure a number of new rental housing units; and has enacted measures to protect existing ‘primary’ rental units from

\textsuperscript{11} This total does not include the Evelyn Drive development (not constructed yet).
being converted to strata ownership, and to increase the supply of ‘secondary’ rental units. These actions are described below.

4.3.1 Strata Conversion Policy (1990)

Council is the approving authority for conversion of rental housing to strata. Under section 242(6) of the Strata Property Act, Council must consider a number of factors in reviewing an application for conversion of a previously occupied rental building to strata title, including the priority of rental accommodation over privately owned housing in the community. Where the benefits of privately owned housing or other factors outweigh the potential loss of rental units, it would be reasonable for Council to approve a conversion.

In 1990, the District of West Vancouver adopted a Strata Conversion Policy, which is to “not approve future applications for conversion of existing rental apartments, greater than fourplexes, to non-rental ownership.” This policy enables Council to evaluate potential benefits of strata conversion on a case-by-case basis where the loss of rental units is relatively small, while maintaining a clear policy position on larger buildings which represent more significant losses. No purpose-built rental apartment buildings have been converted to strata-titled ownership since the Strata Conversion Policy was adopted in 1990.

Buildings of four units or less were specifically excluded from the policy, because the 1990 Planning and Land Use Committee of West Vancouver Council considered the apartment conversion issue to be quantitatively and qualitatively different from that of duplexes. Duplex units, albeit small in number, fill a fairly significant need for existing residents who wish to move out of single-detached houses and find alternate forms of housing (regardless of tenure type). However, in 2004, Council did not approve the proposed strata conversion of a duplex, citing concerns over the potential loss of rental housing.

While the Strata Conversion Policy does not address the need for additional rental housing or the potential loss of rental housing through demolition and redevelopment, it has so far prevented conversion of existing rental units to strata ownership.
4.3.2 New Primary Rental Units

Since the OCP was adopted in 2004, new rental housing has been secured as a community benefit in major development projects. These include:

- Dundarave Landing (Marine Drive and 25th Street) – 4 townhouse units to be rental for a period of 10 years from issuance of occupancy permit (built 2007).
- Evelyn Drive (Keith Road and Taylor Way) – 30 rental apartment units in perpetuity (not constructed yet).

4.3.3 Secondary Suites Program (2010)

Secondary suites play a key role in the rental housing market, in the absence of new purpose-built rental accommodation. During the Community Dialogue, there was strong public support for the legalization of secondary suites as a means of improving housing choice and affordability in West Vancouver’s neighbourhoods, without changing the established ‘single-detached’ character.

Under the District’s Secondary Suites Program, which went into effect on March 1st, 2010, property owners are able to legalize an existing suite or construct a new suite. A ‘secondary suite’ is a separate residential unit within a house (usually in the basement); maximum size is the lesser of 968 sq.ft. or 40% of the floor area of the house. In March 2011, the program was expanded to allow for secondary suites in non-owner occupied homes.

Implementation of the secondary suites program has been highly successful. As of November 5, 2012, the District has received a total of 859 applications for legal suites, comprised of: 95 new suites and 764 pre-existing suites. 724 suites have been approved to date. While legalization of existing suites does not increase the rental housing supply; as a result of the legalization process, there is greater assurance of the quality and safety of these units, which is a key objective of this program.
4.4 Housing Diversity

OCP Principle #3: "Provide for a diversity of housing types to accommodate a balanced and diverse population in terms of age, ability, income, and household type."

4.4.1 New and Redeveloping Neighbourhoods

Rodgers Creek Area of the Upper Lands – The zoning for Rodgers Creek provides for a maximum 736 housing units, with a diversity of housing types to be provided as follows:

- No more than 120 single-family and two-family dwelling units;
- At least 100 cluster or townhouse dwelling units;
- 30% of apartments to be less than 93 m² in size; and
- Apartment units with adaptable design elements are to be included.

Clyde Avenue Area east of Taylor Way – Under Official Community Plan Policy BF-D 3, a density bonus of up to 0.25 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) may be considered for proposals that provide seniors' care services, rental accommodations or assisted and congregate care housing. Two projects have been developed under this policy:

- Amica at West Vancouver – a seniors market rental supportive housing development of 112 units; and
- Water's Edge – which included 16 rental apartment units in perpetuity in a stand-alone building.

Evelyn Drive Area – The Evelyn Drive area is centrally located, with Park Royal Shopping Centre to the south, and Taylor Way to the east. The Evelyn Drive Plan and subsequent rezoning to CD1 was undertaken under Official Community Plan Policy H3. This policy provides "that opportunities occur in limited site specific situations where a housing need may be addressed in a manner that is consistent with the Principles of the OCP. This Plan specifies that applications for such site-specific zoning or OCP amendments within a single-family area should apply in limited circumstances and be subject to Council’s Public Involvement Policy and defined criteria."
The CD1 zoning of the Evelyn Drive Area provides for 56 single-family lots to be redeveloped into 349 housing units, of which at least 210 must be apartments, and 53 must be cluster housing. Further, apartments must have an average size of 93 m², and at least 10% of all apartments must be less than 70 m² in size. Cluster housing units must have an average size of 140 m². In addition, the project will provide for 30 rental units in perpetuity.

4.4.2 Housing Pilot Program

The Community Dialogue confirmed public interest in trying out new ideas through a limited number of ‘pilot projects’. From a housing perspective, this meant an exploration of potential new housing prototypes that would meet community demand for improved housing choice and affordability, and be designed to ‘fit’ with the established character of West Vancouver neighbourhoods.

A citizens’ working group was appointed by Council in 2009, and charged with the task of developing the objectives for the Housing Pilot Program, and undertaking a ‘pilot project’ selection process. In December 2009, Council selected two of four proposals recommended by the working group and staff to proceed as pilot projects in 2010. Both of the selected proposals were put forward by property owners wishing to downsize to a smaller house on their own property. One of these projects has since been withdrawn by the property owner; while the other property owner has yet to finalize a development application.

The Housing Pilot Program has not realized a completed project due, in large part, to uncertainty for participating property owners with regard to: servicing and other construction costs, expectations around the cost of ‘downsizing’, and general uncertainty inherent in the development approval process.

The possibility of future pilot projects should be considered on a case-by-case basis, including whether it may be more feasible to pursue new housing prototypes on surplus District-owned lands, rather than on private property.
4.4.3 Infill Housing Block

On July 4, 2011, Council amended the OCP to establish an ‘infill’ housing designation (future land use) for the 2000-block Esquimalt Avenue (north side) and Fulton Avenue (south side). This block was also designated a Development Permit Area with corresponding form and character guidelines.

Under OCP Policy BF-B13, Council may consider applications for rezoning of individual properties in this block to enable development of ground-oriented infill housing, not exceeding a density of 0.61 Floor Area Ratio (FAR). Infill housing types may include smaller single-family dwellings, coach houses, duplexes, triplexes and combinations thereof.

The first rezoning in this block, approved in tandem with the OCP amendment, is for a mix of duplexes and coach houses (nine units total) on an assembled site of three existing lots on Esquimalt Avenue. This project, known as “Hollyburn Mews” is under construction as of November 2012. A second rezoning application in this block (for a duplex and coach house) has been received and is currently being reviewed by staff.

Rendering of Proposed Coach Houses at “Hollyburn Mews”

While Policy BF-B13 only applies to this single block, development proposals for individual properties will provide opportunities to: consider various types of infill housing; regulate form and character of new development to ensure ‘fit’ within a mixed context of single-detached and multi-unit housing; and further engage the public in a discussion of possible new housing prototypes.
5.0 MOVING FORWARD

West Vancouver has jurisdiction over land use and development within its boundaries, and can implement policy objectives for greater housing diversity through the development approval process. On the larger issue of housing affordability, the District can support the efforts of senior government agencies and non-profit organizations through its land use and development policies, and its approval authority. However, direct provision of housing for core need households is beyond local government resources and is a responsibility rightly vested under the Federal and Provincial Governments.

Action 1: Continue established practices for supporting development of seniors’ and rental housing, accessible/adaptable housing units, and variations in unit size in new developments

The District of West Vancouver has a long tradition of addressing housing issues in West Vancouver by supporting development of seniors’ and rental housing, securing accessible/adaptable housing units, and broadening housing choice through variations in unit size and housing tenure in development projects. It is recommended that these practices be continued as new opportunities arise.

Action 2: Consider coach houses following an informed community discussion

District staff receive regular enquiries from residents of all areas of West Vancouver wishing to build a ‘coach house’ on their properties. The common reasons provided by residents are that a coach house would provide them the opportunity to:

- downsize into a smaller housing unit on their own property;
- provide self-contained accommodation for an elderly parent, adult child or on-site caregiver;
- design a custom housing unit for a family member with special needs (e.g., limited mobility); or
- create a detached secondary suite to maintain the privacy of the main dwelling unit.
It is anticipated that a small number of coach houses could be realized in West Vancouver through development proposals in the ‘infill housing block’ (2000-block Esquimalt/Fulton Avenues) and possible pilot projects. In June 2012, Council authorized a broader examination of coach house potential, partly in response to ongoing community interest in this type of housing. This work will include:

- A discussion paper on policy and regulations in other jurisdictions and on lessons learned from the experience of these other jurisdictions – both in Metro Vancouver and communities further afield;
- Community engagement on coach houses; and
- If the engagement program confirms broad public interest in coach houses in West Vancouver, draft policies and regulations would be prepared for Council and community review.

It is anticipated that the discussion paper will be presented to Council in December 2012; followed by community engagement through Spring 2013. Some of the key questions to be considered as part of the coach house examination are:

- What housing gaps could this type of housing fulfill?
- Should coach houses be rental only or should we allow for stratification?
- What would be an appropriate size(s) of unit?
- What are the design considerations?
- What are the potential ‘neighbour’ impacts and how might they be mitigated?
- Should coach houses be allowed...District-wide? Only in certain areas? Or, only under certain conditions?

**Action 3: Identify, consider and engage the community in a discussion of opportunities to retain and add purpose-built rental housing**

Much of West Vancouver’s purpose-built rental housing stock is now 40 to 50 years old, and may become vulnerable to loss through redevelopment.
Council has taken measures to prevent conversion of rental units to strata\textsuperscript{12}, but any of these properties could still be redeveloped under existing zoning. Council has no legal authority to prevent demolition of a rental apartment building, or to require that a redeveloped property remain rental.

An in-depth analysis of West Vancouver's purpose-built rental housing stock is warranted, and a report to Council is expected in early 2013. This work will:

- Describe West Vancouver's inventory;
- Review the Metro Vancouver study on the vulnerability of purpose-built rental housing in the region; and
- Identify policy options for retaining the existing rental stock and encouraging development of new purpose-built rental housing.

\textbf{Action 4: Strengthen OCP policies on housing diversity to provide a framework for consideration of innovative housing proposals}

The housing policies in the 2004 OCP are focused and limited, in the absence of a comprehensive understanding of housing issues in the community, and residents' support for various actions to address these. The subsequent 2007-2008 Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing has provided greater depth to the community's understanding of housing issues and options in West Vancouver.

The District would like to encourage innovative housing proposals that meet defined housing gaps in the community and are sensitive to established neighbourhood character. To provide the necessary framework for considering such proposals, the OCP will need to be amended to clarify and strengthen policies on housing diversity. This policy work would be informed by the findings of the Community Dialogue, along with the District's past experience in supporting development of seniors', rental, and accessible/adaptable housing, and new initiatives related to coach houses and purpose-built rental housing.

\textsuperscript{12} 1990 Strata Conversion Policy
Action 5: Monitor and report annually on the Housing Action Plan

To maintain awareness of housing issues in West Vancouver and progress being made to improve housing choice and affordability, an annual monitoring report is to be provided. This would provide the basis for any updates of the Housing Action Plan.

Towards this end, staff resources will continue to be allocated to the North Shore Advisory Committee on Disability Issues (ACDI), and to information-gathering and information-sharing (i.e., continuing the 'dialogue' on housing).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Action Plan Implementation</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coach Houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Back to Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose Built Rental Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report to Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Back to Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processing Applications for Innovative Housing Proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Bulk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Prepare background Report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report to Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Back to Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulevards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of Staff Task Force</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification of Policies/Rules/ Procedures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Back to Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Follow-Up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.0 OVERVIEW

A Housing Action Plan provides a local government framework for developing and implementing strategies to address defined housing issues in the community. West Vancouver's Housing Action Plan builds on the work undertaken during the 2004 Official Community Plan (OCP) update and the 2007-2008 Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing. The Plan will be used to:

- continue the ‘dialogue’ on housing issues and opportunities in the community;
- clarify West Vancouver's goals for housing diversity and affordability; and
- identify possible local government actions to address these goals and establish priorities for the District.

The Housing Action Plan outlines the existing policy framework for housing in West Vancouver, the key housing ‘gaps’ based on population and demographic trends and the Community Dialogue discussions, and the District’s current practices related to housing. Finally, it recommends five actions for moving forward on housing issues, as follows:

1. Continue established practices for supporting development of seniors’ and rental housing, accessible/adaptable housing units, and variations in unit size in new developments;
2. Consider coach houses following an informed community discussion;
3. Identify, consider and engage the community in a discussion of opportunities to retain and add purpose-built rental housing;
4. Strengthen OCP Policies on housing diversity to provide a framework for consideration of innovative housing proposals; and
2.0 THE POLICY CONTEXT FOR HOUSING IN WEST VANCOUVER

2.1 Official Community Plan

West Vancouver residents recognize the challenges of managing future change and meeting emerging housing needs, while preserving the highly valued character of West Vancouver’s existing neighbourhoods.

During West Vancouver’s Official Community Plan (OCP) review process (2001-2004), residents identified ‘housing’ as the most important issue for the community. Key concerns included limited housing choice and affordability—particularly for seniors, young adults, and young families. Differing ideas about the underlying issues and how they should be addressed emerged from the OCP review discussion. Consequently, the OCP includes focused and limited policies related to housing choice and affordability; and affirmed the need for more work to understand housing issues and potential actions.

The OCP is founded on eight planning principles for building a sustainable community. Principle #3 is to: “provide for a diversity of housing types to accommodate a balanced and diverse population in terms of age, ability, income, and household type.” Key OCP housing policies are as follows:

Policy H 1 Engage in further dialogue at both a community and local neighbourhood level to develop a full understanding of community trends, desires and related housing needs and potential policies for addressing them.

Policy H 3 (This policy) recognizes that opportunities occur in limited site-specific situations where a housing need may be addressed in a manner that is consistent with the Principles of the OCP. This Plan specifies that applications for such site-specific zoning or OCP amendments within a single-family area should apply in limited circumstances and be subject to Council’s Public Involvement Policy and defined criteria.

Policy H 6 Encourage a variety of housing types in the future neighbourhoods in the Upper Lands.
**Policy H8**  Support the provision of adaptable design in a variety of housing forms.
- Consider establishment of adaptable design guidelines.
- Consider encouraging adaptable design through floor area bonuses.

**Policy H9**  Support the provision of rental housing.
- Do not support conversion of rental apartments to strata in buildings greater than four units.
- Explore mechanisms for recognizing secondary suites.
- Consider amenity zoning (bonuses) for rental housing.

**Policy H10**  Support the provision of greater housing options for the District's growing senior population.
- Examine the potential role of secondary suites in providing additional housing options for seniors.
- Support the development of home service and assistance programs to allow seniors to remain in their existing homes and neighbourhoods.
- Support the creation of new senior housing in areas with convenient access to services and transit.

To improve community understanding about housing issues and possible actions, the District undertook two initiatives: (1) the preparation of a series of background reports on demographic and housing trends in West Vancouver, now entitled “Facts and Stats: Our Community by the Numbers”; and (2) a comprehensive public engagement program, called the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing.
2.2 The 'Community Dialogue'

The Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing was developed and implemented by District staff and a citizens' working group, and was undertaken over 15 months during 2007-2008. This was a process involving hundreds of West Vancouver residents talking to each other about the future of their neighbourhoods, and issues related to housing choice and affordability. The Community Dialogue provided a forum for engaging the community in developing its own policy directions for housing and neighbourhood character.

Through this process, the District heard that more diverse housing options are needed for:

- Older residents wishing to downsize into smaller, more manageable housing that will allow them to age in place in their own neighbourhoods;
- Younger families and young adults wishing to establish themselves in the community;
- Lower income residents wishing to find more affordable housing options, including rental housing;
- People requiring accessible/adaptable housing, with special features to accommodate their unique requirements; and
- People requiring assisted living and other support to remain in the community.
While not official District policy, the final report and recommendations of the Community Dialogue Working Group (September 2008) provided direction for subsequent District housing initiatives, and new development projects including:

- the examination of possible new ground-oriented housing prototypes through a District-led Housing Pilot Program (per new OCP Policy H 4.11);
- the legalization of secondary suites;
- designation of an ‘infill housing’ block at 21st Street and Esquimalt Avenue; and
- the Rodgers Creek development.

Six of the Working Group’s recommendations pertain specifically to housing choice and affordability:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Amend the OCP, as may be required, to enable consideration of new housing types to meet the current and future needs of West Vancouver residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Develop an implementation program for allowing secondary suites, which would:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- identify issues around suites;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- recommend a process and criteria for legalizing suites; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- provide for amendments to zoning and other bylaws to allow secondary suites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Develop policies and criteria to determine under which conditions ‘infill’ housing would be suitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Consider a demonstration program to enable introduction of new housing types on a limited basis, in advance of new housing policies and regulatory tools being formally adopted. This process would enable ideas and concepts for new housing types to be explored through a community planning and design process that would include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- study of various housing types and tenures using examples from other communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- community design workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- possible ‘pilot projects’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Develop a strategy to increase the supply of a range of relatively more affordable market and non-market housing alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Examine opportunities for using surplus District-owned lands to address identified housing gaps in the community, particularly limited housing choice and affordability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 OCP Policy H 4.1 was adopted in July 2010.
2.3 Metro Vancouver’s Regional Growth Strategy

Concurrent with West Vancouver’s efforts to address local housing issues, Metro Vancouver and its member municipalities have increasingly examined what roles they can play to address housing diversity and affordability challenges, both today and in the future. This work evolved into a specific strategy in the new Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy (RGS)²:

"Provide diverse and affordable housing choices". (RGS Strategy 4.1)

Metro Vancouver’s Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) articulates the respective roles of all four levels of government (i.e., federal, provincial, regional, and municipal) in providing diverse and affordable housing choices within local communities. Federal and Provincial governments and their agencies are called upon to:

- Stimulate private sector investment in rental housing;
- Provide capital funding for low and moderate income housing; and
- Provide capital and operating funding for the development of supportive and transitional housing units.

The RGS identifies a diverse mix of housing types as a fundamental component of ‘complete communities’. This would include a mix of housing types and tenures that respond to an aging population, changing family and household characteristics, and the full range of household incomes and needs across the region.

Under RGS Strategy 4.1, member municipalities are required to prepare and implement a Housing Action Plan, which is to:

- assess local housing market conditions;

---

² Metro Vancouver’s Regional Growth Strategy was adopted by the Greater Vancouver Regional District Board on July 29, 2011.
• identify housing priorities;
• identify possible implementation measures to address local housing issues within the jurisdiction and financial capability of the municipality;
• identify possible actions to encourage the supply of new rental housing and where appropriate mitigate or limit the loss of the existing rental housing stock; and
• identify opportunities to participate with other levels of government to secure additional affordable housing to meet housing needs across the affordable housing continuum.

West Vancouver’s Housing Action Plan builds on the work undertaken during the 2004 OCP update and the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing, and will be used to:
• continue the ‘dialogue’ on housing issues and opportunities in the community;
• clarify West Vancouver’s goals for housing diversity and affordability; and
• identify possible local government actions to address these goals and establish priorities for the District.
3.0 UNDERSTANDING WEST VANCOUVER

Prior to the 1950s, most homes built in West Vancouver were single-detached dwellings, which reflected a community largely comprised of traditional families living in a low-density, suburban context. Since that time, West Vancouver’s population profile has become more diverse, and is characterized by a greater proportion of seniors, and a trend towards smaller household size.

An informed discussion on housing issues and opportunities in West Vancouver requires a thorough understanding of how the community has changed, and how it will continue to change based on key population and housing trends. This section provides a summary of these trends from the following sources:

- “Facts and Stats: Our Community by the Numbers”, a comprehensive demographic profile of West Vancouver;
- Metro Vancouver’s “Housing Data Book” and “Regional Growth Strategy”; and
- “Metro Vancouver’s Purpose Built Rental Housing: Inventory and Risk Analysis” (Coriolis Consulting Corp., April 2012).

3.1 Population

Compared to several decades ago, West Vancouver has a greater proportion of older residents, and a smaller proportion of young and middle age adults. This is also reflected in the median\(^3\) age of West Vancouver residents. In 2006, the median age was 48 and in 2011 the median age was 50; in contrast to Metro Vancouver with a median age of 40 in both 2006 and 2011.

---

\(^3\) Median age is the point at which half the population is over that age and half is below.
Census data also tells us that, as of 2011, 25% of West Vancouver residents (10,865 people) were age 65 or older, compared to 13% in Metro Vancouver.

Projected Population Age Distribution in the West Vancouver Local Health Area

---

4 The West Vancouver Local Health Area (WVLHA) includes Bowen Island, Lions Bay and Capilano S First Nations Reserve. West Vancouver Municipality represents approximately 85% of the total WVLHA population.
Population projections for the West Vancouver Local Health Area show the following trends over the period 2006 to 2036:

- a decline in the proportion of youth age 10-24
- an increase in the proportion of young adults age 25-39
- a decline in the proportion of middle age adults age 45-64
- continued increase in the proportion of seniors age 65+

The growing proportion of older residents in the community has significant implications for health and social services, recreation, transportation planning, and housing. Access to well-located, low-maintenance, and adaptable/accessible housing that is convenient to community support networks is important to the overall well being and quality of life for many of these residents.

3.2 Housing Mix

In the 1950’s, West Vancouver emerged from a seaside community of summer homes to a growing, residential community characterized by single-detached houses interspersed with parks and schools. During this period of growth, family size and composition were changing; and an ‘urbanization’ trend occurring in Vancouver and surrounding communities. These trends influenced the 1958 OCP policy to allow high-rise apartments in a 50 acre area surrounding the Ambleside commercial centre.

The apartment zoning came into effect in 1959, and close to 1200 new apartment units were built in the 1960’s. This period also saw a significant increase in the number of single detached houses.

In the 1970’s, apartment construction slowed, but approximately 700 units were added during this decade. This was partly due to a reduction in available development sites as well as the cessation of some key federal government rental incentive programs. At the same time, population shifts were occurring, such as decreasing family and household size and shifts in age distribution to fewer school age children and an increasing number of seniors.

Over the last two decades, there has been some change to the distribution of housing by type in West Vancouver. In 1991, the housing mix was 65% single-
detached, 7% duplex/townhouse and 28% apartments; in 2011, the distribution changed to 58% single detached, 13% duplex/townhouse\(^5\) and 29% apartments. Nevertheless, the basic housing choice has been between a detached house on its own fee simple lot or an apartment in a multi-family building. There are few options in between, particularly ground-oriented housing alternatives.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All dwellings</td>
<td>15,130</td>
<td>16,340</td>
<td>16,840</td>
<td>17,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-detached house</td>
<td>9,905</td>
<td>10,290</td>
<td>9,725 (^5)</td>
<td>9,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex or house with suite</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1,905 (^5)</td>
<td>1,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment, less than five storeys</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>1,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment, five or more storeys</td>
<td>3,205</td>
<td>3,340</td>
<td>3,445</td>
<td>3,445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.3 The Housing Continuum

The housing continuum is a concept used to describe and categorize different types of housing and related services. On the non-market end of the continuum are emergency services and transitional housing, which often require the most public funding, moving towards supportive and subsidized housing options in the middle of the continuum, and then towards independent housing options, where housing is provided by the private market. The continuum implicitly suggests that residents should have the opportunity to move across the continuum and find the housing that is most appropriate and best suited to their needs and circumstances.

Increasing the supply and diversity at the higher affordable market end of the continuum plays an important role in relieving pressure on low cost rental and subsidized housing, and contributes to overall housing diversity in a community.

---

\(^5\) This change is due in part to changes in Statistics Canada classifications of dwellings. For the 2006 Census, the Structural Type of Dwelling variable was clarified to better identify hard-to-find dwellings such as basement apartments. As a result, structures that may have been classified in previous censuses as a single-detached house because there was no outside sign of a second dwelling unit within the building are more likely to be classified as a duplex in the 2006 and 2011 Census.
In West Vancouver, the housing continuum is represented by:

- 518 non-market seniors-specific units and 32 other non-market housing units (2012 West Vancouver inventory);
- 1,900 purpose-built rental apartments;
- An estimated 1,828 units in the secondary rental market; and
- Based on 2006 Census data, owner occupancy of:
  - 91% of the 9,725 single-detached housing units;
  - 78% of 2,235 ground-oriented multi-family housing units (houses with suites, duplexes and townhouses); and
  - 48% of 4,875 apartments

---

6 The 'secondary' rental market comprises various types of housing that were not specifically built for rental purposes but are being rented out. There are approximately 1,828 secondary rental units in West Vancouver, including: ±926 single-detached houses, ±189 strata units (2009 estimate), and 724 secondary suites (approved as of November 5, 2012).
### 3.4 Rental Housing

Rental housing in West Vancouver consists of purpose-built rental apartments (the primary rental market) and a secondary rental market comprised of single-detached houses, suites in houses, and rented strata units. This purpose-built rental housing was largely the outcome of a significant rezoning in Ambleside (1959), and federal government incentive programs (1960s-1970s) to support construction of rental housing.

#### West Vancouver Existing Purpose Built Rental Inventory by Age of Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2011, Metro Vancouver commissioned Coriolis Consulting Corp. to compile an inventory of purpose-built rental housing in the region; and to identify what portion of the rental stock may be at risk\(^7\) for loss through demolition and redevelopment in six municipalities: Richmond, Surrey, New Westminster, North Vancouver City, North Vancouver District, and West Vancouver. Study findings for West Vancouver indicate that 17% of the total rental stock (309 units in four buildings) is considered currently at risk of loss through redevelopment. This compares to 1.7% (150 units) in New Westminster, 8% (451 units) in Surrey, 23% (1,533 units) in the City of North Vancouver, and 48% (1,078 units) in Richmond\(^8\).

In general, the study found that land values for development sites in West Vancouver are high, which creates redevelopment pressure on the existing

---

\(^7\) 'At risk' in the absence of municipal policies to protect this stock.

\(^8\) Source: "Metro Vancouver Purpose-Built Rental Housing: Inventory and Risk Analysis", Coriolis Consulting Corp., April 2012.
rental housing stock. However, existing rental buildings are generally built to maximum allowable densities which makes the existing buildings valuable, and redevelopment less attractive. The four West Vancouver apartment properties considered currently at risk in West Vancouver are characterized as follows:

- Waterfront rental buildings – the value of waterfront development sites in West Vancouver is very high and the land value exceeds the value of the potential income stream from these rental buildings.
- Rental buildings that are not fully utilizing permitted density will be increasingly at risk if land values for development sites increase at a faster rate than rental building values (as has been the trend).

3.5 Mobility

Data on local population mobility provides insight into whether housing needs in the community are being met through the available housing options, in terms of type, size, and cost. Between 1996 and 2001:

- 79% of younger (age 15-34) and 86% of older (age 55+) residents moving from West Vancouver to elsewhere on the North Shore and Vancouver moved into attached multi-unit housing;
- 70% of residents age 65+ who moved within West Vancouver moved into multi-unit housing.

This suggests that the availability of multi-unit housing such as duplexes, townhouses, and apartments plays a significant role in determining whether young adults and seniors can be accommodated in the community, or must leave to find the right type of housing elsewhere.

3.6 Housing Affordability

Housing affordability\(^9\) is a measure of the cost of housing and the ability for households to meet these costs. According to Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC), housing is affordable if costs do not exceed 30% of a household’s gross income.

---

\(^9\) Market options are considered “affordable” relative to the typical cost of housing in the community in which they are located.
The discussion of housing affordability in Metro Vancouver municipalities is a challenging one. Given the region’s growing attractiveness as a place to live, a highly constrained supply of land available for development, and high land values in places like West Vancouver, housing is simply not affordable for many residents, particularly in comparison to other Canadian cities.

For West Vancouver, the question is: What can be done to improve relative affordability? Part of the answer lies in increasing the supply and diversity of housing options available along the housing continuum, based on type, size and tenure of housing.

"Core Need" Households

Households in “core need”, as defined by CMHC, occupy housing that is considered inadequate in terms of condition or size, or costs more than 30% of household income; and they are not able to find an affordable alternative.

West Vancouver Households in Core Need, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Households In Core Need in West Vancouver (DWV)</th>
<th>Renter Households in Core Need</th>
<th>Owner Households in Core Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number % of Total 15,490 Households in DWV Number % of all Renter Households Number % of All Owner Households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,950 13% 1,005 30% 945 8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Metro Vancouver Housing Data Book, 2011

West Vancouver Households in Core Need and Spending at Least Half (INALH)10, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Households in INALH in West Vancouver (DWV)</th>
<th>Renter Households in INALH</th>
<th>Owner Households in INALH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number % of total 15,490 Households in DWV Number % of all Renter Households Number % of All Owner Households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,035 7% 585 17% 450 4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Metro Vancouver Housing Data Book, 2011

According to 2006 Census data, approximately half of the West Vancouver households in core need are seniors’ households (65+ years). Further, 53% of households in core need (1,035 households) are considered to have extremely

---

10 INALH refers to households in core need who are also spending at least half of household income on shelter (INALH)
dire housing circumstances because they are spending at least half of household income on shelter; this group is considered to be at risk of homelessness by Metro Vancouver.

**Housing Costs**

Rental housing costs in West Vancouver are high compared to regional averages, and vacancy rates are among the lowest in Metro Vancouver. The vacancy rate in West Vancouver in 2011 was 0.2% and average monthly rents were $1,478 (for all bedroom types). This compares to 1.4% and $1,027 respectively in Metro Vancouver (CMHC, 2011).

Housing sale prices and construction costs have escalated across the region in recent years. This trend has been particularly pronounced in West Vancouver where the median sale price of a single-detached house was $1,780,000 for the year 2011.

**Income Levels and Housing Costs**

In 2006, West Vancouver’s average household income of $155,071 was more than twice the regional average of $73,258. The median household income was $76,893 compared to $55,231 for Metro Vancouver. At the same time,

- one in five West Vancouver households has an annual income less than $30,000 (compared to one in four households in Metro Vancouver);
- 51% of seniors earn less than $30,000 per year; and
- 12% (or 1,510) of families are lone parent families (2011 Census): 79% of these are lone female parents earning half the income of their male counterparts.
- 1,950 or 13% of households in West Vancouver are in “core need” of housing.

West Vancouver’s high income levels are consistent with its comparatively high rate of home ownership (77% of homes in West Vancouver are owned compared to 65% in the region); and the lower proportion of owners spending 30% or more of household income on housing payments (24% in West Vancouver compared to 27% in the region). However, there is a disparity between income levels and housing costs among West Vancouver tenant
households, 55% of whom spend more than 30% of their household income on rent.

3.7 Summary: Key Housing Challenges

Housing that is appropriate for people of all ages and incomes is an essential component of complete and sustainable communities. Some of the key challenges that the Housing Action Plan for West Vancouver needs to address in order to support housing diversity and affordability in the future include:

1. **Addressing Core Housing Need**

Most West Vancouver residents are considered well-housed. Nevertheless, Metro Vancouver 2006 data identifies 1,950 households or 13% of all West Vancouver households as being in core need; and approximately half of these are considered to be at risk of homelessness.

Direct provision of housing for core need households is beyond local government resources and is a responsibility rightly vested with the Federal and Provincial Governments. Nevertheless, West Vancouver can play a role in advocating for affordable housing for its most vulnerable households.

2. **Housing for Seniors**

While many West Vancouver seniors have had to leave West Vancouver to find housing more suitable to their needs, most seniors would like to remain in their community of many years. In order to do so, they need more appropriate housing options to support aging-in-place, and to adapt to changes in their mobility and overall well-being. Appropriate, affordable housing for seniors would include:

- smaller, more manageable housing units
- adaptable design/accessibility features
- rental housing options
- housing that is well-located, in proximity to family, friends, and community services and amenities
- access to in-house or community-based services to support independent living

3. Housing for Younger and Middle-Aged Households

Past housing initiatives in West Vancouver have been focused on the needs of seniors, and related objectives for accessible / adaptable housing. However, if West Vancouver is to achieve a more balanced social mix, it needs to provide the right size and right type of housing for all residents, including: young adults and young families wishing to establish in the community, middle-aged households with or without children, and ‘empty-nesters’ looking to downsize. Providing a range of affordable, ground-oriented market housing types is central to achieving this.

4. Aging of the Purpose-Built Rental Housing Stock

Retaining West Vancouver’s aging stock of purpose-built rental apartments is critical, as only one purpose-built non-seniors’ rental apartment building (16 units) has been constructed since 1979. The addition of new primary and secondary rental units will be necessary for maintaining a healthy supply of rental housing to support housing choice and relative affordability.

5. Providing New Housing Opportunities in Existing Neighbourhoods

A fundamental challenge for West Vancouver is: How to provide more diverse housing options for residents wishing to remain in their neighbourhoods as their housing needs change over time, while preserving the valued characteristics of those neighbourhoods? This will require a thoughtful examination of various ground-oriented ‘infill’ housing types.
4.0 FROM POLICY TO RECENT ACTIONS

West Vancouver has played a direct role in supporting development of seniors’ and rental housing, securing accessible/adaptable housing units, and broadening housing choice through variations in unit size and housing tenure. These actions are described in the following Sections 4.1 through 4.4, both in terms of policy and outcomes.

4.1 Seniors’ Housing

Policy H 10 Support the provision of greater housing options for the District’s growing senior population.

The District of West Vancouver has supported the creation of seniors’ housing opportunities through: land acquisition, site assembly, and long-term lease of District-owned lands. Examples include the following:

- Amblesview Place Housing Cooperative (606-14th Street) – 42 units built in 1987 with a 60 year land lease from West Vancouver
- Kiwanis Manor at Kiwanis Garden Village (959-21st Street) – 76 rental units built in 2003 with West Vancouver providing some of the land, and waiving $505,835 in municipal development cost charges
- Hollyburn House (2095 Marine Drive) – 66 rental units built in 1987 with West Vancouver selling part of the site solely for the purpose of seniors housing
- Kiwanis (900 block – 21st Street) – the District waived $818,533 in municipal development cost charges to facilitate two new rental buildings with a net increase of ± 90 units on the Kiwanis site in 2011
- The Westerleigh (725-22nd Street) – 126 rental units (under construction) with a 125 year land lease from West Vancouver

A range of market and non-market housing options exist in West Vancouver for meeting the specific needs of seniors, in terms of housing type, location, services and amenities. These include the following:
Market and Non-Market Housing Options for Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambleview Place</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Housing Co-op</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capilano Towers</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Subsidized Rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiwanis</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klahanees Park Lodge</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lions Libby Lodge</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyside Manor</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>442</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amica Condominiums</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Gardens</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudor Gardens</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kiwanis</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Subsidized Rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amica at West Vancouver</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Market Rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollyburn House</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Market Rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>254</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residential Care Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capilano Care Centre</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollyburn House</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inglewood Care Centre</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Vancouver Care Centre</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>563</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Accessible / Adaptable Housing

_Policy H8_ Support the provision of adaptable design in a variety of housing forms.

One quarter of West Vancouver’s population is over 65 years of age, and 15% of the population experiences a physical or health issue which limits their daily activities. A range of housing options that includes adaptable housing, rental, seniors’ specific, and affordable units is essential for ensuring that the overall housing stock supports an age-friendly community.

In addition to seniors’ specific housing, the District has secured adaptable design features (beyond those required by the BC Building Code) in new multi-unit housing developments. Since 2002, this has resulted in 520 new housing
units\textsuperscript{11}, all of which meet the City of Vancouver’s universal accessibility standards, and 430 of which meet the City of North Vancouver’s adaptable design guidelines (either Level 1 or Level 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th># of Adaptable / Accessible Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2436 Haywood Avenue</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiwanis (2105-2165 Haywood Avenue)</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerleigh (725 – 22\textsuperscript{nd} Street)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2388 – 2396 Marine Drive</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891 Marine Drive</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6390 Bay Street</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amica at West Vancouver (659 Clyde Avenue)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amica Seniors (605 Clyde Avenue)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiwanis Manor (959 – 21\textsuperscript{st} Street)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water’s Edge (540, 612 and 626 Clyde Avenue)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90 (universal) 5 (Level 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundarave Landing (25\textsuperscript{th} Street &amp; Marine Drive)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Drive (bounded by Park Royal North, Taylor Way and Keith Road)</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>20% of apartments to be Level 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Rental Housing

\textit{Policy H 9}  \ Support the provision of rental housing.

- Do not support conversion of rental apartments to strata in buildings greater than four units.
- Explore mechanisms for recognizing secondary suites.
- Consider amenity zoning (bonuses) for rental housing.

Most local governments do not have the financial capability to directly support the development of purpose-built rental housing. However, West Vancouver has utilized the development approval process for larger residential and mixed-use projects to secure a number of new rental housing units; and has enacted measures to protect existing ‘primary’ rental units from

\textsuperscript{11} This total does not include the Evelyn Drive development (not constructed yet).
being converted to strata ownership, and to increase the supply of 'secondary' rental units. These actions are described below.

4.3.1 Strata Conversion Policy (1990)

Council is the approving authority for conversion of rental housing to strata. Under section 242(6) of the Strata Property Act, Council must consider a number of factors in reviewing an application for conversion of a previously occupied rental building to strata title, including the priority of rental accommodation over privately owned housing in the community. Where the benefits of privately owned housing or other factors outweigh the potential loss of rental units, it would be reasonable for Council to approve a conversion.

In 1990, the District of West Vancouver adopted a Strata Conversion Policy, which is to "not approve future applications for conversion of existing rental apartments, greater than fourplexes, to non-rental ownership." This policy enables Council to evaluate potential benefits of strata conversion on a case-by-case basis where the loss of rental units is relatively small, while maintaining a clear policy position on larger buildings which represent more significant losses. No purpose-built rental apartment buildings have been converted to strata-titled ownership since the Strata Conversion Policy was adopted in 1990.

Buildings of four units or less were specifically excluded from the policy, because the 1990 Planning and Land Use Committee of West Vancouver Council considered the apartment conversion issue to be quantitatively and qualitatively different from that of duplexes. Duplex units, albeit small in number, fill a fairly significant need for existing residents who wish to move out of single-detached houses and find alternate forms of housing (regardless of tenure type). However, in 2004, Council did not approve the proposed strata conversion of a duplex, citing concerns over the potential loss of rental housing.

While the Strata Conversion Policy does not address the need for additional rental housing or the potential loss of rental housing through demolition and redevelopment, it has so far prevented conversion of existing rental units to strata ownership.
4.3.2 New Primary Rental Units

Since the OCP was adopted in 2004, new rental housing has been secured as a community benefit in major development projects. These include:

- Dundarave Landing (Marine Drive and 25th Street) – 4 townhouse units to be rental for a period of 10 years from issuance of occupancy permit (built 2007).
- Evelyn Drive (Keith Road and Taylor Way) – 30 rental apartment units in perpetuity (not constructed yet).

4.3.3 Secondary Suites Program (2010)

Secondary suites play a key role in the rental housing market, in the absence of new purpose-built rental accommodation. During the Community Dialogue, there was strong public support for the legalization of secondary suites as a means of improving housing choice and affordability in West Vancouver’s neighbourhoods, without changing the established ‘single-detached’ character.

Under the District’s Secondary Suites Program, which went into effect on March 1st, 2010, property owners are able to legalize an existing suite or construct a new suite. A ‘secondary suite’ is a separate residential unit within a house (usually in the basement); maximum size is the lesser of 968 sq.ft. or 40% of the floor area of the house. In March 2011, the program was expanded to allow for secondary suites in non-owner occupied homes.

Implementation of the secondary suites program has been highly successful. As of November 5, 2012, the District has received a total of 859 applications for legal suites, comprised of: 95 new suites and 764 pre-existing suites. 724 suites have been approved to date. While legalization of existing suites does not increase the rental housing supply; as a result of the legalization process, there is greater assurance of the quality and safety of these units, which is a key objective of this program.
4.4 Housing Diversity

OCP Principle #3: “Provide for a diversity of housing types to accommodate a balanced and diverse population in terms of age, ability, income, and household type.”

4.4.1 New and Redeveloping Neighbourhoods

Rodgers Creek Area of the Upper Lands — The zoning for Rodgers Creek provides for a maximum 736 housing units, with a diversity of housing types to be provided as follows:

- No more than 120 single-family and two-family dwelling units;
- At least 100 cluster or townhouse dwelling units;
- 30% of apartments to be less than 93 m² in size; and
- Apartment units with adaptable design elements are to be included.

Clyde Avenue Area east of Taylor Way — Under Official Community Plan Policy BF-D 3, a density bonus of up to 0.25 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) may be considered for proposals that provide seniors’ care services, rental accommodations or assisted and congregate care housing. Two projects have been developed under this policy:

- Amica at West Vancouver — a seniors market rental supportive housing development of 112 units; and
- Water’s Edge — which included 16 rental apartment units in perpetuity in a stand-alone building.

Evelyn Drive Area — The Evelyn Drive area is centrally located, with Park Royal Shopping Centre to the south, and Taylor Way to the east. The Evelyn Drive Plan and subsequent rezoning to CD1 was undertaken under Official Community Plan Policy H3. This policy provides “that opportunities occur in limited site specific situations where a housing need may be addressed in a manner that is consistent with the Principles of the OCP. This Plan specifies that applications for such site-specific zoning or OCP amendments within a single-family area should apply in limited circumstances and be subject to Council’s Public Involvement Policy and defined criteria.”
The CD1 zoning of the Evelyn Drive Area provides for 56 single-family lots to be redeveloped into 349 housing units, of which at least 210 must be apartments, and 53 must be cluster housing. Further, apartments must have an average size of 93 m², and at least 10% of all apartments must be less than 70 m² in size. Cluster housing units must have an average size of 140 m². In addition, the project will provide for 30 rental units in perpetuity.

4.4.2 Housing Pilot Program

The Community Dialogue confirmed public interest in trying out new ideas through a limited number of ‘pilot projects’. From a housing perspective, this meant an exploration of potential new housing prototypes that would meet community demand for improved housing choice and affordability, and be designed to ‘fit’ with the established character of West Vancouver neighbourhoods.

A citizens’ working group was appointed by Council in 2009, and charged with the task of developing the objectives for the Housing Pilot Program, and undertaking a ‘pilot project’ selection process. In December 2009, Council selected two of four proposals recommended by the working group and staff to proceed as pilot projects in 2010. Both of the selected proposals were put forward by property owners wishing to downsize to a smaller house on their own property. One of these projects has since been withdrawn by the property owner; while the other property owner has yet to finalize a development application.

The Housing Pilot Program has not realized a completed project due, in large part, to uncertainty for participating property owners with regard to: servicing and other construction costs, expectations around the cost of ‘downsizing’, and general uncertainty inherent in the development approval process.

The possibility of future pilot projects should be considered on a case-by-case basis, including whether it may be more feasible to pursue new housing prototypes on surplus District-owned lands, rather than on private property.
4.4.3 Infill Housing Block

On July 4, 2011, Council amended the OCP to establish an ‘infill’ housing designation (future land use) for the 2000-block Esquimalt Avenue (north side) and Fulton Avenue (south side). This block was also designated a Development Permit Area with corresponding form and character guidelines.

Under OCP Policy BF-B13, Council may consider applications for rezoning of individual properties in this block to enable development of ground-oriented infill housing, not exceeding a density of 0.61 Floor Area Ratio (FAR). Infill housing types may include smaller single-family dwellings, coach houses, duplexes, triplexes and combinations thereof.

The first rezoning in this block, approved in tandem with the OCP amendment, is for a mix of duplexes and coach houses (nine units total) on an assembled site of three existing lots on Esquimalt Avenue. This project, known as “Hollyburn Mews” is under construction as of November 2012. A second rezoning application in this block (for a duplex and coach house) has been received and is currently being reviewed by staff.

Rendering of Proposed Coach Houses at “Hollyburn Mews”

While Policy BF-B13 only applies to this single block, development proposals for individual properties will provide opportunities to: consider various types of infill housing; regulate form and character of new development to ensure ‘fit’ within a mixed context of single-detached and multi-unit housing; and further engage the public in a discussion of possible new housing prototypes.
5.0 MOVING FORWARD

West Vancouver has jurisdiction over land use and development within its boundaries, and can implement policy objectives for greater housing diversity through the development approval process. On the larger issue of housing affordability, the District can support the efforts of senior government agencies and non-profit organizations through its land use and development policies, and its approval authority. However, direct provision of housing for core need households is beyond local government resources and is a responsibility rightly vested under the Federal and Provincial Governments.

**Action 1:** Continue established practices for supporting development of seniors’ and rental housing, accessible/adaptable housing units, and variations in unit size in new developments

The District of West Vancouver has a long tradition of addressing housing issues in West Vancouver by supporting development of seniors’ and rental housing, securing accessible/adaptable housing units, and broadening housing choice through variations in unit size and housing tenure in development projects. It is recommended that these practices be continued as new opportunities arise.

**Action 2:** Consider coach houses following an informed community discussion

District staff receive regular enquiries from residents of all areas of West Vancouver wishing to build a ‘coach house’ on their properties. The common reasons provided by residents are that a coach house would provide them the opportunity to:

- downsize into a smaller housing unit on their own property;
- provide self-contained accommodation for an elderly parent, adult child or on-site caregiver;
- design a custom housing unit for a family member with special needs (e.g., limited mobility); or
- create a detached secondary suite to maintain the privacy of the main dwelling unit.
It is anticipated that a small number of coach houses could be realized in West Vancouver through development proposals in the ‘infill housing block’ (2000-block Esquimalt/Fulton Avenues) and possible pilot projects. In June 2012, Council authorized a broader examination of coach house potential, partly in response to ongoing community interest in this type of housing. This work will include:

- A discussion paper on policy and regulations in other jurisdictions and on lessons learned from the experience of these other jurisdictions – both in Metro Vancouver and communities further afield;
- Community engagement on coach houses; and
- If the engagement program confirms broad public interest in coach houses in West Vancouver, draft policies and regulations would be prepared for Council and community review.

It is anticipated that the discussion paper will be presented to Council in December 2012; followed by community engagement through Spring 2013. Some of the key questions to be considered as part of the coach house examination are:

- What housing gaps could this type of housing fulfill?
- Should coach houses be rental only or should we allow for stratification?
- What would be an appropriate size(s) of unit?
- What are the design considerations?
- What are the potential ‘neighbour’ impacts and how might they be mitigated?
- Should coach houses be allowed...District-wide? Only in certain areas? Or, only under certain conditions?

**Action 3:** Identify, consider and engage the community in a discussion of opportunities to retain and add purpose-built rental housing

Much of West Vancouver’s purpose-built rental housing stock is now 40 to 50 years old, and may become vulnerable to loss through redevelopment.
Council has taken measures to prevent conversion of rental units to strata\textsuperscript{12}, but any of these properties could still be redeveloped under existing zoning. Council has no legal authority to prevent demolition of a rental apartment building, or to require that a redeveloped property remain rental.

An in-depth analysis of West Vancouver’s purpose-built rental housing stock is warranted, and a report to Council is expected in early 2013. This work will:

- Describe West Vancouver’s inventory;
- Review the Metro Vancouver study on the vulnerability of purpose-built rental housing in the region; and
- Identify policy options for retaining the existing rental stock and encouraging development of new purpose-built rental housing.

**Action 4: Strengthen OCP policies on housing diversity to provide a framework for consideration of innovative housing proposals**

The housing policies in the 2004 OCP are focused and limited, in the absence of a comprehensive understanding of housing issues in the community, and residents’ support for various actions to address these. The subsequent 2007-2008 Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing has provided greater depth to the community’s understanding of housing issues and options in West Vancouver.

The District would like to encourage innovative housing proposals that meet defined housing gaps in the community and are sensitive to established neighbourhood character. To provide the necessary framework for considering such proposals, the OCP will need to be amended to clarify and strengthen policies on housing diversity. This policy work would be informed by the findings of the Community Dialogue, along with the District’s past experience in supporting development of seniors’, rental, and accessible/adaptable housing, and new initiatives related to coach houses and purpose-built rental housing.

\textsuperscript{12} 1990 Strata Conversion Policy
**Action 5: Monitor and report annually on the Housing Action Plan**

To maintain awareness of housing issues in West Vancouver and progress being made to improve housing choice and affordability, an annual monitoring report is to be provided. This would provide the basis for any updates of the Housing Action Plan.

Towards this end, staff resources will continue to be allocated to the North Shore Advisory Committee on Disability Issues (ACDI), and to information-gathering and information-sharing (i.e., continuing the ‘dialogue’ on housing).
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This Discussion Paper was produced by the District of West Vancouver Planning Department to provide a basis for informed discussion during community engagement on coach houses. This final version is dated December 2012, and incorporates minor edits made through December 11, 2012.
1.0 OVERVIEW: WEST VANCOUVER’S ‘COACH HOUSE’ EXAMINATION

In June 2012, West Vancouver Council authorized an examination of ‘coach houses’ as the policy focus for the District’s efforts in exploring new housing types in 2012-2013. This work is identified in the Draft Housing Action Plan (November 2012) as one of five key actions for addressing housing issues in West Vancouver; specifically, limited choice and affordability.

The work program for the coach house examination includes:

- This Discussion Paper, which provides an overview of policy, regulations and approval processes developed in other municipalities to support coach house development, and lessons learned from program implementation. It will provide the basis for an informed community discussion on coach house potential in West Vancouver.

- A Community Engagement Program which may include: public displays, presentations and special events, questionnaires, and tours.

- Should feedback from residents confirm sufficient community interest in coach houses as a new housing type for West Vancouver, the preparation of Draft Coach House Policies and Regulations for Council and community review.

2.0 WHAT IS A ‘COACH HOUSE’?

Historically, a ‘coach house’ was an accessory building used for housing horse-drawn coaches, carriages and other vehicles (i.e., a precursor to the modern-day garage). Some coach houses included living quarters for drivers or servants. Today, the term ‘coach house’ refers primarily to a smaller detached dwelling, which is typically attached to a garage.

Even though coach houses are becoming more common in Metro Vancouver, there is still public misconception about what a ‘coach house’ is due to the common use of various terms to mean essentially the same thing. For example, all of the following terms are used within the Metro Vancouver region:

- Accessory Coach House
- Accessory Dwelling
- Backyard Cottage
- Carriage House
- Coach House
- Detached Garden Suite
- Garden Cottage
- Garden Suite
- Infill One-Family Dwelling
- Laneway House
- Secondary Dwelling Unit
Sometimes different terms are defined within municipal zoning bylaws to describe different types of coach houses (e.g., single v. two-level units, those built at grade level v. those built above a garage, etc.). In other instances, specific terms are used to connote differences between unit size, tenure, location on a lot, relationship to a principal dwelling, or lane orientation. The glossary to West Vancouver’s Official Community Plan (OCP) includes the following definition for a ‘carriage house’, which serves as a good working definition for the purposes of this coach house investigation:

"a separate, smaller dwelling unit, often located above or attached to a garage, built on a residential lot occupied by a primary residence"

3.0 UNDERSTANDING WEST VANCOUVER’S HOUSING ‘GAPS’

Determining whether or not coach houses are an appropriate housing type for West Vancouver requires an understanding of the housing ‘gaps’ in this community, and what role coach houses could play in meeting the housing requirements of West Vancouver residents.

Between 2005 and 2008, the District undertook two initiatives to improve community understanding about housing issues in the community, and possible actions to address these: (1) the preparation of a series of background reports on demographic and housing trends in West Vancouver, now titled “Facts and Stats: Our Community by the Numbers”; and (2) a comprehensive public engagement program, called the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing.

These initiatives have identified the following:

- West Vancouver has a greater proportion of older residents than the region as a whole – i.e., median age of 50 in 2011, compared to a median age of 40 in Metro Vancouver.
- 25% of West Vancouver residents were age 65 or older in 2011, compared to 13% in Metro Vancouver.

The growing proportion of older residents in the community has significant implications for health and social services, recreation, transportation planning, and housing. Access to well-located, low-maintenance, and adaptable/accessible housing that is convenient to community support networks is important to the overall well being and quality of life for many of these residents.

- In 2011, West Vancouver’s housing mix was 65% single-detached, 13% duplex¹/townhouse, and 29% apartments. For most residents, however, the basic

¹ Note: The ‘duplex’ category includes single-detached houses with secondary suites.
housing choice in West Vancouver remains a detached house on its own fee simple lot or an apartment in a multi-family building.

- 79% of younger (age 15-34) and 86% of older (age 55+) residents moving from West Vancouver to elsewhere on the North Shore and Vancouver moved into attached multi-unit housing;
- 70% of residents aged 65+ who moved within West Vancouver moved into multi-unit housing.

This suggests that the availability of multi-unit housing such as duplexes, townhouses, and apartments plays a significant role in determining whether young adults and seniors can be accommodated in the community, or must leave West Vancouver to find the right type of housing elsewhere.

- 17% of West Vancouver’s purpose-built rental stock is considered currently at risk of loss through redevelopment.²

- Given the region’s growing attractiveness as a place to live, a highly constrained supply of land available for development, and high land values in places like West Vancouver, housing is simply not affordable for many residents, particularly in comparison to other Canadian cities.

For West Vancouver, the question is what can be done to improve relative affordability? Part of the answer lies in increasing the supply and diversity of housing options available along the housing continuum, based on type, size and tenure of housing.

The ‘Right Type’ and ‘Right Size’ of Housing

Through the Community Dialogue, West Vancouver residents called for the right type and right size of housing for a diversity of needs in the community; specifically for:

- Older residents wishing to downsize into smaller, more manageable housing that will allow them to age in place in their own neighbourhoods;
- Younger families and young adults wishing to establish themselves in the community;
- Lower income residents wishing to find more affordable housing options, including rental housing;

- People requiring accessible / adaptable housing, with special features to accommodate their unique requirements; and
- People requiring assisted living and other support to remain in the community.

Residents also identified the kinds of new housing they would like to see introduced in West Vancouver to begin to address some of these housing gaps. A community survey\(^3\) conducted during Phase III of the Community Dialogue identified strong community interest in the following:

- More housing options for seniors and young families (71% and 54% respectively)
- More affordable housing (51%)
- Accessible / adaptable housing (61%)
- Housing units in the 1,000 to 1,500 sq.ft. range (62%)

On a District-wide basis, 74% supported the legalization of secondary suites, and 61% indicated support for introducing ‘infill’ units (such as coach houses) on existing single-family lots.

**Ongoing Public Interest in ‘Coach Houses’**

The District receives regular enquiries from residents in all areas of West Vancouver wishing to build a coach house on their properties. The common reasons provided by residents are that a coach house would provide them the opportunity to:

- downsize into a smaller housing unit on their own property;
- provide self-contained accommodation for an elderly parent, adult child, or on-site caregiver;
- design a custom housing unit for a family member with special needs (e.g., limited mobility); or
- create a detached secondary suite to maintain the privacy of the principal dwelling unit.

---

\(^3\) This survey was undertaken during Phase III of the Community Dialogue (May-June 2008), and was administered by Synovate, a professional survey firm. The statistical confidence limits for a sample size of 654 are ±3.8%, 19 times out of 20.
4.0 THE ‘COACH HOUSE’ EXPERIENCE IN OTHER COMMUNITIES

While West Vancouver is now examining the potential for coach houses in this community, a number of other municipalities in Metro Vancouver, elsewhere in British Columbia, and in Washington State have implemented policies and regulations to provide for coach house development. Built coach houses in each of these communities provide readily-accessible examples of different unit types and sizes, and shed light on typical design issues related to coach houses and their ‘fit’ within new or established neighbourhoods.

The following municipalities provide a cross-section of communities in terms of size and location, and illustrate both common and unique regulatory approaches for coach house development.

**Metro Vancouver**
- City of Coquitlam
- Corporation of Delta
- Township of Langley
- District of Maple Ridge
- City of North Vancouver
- City of Richmond
- City of Vancouver

**British Columbia**
- City of Kelowna
- City of Sidney
- City of Victoria

**Washington State**
- City of Kirkland
- City of Seattle

In researching coach house policies and regulations adopted in these communities, key questions have included the following:

- What were the key objectives for introducing coach houses?
- How has coach house development been implemented (i.e., regulations, approval processes)?
- What are the outcomes? (e.g., issues that may have arisen, subsequent changes to regulations/processes, number of units built, etc.)

Understanding the experience of these communities provides:

- the basis for informed community discussion about coach houses as a potential new housing type in West Vancouver; and
- possible models for draft coach house regulations, should there be strong public support for introducing this type of housing in West Vancouver neighbourhoods.

The following discussion provides an overview of both common and unique approaches to coach house implementation, in terms of land use and housing policies, and zoning regulations.
4.1 COMMON OBJECTIVES

Communities in Metro Vancouver and further afield have primarily looked to coach houses as an opportunity to diversify existing housing choices in single-family neighbourhoods, and specifically, to provide a rental housing option. Coach houses are often described and perceived of as a form of 'hidden' or 'invisible' density:

- Coach houses are modest-sized dwellings typically located in the rear yard, and are not readily visible from behind the main (street-facing) house;
- They are typically sited on the portion of a lot that would otherwise be occupied by a detached garage, and do not reduce the area of the back yard.
- They are seen as a more sensitive approach for adding rental units and densifying established neighbourhoods – i.e., as compared to more intensive infill housing types.

4.2 DIFFERENT COMMUNITY CONTEXTS

**Older, Established Communities**

In general, the introduction of coach houses in older, established communities must address issues related to neighbourhood character, resistance to land use intensification, and potential requirements for upgrading aging infrastructure to accommodate new development. Both the City of Vancouver and the City of North Vancouver undertake a comprehensive design review to ensure compatibility of coach houses with adjacent properties. Coach house regulations in these communities, as well as in Seattle and Kirkland in Washington State, apply to single-family neighbourhoods across the municipality, rather than any one neighbourhood.

Some communities have chosen to consider coach house proposals on a one-by-one basis through individual rezoning applications:

- Kelowna has provided for coach houses since 1998; and 167 units have been approved through rezoning. A further 500+ coach houses have been built within the RU6 (Two Dwelling House) Zone, where coach houses are a permitted use (rezoning not required). Rezoning applications have been denied in cases where there has been considerable neighbour opposition (typically in areas with very few coach houses).
- Victoria adopted its 'Garden Suite' policy in 2011. Since that time, two rezoning applications have been approved, one has been denied, and one is currently under review.
New and Redeveloping Communities

Newer, growing communities in more outlying areas have a greater opportunity to provide for housing diversity in the development of planned new neighbourhoods, rather than ‘retrofit’ existing neighbourhoods to meet changing housing needs. A good example of this is the Township of Langley, which has provided for coach house development within newly urbanizing areas in Willoughby, Fort Langley, and Murrayville.

Some older, suburban communities have identified coach houses as an appropriate housing form in specific areas or neighbourhoods – such as Southwest Coquitlam, Delta’s three urban centres (Ladner, North Delta and Tsawwassen), and Maple Ridge’s town centre area. The Town of Sidney has identified ‘detached secondary dwellings’ as an appropriate infill housing type in its established Orchard Avenue area.

4.3 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Coach houses are commonly viewed as ‘detached’ secondary suites, as reflected in similar zoning requirements – e.g., maximum floor area, parking, etc. A comparative overview of zoning regulations in other communities is provided in Tables 1-A, 1-B, 2 and 3 in the Appendix. These tables also define the respective ‘coach house’ terms used in each community, and describe where coach houses are permitted, whether or not coach houses provide for additional density on a lot, maximum building height, and required development approvals.

The approval process for coach houses varies between local governments. Some municipalities require a building permit only. Others have implemented a process of design review, which is implemented through a Development Permit (Council approval or delegated to staff); or, in one case (Delta) a design covenant. As noted above, some municipalities require rezoning, so that coach house proposals can be considered on a one-by-one basis.

4.4 COMMUNITY HIGHLIGHTS

Vancouver

The City of Vancouver has played a lead role in coach house development, given its high profile ‘EcoDensity’ initiatives, and the public interest generated by its ‘Laneway Housing’ program. With over 700 laneway houses now approved, Vancouver provides a number of coach house examples within different neighbourhood contexts, and a laboratory for understanding various issues related to this type of housing.

The City of Vancouver’s ‘laneway housing’ regulations provide for an increase in number of units (i.e., a second legal suite) on a single lot, and an increase in density – i.e., an additional...
0.15 Floor Area Ratio (FAR); whereas other communities provide for either a secondary suite or a coach house, but not both.

Most municipalities require that one parking space be provided for a ‘coach house’. In Vancouver, however, only one parking space is required when a laneway house is added to a property – for use by any one of three potential dwelling units on the lot. Victoria requires a minimum one parking space for the principal dwelling only.

In monitoring the implementation of its Laneway Housing program, the City of Vancouver reported in October 2012 that rental rates for laneway houses ranged from $1,000 to $2,100 per month for 1 – 2 bedroom units in various locations across the city. Media reports in Vancouver have also cited typical construction costs for laneway house as ranging between $200,000 and $300,000.

---

4 Vancouver permits a laneway house in addition to a secondary suite in areas zoned RS-1 and RS-5 (the majority of the city’s single-family areas), which means up to three self-contained dwellings on a single lot.
North Vancouver

The City of North Vancouver looks to rental coach houses as a ‘redistribution’ of permitted floor area (i.e., from the principal house to the coach house), which is common to other communities (e.g., Sidney). Something unique to North Vancouver is a two-tiered approval process:

- Both Level ‘A’ (≤ 800 sq.ft., one storey) and Level ‘B’ (≤ 1,000 sq.ft., 1.6 storeys) coach houses require a Development Permit (staff approval).
- Level ‘B’ units require a Development Variance Permit (Council approval) to allow for the additional height (above the 1 storey allowed for a Level ‘A’ units), and the ‘redistribution’ of additional floor area from the principal dwelling to the coach house.

Kelowna

The City of Kelowna has provided for ‘carriage houses’ since 1998, and nearly 700 units have built in that community under different zoning approaches:

- Carriage houses are a permitted use in the RU6 Zone. Over 500 units have been developed without rezoning.
- 167 units have resulted from individual rezoning.
- In all cases, a Development Permit (delegated to staff) is required.

Richmond

Coach houses were introduced in Richmond in 2004, and approximately 100 units have been built to date. They are provided for in a number of areas, and rezoning is required. In November 2012, Richmond amended zoning regulations for the ‘Edgemere’ area to permit both ‘coach houses’ and ‘granny flats’ (the latter a single-level unit, not attached to a garage) as outright uses (no rezoning required), but established a Development Permit requirement.
Victoria

Victoria's Garden Suites policy was adopted in September 2011, and only a handful of garden suite applications have been considered to date. Given the age of this community, and the distinct heritage character of many of its neighbourhoods, the City may request heritage designation (for the principal dwelling) for applicable properties – as a condition for garden suite approval.

Seattle and Kirkland

Coach house policies in Seattle and Kirkland are, in part, an outcome of the Washington State Growth Management Act (1990), which directed local governments to focus future growth within established urban areas and contain suburban sprawl. Coach houses in Washington state communities have been introduced within a broader context of ground-oriented infill housing. Kirkland uses the term ‘accessory dwelling unit’ to describe any additional dwelling units on a single family lot, whereas ‘cottage’ and ‘carriage unit’ are two infill housing types that may be developed as either rental or ownership housing. Seattle’s rental coach houses are referred to as ‘backyard cottages’.
5.0 ARE COACH HOUSES APPROPRIATE FOR WEST VANCOUVER?

Determining whether or not coach houses are an appropriate housing type for West Vancouver requires a thorough understanding of the housing gaps in this community, and what role coach houses could play in fulfilling the housing requirements of West Vancouver residents. Specific objectives for housing choice and affordability have implications for unit size, building design, outdoor space, landscaping, parking, and other considerations such as fit with established neighbourhood character.

A primary objective of this Discussion Paper is to stimulate public debate on coach houses as a possible new housing type in West Vancouver, and to generate community input on specific issues related to coach houses:

1. How Could Coach Houses Help to Improve Housing Choice and Affordability in West Vancouver?

- A coach house, as rental housing, provides a potential mortgage-helper for supporting home ownership.

- A coach house provides an opportunity to house family members on-site in a detached, self-contained unit; perhaps enabling older individuals to ‘downsize’ from a traditional house elsewhere in the community. Coach houses are ‘smaller’ units (typically under 1,000 sq.ft.) and are considered appropriate for households of 1 to 2 adults, perhaps with a young child.

- Coach houses could be custom-designed to meet specific housing needs within a relatively small space:
  - Accessibility / adaptable design features
  - Flexibility for live-work options
  - With or without attached parking
  - Manageable private outdoor space

2. What is the Right Size for a Coach House?

- During the Community Dialogue, residents indicated a strong desire for smaller-sized housing units in the 1,000 – 1,500 sq.ft. range. The maximum size for a secondary suite in West Vancouver is just under 1,000 sq.ft.; this is also the maximum unit size among other Metro Vancouver municipalities that allow for coach houses as detached suites and is based upon provisions within the BC Building Code.
- Does this coincide with household expectations for down-sized living in West Vancouver, or should we be considering different-sized coach houses?

3. **Should Coach Houses Provide Rental Accommodation Only? Or, Should the District Allow for Strata-Titled Ownership?**

- At the outset of research into other municipalities, no assumptions were made about unit size or tenure. However, the communities surveyed as part of this examination have looked to coach houses as a form of rental housing in single-family neighbourhoods and, in most cases, as a detached alternative to a secondary suite.

- Regulations for rental coach houses are typically based on secondary suite provisions, with maximum unit sizes under 1,000 sq.ft.

- Some communities do provide for ‘strata-titled’ coach houses within designated areas but this is a more intensive ‘infill’ housing type, with unit sizes typically ranging from 1,200 to 1,800 sq.ft.

- There are three examples of strata-titled coach houses currently under construction in West Vancouver; in the “Hollyburn Mews” development in the 2000-block Esquimalt Avenue (see artist’s rendering below). This project required an Official Community Plan amendment (which designated the block for future infill housing development) and a rezoning to permit a mix of duplexes and coach houses (9 strata units).

---

**Strata-Titled Coach Houses at “Hollyburn Mews”, West Vancouver (under construction)**
4. What are the Potential ‘Neighbour’ Impacts of Coach Houses, and How Might These be Mitigated?

- Based on a review of other jurisdictions, common neighbour concerns relate to scale and massing of coach houses, privacy and view impacts on adjacent properties, and parking. These are addressed in part, through zoning regulations and, in some cases, through a formal design review process (see below).

5. How Can We Ensure that Coach Houses ‘Fit’ With the Established Built Form Character of West Vancouver’s Neighbourhoods?

- Form and character guidelines could be developed to ensure fit with neighbourhood context, and a design review process could be implemented. This may include a Development Permit requirement (approval by Council or delegated to staff). The Design Review Committee (DRC) may play a role in the development of form and character guidelines. The DRC could also potentially review coach house designs, though this would significantly alter its Terms of Reference and increase time and processing costs; an alternative may be to refer projects to the DRC that staff are unable to resolve.

Example of a ‘Laneway House’ in Vancouver’s Mackenzie Heights neighbourhood, designed in the same style as the 1930s-era principal dwelling, and using the same exterior materials and colours.


- Municipal approaches to coach house development vary between communities:
  - Where there is an opportunity to introduce greater housing diversity through development of new neighbourhoods, coach house implementation tends to focus on those areas, rather than established neighbourhoods.
In mature, built-out communities, greater efforts are made to increase the variety of housing options in existing neighbourhoods. Coach house policies are either implemented in single-family neighbourhoods across the municipality, or are focused on particular neighbourhoods, or allowed only on properties meeting certain criteria.

Some municipalities limit coach house potential to only those lots with lane access or location on a corner. From a design perspective, corner lots provide an opportunity for coach houses to have a front door facing a street, and a stronger identity as a smaller private residence.

7. Should Coach Houses Provide for Densification in Existing Neighbourhoods?

- The City of Vancouver has provided for increased density in implementing its Laneway Housing program – i.e., an additional (third) dwelling unit on a lot, and a density of 0.15 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for coach house units to a maximum of 750 sq.ft.\(^5\).

- Other communities have restricted coach houses to a detached suite option (i.e., one rental suite per property); in some cases, with an increase in permitted floor area (i.e., as compared to maximum floor area without a coach house).

- The City of North Vancouver looks to rental coach houses as a ‘redistribution’ of permitted floor area (i.e., from the principal house to the coach house).

---

\(^5\) 750 sq.ft. is the maximum size of a laneway house on a 50 ft. x 120 ft. or larger lot; maximum unit size on a typical 33 ft. x 120 ft. lot is approximately 500 sq.ft.
6.0 POSSIBLE DIRECTIONS FOR WEST VANCOUVER

If community engagement on coach houses indicates strong public support for this type of housing in West Vancouver, the following outlines some possible directions for moving forward on coach house implementation:

**Over the Shorter Term**

Based on the lessons learned from other jurisdictions, introduction of coach houses as detached secondary suites (without an increase in permitted density) could be implemented in West Vancouver over the shorter term. Required work would include the following:

- A Zoning Bylaw amendment (to allow for ‘detached suites’ as a permitted use, in zones that permit secondary suites). Alternatively, Development Variance Permits (DVPs) could be used to allow for suite ‘detachment’ on individual properties. However, this would be a more onerous process for property owner, and require more District resources to implement – given that each application would be considered on a one-by-one basis, and would be subject to Council approval.

- If a process of design review is implemented, an Official Community Plan amendment would be required to establish a Development Permit Area designation and guidelines for coach house development. Based on examples from other jurisdictions, delegation of Development Permit approval to staff would be appropriate (as is the case with Environmental Development Permits).

**Possible Over the Longer Term**

If West Vancouver residents wish to explore forms of ‘coach house’ development, which are more akin to infill housing, further work would be required to develop a policy framework for infill housing – e.g., locational considerations (area, neighbourhood, proximity to transit, community services and amenities), size and tenure of units, etc.
APPENDIX:

COMPARISON OF COACH HOUSE REGULATIONS

IN OTHER COMMUNITIES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>MUNICIPALITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – A</td>
<td>Metro Vancouver</td>
<td>▪ Coquitlam, Delta, Langley Township and Maple Ridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – B</td>
<td>Metro Vancouver</td>
<td>▪ North Vancouver City, Richmond and Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other B.C.</td>
<td>▪ Kelowna, Sidney and Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Washington State</td>
<td>▪ Washington State: Kirkland and Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COQUITLAM</td>
<td>DELTA</td>
<td>LANGLEY TOWNSHIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Term Used</strong></td>
<td>Garden Cottage</td>
<td>Secondary Dwelling Unit Term used in Zoning Bylaw but not specifically defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage House</td>
<td>A one-storey, at-grade residential structure accessory to a one-family dwelling unit.</td>
<td>Coach Housing (OCP definition) A second dwelling unit located in an accessory building on a lot. The accessory building is typically a separate garage with the dwelling unit situated on the 2nd storey or at ground level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Where Allowed per OCP and Zoning Bylaw?</strong></td>
<td>Properties designated in the SW Coquitlam Plan as &quot;Neighbourhood Attached Residential&quot; (NAR) can be developed with garden cottages or carriage houses, under RT-1 zoning. Approximately 1,100 of 1,500 NAR-designated lots are already zoned RT-1; the balance would require rezoning. RT-1 Zone establishes following requirements for garden cottages / carriage houses:  - Min. 370 m² lot area and 10 m lot width if there is a lane; Min. 12m lot width without lane  - Not permitted on a lot with a secondary suite or lots less than 740m²  - lots larger than 740m² can have both a secondary suite and a garden cottage/carriage house</td>
<td>OCP identifies coach houses as appropriate for urban areas close to community services and amenities in Ladner, North Delta and Tsawassen - i.e., in areas with a &quot;Ground-Oriented Residential&quot; designation Rezoning to RS 9 Zone - Single Family (330 m²) Infill Residential is required (considered on a site-by-site basis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Density</strong></td>
<td>Yes. Floor area of garden cottage/carriage house is in addition to the max. floor area of for the principal dwelling.</td>
<td>No. Floor area of coach house is within the max. 0.65 FAR permitted for the lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Size</strong></td>
<td>Max. 50 m²</td>
<td>Min. 42 m² excluding garage; Max. 110 m² including garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COQUITLAM</td>
<td>DELTA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. Height</strong></td>
<td>Garden Cottage: 3.0 metres; or 4.3 metres for buildings with roof slope of ≥ 3:12 for an area of at least 80% of all roof surfaces. Carriage House: 5.0 metres; or 7.0 metres per above requirements.</td>
<td>2 storeys 9.8 metres to ridge of pitched roof 7.3 metres to mid-roof (or to top of a flat roof)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-Site Parking</strong></td>
<td>1 space for accessory rental suite, plus two spaces for principal house</td>
<td>1 space for secondary dwelling unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approval Process</strong></td>
<td>Building Permit only</td>
<td>No Development Permit required, but applicants must enter into a design covenant in accordance with Ladner Coach House Guidelines for single-family neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Notes**            | - Introduced January 2012  
- 4 applications in process in Southwest Coquitlam  
- To date: 8 building permits issued in Somerton Development in East Coquitlam; 6 more in process | - 1999 – First coach house rezoning (in Ladner)  
- 2007 – Ladner Area Plan amended to include Design Guidelines for coach houses  
- To date: 30 coach houses built in Ladner; 4 in North Delta | - 1999 – First coach house rezoning (in Ladner)  
- 2007 – Ladner Area Plan amended to include Design Guidelines for coach houses  
- To date: 30 coach houses built in Ladner; 4 in North Delta | - Introduced in 2008  
- 15 approved or in process |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term Used</th>
<th>NORTH VANCOUVER CITY</th>
<th>RICHMOND</th>
<th>RICHMOND (Edgemere)</th>
<th>VANCOUVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Coach House</td>
<td>A detached unit that is subordinate in size to the principal home, and must be non-stratified. The owner must reside on the property.</td>
<td>Coach house - a self-contained dwelling that: [Bylaw 8922, Nov 19/12] a) is accessory and either attached or detached to the single detached housing unit, except in Edgemere where it must be detached from the principal dwelling unit; b) has at least 75% of its floor area located above the garage, except in Edgemere where a maximum of 60% of its floor area must be located above a detached garage; c) has cooking, food preparation, sleeping and bathing facilities that are separate from those of the principal dwelling unit located on the lot; d) has an entrance separate from the entrance to the garage; and e) is a separate and distinct use from a secondary suite, and does not include its own secondary suite.</td>
<td>Granny flat - a self-contained dwelling that: [Bylaw 8922, Nov 19/12] a) is accessory to and detached from the single detached housing unit; b) is located totally on the ground floor in the rear yard of a single detached housing lot; c) has cooking, food preparation, sleeping and bathing facilities that are separate from those of the principal dwelling unit located on the lot; d) has an entrance separate from the entrance to the garage; and e) is a separate and distinct use from a secondary suite, and does not include its own secondary suite.</td>
<td>Laneway House</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Where Allowed per OCP and Zoning Bylaw?**

- **OCP established Coach House Development Permit Area designation.**
  - Accessory Coach Houses are permitted in all single-family (RS-1) zones. Lane required. Rezoning may be required for some Level 'B' units.
  - Rezoning required on a site-by-site basis. Permitted use in the following zones:
    - Coach Houses (RCH)
    - Infill Residential (R1, R2)
    - R/9 (Hamilton)
    - ZS12 (Broadmoor)
    - ZS20 (Burkeville)
  - Lane required in RCH, R/9 and ZS20 Zones
  - As an outcome of Richmond's current OCP review process, a portion of the Edgemere area was re-zoned to RE1 Zone (to permit granny flats and coach houses) in November 2012.
  - The draft OCP includes Development Permit Area Guidelines for Granny Flats and Coach Houses in Edgemere.
  - Lane required.
  - RS1 and RS5 zones city-wide.
  - Min. lot width: 10 metres
  - Lots must have access to an open lane, be located on a corner with an open or dedicated lane, or on a double-fronting lot.

---

**Additional Density**

- No
  - Yes: Additional 0.05 FAR in R/9 Zone; and additional 0.10 FAR in R1, R2, and ZS12 Zones
  - Yes: Additional 23.2 m² (0.05 FAR x 484.5 m²) on lots with an accessory dwelling
  - Yes: Additional 0.125 FAR and laneway house in addition to secondary suite (3 units on one lot)

---

**Unit Size**

- Lesser of 0.15 times lot area or 74.32 m² for Level 'A' units or 92.9 m² for Level 'B' units.
  - Min. 33 m² and max. 60 m² in the RCH and ZS20 Zones; Max. 60 m² in the R/9, R1, R2 and ZS12 Zones.
  - Granny Flat: min. 33 m² / max. 70 m²
  - Coach House: min. 33m² / max. 60m², of which at least 40% is on 1st storey.
  - 0.125 FAR to max. 70 m², results in 46.5 m² on typical 33x120 lot and 70 m² on 50x120 or larger lot.
### TABLE 1-B: OVERVIEW OF COACH HOUSE REGULATIONS IN SELECTED METRO VANCOUVER COMMUNITIES:
NORTH VANCOUVER CITY, RICHMOND AND VANCOUVER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Max. Height</th>
<th>NORTH VANCOUVER CITY</th>
<th>RICHMOND</th>
<th>RICHMOND (Edgemere)</th>
<th>VANCOUVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 'A' Units: 1 storey, 4.57 metres</td>
<td>RCH, R/9 and ZS20 Zones: Lesser of 2 storeys or 7.4 metres</td>
<td>Granny Flat: Lesser of 1 storey or 5 metres</td>
<td>1-storey: 3.7 metres; 1.5-storey: 6.1 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 'B' Units: 1.6 storeys, 6.7 metres</td>
<td>R1/1, R1/2 and ZS12 Zones: 9.0 metres.</td>
<td>Coach House: Lesser of 1.5 storeys or 6 metres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Parking</td>
<td>2 spaces; 1 for main dwelling and 1 for coach house</td>
<td>R1/1 and R1/2 Zones: 1 space per dwelling or 0.5 space per bedroom, whichever is greater; max. 1.7 spaces per dwelling unit</td>
<td>1 space per granny flat or coach house.</td>
<td>Min. 1 parking space on the lot, for use by any of a potential three dwelling units on the lot (including the laneway house). On lots up to 740 m², max. 1 enclosed or covered parking space up to 21 m². On larger lots, max.2 enclosed or covered spaces up to 42 m².</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval Process</td>
<td>Development Permit required (delegated to staff). Development Variance Permit (DVP) or Rezoning required to permit Level 'B' Units.</td>
<td>Building permit only.</td>
<td>Development permit required (delegated to staff).</td>
<td>Applications subject to &quot;Development Planner (staff) Review&quot;, which focuses on the massing and design of the partial upper storey, to reduce impacts on neighbouring properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Introduced in 2012. As of November 23, 2012: 12 units occupied or under construction; Development Permits for another 8 units issued or under review.</td>
<td>Introduced in 2004. Approximately 100 units built to date.</td>
<td>Introduced November 2012 n/a</td>
<td>Introduced July 2009. As of November 16, 2012: 739 applications approved (of these 3400 have had final inspections and are occupied)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KELOWNA</td>
<td>SIDNEY</td>
<td>VICTORIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Term Used</strong></td>
<td><strong>Detached Secondary Dwelling</strong></td>
<td><strong>Garden Suite</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage House</td>
<td>A secondary dwelling located in an accessory building.</td>
<td>A building used or designated as a self-contained dwelling unit located on a lot with a single family dwelling and does not include a strata lot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An additional dwelling unit located within an accessory building that is subordinate to the principal dwelling unit and is a single real estate entity.</td>
<td>Requires rezoning to the 'c' version of the following zones: (e.g., RU1 to RU1c)</td>
<td>OCP establishes Development Permit Area 15E – Intensive Residential Garden Suites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted use in the RU6 (Residential Zone)</td>
<td>R1.3 and R3 Zones in the Orchard Avenue area. Owner occupancy required Only in conjunction with a single-family dwelling with no secondary suite</td>
<td>Rezoning on an individual site basis is required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires rezoning to the 'c' version of the following zones: (e.g., RU1 to RU1c)</td>
<td>Min. lot area = 400 m² Min. lot width = 10 metres</td>
<td>Garden suites are permitted in the R1-B-GS and R1-B-GS2 Zones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Density</strong></td>
<td><strong>Max. 2 storeys. Lesser of 85% of height of principal dwelling or 8 metres</strong></td>
<td><strong>Yes. Floor area of the garden suite is in addition to that of the principal dwelling.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes. Floor area of carriage house is in addition to that allowed for principal dwelling.</td>
<td>Max. 37 m² except: potential for larger unit size for conversion of existing garages (R1-B-GS); and</td>
<td>Max 37 m² except: potential for larger unit size for conversion of existing garages (R1-B-GS); and 56 m² on &quot;plus sites&quot; – i.e., on lots located on corner, with two street frontages, rear lane, and &gt; 557 m² (R1-B-GS2).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Size</strong></td>
<td><strong>Max. 2 storeys. Lesser of 85% of height of principal dwelling or 8 metres</strong></td>
<td>3.5 metres (R1-B-GS) 5.5 metres (R1-B-GS2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser of 90 m² or 75% of the total floor area of the principal building.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. Height</strong></td>
<td><strong>Max. 2 storeys. Lesser of 85% of height of principal dwelling or 8 metres</strong></td>
<td>3.5 metres (R1-B-GS) 5.5 metres (R1-B-GS2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The lesser of 4.5 metres or the height of the existing principal dwelling unit on the same property.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-Site Parking</strong></td>
<td><strong>1 space for carriage house.</strong></td>
<td><strong>No additional parking requirement for garden suite, but primary dwelling requires min. 1 space</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 space for carriage house.</td>
<td><strong>1 space for detached secondary dwelling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approval Process</strong></td>
<td><strong>Development Permit required (delegated to staff).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Approval Process</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Permit only. DVP required to allow for detached secondary dwelling on properties that do not have sufficient unused lot coverage.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Development Permit (DP Area 15E) is processed concurrent with rezoning (Council approval). Heritage Designation requested if property is on Register.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Introduced June 2012. To date: 1 Building Permit approved, but project is not proceeding.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Garden Suite policy adopted in Sept 2011; OCP amended to establish Development Permit requirement for garden suites (as intensive residential development). To date: 2 approved rezoning; 1 denied; and 1 in process.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced circa 1998. To date: 167 carriage houses (from rezoning); and over 500 units in the RU6 (Two Dwelling Housing) Zone, where coach houses are a permitted use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Document # 584275v2**
## TABLE 3: OVERVIEW OF 'COACH HOUSE' REGULATIONS IN WASHINGTON STATE COMMUNITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term Used</th>
<th>KIRKLAND</th>
<th>SEATTLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU)</strong></td>
<td>A subordinate dwelling unit added to, created within, or detached from a single-family structure, that provides basic requirements for living, sleeping, eating, cooking and sanitation.</td>
<td><strong>Backyard Cottage</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Related Terminology (for multi-unit development in low density zones):**
1. **Cottage** — A detached, single-family dwelling unit (≤ 1500 sq.ft.).
2. **Carriage Unit** — A single-family dwelling unit (≤ 800 sq.ft.) located above a garage structure in a cottage housing development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where Allowed?</th>
<th>In conjunction with any single-family dwelling, unless specifically excluded in Zoning Code — e.g., not permitted with cottage or carriage units.</th>
<th>SF 5000, SF 7200 and SF 9600 Zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min. lot requirements:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Area = 371.6 m²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Width = 7.62 metres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Depth = 21.34 metres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Additional Density</strong></th>
<th>No, but not counted as a &quot;dwelling unit&quot; in sections of the Zoning Ordinance which limit the number of detached dwelling units in a single-family zone to one.</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Size</strong></td>
<td>The lesser of 74.32 m² of gross floor area or 40% of the of the primary residence and ADU combined.</td>
<td>Max. 74.32 m² (including garage or storage)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Max. Height** | Must conform to the height restrictions for single-family dwellings in the applicable zone (usually 7.6 metres to 9.1 metres) | 3.7 metres to 4.9 metres (varies depending on lot width) |

| **On-Site Parking** | One parking space for the accessory dwelling unit. | 1 parking space for backyard cottage. No parking required if located in a designated urban village or urban centre. |

| **Approval Process** | Assumed to be building permit only. | Building permit only (Washington State equivalent). Owner occupancy covenant. |

<p>| <strong>Notes</strong> | An ADU is a rental-only use, whereas cottages and carriage units may be developed as either ownership or rental housing. | Introduced in Southeast Seattle in 2006; expanded city-wide in 2009. Approximately 55 units approved through April 2011. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>PARTICULARS</th>
<th>MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Building a Sustainable Community</td>
<td>Revise District policies, regulations, and processes to achieve the sustainable community that is envisioned in the OCP</td>
<td>Corporate Strategic Plan&lt;br&gt;• Vision &amp; Mission&lt;br&gt;• Balanced Scorecard</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Articulating &quot;Neighbourhood Character&quot;</td>
<td>Prepare character statements for individual neighbourhoods to help articulate their character-defining elements, and the community values around these, for inclusion in the OCP</td>
<td>Adaptation of heritage conservation tools, such as a Statements of Significance (SOS) to provide the basic template for drafting a neighbourhood character statement. This would be done on an as-needed basis or as opportunities arise.</td>
<td>Fit with established character is a key consideration in the development application review process&lt;br&gt;A Statement of Significance (SOS) was used to inform amendments to OCP policy and guidelines for the Lower Caulfield Heritage Conservation Area (adopted July 9, 2012)&lt;br&gt;Neighbourhood character statements were prepared for: (1) 2000-block Esquimalt / Fulton (OCP amended in July 2011 to allow for future infill housing); and (2) small neighbourhood enclave at 26\textsuperscript{th} &amp; Ottawa (location of housing pilot project)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>TOPIC</td>
<td>PARTICULARS</td>
<td>MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION</td>
<td>CURRENT STATUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Making the Construction Process More Neighbourly</td>
<td>Review and revise, if necessary, building permit regulations and bylaw enforcement provisions to address resident concerns over negative impacts of new construction – e.g., truck traffic, parking, noise, vibrations, construction debris, blasting, hours of work, etc.</td>
<td>Review of Bylaw Provisions &amp; Enforcement Related to New Construction</td>
<td>• In November 2011, Council adopted a series of bylaw amendments related to construction standards, and reducing the impacts of new construction on neighbours • Affected bylaws are: (1) Building Bylaw; (2) Bylaw Notice Enforcement Bylaw; (3) Fees and Charges Bylaw; (4) Soil Removal and Deposit Regulation Bylaw; (5) Traffic and Parking Bylaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Protecting Boulevard and Streetscape Character</td>
<td>Review the Boulevard Bylaw and the Boulevard Maintenance and Encroachment Policy, and any related guidelines to address resident concerns over loss of established neighbourhood character…</td>
<td>Amendments to Boulevard Bylaw and related policy(ies)</td>
<td>• Commencing a review and update of the District’s Boulevard Bylaw and Guidelines is indicated on the Planning, Lands &amp; Permits Division’s work program for 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Minimizing Site Alteration</td>
<td>Prepare regulations, guidelines &amp; incentives to encourage designs that are sympathetic to a site’s natural features, and minimize site alteration and loss of trees during new construction</td>
<td>• Heritage Revitalization Agreements (HRAs) • Lower Caulfeild Heritage Conservation Area (Guidelines for Alteration Permits)</td>
<td>• Amendments to Alteration Permit Guidelines for Lower Caulfeild, which include site alteration, were approved by Council on July 9, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Learning How to ‘Design with Nature’</td>
<td>In concert with recommendation #2.5, consider a demonstration program for examining how a site’s natural features can be retained in new development</td>
<td>Demonstration Program of Pilot Projects</td>
<td>• This was considered in the review of housing pilot project proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Conserving our Heritage Resources</td>
<td>Develop an incentive program to encourage and support heritage conservation efforts by private property owners</td>
<td>• Heritage Strategic Plan • Community Heritage Register • Heritage Revitalization Agreements (HRAs)</td>
<td>• Council endorsed the use of land use incentives for heritage conservation in June 2009 • Community Heritage Register</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMMUNITY DIALOGUE ON NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER AND HOUSING WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS – CURRENT STATUS (JANUARY 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>PARTICULARS</th>
<th>MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of built new housing prototypes (via Housing Pilot Program) to inform future district policies</td>
<td>establishes eligibility for conservation incentives (41 resources have been listed to date; future additions are anticipated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consideration of the findings and directions from the Community Dialogue in the review of OCP amendment applications</td>
<td>Two HRA proposals have been submitted since 2009. Infill proposal for 'Toby House' (2055 Queens) expected to proceed to Council in 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>BC Binning House now eligible for property tax exemption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conservation plans have been prepared for Pt. Atkinson Light Station, Hollyburn Lodge, and Municipal Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Action #4 in the draft Housing Action Plan (November 2012) is to &quot;strengthen OCP policies on housing diversity to provide a framework for consideration of innovative housing proposals&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Amending OCP Housing Policies</td>
<td>Amend the OCP, as may be required, to enable consideration of new housing types to meet the current and future needs of West Vancouver residents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Allowing Secondary Suites</td>
<td>Develop an implementation program for allowing secondary suites, which would identify issues around suites; recommend a process and criteria for legalizing suites; and provide for amendments to zoning and other bylaws to allow secondary suites</td>
<td>Secondary Suites Review &amp; Implementation Program</td>
<td>Council adopted Zoning Bylaw amendments to legalize secondary suites in December 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Program implementation began March 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>As of November 5, 2012, 859 applications received to legalize (764 existing and 95 new) suites; 724 suites approved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IMPLEMENTATION OF THE COMMUNITY DIALOGUE ON NEIGHBOURHOOD CHARACTER AND HOUSING
## WORKING GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS – CURRENT STATUS (JANUARY 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>PARTICULARS</th>
<th>MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.3| Considering 'Infill' Housing | Develop policies and criteria to determine under which conditions 'infill' housing would be suitable | OCP Amendment and/or OCP Update, Review of Development Applications                      | • July 2011: Council amended the OCP to designate the 2000-block Esquimalt/Fulton for future infill housing development; and approved the 1st rezoning in this block for a 9-unit strata project (6 duplex units and 3 coach houses)  
• 2nd rezoning application (3 units) is currently under staff review |
| 3.4| Exploring New Housing Types  | Consider a demonstration program to enable introduction of new housing types on a limited basis, in advance of new housing policies and regulatory tools being formally adopted... | Demonstration Program of Pilot Projects, Community engagement program on coach houses is being implemented under Housing Action Plan implementation (Action #2) | • December 2009: Council formally selected two pilot projects to start in 2010  
• July 2010: Council amended OCP to provide for Housing Pilot Program (Policy H 4.1)  
• 2013: Program has since been re-cast to focus on coach houses as a possible new housing type for West Vancouver – based on a review of lessons learned from other jurisdictions, and a community engagement program this year. |
| 3.5| Addressing Housing Affordability | Develop a strategy to increase the supply of a range of relatively more affordable market and non-market housing alternatives... | Preparation of a Housing Action Plan per Strategy 4.1 of Metro Vancouver's Regional Growth Strategy (adopted July 29, 2011) | • In October 2011, Council approved the Kiwanis project which provides 137 new low-income rental housing units (net increase of 86 units on this site).  
• November 2012: Draft Housing Action Plan presented to Council. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>PARTICULARS</th>
<th>MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.6 | Utilizing Surplus District-Owned Lands    | Examine opportunities for using surplus District-owned lands:  
- To address identified housing gaps in the community – particularly, limited housing choice and affordability; and  
- To meet other social, economic, and environmental sustainability objectives.                                                                                                                            | Disposition of Surplus District-Owned Lands:                                                                                      
- Former Wetmore Motors' site (long-term land lease for private seniors' housing project)                                               | "The Westerleigh" is currently under construction                                                                                     |
|     |                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                             | Proposed sale of District-owned lands in the 1300-block Marine Drive                                                                  | On March 6, 2012, Council approved execution of Purchase and Sale Agreements                                                                                         |
|     |                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                             | Former Horseshoe Bay Firehall site (subdivided into three lots and sold)                                                            | Property subdivided into three lots and sold; site awaiting redevelopment                                                                                               |
|     |                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                             | Creation of new residential lots from surplus road ends, with design controls to ensure fit with established character | 26th & Ottawa (lot sold); 26th & Marine (community consultation, rezoning and subdivision completed in 2012)                                                                 |
|     |                                           |                                                                                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                     | Ottabum lots sold                                                                                                                                                        |
| 3.7 | Encouraging ‘Green’ Buildings             | Adopt minimum standards for employing sustainable (green) building design and operating systems...                                                                                                      | Continue to register green building and energy efficiency requirements (West Vancouver Standard) on title of District lands to be sold (applies to 3.6 above)  
- Secure sustainability measures through development approval process  
- Home energy audit program                                                                                                         | OCP amended in June 2010 to add community greenhouse gas reduction targets and policies, as required by Provincial Bill 27  
- Council considers home energy performance when considering rezoning, development permits, and development variance permits (OCP Policy H 2) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>PARTICULARS</th>
<th>MEANS OF IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>CURRENT STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Reducing Reliance on the Private Automobile</td>
<td>Make provisions for enhanced pedestrian, cycling, and transit facilities to lessen reliance on the private automobile, enable more sustainable transportation choices, and increase opportunities for community connections</td>
<td>Strategic Transportation Plan</td>
<td>Strategic Transportation Plan completed and received by Council for information in April 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Ongoing Public Education &amp; Input</td>
<td>Provide opportunities for ongoing public education, awareness, and input on neighbourhood character and housing issues – and related issues such as heritage conservation, sustainable building design and construction practices, etc.</td>
<td>• Housing Pilot Program&lt;br&gt;• Review of Development Applications&lt;br&gt;• Partnerships – e.g., Community Centre Dialogue Series</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Developing Pilot Projects</td>
<td>Develop a selection process and evaluation criteria for consideration of possible ‘pilot projects’ by Council</td>
<td>Housing Pilot Program</td>
<td>See 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>Holding Workshops on Key Topics or Issues</td>
<td>Hold future workshops on various topics that require future exploration – e.g., affordable housing, green buildings, and ‘designing with nature’.</td>
<td>As needs and opportunities arise</td>
<td>• Staff presentation on “Aging in Place: What we learned from the Community Dialogue” at invitation of Western Residents Association (March 2012)&lt;br&gt;• Community engagement on coach houses and purpose-built rental housing will be undertaken in 2013.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISTRICT OF WEST VANCOUVER
750 – 17TH STREET, WEST VANCOUVER, BC V7V 3T3

COUNCIL REPORT

Date: November 30, 2012
From: Geri Boyle Manager of Community Planning
and Stephen Mikicich, Sr. Community Planner
Subject: Coach House Discussion Paper

RECOMMENDED THAT:

1. The Discussion Paper, titled "The Potential for Coach Houses in West Vancouver: A Discussion Paper", attached as Appendix ‘A’ to the report from the Manager of Community Planning and the Senior Community Planner, dated November 30, 2012, provide the basis for community engagement on coach houses; and

2. Staff report back to Council, at a Committee of the Whole meeting in mid-2013, on the results of the engagement process, including possible directions supported by the community.

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to present for Council's consideration a Discussion Paper on coach houses, which will be used as an information tool during community engagement on the potential for coach houses to address defined housing ‘gaps’ in West Vancouver.

1.0 Background

1.1 Prior Resolutions

June 25, 2012 – Council established an examination of ‘coach houses’ as the policy focus for the District’s efforts in exploring new housing types during 2012-2013.
2.0 **Balanced Scorecard**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC INITIATIVES</th>
<th>2012 MILESTONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1 Implement the recommendations of the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood</td>
<td>▪ Evolve Pilot Projects Program to emphasize coach houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character and Housing Working Group</td>
<td>▪ Continue implementation of Secondary Suites Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2 Support regional and North Shore planning to advance West Vancouver’s</td>
<td>▪ Commence Regional Context Statement and Housing Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interests</td>
<td>▪ Continue to participate with Metro Vancouver on regional planning issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.0 **Analysis**

3.1 **Discussion**

The Discussion Paper, titled "The Potential for ‘Coach Houses’ in West Vancouver: A Discussion Paper" is attached as Appendix ‘A’ to this report. It will provide the basis for informed discussion during community engagement on the potential for coach houses to address the specific housing needs of West Vancouver residents. Included in Section 3.0 of the Discussion Paper is an overview of key housing issues in West Vancouver, as identified in the Housing Action Plan, and through extensive public engagement during the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing.

In light of the various, and often confusing terms used to describe this type of housing in different jurisdictions, the Discussion Paper establishes a working definition of a coach house as follows: "*a separate, smaller dwelling unit, often located above or attached to a garage, built on a residential lot occupied by a primary residence.*"

The Discussion Paper provides an overview of the ‘coach house’ experience in other municipalities, and illustrates both common and unique approaches for regulating coach house development. Built coach houses in these communities provide readily-accessible examples of different unit types and sizes, and shed light on typical design issues related to coach houses and their ‘fit’ within new or established neighbourhoods.
The following municipalities are profiled in the Discussion Paper:

**Metro Vancouver**
- City of Coquitlam  
- Corporation of Delta  
- Township of Langley  
- District of Maple Ridge  
- City of North Vancouver  
- City of Richmond  
- City of Vancouver

**British Columbia**
- City of Kelowna  
- City of Sidney  
- City of Victoria

**Washington State**
- City of Kirkland  
- City of Seattle

A review of policy objectives in each of these communities illustrates a common desire to diversify existing housing choices in single-family neighbourhoods, and specifically, to provide more rental housing options through 'detached' secondary suites (i.e., coach houses). The Discussion Paper describes contextual differences between municipalities – i.e., older communities where coach houses are being introduced in established neighbourhoods; and newer, outlying communities whether there are opportunities to plan for housing diversity at the outset, through the development of new neighbourhoods. These differences have, in part, shaped the different zoning regulations and approval processes implemented in the respective communities.

A primary objective in preparing this Discussion Paper is to stimulate public debate on coach houses as a possible new housing type in West Vancouver, and to generate public input on specific issues related to coach houses, including:

- Housing choice and affordability;
- Tenure (rental or ownership opportunities);
- Size of units;
- Potential neighbour impacts, and how they might be mitigated;
- How coach houses could ‘fit’ with the established built form character of West Vancouver neighbourhoods;
- District-wide application or geographic limitations (i.e., coach houses throughout the municipality, or only in certain neighbourhoods or under certain conditions); and
- Whether coach houses should provide an opportunity for increased density in single-family neighbourhoods, or whether current density provisions (measured as floor area ratio) should be maintained.
3.2 Consultation

Engagement activities related to coach houses will be undertaken in the Winter/Spring of 2013, and will include:

- Public distribution of the Coach House Discussion Paper, along with other background information, which will be posted on westvancouver.ca;

- Public forum / panel discussion on coach houses (i.e., the third in a series of such forums, based on the successful format initiated during the Community Dialogue);

- Other presentations and special events (to be determined); and

- A community survey.

At the Committee of the Whole meeting in early 2013, where the proposed Housing Action Plan is discussed, Council will be provided with an update on coach house engagement activities.

4.0 Options

4.1 Council may

(as recommended)

- Direct that the discussion paper, titled "The Potential for Coach Houses in West Vancouver: A Discussion Paper", attached as Appendix 'A' to this report, provide the basis for community engagement on coach houses; and

- Direct staff to report back to Council, at a Committee of the Whole meeting in mid-2013, on the results of the engagement process, including possible directions supported by the community.

(or, alternatively)

- Request further information
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1.0 OVERVIEW: WEST VANCOUVER’S ‘COACH HOUSE’ EXAMINATION

In June 2012, West Vancouver Council authorized an examination of ‘coach houses’ as the policy focus for the District’s efforts in exploring new housing types in 2012-2013. This work is identified in the Draft Housing Action Plan (November 2012) as one of five key actions for addressing housing issues in West Vancouver; specifically, limited choice and affordability.

The work program for the coach house examination includes:

- This Discussion Paper, which provides an overview of policy, regulations and approval processes developed in other municipalities to support coach house development, and lessons learned from program implementation. It will provide the basis for an informed community discussion on coach house potential in West Vancouver.

- A Community Engagement Program which may include: public displays, presentations and special events, questionnaires, and tours.

- Should feedback from residents confirm sufficient community interest in coach houses as a new housing type for West Vancouver, the preparation of Draft Coach House Policies and Regulations for Council and community review.

2.0 WHAT IS A ‘COACH HOUSE’?

Historically, a ‘coach house’ was an accessory building used for housing horse-drawn coaches, carriages and other vehicles (i.e., a precursor to the modern-day garage). Some coach houses included living quarters for drivers or servants. Today, the term ‘coach house’ refers primarily to a smaller detached dwelling, which is typically attached to a garage.

Even though coach houses are becoming more common in Metro Vancouver, there is still public misconception about what a ‘coach house’ is due to the common use of various terms to mean essentially the same thing. For example, all of the following terms are used within the Metro Vancouver region:

- Accessory Coach House
- Accessory Dwelling
- Backyard Cottage
- Carriage House
- Coach House
- Detached Garden Suite
- Garden Cottage
- Garden Suite
- Infill One-Family Dwelling
- Laneway House
- Secondary Dwelling Unit
Sometimes different terms are defined within municipal zoning bylaws to describe different types of coach houses (e.g., single v. two-level units, those built at grade level v. those built above a garage, etc.). In other instances, specific terms are used to connote differences between unit size, tenure, location on a lot, relationship to a principal dwelling, or lane orientation. The glossary to West Vancouver’s Official Community Plan (OCP) includes the following definition for a ‘carriage house’, which serves as a good working definition for the purposes of this coach house investigation:

“a separate, smaller dwelling unit, often located above or attached to a garage, built on a residential lot occupied by a primary residence”

3.0 UNDERSTANDING WEST VANCOUVER’S HOUSING ‘GAPS’

Determining whether or not coach houses are an appropriate housing type for West Vancouver requires an understanding of the housing ‘gaps’ in this community, and what role coach houses could play in meeting the housing requirements of West Vancouver residents.

Between 2005 and 2008, the District undertook two initiatives to improve community understanding about housing issues in the community, and possible actions to address these: (1) the preparation of a series of background reports on demographic and housing trends in West Vancouver, now titled “Facts and Stats: Our Community by the Numbers”; and (2) a comprehensive public engagement program, called the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing.

These initiatives have identified the following:

- West Vancouver has a greater proportion of older residents than the region as a whole – i.e., median age of 50 in 2011, compared to a median age of 40 in Metro Vancouver.
- 25% of West Vancouver residents were age 65 or older in 2011, compared to 13% in Metro Vancouver.

The growing proportion of older residents in the community has significant implications for health and social services, recreation, transportation planning, and housing. Access to well-located, low-maintenance, and adaptable/accessible housing that is convenient to community support networks is important to the overall well being and quality of life for many of these residents.

- In 2011, West Vancouver’s housing mix was 65% single-detached, 13% duplex¹/townhouse, and 29% apartments. For most residents, however, the basic

¹ Note: The ‘duplex’ category includes single-detached houses with secondary suites.
housing choice in West Vancouver remains a detached house on its own fee simple lot or an apartment in a multi-family building.

- 79% of younger (age 15-34) and 86% of older (age 55+) residents moving from West Vancouver to elsewhere on the North Shore and Vancouver moved into attached multi-unit housing;
- 70% of residents aged 65+ who moved within West Vancouver moved into multi-unit housing.

This suggests that the availability of multi-unit housing such as duplexes, townhouses, and apartments plays a significant role in determining whether young adults and seniors can be accommodated in the community, or must leave West Vancouver to find the right type of housing elsewhere.

- 17% of West Vancouver’s purpose-built rental stock is considered currently at risk of loss through redevelopment.²

- Given the region’s growing attractiveness as a place to live, a highly constrained supply of land available for development, and high land values in places like West Vancouver, housing is simply not affordable for many residents, particularly in comparison to other Canadian cities.

For West Vancouver, the question is what can be done to improve relative affordability? Part of the answer lies in increasing the supply and diversity of housing options available along the housing continuum, based on type, size and tenure of housing.

The ‘Right Type’ and ‘Right Size’ of Housing

Through the Community Dialogue, West Vancouver residents called for the right type and right size of housing for a diversity of needs in the community; specifically for:

- Older residents wishing to downsize into smaller, more manageable housing that will allow them to age in place in their own neighbourhoods;
- Younger families and young adults wishing to establish themselves in the community;
- Lower income residents wishing to find more affordable housing options, including rental housing;

² Source: “Metro Vancouver Purpose-Built Rental Housing: Inventory and Risk Analysis”, Coriolis Consulting Corp., April 2012.
- People requiring accessible / adaptable housing, with special features to accommodate their unique requirements; and
- People requiring assisted living and other support to remain in the community.

Residents also identified the kinds of new housing they would like to see introduced in West Vancouver to begin to address some of these housing gaps. A community survey\(^3\) conducted during Phase III of the Community Dialogue identified strong community interest in the following:

- More housing options for seniors and young families (71% and 54% respectively)
- More affordable housing (51%)
- Accessible / adaptable housing (61%)
- Housing units in the 1,000 to 1,500 sq.ft. range (62%)

On a District-wide basis, 74% supported the legalization of secondary suites, and 61% indicated support for introducing ‘infill’ units (such as coach houses) on existing single-family lots. District staff continue to receive regular inquiries from West Vancouver residents who are interested in building a coach house on their properties, but there are no policies or regulations currently in place to provide for coach house development.

**Ongoing Public Interest in ‘Coach Houses’**

The District receives regular enquiries from residents in all areas of West Vancouver wishing to build a coach house on their properties. The common reasons provided by residents are that a coach house would provide them the opportunity to:

- downsize into a smaller housing unit on their own property;
- provide self-contained accommodation for an elderly parent, adult child, or on-site caregiver;
- design a custom housing unit for a family member with special needs (e.g., limited mobility); or
- create a detached secondary suite to maintain the privacy of the principal dwelling unit.

---

\(^3\) This survey was undertaken during Phase III of the Community Dialogue (May-June 2008), and was administered by Synovate, a professional survey firm. The statistical confidence limits for a sample size of 654 are ±3.8%, 19 times out of 20.
4.0 THE ‘COACH HOUSE’ EXPERIENCE IN OTHER COMMUNITIES

While West Vancouver is now examining the potential for coach houses in this community, a number of other municipalities in Metro Vancouver, elsewhere in British Columbia, and in Washington State have implemented policies and regulations to provide for coach house development. Built coach houses in each of these communities provide readily-accessible examples of different unit types and sizes, and shed light on typical design issues related to coach houses and their ‘fit’ within new or established neighbourhoods.

The following municipalities provide a cross-section of communities in terms of size and location, and illustrate both common and unique regulatory approaches for coach house development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metro Vancouver</th>
<th>British Columbia</th>
<th>Washington State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Coquitlam</td>
<td>City of Kelowna</td>
<td>City of Kirkland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation of Delta</td>
<td>City of Sidney</td>
<td>City of Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township of Langley</td>
<td>City of Victoria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Maple Ridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of North Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Richmond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In researching coach house policies and regulations adopted in these communities, key questions have included the following:

- What were the key objectives for introducing coach houses?
- How has coach house development been implemented (i.e., regulations, approval processes)?
- What are the outcomes? (e.g., issues that may have arisen, subsequent changes to regulations/processes, number of units built, etc.)

Understanding the experience of these communities provides:

- the basis for informed community discussion about coach houses as a potential new housing type in West Vancouver; and
- possible models for draft coach house regulations, should there be strong public support for introducing this type of housing in West Vancouver neighbourhoods.

The following discussion provides an overview of both common and unique approaches to coach house implementation, in terms of land use and housing policies, and zoning regulations.
4.1 COMMON OBJECTIVES

Communities in Metro Vancouver and further afield have primarily looked to coach houses as an opportunity to diversify existing housing choices in single-family neighbourhoods, and specifically, to provide a rental housing option. Coach houses are often described and perceived of as a form of ‘hidden’ or ‘invisible’ density:

- Coach houses are modest-sized dwellings typically located in the rear yard, and are not readily visible from behind the main (street-facing) house;
- They are typically sited on the portion of a lot that would otherwise be occupied by a detached garage, and do not reduce the area of the back yard.
- They are seen as a more sensitive approach for adding rental units and densifying established neighbourhoods – i.e., as compared to more intensive infill housing types.

4.2 DIFFERENT COMMUNITY CONTEXTS

*Older, Established Communities*

In general, the introduction of coach houses in older, established communities must address issues related to neighbourhood character, resistance to land use intensification, and potential requirements for upgrading aging infrastructure to accommodate new development. Both the City of Vancouver and the City of North Vancouver undertake a comprehensive design review to ensure compatibility of coach houses with adjacent properties. Coach house regulations in these communities, as well as in Seattle, Washington and Kirkland, Washington apply to single-family neighbourhoods across the municipality, rather than any one neighbourhood.

Some communities have chosen to consider coach house proposals on a one-by-one basis through individual rezoning applications:

- Kelowna has provided for coach houses since 1998; and 167 units have been approved through rezoning. A further 500+ coach houses have been built within the RU6 (Two Dwelling House) Zone, where coach houses are a permitted use (rezoning not required). Rezoning applications have been denied in cases where there has been considerable neighbour opposition (typically in areas with very few coach houses).
- Victoria adopted its ‘Garden Suite’ policy in 2011. Since that time, two rezoning applications have been approved, one has been denied, and one is currently under review.
New and Redeveloping Communities

Newer, growing communities in more outlying areas have a greater opportunity to provide for housing diversity in the development of planned new neighbourhoods, rather than ‘retrofit’ existing neighbourhoods to meet changing housing needs. A good example of this is the Township of Langley, which has provided for coach house development within newly urbanizing areas in Willoughby, Fort Langley, and Murrayville.

Some older, suburban communities have identified coach houses as an appropriate housing form in specific areas or neighbourhoods – such as Southwest Coquitlam, Delta’s three urban centres (Ladner, North Delta and Tsawwassen), and Maple Ridge’s town centre area. The Town of Sidney has identified ‘detached secondary dwellings’ as an appropriate infill housing type in its established Orchard Avenue area.

4.3 REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

Coach houses are commonly viewed as ‘detached’ secondary suites, as reflected in similar zoning requirements – e.g., maximum floor area, parking, etc. A comparative overview of zoning regulations in other communities is provided in Tables 1-A, 1-B, 2 and 3 in the Appendix. These tables also define the respective ‘coach house’ terms used in each community, and describe where coach houses are permitted, whether or not coach houses provide for additional density on a lot, maximum building height, and required development approvals.

The approval process for coach houses varies between local governments. Some municipalities require a building permit only. Others have implemented a process of design review, which is implemented through a Development Permit (Council approval or delegated to staff); or, in one case (Delta) a design covenant. As noted above, some municipalities require rezoning, so that coach house proposals can be considered on a one-by-one basis.

4.4 COMMUNITY HIGHLIGHTS

Vancouver

The City of Vancouver has played a lead role in coach house development, given its high profile ‘EcoDensity’ initiatives, and the public interest generated by its ‘Laneway Housing’ program. With over 700 laneway houses now approved, Vancouver provides a number of coach house examples within different neighbourhood contexts, and a laboratory for understanding various issues related to this type of housing.

The City of Vancouver’s ‘laneway housing’ regulations provide for an increase in number of units (i.e., a second legal suite) on a single lot, and an increase in density – i.e., an additional
0.15 Floor Area Ratio (FAR); whereas other communities provide for either a secondary suite or a coach house, but not both.

Vancouver is also unique among municipalities, in that only one parking space is required when a laneway house is added to a property – for use by any one of three potential dwelling units on the lot. Most municipalities require that one parking space be provided for the coach house; the other exception being Victoria, which requires a minimum one parking space for the principal dwelling only.

In monitoring the implementation of its Laneway Housing program, the City of Vancouver reported in October 2012 that rental rates for laneway houses ranged from $1,000 to $2,100 per month for 1 – 2 bedroom units in various locations across the city. Media reports in Vancouver have also cited typical construction costs for laneway house as ranging between $200,000 and $300,000.

---

4 Vancouver permits a laneway house in addition to a secondary suite in areas zoned RS-1 and RS-5 (the majority of the city’s single-family areas), which means up to three self-contained dwellings on a single lot.
North Vancouver

The City of North Vancouver looks to rental coach houses as a ‘redistribution’ of permitted floor area (i.e., from the principal house to the coach house), which is common to other communities (e.g., Sidney). Something unique to North Vancouver is a two-tiered approval process:

- Both Level ‘A’ (≤ 800 sq.ft., one storey) and Level ‘B’ (≤ 1000 sq.ft., 1.6 storeys) coach houses require a Development Permit (staff approval).
- Level ‘B’ units also require a Development Variance Permit (Council approval) to allow for the additional height, and the ‘redistribution’ of the additional floor area above the 800 square feet and 1 storey allowed for a Level ‘A’ coach house.

Kelowna

The City of Kelowna has provided ‘carriage houses’ since 1998, and nearly 700 units have built in that community under different zoning approaches:

- Carriage houses are a permitted use in the RU6 Zone. Over 500 units have been developed without rezoning.
- 167 units have resulted from individual rezoning.
- In all cases, a Development Permit (delegated to staff) is required.

Richmond

Coach houses were introduced in Richmond in 2004, and approximately 100 units have been built to date. They are provided for in a number of areas, and rezoning is required. In November 2012, Richmond amended zoning regulations for the ‘Edgemere’ area to permit both ‘coach houses’ and ‘granny flats’ (the latter a single-level unit, not attached to a garage) as outright uses (no rezoning required), but established a Development Permit requirement.
Victoria

Victoria’s Garden Suites policy was adopted in September 2011, and only a handful of garden suite applications have been considered to date. Given the age of this community, and the distinct heritage character of many of its neighbourhoods, the City may request heritage designation (for the principal dwelling) for applicable properties – as a condition for garden suite approval.

Seattle and Kirkland

Coach house policies in Seattle and Kirkland are, in part, an outcome of the Washington State Growth Management Act (1990), which directed local governments to focus future growth within established urban areas and contain suburban sprawl. Coach houses in Washington state communities have been introduced within a broader context of ground-oriented infill housing. Kirkland uses the term ‘accessory dwelling unit’ to describe any additional dwelling units on a single family lot, whereas ‘cottage’ and ‘carriage unit’ are two infill housing types that may be developed as either rental or ownership housing. Seattle’s rental coach houses are referred to as ‘backyard cottages’.

Backyard Cottage, Seattle

‘Danielson Grove’ Cottage Community in Kirkland
(developed by The Cottage Company)
5.0 ARE COACH HOUSES APPROPRIATE FOR WEST VANCOUVER?

Determining whether or not coach houses are an appropriate housing type for West Vancouver requires a thorough understanding of the housing gaps in this community, and what role coach houses could play in fulfilling the housing requirements of West Vancouver residents. Specific objectives for housing choice and affordability have implications for unit size, building design, outdoor space, landscaping, parking, and other considerations such as fit with established neighbourhood character.

A primary objective of this Discussion Paper is to stimulate public debate on coach houses as a possible new housing type in West Vancouver, and to generate community input on specific issues related to coach houses:

1. How Could Coach Houses Help to Improve Housing Choice and Affordability in West Vancouver?

- A coach house, as rental housing, provides a potential mortgage-helper for supporting home ownership.

- A coach house provides an opportunity to house family members on-site in a detached, self-contained unit; perhaps enabling older individuals to ‘downsize’ from a traditional house elsewhere in the community. Coach houses are ‘smaller’ units (typically under 1000 sq.ft.) and are considered appropriate for households of 1 to 2 adults, perhaps with a young child.

- Coach houses could be custom-designed to meet specific housing needs within a relatively small space:
  - Accessibility / adaptable design features
  - Flexibility for live-work options
  - With or without attached parking
  - Manageable private outdoor space

2. What is the Right Size for a Coach House?

- During the Community Dialogue, residents indicated a strong desire for smaller-sized housing units in the 1,000 – 1,500 sq.ft. range. The maximum size for a secondary suite in West Vancouver is just under 1,000 sq.ft.; this is also the maximum unit size among other Metro Vancouver municipalities that allow for coach houses as detached suites and is based upon provisions within the BC Building Code.
• Does this coincide with household expectations for down-sized living in West Vancouver, or should we be considering different-sized coach houses?

3. **Should Coach Houses Provide Rental Accommodation Only? Or, Should the District Allow for Strata-Titled Ownership?**

• At the outset of research into other municipalities, no assumptions were made about unit size or tenure. However, the communities surveyed as part of this examination have looked to coach houses as a form of rental housing in single-family neighbourhoods and, in most cases, as a detached alternative to a secondary suite.

• Regulations for rental coach houses are typically based on secondary suite provisions, with maximum unit sizes under 1,000 sq.ft.

• Some communities do provide for ‘strata-titled’ coach houses within designated areas but this is a more intensive ‘infill’ housing type, with unit sizes typically ranging from 1,200 to 1,800 sq.ft.

• There are three examples of strata-titled coach houses currently under construction in West Vancouver; in the “Hollyburn Mews” development in the 2000-block Esquimalt Avenue (see artist’s rendering below). This project required an Official Community Plan amendment (which designated the block for future infill housing development) and a rezoning to permit a mix of duplexes and coach houses (9 strata units).

![Strata-Titled Coach Houses at “Hollyburn Mews”, West Vancouver (under construction)](image)
4. **What are the Potential ‘Neighbour’ Impacts of Coach Houses, and How Might These be Mitigated?**

- Based on a review of other jurisdictions, common neighbour concerns relate to scale and massing of coach houses, privacy and view impacts on adjacent properties, and parking. These are addressed in part, through zoning regulations and, in some cases, through a formal design review process (see below).

5. **How Can We Ensure that Coach Houses ‘Fit’ With the Established Built Form Character of West Vancouver’s Neighbourhoods?**

- Form and character guidelines could be developed to ensure fit with neighbourhood context, and a design review process could be implemented. This may include a Development Permit requirement (approval by Council or delegated to staff). The Design Review Committee (DRC) may play a role in the development of the form and character guidelines. The DRC could also potentially review coach house designs, though this would significantly alter its Terms of Reference and increase time and processing costs; an alternative may be to refer projects to the DRC that staff are unable to resolve.

![Example of a ‘Laneway House’ in Vancouver’s Mackenzie Heights neighbourhood, designed in the same style as the 1930s-era principal dwelling, and using the same exterior materials and colours.](image)

6. **Should Coach Houses be Allowed: District-Wide? Only in Certain Areas? Or, Only Under Certain Conditions?**

- Municipal approaches to coach house development vary between communities:
  - Where there is an opportunity to introduce greater housing diversity through development of new neighbourhoods, coach house implementation tends to focus on those areas, rather than established neighbourhoods.
In mature, built-out communities, greater efforts are made to increase the variety of housing options in existing neighbourhoods. Coach house policies are either implemented in single-family neighbourhoods across the municipality, or are focused on particular neighbourhoods, or allowed only on properties meeting certain criteria.

Some municipalities limit coach house potential to only those lots with lane access or location on a corner. From a design perspective, corner lots provide an opportunity for coach houses to have a front door facing a street, and a stronger identity as a smaller private residence.

7. Should Coach Houses Provide for Densification in Existing Neighbourhoods?

- The City of Vancouver has provided for increased density in implementing its Laneway Housing program – i.e., an additional (third) dwelling unit on a lot, and a density of 0.15 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for coach house units to a maximum of 750 sq.ft.⁵.

- Other communities have restricted coach houses to a detached suite option (i.e., one rental suite per property); in some cases, with an increase in permitted floor area (i.e., as compared to maximum floor area without a coach house).

- The City of North Vancouver looks to rental coach houses as a ‘redistribution’ of permitted floor area (i.e., from the principal house to the coach house).

⁵ 750 sq.ft. is the maximum size of a laneway house on a 50 ft. x 120 ft. or larger lot; maximum unit size on a typical 33 ft. x 120 ft. lot is approximately 500 sq.ft.
6.0 POSSIBLE DIRECTIONS FOR WEST VANCOUVER

If community engagement on coach houses indicates strong public support for this type of housing in West Vancouver, the following outlines some possible directions for moving forward on coach house implementation:

**Over the Shorter Term**

Based on the lessons learned from other jurisdictions, introduction of coach houses as detached secondary suites (without an increase in permitted density) could be implemented in West Vancouver over the shorter term. Required work would include the following:

- A Zoning Bylaw amendment (to allow for ‘detached suites’ as a permitted use, in zones that permit secondary suites). Alternatively, Development Variance Permits (DVPs) could be used to allow for suite ‘detachment’ on individual properties. However, this would be a more onerous process for property owner, and require more District resources to implement – given that each application would be considered on a one-by-one basis, and would be subject to Council approval.

- If a process of design review is implemented, an Official Community Plan amendment would be required to establish a Development Permit Area designation and guidelines for coach house development. Based on examples from other jurisdictions, delegation of Development Permit approval to staff would be appropriate (as is the case with Environmental Development Permits).

**Possible Over the Longer Term**

If West Vancouver residents wish to explore forms of ‘coach house’ development, which are more akin to infill housing, further work would be required to develop a policy framework for infill housing – e.g., locational considerations (area, neighbourhood, proximity to transit, community services and amenities), size and tenure of units, etc.
APPENDIX:

COMPARISON OF COACH HOUSE REGULATIONS

IN OTHER COMMUNITIES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE</th>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>MUNICIPALITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - A</td>
<td>Metro Vancouver</td>
<td>Coquitlam, Delta, Langley Township and Maple Ridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - B</td>
<td>Metro Vancouver</td>
<td>North Vancouver City, Richmond and Vancouver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Other B.C.</td>
<td>Kelowna, Sidney and Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Washington State</td>
<td>Washington State: Kirkland and Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TABLE 1-A: OVERVIEW OF COACH HOUSE 'REGULATIONS' IN SELECTED METRO VANCOUVER COMMUNITIES: COQUITLAM, DELTA, LANGLEY TOWNSHIP, AND MAPLE RIDGE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Term Used</strong></td>
<td><strong>COQUITLAM</strong></td>
<td><strong>DELTA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Cottage</td>
<td>A one-storey, at-grade residential structure accessory to a one-family dwelling unit.</td>
<td>Secondary Dwelling Unit Term used in Zoning Bylaw but not specifically defined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carriage House</td>
<td>An accessory residential suite, located on the second storey above a garage.</td>
<td>Coach Housing (OCP definition) A second dwelling unit located in an accessory building on a lot. The accessory building is typically a separate garage with the dwelling unit situated on the 2nd storey or at ground level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Where Allowed per OCP and Zoning Bylaw?</strong></td>
<td>Properties designated in the SW Coquitlam Plan as &quot;Neighbourhood Attached Residential&quot; (NAR) can be developed with garden cottages or carriage houses, under RT-1 zoning. Approximately 1,100 of 1,500 NAR-designated lots are already zoned RT-1; the balance would require rezoning. RT-1 Zone establishes following requirements for garden cottages / carriage houses:  - Min. 370 m² lot area and 10 m lot width if there is a lane; Min. 12m lot width without lane  - Not permitted on a lot with a secondary suite or lots less than 740m²  - Lots larger than 740m2 can have both a secondary suite and a garden cottage/carriage house.</td>
<td>OCP identifies coach houses as appropriate for urban areas close to community services and amenities in Ladner, North Delta and Tsawassen - i.e., In areas with a &quot;Ground-Oriented Residential&quot; designation. Rezoning to RS 9 Zone - Single Family (330 m²) Infill Residential is required (considered on a site-by-site basis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Density</strong></td>
<td>Yes. Floor area of garden cottage/carriage house is in addition to the max. floor area of for the principal dwelling.</td>
<td>No. Floor area of coach house is within the max. 0.65 FAR permitted for the lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Size</strong></td>
<td>Max. 50 m²</td>
<td>Min. 42 m² excluding garage; Max. 110 m² including garage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1-A: Overview of Coach House 'Regulations' in Selected Metro Vancouver Communities: Coquitlam, Delta, Langley Township, and Maple Ridge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coquitlam</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Langley Township</th>
<th>Maple Ridge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Max. Height</strong></td>
<td>Garden Cottage: 3.0 metres; or 4.3 metres for buildings with roof slope of ≥ 3:12 for an area of at least 80% of all roof surfaces. Carriage House: 5.0 metres; or 7.0 metres per above requirements.</td>
<td>2 storeys 9.8 metres to ridge of pitched roof 7.3 metres to mid-roof (or to top of a flat roof)</td>
<td>CD-4 Zone: Max. FAR of all buildings and structures ≤ 0.65; Max. 2-person occupancy.</td>
<td>(1) Lesser of 4.5m or 1 storey for lot sizes &lt; 0.4 hectare, except: (a) 6.0 metres for properties zoned RS-2 or RS-3; and (b) on properties with lane access, detached garden suite above an accessory structure or garage: 6.0 metres; or ground level unit: 4.5 metres (2) Lesser of 6 metres or 2 storeys for lot sizes of ≥ hectares, except: (a) on properties zoned A-1, A-2, A-3 &amp; A-4, may build a detached garden suite above the detached residential structure or an off-street parking structure to a maximum height of 7.5 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On-Site Parking</strong></td>
<td>1 space for accessory rental suite, plus two spaces for principal house</td>
<td>1 space for secondary dwelling unit</td>
<td>R-CL(CH) Zone: 1 space for coach house; CD-4 Zone: 2 additional spaces</td>
<td>1 (covenanted) space for detached garden suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approval Process</strong></td>
<td>Building Permit only</td>
<td>No Development Permit required, but applicants must enter into a design covenant in accordance with Ladner Coach House Guidelines for single-family neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Building Permit only</td>
<td>Building Permit only. Prior to permit issuance, covenants are required for the following: - Housing Agreement for provision of affordable rental housing and owner-occupancy - Dedicated parking space for the detached garden suite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notes</strong></td>
<td>- Introduced January 2012 - 4 applications in process in Southwest Coquitlam - To date: 8 building permits issued in Somerton Development in East Coquitlam; 6 more in process</td>
<td>- 1999 – First coach house rezoning (in Ladner) - 2007 – Ladner Area Plan amended to include Design Guidelines for coach houses - To date: 30 coach houses built in Ladner; 4 in North Delta</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Introduced in 2008 - 15 approved or in process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term Used</td>
<td>NORTH VANCOUVER CITY</td>
<td>RICHMOND</td>
<td>RICHMOND / Edgemere Area</td>
<td>VANCOUVER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Coach House</td>
<td>A detached unit that is subordinate in size to the principal home, and must be non-stratified. The owner must reside on the property.</td>
<td>Coach house - a self-contained dwelling that: [Bylaw 8922, Nov 19/12] a) is accessory and either attached or detached to the single detached housing unit, except in Edgemere where it must be detached from the principal dwelling unit; b) has at least 75% of its floor area located above the garage, except in Edgemere where a maximum of 60% of its floor area must be located above a detached garage; c) has cooking, food preparation, sleeping and bathing facilities that are separate from those of the principal dwelling unit located on the lot; d) has an entrance separate from the entrance to the garage; and e) is a separate and distinct use from a secondary suite, and does not include its own secondary suite.</td>
<td>Granny flat - a self-contained dwelling that: [Bylaw 8922, Nov 19/12] a) is accessory to and detached from the single detached housing unit; b) is located totally on the ground floor in the rear yard of a single detached housing lot; c) has cooking, food preparation, sleeping and bathing facilities that are separate from those of the principal dwelling unit located on the lot; d) has an entrance separate from the entrance to the garage; and e) is a separate and distinct use from a secondary suite, and does not include its own secondary suite.</td>
<td>Laneway House - A small house at the rear of a lot near the lane which may include both a dwelling unit and parking/accessory uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where Allowed per OCP and Zoning Bylaw?

| OCP established Coach House Development Permit Area designation. Accessory Coach Houses are permitted in all single-family (RS-1) zones. Lane required. Rezoning may be required for some Level 'B' units. | Rezoning required on a site-by-site basis. Permitted use in the following zones: - Coach Houses (RCH) - Infill Residential (R11, R12) - R/9 (Hamilton) - ZS12 (Broadmoor) - ZS20 (Burkeville) Lane required in RCH, R/0 and ZS20 Zones | As an outcome of Richmond's current OCP review process, a portion of the Edgemere area was re-zoned to RE1 Zone (to permit granny flats and coach houses) in November 2012. The draft OCP includes Development Permit Area Guidelines for Granny Flats and Coach Houses in Edgemere. Lane required. | RS1 and RS5 zones city-wide. Min. lot width: 10 metres Lots must have access to an open lane, be located on a corner with an open or dedicated lane, or on a double-fronting lot. |

Additional Density

| No | Yes: Additional 0.05 FAR in R/9 Zone; and additional 0.10 FAR in R11, R12, and ZS12 Zones | Yes: Additional 23.2 m² (0.05 FAR x 464.5 m²) on lots with an accessory dwelling | Yes: Additional 0.125 FAR and laneway house in addition to secondary suite (3 units on one lot) |

Unit Size

<p>| Lesser of 0.15 times lot area or 74.32 m² for Level 'A' units or 92.9 m² for Level 'B' units. | Min. 33 m² and max. 60 m² in the RCH and ZS20 Zones; Max. 60 m² in the R/9, R11, R12 and ZS12 Zones. | Granny Flat: min. 33 m² / max. 70 m² Coach House: min. 33m² / max. 60m², of which at least 40% is on 1st storey. | 0.125 FAR to max. 70 m², results in 46.5 m² on typical 33x120 lot and 70 m² on 50x120 or larger lot. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Max. Height</th>
<th>NORTH VANCOUVER CITY</th>
<th>RICHMOND</th>
<th>RICHMOND / Edgemere Area</th>
<th>VANCOUVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 'A' Units: 1 storey, 4.57 metres</td>
<td>RCH, R/9 and ZS20 Zones: Lesser of 2 storeys or 7.4 meters</td>
<td>Granny Flat: Lesser of 1 storey or 5 metres</td>
<td>1-storey: 3.7 metres; 1.5-storey: 6.1 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Level 'B' Units: 1.6 storeys, 6.7 metres</td>
<td>RI1, RI2 and ZS12 Zones: 9.0 metres.</td>
<td>Coach House: Lesser of 1.5 storeys or 6 metres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Parking</td>
<td>2 spaces; 1 for main dwelling and 1 for coach house</td>
<td>RI1 and RI2 Zones: 1 space per dwelling or 0.5 space per bedroom, whichever is greater; max. 1.7 spaces per dwelling unit</td>
<td>1 space per granny flat or coach house.</td>
<td>Min. 1 parking space on the lot, for use by any of a potential three dwelling units on the lot (including the laneway house).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R/9 and ZS20 Zones: 1 space for coach house</td>
<td>ZS12 Zone: 2 spaces per primary dwelling; 2 per additional smaller dwelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>On lots up to 740 m², max. 1 enclosed or covered parking space up to 21 m². On larger lots, max. 2 enclosed or covered spaces up to 42 m².</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval Process</td>
<td>Development Permit required (delegated to staff).</td>
<td>Building permit only.</td>
<td>Development permit required (delegated to staff).</td>
<td>Applications subject to “Development Planner (staff) Review”, which focuses on the massing and design of the partial upper storey, to reduce impacts on neighbouring properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Introduced in 2012. As of November 23, 2012: 12 units occupied or under construction; Development Permits for another 8 units issued or under review.</td>
<td>Introduced in 2004. Approximately 100 units built to date.</td>
<td>Introduced November 2012 n/a</td>
<td>Introduced July 2009. As of November 16, 2012: 739 applications approved (of these ±400 have had final inspections and are occupied).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term Used</td>
<td>KELOWNA</td>
<td>SIDNEY</td>
<td>VICTORIA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carriage House</td>
<td>Detached Secondary Dwelling</td>
<td>Garden Suite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An additional dwelling unit located within an</td>
<td>A secondary dwelling located in an accessory building.</td>
<td>A building used or designated as a self-contained dwelling unit located on a lot with a single family dwelling and does not include a strata lot.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accessory building that is subordinate to the principle dwelling unit and is a single real estate entity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where Allowed per OCP and Zoning Bylaw?</td>
<td>Requires rezoning to the ‘c’ version of the following zones: (e.g., RU1 to RU1c)</td>
<td>R1.3 and R3 Zones in the Orchard Avenue area. Owner occupancy required. Only in conjunction with a single-family dwelling with no secondary suite. Min. lot area = 400 m² Min. lot width = 10 metres</td>
<td>OCP establishes Development Permit Area 15E – Intensive Residential Garden Suites Rezoning on an individual site basis is required Garden suites are permitted in the R1-B-GS and R1-B-GS2 Zones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Density</td>
<td>Yes. Floor area of carriage house is in addition to that allowed for principal dwelling.</td>
<td>No. Size of building is regulated through lot coverage: max 35% for 2-storey; and 40% for 1-storey. Balance of site coverage not used for principal dwelling may be used for detached secondary dwelling.</td>
<td>Yes. Floor area of the garden suite is in addition to that of the principal dwelling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Size</td>
<td>Lesser of 90 m² or 75% of the total floor area of the principal building.</td>
<td>Min. 37 m² Max. 60 m²</td>
<td>Max 37 m² except: potential for larger unit size for conversion of existing garages (R1-B-GS); and Max. 56 m² on &quot;plus sites&quot; – i.e., on lots located on corner, with two street frontages, rear lane, and &gt; 557 m² (R1-B-GS2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note</td>
<td>A secondary suites is the lesser of 90 m² or 40%.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Height</td>
<td>The lesser of 4.5 metres or the height of the existing principal dwelling unit on the same property.</td>
<td>Max. 2 storeys. Lesser of 85% of height of principal dwelling or 6 metres</td>
<td>3.5 metres (R1-B-GS) 5.5 metres (R1-B-GS2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Site Parking</td>
<td>1 space for carriage house.</td>
<td>1 space for detached secondary dwelling</td>
<td>No additional parking requirement for garden suite, but primary dwelling requires min. 1 space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval Process</td>
<td>Development Permit required (delegated to staff).</td>
<td>Building Permit only. DVP required to allow for detached secondary dwelling on properties that do not have sufficient unused lot coverage.</td>
<td>Development Permit (DP Area 15E) is processed concurrent with rezoning (Council approval). Heritage Designation requested if property is on Register.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes</td>
<td>Introduced circa 1998. To date: 167 carriage houses (from rezoning); and over 500 units in the RU6 (Two Dwelling Housing) Zone, where coach houses are a permitted use</td>
<td>Introduced June 2012. To date: 1 Building Permit approved, but project is not proceeding.</td>
<td>Garden Suite policy adopted in Sept 2011; OCP amended to establish Development Permit requirement for garden suites (as intensive residential development). To date: 2 approved rezoning; 1 denied; and 1 in process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIRKLAND</td>
<td>SEATTLE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Term Used</strong></td>
<td>Backyard Cottage – A small residential structure sharing the same lot as a house, but self-contained and physically separate from the primary house. Referred to in zoning terms as “Accessory Dwelling Unit, Detached”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) – A subordinate dwelling unit added to, created within, or detached from a single-family structure, that provides basic requirements for living, sleeping, eating, cooking and sanitation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Where Allowed?</strong></td>
<td>SF 5000, SF 7200 and SF 9600 Zones</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| In conjunction with any single-family dwelling, unless specifically excluded in Zoning Code – e.g., not permitted with cottage or carriage units. | Min. lot requirements:  
- Area = 371.6 m²  
- Width = 7.62 metres  
- Depth = 21.34 metres |
| **Additional Density**                                                  | No                                                                      |
| No, but not counted as a “dwelling unit” in sections of the Zoning Ordinance which limit the number of detached dwelling units in a single-family zone to one. |                                                                 |
| **Unit Size**                                                          | Max. 74.32 m² (including garage or storage)                           |
| The lesser of 74.32 m² of gross floor area or 40% of the of the primary residence and ADU combined. |                                                                 |
| **Max. Height**                                                        | 3.7 metres to 4.9 metres (varies depending on lot width)               |
| Must conform to the height restrictions for single-family dwellings in the applicable zone (usually 7.6 metres to 9.1 metres) |                                                                 |
| **On-Site Parking**                                                    | 1 parking space for the accessory dwelling unit.                       |
| One parking space for the accessory dwelling unit.                     | No parking required if located in a designated urban village or urban centre. |
| **Approval Process**                                                   | Building permit only (Washington State equivalent).  
Owner occupancy covenant.                                              |
| Assumed to be building permit only.                                    |                                                                 |
| **Notes**                                                              | Introduced in Southeast Seattle in 2006; expanded city-wide in 2009.  
Approximately 55 units approved through April 2011.                   |
| An ADU is a rental-only use, whereas cottages and carriage units may be developed as either ownership or rental housing. |                                                                 |
COUNCIL REPORT

Date: November 19, 2012
From: Geri Boyle, Manager of Community Planning
       Stephen Mikicich, Sr. Community Planner
Subject: Housing Action Plan

RECOMMENDED THAT:


2. Staff report back to Council on the results of the community review;

3. Council consider the Housing Action Plan, specifically the five recommended actions for addressing housing issues, at a Committee of the Whole in early 2013; and

4. Council consider adoption of the Housing Action Plan, with appropriate refinements, so that the Housing Action Plan may form the basis for the District work plan related to housing.

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to present for Council’s consideration a Housing Action Plan for West Vancouver. A Housing Action Plan provides a local government framework for developing and implementing strategies to address defined housing issues in the community.

West Vancouver’s Housing Action Plan builds on the work undertaken during the 2004 Official Community Plan (OCP) update and the 2007-2008 Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing. The Plan will be used to:

- continue the ‘dialogue’ on housing issues and opportunities in the community;
- clarify West Vancouver’s goals for housing diversity and affordability; and
- identify possible local government actions to address these goals and establish priorities for the District.
1.0 Background

1.1 Prior Resolutions

June 25, 2012 — Council received for information the report from the Manager of Community Planning titled “Housing Action Plan”, dated June 12, 2012; and the report from the Manager of Community Planning and Senior Community Planner titled “Transitioning to an Investigation of the Potential of Coach Houses in West Vancouver”, dated June 11, 2012. Further, Council established an examination of ‘coach houses’ as the policy focus for the District’s efforts in exploring new housing types during 2012-2013.

2.0 Balanced Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC INITIATIVES</th>
<th>2012 MILESTONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1 Implement the recommendations of the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing Working Group</td>
<td>▪ Evolve Pilot Projects Program to emphasize coach houses&lt;br&gt;▪ Continue implementation of Secondary Suites Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2 Support regional and North Shore planning to advance West Vancouver’s interests</td>
<td>▪ Commence Regional Context Statement and Housing Action Plan&lt;br&gt;▪ Continue to participate with Metro Vancouver on regional planning issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.0 Analysis

3.1 Discussion

The Housing Action Plan is a tool for raising community awareness about housing issues in West Vancouver; and for developing targeted policies and practices for improving housing choice and affordability.

The Plan (attached as Appendix ‘A’) outlines the existing policy framework for housing in West Vancouver, the key housing ‘gaps’ based on population and demographic trends and the Community Dialogue discussions, and the District’s current practices related to housing. Finally, it recommends five actions for moving forward on housing issues, as follows:

1. Continue established practices for supporting development of seniors’ and rental housing, accessible/adaptable housing units, and variations in unit size in new developments;

2. Consider coach houses following an informed community discussion;
3. Identify, consider and engage the community in a discussion of opportunities to retain and add purpose-built rental housing;

4. Strengthen OCP Policies on housing diversity to provide a framework for consideration of innovative housing proposals; and


3.2 Consultation

Consultation on the Housing Action Plan provides an opportunity to continue West Vancouver's community dialogue on housing.

The Plan will be posted on westvancouver.ca. Residents will be advised of the opportunity to review and make comments on the Plan via an advertisement in the North Shore News (November 2012), and a notice in the District's Community Report (December 2012). Written comments may be submitted by letter or email, and all input will be summarized in a report to Council.

Further engagement opportunities will be provided during Housing Action Plan implementation, which will focus on coach houses and purpose-built rental housing during 2013.

4.0 Options

4.1 Council may:

(as recommended)

- Direct staff to make the Housing Action Plan available for community review and comment through January 2013, and report back to Council on the results of this process at a Committee of the Whole meeting in early 2013; and consider adoption of the Housing Action Plan, with appropriate refinements, so that the Housing Action Plan may form the basis for the District work plan related to housing.

(or, alternatively)

- Request further information
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1.0 OVERVIEW

A Housing Action Plan provides a local government framework for developing and implementing strategies to address defined housing issues in the community. West Vancouver’s Housing Action Plan builds on the work undertaken during the 2004 Official Community Plan (OCP) update and the 2007-2008 Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing. The Plan will be used to:

- continue the ‘dialogue’ on housing issues and opportunities in the community;
- clarify West Vancouver’s goals for housing diversity and affordability; and
- identify possible local government actions to address these goals and establish priorities for the District.

The Housing Action Plan outlines the existing policy framework for housing in West Vancouver, the key housing ‘gaps’ based on population and demographic trends and the Community Dialogue discussions, and the District’s current practices related to housing. Finally, it recommends five actions for moving forward on housing issues, as follows:

1. Continue established practices for supporting development of seniors’ and rental housing, accessible/adaptable housing units, and variations in unit size in new developments;
2. Consider coach houses following an informed community discussion;
3. Identify, consider and engage the community in a discussion of opportunities to retain and add purpose-built rental housing;
4. Strengthen OCP Policies on housing diversity to provide a framework for consideration of innovative housing proposals; and
2.0 THE POLICY CONTEXT FOR HOUSING IN WEST VANCOUVER

2.1 Official Community Plan

West Vancouver residents recognize the challenges of managing future change and meeting emerging housing needs, while preserving the highly valued character of West Vancouver’s existing neighbourhoods.

During West Vancouver’s Official Community Plan (OCP) review process (2001-2004), residents identified ‘housing’ as the most important issue for the community. Key concerns included limited housing choice and affordability – particularly for seniors, young adults, and young families. Differing ideas about the underlying issues and how they should be addressed emerged from the OCP review discussion. Consequently, the OCP includes focused and limited policies related to housing choice and affordability; and affirmed the need for more work to understand housing issues and potential actions.

The OCP is founded on eight planning principles for building a sustainable community. Principle #3 is to: “provide for a diversity of housing types to accommodate a balanced and diverse population in terms of age, ability, income, and household type.” Key OCP housing policies are as follows:

Policy H 1 Engage in further dialogue at both a community and local neighbourhood level to develop a full understanding of community trends, desires and related housing needs and potential policies for addressing them.

Policy H 3 (This policy) recognizes that opportunities occur in limited site-specific situations where a housing need may be addressed in a manner that is consistent with the Principles of the OCP. This Plan specifies that applications for such site-specific zoning or OCP amendments within a single-family area should apply in limited circumstances and be subject to Council’s Public Involvement Policy and defined criteria.

Policy H 6 Encourage a variety of housing types in the future neighbourhoods in the Upper Lands.
Policy H8  Support the provision of adaptable design in a variety of housing forms.
  ▪ Consider establishment of adaptable design guidelines.
  ▪ Consider encouraging adaptable design through floor area bonuses.

Policy H9  Support the provision of rental housing.
  ▪ Do not support conversion of rental apartments to strata in buildings greater than four units.
  ▪ Explore mechanisms for recognizing secondary suites.
  ▪ Consider amenity zoning (bonuses) for rental housing.

Policy H10  Support the provision of greater housing options for the District’s growing senior population.
  ▪ Examine the potential role of secondary suites in providing additional housing options for seniors.
  ▪ Support the development of home service and assistance programs to allow seniors to remain in their existing homes and neighbourhoods.
  ▪ Support the creation of new senior housing in areas with convenient access to services and transit.

To improve community understanding about housing issues and possible actions, the District undertook two initiatives: (1) the preparation of a series of background reports on demographic and housing trends in West Vancouver, now entitled “Facts and Stats: Our Community by the Numbers”; and (2) a comprehensive public engagement program, called the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing.
2.2 The ‘Community Dialogue’

The Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing was developed and implemented by District staff and a citizens’ working group, and was undertaken over 15 months during 2007-2008. This was a process involving hundreds of West Vancouver residents talking to each other about the future of their neighbourhoods, and issues related to housing choice and affordability. The Community Dialogue provided a forum for engaging the community in developing its own policy directions for housing and neighbourhood character.

Through this process, the District heard that more diverse housing options are needed for:

- Older residents wishing to downsize into smaller, more manageable housing that will allow them to age in place in their own neighbourhoods;
- Younger families and young adults wishing to establish themselves in the community;
- Lower income residents wishing to find more affordable housing options, including rental housing;
- People requiring accessible/adaptable housing, with special features to accommodate their unique requirements; and
- People requiring assisted living and other support to remain in the community.
While not official District policy, the final report and recommendations of the Community Dialogue Working Group (September 2008) provided direction for subsequent District housing initiatives, and new development projects including:

- the examination of possible new ground-oriented housing prototypes through a District-led Housing Pilot Program (per new OCP Policy H 4.1);
- the legalization of secondary suites;
- designation of an ‘infill housing’ block at 21st Street and Esquimalt Avenue; and
- the Rodgers Creek development.

Six of the Working Group’s recommendations pertain specifically to housing choice and affordability:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Amend the OCP, as may be required, to enable consideration of new housing types to meet the current and future needs of West Vancouver residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Develop an implementation program for allowing secondary suites, which would:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- identify issues around suites;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- recommend a process and criteria for legalizing suites; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- provide for amendments to zoning and other bylaws to allow secondary suites.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>Develop policies and criteria to determine under which conditions ‘infill’ housing would be suitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Consider a demonstration program to enable introduction of new housing types on a limited basis, in advance of new housing policies and regulatory tools being formally adopted. This process would enable ideas and concepts for new housing types to be explored through a community planning and design process that would include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- study of various housing types and tenures using examples from other communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- community design workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- possible ‘pilot projects’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Develop a strategy to increase the supply of a range of relatively more affordable market and non-market housing alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Examine opportunities for using surplus District-owned lands to address identified housing gaps in the community, particularly limited housing choice and affordability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 OCP Policy H 4.1 was adopted in July 2010.
2.3 Metro Vancouver’s Regional Growth Strategy

Concurrent with West Vancouver’s efforts to address local housing issues, Metro Vancouver and its member municipalities have increasingly examined what roles they can play to address housing diversity and affordability challenges, both today and in the future. This work evolved into a specific strategy in the new Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy (RGS)²:

“Provide diverse and affordable housing choices”. (RGS Strategy 4.1)

Metro Vancouver’s Regional Growth Strategy (RGS) articulates the respective roles of all four levels of government (i.e., federal, provincial, regional, and municipal) in providing diverse and affordable housing choices within local communities. Federal and Provincial governments and their agencies are called upon to:

- Stimulate private sector investment in rental housing;
- Provide capital funding for low and moderate income housing; and
- Provide capital and operating funding for the development of supportive and transitional housing units.

The RGS identifies a diverse mix of housing types as a fundamental component of ‘complete communities’. This would include a mix of housing types and tenures that respond to an aging population, changing family and household characteristics, and the full range of household incomes and needs across the region.

Under RGS Strategy 4.1, member municipalities are required to prepare and implement a Housing Action Plan, which is to:

- assess local housing market conditions;

² Metro Vancouver’s Regional Growth Strategy was adopted by the Greater Vancouver Regional District Board on July 29, 2011.
- identify housing priorities;
- identify possible implementation measures to address local housing issues within the jurisdiction and financial capability of the municipality;
- identify possible actions to encourage the supply of new rental housing and where appropriate mitigate or limit the loss of the existing rental housing stock; and
- identify opportunities to participate with other levels of government to secure additional affordable housing to meet housing needs across the affordable housing continuum.

West Vancouver’s Housing Action Plan builds on the work undertaken during the 2004 OCP update and the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing, and will be used to:

- continue the ‘dialogue’ on housing issues and opportunities in the community;
- clarify West Vancouver’s goals for housing diversity and affordability; and
- identify possible local government actions to address these goals and establish priorities for the District.
3.0 UNDERSTANDING WEST VANCOUVER

Prior to the 1950s, most homes built in West Vancouver were single-detached dwellings, which reflected a community largely comprised of traditional families living in a low-density, suburban context. Since that time, West Vancouver’s population profile has become more diverse, and is characterized by a greater proportion of seniors, and a trend towards smaller household size.

An informed discussion on housing issues and opportunities in West Vancouver requires a thorough understanding of how the community has changed, and how it will continue to change based on key population and housing trends. This section provides a summary of these trends from the following sources:

- “Facts and Stats: Our Community by the Numbers”, a comprehensive demographic profile of West Vancouver;
- Metro Vancouver’s “Housing Data Book” and “Regional Growth Strategy”; and
- “Metro Vancouver’s Purpose Built Rental Housing: Inventory and Risk Analysis” (Coriolis Consulting Corp., April 2012).

3.1 Population

Compared to several decades ago, West Vancouver has a greater proportion of older residents, and a smaller proportion of young and middle age adults. This is also reflected in the median\(^3\) age of West Vancouver residents. In 2006, the median age was 48 and in 2011 the median age was 50; in contrast to Metro Vancouver with a median age of 40 in both 2006 and 2011.

---

\(^3\) Median age is the point at which half the population is over that age and half is below.
Census data also tells us that, as of 2011, 25% of West Vancouver residents (10,865 people) were age 65 or older, compared to 13% in Metro Vancouver.

Projected Population Age Distribution in the West Vancouver Local Health Area

---

4 The West Vancouver Local Health Area (WVLHA) includes Bowen Island, Lions Bay and Capilano 5 First Nations Reserve. West Vancouver Municipality represents approximately 85% of the total WVLHA population.
Population projections for the West Vancouver Local Health Area show the following trends over the period 2006 to 2036:

- a decline in the proportion of youth age 10-24
- an increase in the proportion of young adults age 25-39
- a decline in the proportion of middle age adults age 45-64
- continued increase in the proportion of seniors age 65+

The growing proportion of older residents in the community has significant implications for health and social services, recreation, transportation planning, and housing. Access to well-located, low-maintenance, and adaptable/accessible housing that is convenient to community support networks is important to the overall well being and quality of life for many of these residents.

3.2 Housing Mix

In the 1950’s, West Vancouver emerged from a seaside community of summer homes to a growing, residential community characterized by single-detached houses interspersed with parks and schools. During this period of growth, family size and composition were changing; and an ‘urbanization’ trend occurring in Vancouver and surrounding communities. These trends influenced the 1958 OCP policy to allow high-rise apartments in a 50 acre area surrounding the Ambleside commercial centre.

The apartment zoning came into effect in 1959, and close to 1200 new apartment units were built in the 1960’s. This period also saw a significant increase in the number of single detached houses.

In the 1970’s, apartment construction slowed, but approximately 700 units were added during this decade. This was partly due to a reduction in available development sites as well as the cessation of some key federal government rental incentive programs. At the same time, population shifts were occurring, such as decreasing family and household size and shifts in age distribution to fewer school age children and an increasing number of seniors.

Over the last two decades, there has been some change to the distribution of housing by type in West Vancouver. In 1991, the housing mix was 65% single-
detached, 7% duplex/townhouse and 28% apartments; in 2011, the
distribution changed to 58% single detached, 13% duplex/townhouse\(^5\) and
29% apartments. Nevertheless, the basic housing choice has been between a
detached house on its own free simple lot or an apartment in a multi-family
building. There are few options in between, particularly ground-oriented
housing alternatives.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All dwellings</td>
<td>15,130</td>
<td>16,340</td>
<td>16,840</td>
<td>17,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-detached house</td>
<td>9,905</td>
<td>10,290</td>
<td>9,725(^5)</td>
<td>9,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex or house with suite</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1,905(^5)</td>
<td>1,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment, less than five storeys</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>1,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartment, five or more storeys</td>
<td>3,205</td>
<td>3,340</td>
<td>3,445</td>
<td>3,445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.3 The Housing Continuum

The housing continuum is a concept used to describe and categorize different
types of housing and related services. On the non-market end of the
continuum are emergency services and transitional housing, which often
require the most public funding, moving towards supportive and subsidized
housing options in the middle of the continuum, and then towards
independent housing options, where housing is provided by the private
market. The continuum implicitly suggests that residents should have the
opportunity to move across the continuum and find the housing that is most
appropriate and best suited to their needs and circumstances.

Increasing the supply and diversity at the higher affordable market end of the
continuum plays an important role in relieving pressure on low cost rental and
subsidized housing, and contributes to overall housing diversity in a
community.

---

\(^5\) This change is due in part to changes in Statistics Canada classifications of dwellings. For the 2006 Census, the Structural Type of Dwelling variable was clarified to better identify hard-to-find dwellings such as basement apartments. As a result, structures that may have been classified in previous censuses as a single-detached house because there was no outside sign of a second dwelling unit within the building are more likely to be classified as a duplex in the 2006 and 2011 Census.
In West Vancouver, the housing continuum is represented by:

- 518 non-market seniors-specific units and 32 other non-market housing units (2012 West Vancouver inventory);
- 1,900 purpose-built rental apartments;
- An estimated 1,828 units in the secondary rental market\(^6\); and
- Based on 2006 Census data, owner occupancy of:
  - 91% of the 9,725 single-detached housing units;
  - 78% of 2,235 ground-oriented multi-family housing units (houses with suites, duplexes and townhouses); and
  - 48% of 4,875 apartments

\(^6\) The ‘secondary’ rental market comprises various types of housing that were not specifically built for rental purposes but are being rented out. There are approximately 1,828 secondary rental units in West Vancouver, including: ±926 single-detached houses, ±189 strata units (2009 estimate), and 724 secondary suites (approved as of November 5, 2012).
3.4 Rental Housing

Rental housing in West Vancouver consists of purpose-built rental apartments (the primary rental market) and a secondary rental market comprised of single-detached houses, suites in houses, and rented strata units. This purpose-built rental housing was largely the outcome of a significant rezoning in Ambleside (1959), and federal government incentive programs (1960s-1970s) to support construction of rental housing.

West Vancouver Existing Purpose Built Rental Inventory by Age of Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2011, Metro Vancouver commissioned Coriolis Consulting Corp. to compile an inventory of purpose-built rental housing in the region; and to identify what portion of the rental stock may be at risk\(^7\) for loss through demolition and redevelopment in six municipalities: Richmond, Surrey, New Westminster, North Vancouver City, North Vancouver District, and West Vancouver. Study findings for West Vancouver indicate that 17% of the total rental stock (309 units in four buildings) is considered currently at risk of loss through redevelopment. This compares to 1.7% (150 units) in New Westminster, 8% (451 units) in Surrey, 23% (1,533 units) in the City of North Vancouver, and 48% (1,078 units) in Richmond\(^8\).

In general, the study found that land values for development sites in West Vancouver are high, which creates redevelopment pressure on the existing

---

\(^7\) 'At risk' in the absence of municipal policies to protect this stock.

\(^8\) Source: "Metro Vancouver Purpose-Built Rental Housing: Inventory and Risk Analysis", Coriolis Consulting Corp., April 2012.
rental housing stock. However, existing rental buildings are generally built to maximum allowable densities which makes the existing buildings valuable, and redevelopment less attractive. The four West Vancouver apartment properties considered currently at risk in West Vancouver are characterized as follows:

- Waterfront rental buildings – the value of waterfront development sites in West Vancouver is very high and the land value exceeds the value of the potential income stream from these rental buildings.
- Rental buildings that are not fully utilizing permitted density will be increasingly at risk if land values for development sites increase at a faster rate than rental building values (as has been the trend).

3.5 Mobility

Data on local population mobility provides insight into whether housing needs in the community are being met through the available housing options, in terms of type, size, and cost. Between 1996 and 2001:

- 79% of younger (age 15-34) and 86% of older (age 55+) residents moving from West Vancouver to elsewhere on the North Shore and Vancouver moved into attached multi-unit housing;
- 70% of residents age 65+ who moved within West Vancouver moved into multi-unit housing.

This suggests that the availability of multi-unit housing such as duplexes, townhouses, and apartments plays a significant role in determining whether young adults and seniors can be accommodated in the community, or must leave to find the right type of housing elsewhere.

3.6 Housing Affordability

Housing affordability\(^9\) is a measure of the cost of housing and the ability for households to meet these costs. According to Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC), housing is affordable if costs do not exceed 30% of a household’s gross income.

---

\(^9\) Market options are considered “affordable” relative to the typical cost of housing in the community in which they are located.
The discussion of housing affordability in Metro Vancouver municipalities is a challenging one. Given the region’s growing attractiveness as a place to live, a highly constrained supply of land available for development, and high land values in places like West Vancouver, housing is simply not affordable for many residents, particularly in comparison to other Canadian cities.

For West Vancouver, the question is: What can be done to improve relative affordability? Part of the answer lies in increasing the supply and diversity of housing options available along the housing continuum, based on type, size and tenure of housing.

“Core Need” Households

Households in “core need”, as defined by CMHC, occupy housing that is considered inadequate in terms of condition or size, or costs more than 30% of household income; and they are not able to find an affordable alternative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>West Vancouver Households in Core Need, 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Households in Core Need in West Vancouver (DWV)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,950</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Metro Vancouver Housing Data Book, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>West Vancouver Households in Core Need and Spending at Least Half (INALH)(^{10}), 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Households in INALH in West Vancouver (DWV)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Metro Vancouver Housing Data Book, 2011

According to 2006 Census data, approximately half of the West Vancouver households in core need are seniors’ households (65+ years). Further, 53% of households in core need (1,035 households) are considered to have extremely

\(^{10}\) INALH refers to households in core need who are also spending at least half of household income on shelter (INALH)
dire housing circumstances because they are spending at least half of household income on shelter; this group is considered to be at risk of homelessness by Metro Vancouver.

**Housing Costs**

Rental housing costs in West Vancouver are high compared to regional averages, and vacancy rates are among the lowest in Metro Vancouver. The vacancy rate in West Vancouver in 2011 was 0.2% and average monthly rents were $1,478 (for all bedroom types). This compares to 1.4% and $1,027 respectively in Metro Vancouver (CMHC, 2011).

Housing sale prices and construction costs have escalated across the region in recent years. This trend has been particularly pronounced in West Vancouver where the median sale price of a single-detached house was $1,780,000 for the year 2011.

**Income Levels and Housing Costs**

In 2006, West Vancouver’s average household income of $155,071 was more than twice the regional average of $73,258. The median household income was $76,893 compared to $55,231 for Metro Vancouver. At the same time,

- one in five West Vancouver households has an annual income less than $30,000 (compared to one in four households in Metro Vancouver);
- 51% of seniors earn less than $30,000 per year; and
- 12% (or 1,510) of families are lone parent families (2011 Census): 79% of these are lone female parents earning half the income of their male counterparts.
- 1,950 or 13% of households in West Vancouver are in “core need“ of housing

West Vancouver’s high income levels are consistent with its comparatively high rate of home ownership (77% of homes in West Vancouver are owned compared to 65% in the region); and the lower proportion of owners spending 30% or more of household income on housing payments (24% in West Vancouver compared to 27% in the region). However, there is a disparity between income levels and housing costs among West Vancouver tenant
households, 55% of whom spend more than 30% of their household income on rent.

3.7 Summary: Key Housing Challenges

Housing that is appropriate for people of all ages and incomes is an essential component of complete and sustainable communities. Some of the key challenges that the Housing Action Plan for West Vancouver needs to address in order to support housing diversity and affordability in the future include:

1. Addressing Core Housing Need

Most West Vancouver residents are considered well-housed. Nevertheless, Metro Vancouver 2006 data identifies 1,950 households or 13% of all West Vancouver households as being in core need; and approximately half of these are considered to be at risk of homelessness.

Direct provision of housing for core need households is beyond local government resources and is a responsibility rightly vested with the Federal and Provincial Governments. Nevertheless, West Vancouver can play a role in advocating for affordable housing for its most vulnerable households.

2. Housing for Seniors

While many West Vancouver seniors have had to leave West Vancouver to find housing more suitable to their needs, most seniors would like to remain in their community of many years. In order to do so, they need more appropriate housing options to support aging-in-place, and to adapt to changes in their mobility and overall well-being. Appropriate, affordable housing for seniors would include:

- smaller, more manageable housing units
- adaptable design/accessibility features
- rental housing options
- housing that is well-located, in proximity to family, friends, and community services and amenities
- access to in-house or community-based services to support independent living

3. **Housing for Younger and Middle-Aged Households**

Past housing initiatives in West Vancouver have been focused on the needs of seniors, and related objectives for accessible / adaptable housing. However, if West Vancouver is to achieve a more balanced social mix, it needs to provide the right size and right type of housing for all residents, including: young adults and young families wishing to establish in the community, middle-aged households with or without children, and ‘empty-nesters’ looking to downsize. Providing a range of affordable, ground-oriented market housing types is central to achieving this.

4. **Aging of the Purpose-Built Rental Housing Stock**

Retaining West Vancouver’s aging stock of purpose-built rental apartments is critical, as only one purpose-built non-seniors’ rental apartment building (16 units) has been constructed since 1979. The addition of new primary and secondary rental units will be necessary for maintaining a healthy supply of rental housing to support housing choice and relative affordability.

5. **Providing New Housing Opportunities in Existing Neighbourhoods**

A fundamental challenge for West Vancouver is: How to provide more diverse housing options for residents wishing to remain in their neighbourhoods as their housing needs change over time, while preserving the valued characteristics of those neighbourhoods? This will require a thoughtful examination of various ground-oriented ‘infill’ housing types.
4.0 FROM POLICY TO RECENT ACTIONS

West Vancouver has played a direct role in supporting development of seniors’ and rental housing, securing accessible/adaptable housing units, and broadening housing choice through variations in unit size and housing tenure. These actions are described in the following Sections 4.1 through 4.4, both in terms of policy and outcomes.

4.1 Seniors’ Housing

Policy H 10 Support the provision of greater housing options for the District’s growing senior population.

The District of West Vancouver has supported the creation of seniors’ housing opportunities through: land acquisition, site assembly, and long-term lease of District-owned lands. Examples include the following:

- Ambleview Place Housing Cooperative (606-14th Street) – 42 units built in 1987 with a 60 year land lease from West Vancouver
- Kiwanis Manor at Kiwanis Garden Village (959-21st Street) – 76 rental units built in 2003 with West Vancouver providing some of the land, and waiving $505,835 in municipal development cost charges
- Hollyburn House (2095 Marine Drive) – 66 rental units built in 1987 with West Vancouver selling part of the site solely for the purpose of seniors housing
- Kiwanis (900 block – 21st Street) – the District waived $818,533 in municipal development cost charges to facilitate two new rental buildings with a net increase of ± 90 units on the Kiwanis site in 2011
- The Westerleigh (725-22nd Street) – 126 rental units (under construction) with a 125 year land lease from West Vancouver

A range of market and non-market housing options exist in West Vancouver for meeting the specific needs of seniors, in terms of housing type, location, services and amenities. These include the following:
Market and Non-Market Housing Options for Seniors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ambleview Place</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Housing Co-op</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capilano Towers</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Subsidized Rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiwanis</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klahanee Park Lodge</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lions Libby Lodge</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunnyside Manor</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>442</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amica Condominiums</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Gardens</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudor Gardens</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>103</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kiwanis</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Subsidized Rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amica at West Vancouver</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Market Rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollyburn House</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Market Rental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>254</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residential Care Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Beds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capilano Care Centre</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollyburn House</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingleburn House</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Vancouver Care Centre</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>563</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Accessible / Adaptable Housing

*Policy H8 Support the provision of adaptable design in a variety of housing forms.*

One quarter of West Vancouver's population is over 65 years of age, and 15% of the population experiences a physical or health issue which limits their daily activities. A range of housing options that includes adaptable housing, rental, seniors' specific, and affordable units is essential for ensuring that the overall housing stock supports an age-friendly community.

In addition to seniors' specific housing, the District has secured adaptable design features (beyond those required by the BC Building Code) in new multi-unit housing developments. Since 2002, this has resulted in 520 new housing
units\textsuperscript{11}, all of which meet the City of Vancouver’s universal accessibility standards, and 430 of which meet the City of North Vancouver’s adaptable design guidelines (either Level 1 or Level 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th># of Adaptable / Accessible Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2436 Haywood Avenue</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiwanis (2105-2165 Haywood Avenue)</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westerleigh (725 – 22\textsuperscript{nd} Street)</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2388 – 2396 Marine Drive</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891 Marine Drive</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6390 Bay Street</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amica at West Vancouver (659 Clyde Avenue)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amica Seniors (605 Clyde Avenue)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiwanis Manor (959 – 21\textsuperscript{st} Street)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water’s Edge (540, 612 and 626 Clyde Avenue)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>90 (universal) 5 (Level 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundarave Landing (25\textsuperscript{th} Street &amp; Marine Drive)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelyn Drive (bounded by Park Royal North, Taylor Way and Keith Road)</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>20% of apartments to be Level 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Rental Housing

Policy H 9 Support the provision of rental housing.

- Do not support conversion of rental apartments to strata in buildings greater than four units.
- Explore mechanisms for recognizing secondary suites.
- Consider amenity zoning (bonuses) for rental housing.

Most local governments do not have the financial capability to directly support the development of purpose-built rental housing. However, West Vancouver has utilized the development approval process for larger residential and mixed-use projects to secure a number of new rental housing units; and has enacted measures to protect existing ‘primary’ rental units from

\textsuperscript{11} This total does not include the Evelyn Drive development (not constructed yet).
being converted to strata ownership, and to increase the supply of 'secondary' rental units. These actions are described below.

4.3.1 Strata Conversion Policy (1990)

Council is the approving authority for conversion of rental housing to strata. Under section 242(6) of the Strata Property Act, Council must consider a number of factors in reviewing an application for conversion of a previously occupied rental building to strata title, including the priority of rental accommodation over privately owned housing in the community. Where the benefits of privately owned housing or other factors outweigh the potential loss of rental units, it would be reasonable for Council to approve a conversion.

In 1990, the District of West Vancouver adopted a Strata Conversion Policy, which is to “not approve future applications for conversion of existing rental apartments, greater than fourplexes, to non-rental ownership.” This policy enables Council to evaluate potential benefits of strata conversion on a case-by-case basis where the loss of rental units is relatively small, while maintaining a clear policy position on larger buildings which represent more significant losses. No purpose-built rental apartment buildings have been converted to strata-titled ownership since the Strata Conversion Policy was adopted in 1990.

Buildings of four units or less were specifically excluded from the policy, because the 1990 Planning and Land Use Committee of West Vancouver Council considered the apartment conversion issue to be quantitatively and qualitatively different from that of duplexes. Duplex units, albeit small in number, fill a fairly significant need for existing residents who wish to move out of single-detached houses and find alternate forms of housing (regardless of tenure type). However, in 2004, Council did not approve the proposed strata conversion of a duplex, citing concerns over the potential loss of rental housing.

While the Strata Conversion Policy does not address the need for additional rental housing or the potential loss of rental housing through demolition and redevelopment, it has so far prevented conversion of existing rental units to strata ownership.
4.3.2 New Primary Rental Units

Since the OCP was adopted in 2004, new rental housing has been secured as a community benefit in major development projects. These include:

- Dundarave Landing (Marine Drive and 25th Street) – 4 townhouse units to be rental for a period of 10 years from issuance of occupancy permit (built 2007).
- Evelyn Drive (Keith Road and Taylor Way) – 30 rental apartment units in perpetuity (not constructed yet).

4.3.3 Secondary Suites Program (2010)

Secondary suites play a key role in the rental housing market, in the absence of new purpose-built rental accommodation. During the Community Dialogue, there was strong public support for the legalization of secondary suites as a means of improving housing choice and affordability in West Vancouver’s neighbourhoods, without changing the established ‘single-detached’ character.

Under the District’s Secondary Suites Program, which went into effect on March 1st, 2010, property owners are able to legalize an existing suite or construct a new suite. A ‘secondary suite’ is a separate residential unit within a house (usually in the basement); maximum size is the lesser of 968 sq.ft. or 40% of the floor area of the house. In March 2011, the program was expanded to allow for secondary suites in non-owner occupied homes.

Implementation of the secondary suites program has been highly successful. As of November 5, 2012, the District has received a total of 859 applications for legal suites, comprised of: 95 new suites and 764 pre-existing suites. 724 suites have been approved to date. While legalization of existing suites does not increase the rental housing supply; as a result of the legalization process, there is greater assurance of the quality and safety of these units, which is a key objective of this program.
4.4 Housing Diversity

*OCP Principle #3:* "Provide for a diversity of housing types to accommodate a balanced and diverse population in terms of age, ability, income, and household type."

4.4.1 New and Redeveloping Neighbourhoods

*Rodgers Creek Area of the Upper Lands* – The zoning for Rodgers Creek provides for a maximum 736 housing units, with a diversity of housing types to be provided as follows:

- No more than 120 single-family and two-family dwelling units;
- At least 100 cluster or townhouse dwelling units;
- 30% of apartments to be less than 93 m² in size; and
- Apartment units with adaptable design elements are to be included

*Clyde Avenue Area east of Taylor Way* – Under Official Community Plan Policy BF-D 3, a density bonus of up to 0.25 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) may be considered for proposals that provide seniors’ care services, rental accommodations or assisted and congregate care housing. Two projects have been developed under this policy:

- *Amica at West Vancouver* – a seniors market rental supportive housing development of 112 units; and
- *Water’s Edge* – which included 16 rental apartment units in perpetuity in a stand-alone building

*Evelyn Drive Area* – The Evelyn Drive area is centrally located, with Park Royal Shopping Centre to the south, and Taylor Way to the east. The Evelyn Drive Plan and subsequent rezoning to CD1 was undertaken under Official Community Plan Policy H3. This policy provides "that opportunities occur in limited site specific situations where a housing need may be addressed in a manner that is consistent with the Principles of the OCP. This Plan specifies that applications for such site-specific zoning or OCP amendments within a single-family area should apply in limited circumstances and be subject to Council’s Public Involvement Policy and defined criteria."
The CD1 zoning of the Evelyn Drive Area provides for 56 single-family lots to be redeveloped into 349 housing units, of which at least 210 must be apartments, and 53 must be cluster housing. Further, apartments must have an average size of 93 m², and at least 10% of all apartments must be less than 70 m² in size. Cluster housing units must have an average size of 140 m². In addition, the project will provide for 30 rental units in perpetuity.

4.4.2 Housing Pilot Program

The Community Dialogue confirmed public interest in trying out new ideas through a limited number of ‘pilot projects’. From a housing perspective, this meant an exploration of potential new housing prototypes that would meet community demand for improved housing choice and affordability, and be designed to ‘fit’ with the established character of West Vancouver neighbourhoods.

A citizens’ working group was appointed by Council in 2009, and charged with the task of developing the objectives for the Housing Pilot Program, and undertaking a ‘pilot project’ selection process. In December 2009, Council selected two of four proposals recommended by the working group and staff to proceed as pilot projects in 2010. Both of the selected proposals were put forward by property owners wishing to downsize to a smaller house on their own property. One of these projects has since been withdrawn by the property owner; while the other property owner has yet to finalize a development application.

The Housing Pilot Program has not realized a completed project due, in large part, to uncertainty for participating property owners with regard to: servicing and other construction costs, expectations around the cost of ‘downsizing’, and general uncertainty inherent in the development approval process.

The possibility of future pilot projects should be considered on a case-by-case basis, including whether it may be more feasible to pursue new housing prototypes on surplus District-owned lands, rather than on private property.
4.4.3 Infill Housing Block

On July 4, 2011, Council amended the OCP to establish an ‘infill’ housing designation (future land use) for the 2000-block Esquimalt Avenue (north side) and Fulton Avenue (south side). This block was also designated a Development Permit Area with corresponding form and character guidelines.

Under OCP Policy BF-B13, Council may consider applications for rezoning of individual properties in this block to enable development of ground-oriented infill housing, not exceeding a density of 0.61 Floor Area Ratio (FAR). Infill housing types may include smaller single-family dwellings, coach houses, duplexes, triplexes and combinations thereof.

The first rezoning in this block, approved in tandem with the OCP amendment, is for a mix of duplexes and coach houses (nine units total) on an assembled site of three existing lots on Esquimalt Avenue. This project, known as “Hollyburn Mews” is under construction as of November 2012. A second rezoning application in this block (for a duplex and coach house) has been received and is currently being reviewed by staff.

Rendering of Proposed Coach Houses at “Hollyburn Mews”

While Policy BF-B13 only applies to this single block, development proposals for individual properties will provide opportunities to: consider various types of infill housing; regulate form and character of new development to ensure ‘fit’ within a mixed context of single-detached and multi-unit housing; and further engage the public in a discussion of possible new housing prototypes.
5.0 MOVING FORWARD

West Vancouver has jurisdiction over land use and development within its boundaries, and can implement policy objectives for greater housing diversity through the development approval process. On the larger issue of housing affordability, the District can support the efforts of senior government agencies and non-profit organizations through its land use and development policies, and its approval authority. However, direct provision of housing for core need households is beyond local government resources and is a responsibility rightly vested under the Federal and Provincial Governments.

**Action 1:**  *Continue established practices for supporting development of seniors’ and rental housing, accessible/adaptable housing units, and variations in unit size in new developments*

The District of West Vancouver has a long tradition of addressing housing issues in West Vancouver by supporting development of seniors’ and rental housing, securing accessible/adaptable housing units, and broadening housing choice through variations in unit size and housing tenure in development projects. It is recommended that these practices be continued as new opportunities arise.

**Action 2:**  *Consider coach houses following an informed community discussion*

District staff receive regular enquiries from residents of all areas of West Vancouver wishing to build a ‘coach house’ on their properties. The common reasons provided by residents are that a coach house would provide them the opportunity to:

- downsize into a smaller housing unit on their own property;
- provide self-contained accommodation for an elderly parent, adult child or on-site caregiver;
- design a custom housing unit for a family member with special needs (e.g., limited mobility); or
- create a detached secondary suite to maintain the privacy of the main dwelling unit.
It is anticipated that a small number of coach houses could be realized in West Vancouver through development proposals in the ‘infill housing block’ (2000-block Esquimalt/Fulton Avenues) and possible pilot projects. In June 2012, Council authorized a broader examination of coach house potential, partly in response to ongoing community interest in this type of housing. This work will include:

- A discussion paper on policy and regulations in other jurisdictions and on lessons learned from the experience of these other jurisdictions – both in Metro Vancouver and communities further afield;
- Community engagement on coach houses; and
- If the engagement program confirms broad public interest in coach houses in West Vancouver, draft policies and regulations would be prepared for Council and community review.

It is anticipated that the discussion paper will be presented to Council in December 2012; followed by community engagement through Spring 2013. Some of the key questions to be considered as part of the coach house examination are:

- What housing gaps could this type of housing fulfill?
- Should coach houses be rental only or should we allow for stratification?
- What would be an appropriate size(s) of unit?
- What are the design considerations?
- What are the potential ‘neighbour’ impacts and how might they be mitigated?
- Should coach houses be allowed...District-wide? Only in certain areas? Or, only under certain conditions?

**Action 3:** Identify, consider and engage the community in a discussion of opportunities to retain and add purpose-built rental housing

Much of West Vancouver’s purpose-built rental housing stock is now 40 to 50 years old, and may become vulnerable to loss through redevelopment. Council has taken measures to prevent conversion of rental units to strata\(^\text{12}\),

\(^{12}\) 1990 Strata Conversion Policy
but any of these properties could still be redeveloped under existing zoning. Council has no legal authority to prevent demolition of a rental apartment building, or to require that a redeveloped property remain rental.

An in-depth analysis of West Vancouver’s purpose-built rental housing stock is warranted, and a report to Council is expected in early 2013. This work will:

- Describe West Vancouver’s inventory;
- Review the Metro Vancouver study on the vulnerability of purpose-built rental housing in the region; and
- Identify policy options for retaining the existing rental stock and encouraging development of new purpose-built rental housing.

**Action 4: Strengthen OCP policies on housing diversity to provide a framework for consideration of innovative housing proposals**

The housing policies in the 2004 OCP are focused and limited, in the absence of a comprehensive understanding of housing issues in the community, and residents’ support for various actions to address these. The subsequent 2007-2008 Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing has provided greater depth to the community’s understanding of housing issues and options in West Vancouver.

The District would like to encourage innovative housing proposals that meet defined housing gaps in the community and are sensitive to established neighbourhood character. To provide the necessary framework for considering such proposals, the OCP will need to be amended to clarify and strengthen policies on housing diversity. This policy work would be informed by the findings of the Community Dialogue, along with the District’s past experience in supporting development of seniors’, rental, and accessible/adaptable housing, and new initiatives related to coach houses and purpose-built rental housing.
Action 5: Monitor and report annually on the Housing Action Plan

To maintain awareness of housing issues in West Vancouver and progress being made to improve housing choice and affordability, an annual monitoring report is to be provided. This would provide the basis for any updates of the Housing Action Plan.

Towards this end, staff resources will continue to be allocated to the North Shore Advisory Committee on Disability Issues (ACDI), and to information-gathering and information-sharing (i.e., continuing the ‘dialogue’ on housing).
Date: June 12, 2012

From: Geri Boyle, Manager of Community Planning

Subject: Housing Action Plan

RECOMMENDED THAT:

1. The report from the Manager of Community Planning dated June 12, 2012, titled “Housing Action Plan”, be received for information.

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to alert Council that staff is commencing work on a Housing Action Plan for West Vancouver, which is a requirement under Metro Vancouver’s Regional Growth Strategy, and the timeline for preparation of the document. Preparation of the Housing Action Plan is included in the Balanced Scorecard as a 2012 Milestone.

This report should be considered in conjunction with the report titled ‘Transitioning to a Coach House Investigation’ dated June 11, 2012.

1.0 Background

1.1 Prior Resolutions

March 7, 2011 Council accepted the new Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy titled “Metro Vancouver 2040 – Shaping our Future”, and passed additional resolutions requesting amendments to the Strategy. Requested amendments pertained to the Old Growth Conservancy, and lands located above the 1200-foot contour level. These amendments are reflected in the Metro Vancouver Regional Growth Strategy, (Bylaw No. 1135, 2010), as adopted by the Greater Vancouver Regional District Board on July 29, 2011.

2.0 Policy

2.1 Policy

The Regional Growth Strategy, Strategy 4.1 is to “provide diverse and affordable housing choices”. Under this strategy, member municipalities are required to adopt a Regional Context Statement, and to prepare and implement a Housing Action Plan.
West Vancouver’s Official Community Plan (OCP) includes a number of policies related to housing choice and affordability:

Policy H 1  Engage in further dialogue at both a community and local neighbourhood level to develop a full understanding of community trends, desires and related housing needs and potential policies for addressing them.¹

Policy H 4.1 Allow for the examination of new housing prototypes in Existing Neighbourhoods through a District of West Vancouver led housing pilot program.

Policy H 6  Encourage a variety of housing types in the future neighbourhoods in the Upper Lands.

Policy H 9  Support the provision of rental housing.

Policy H 10  Support the provision of greater housing options for the District’s growing senior population.

3.0  Balanced Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC INITIATIVES</th>
<th>2012 MILESTONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1  Implement the recommendations of the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing Working Group</td>
<td>▪  Evolve Pilot Projects Program to emphasize coach houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪  Continue implementation of Secondary Suites Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2  Support regional and North Shore planning to advance West Vancouver’s interests</td>
<td>▪  Commence Regional Context Statement and Housing Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪  Continue to participate with Metro Vancouver on regional planning issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.0  Discussion

4.1  The Role of Government in Providing Diverse and Affordable Housing Choices

The Regional Growth Strategy articulates the respective roles of all four levels of government (i.e., federal, provincial, regional, and municipal) in providing diverse and affordable housing choices within local communities. Senior governments (federal and provincial) and their agencies are called upon to:

▪  Stimulate private sector investment in rental housing;
▪  Provide capital funding for low and moderate income housing; and

¹ Policy H 1 has been implemented through preparation of “West Vancouver Facts and Stats”, and the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing, which was completed in 2008. The Community Dialogue Working Group’s recommendation 3.5 is to be implemented through the Housing Action Plan.
- Provide capital and operating funding for the development of supportive and transitional housing units.

Developing affordable housing for the most vulnerable residents in a community is beyond the capabilities of most municipalities, and is a responsibility rightly vested with senior governments. Advocating for the above actions is, however, something that municipalities can support through the advocacy role of Metro Vancouver.

4.2 What is a Housing Action Plan?

A ‘Housing Action Plan’ is a term used in the Regional Growth Strategy. The plan is intended to provide ‘a housing lens’ focus on municipal policies, practices and actions. In doing so, the document is to address the following:

1. An assessment of local housing market supply and demand conditions by tenure, and level of affordability;

2. Housing priorities, based on existing supply conditions, changing household demographics, and defined housing gaps;

3. Possible actions to address local housing issues that are within the jurisdiction and financial capabilities of the municipality, including any actions set out in the District’s Regional Context Statement;

4. Possible actions to encourage the supply of new rental housing and, where appropriate, mitigate or limit the loss of existing rental housing stock; and

5. Housing Action Plans should also describe opportunities for participation in senior government programs for securing additional affordable housing units, to meet housing needs across the affordable housing continuum².

4.3 A Housing Action Plan for West Vancouver

A Housing Action Plan provides an opportunity to showcase District actions to date in supporting housing choice and affordability, and set out a framework for current and future housing initiatives.

Through the ‘West Vancouver Facts and Stats’ and the ‘Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing’, much of the ground work for the Housing Action Plan has already been undertaken. In addition, Metro Vancouver has just completed a region-wide study to inventory purpose-built rental housing and evaluate the degree to which the rental housing is at risk of demolition and redevelopment. Detailed risk analysis was done for six municipalities, one of which was West Vancouver.

The Housing Action Plan would bring this work together and identify appropriate actions to move forward to address local housing issues. In some cases the ‘action’

² “Affordable housing” can be used to describe a range of housing alternatives from homeless shelters and non-market subsidized units for the most vulnerable households, to affordable market options for rent or ownership by households of low to moderate means, such as young families, first-time buyers, and fixed income seniors.
might be ‘strategic’; for example, support the development of a mix of housing products in order to increase housing choice. In other cases, the ‘action’ would not be to provide solutions to local housing issues, but rather would be to engage the community in a discussion of a specific housing issue and possible policy and regulatory responses. Two issues for community discussion would be coach houses and rental housing.

The draft Housing Action Plan would be presented to Council in the early Fall. Concurrent with the preparation of the plan, two discussion papers would be prepared: one on rental housing and the other on coach houses.

4.4 Sustainability

Metro Vancouver's Regional Growth Strategy is based on five key goals for building a sustainable region. Goal #4 recognizes that a diverse mix of housing types is fundamental to the creation of complete communities; and to respond to an aging population, changing family and household characteristics, and the full range of household incomes and needs across the region.

Principle #3 in the OCP's Framework for Action (for creating a sustainable community in West Vancouver) is to provide for a diversity of housing types to accommodate a balanced and diverse population in terms of age, ability, and income and household types.

4.5 Consultation

As noted above, the Housing Action Plan would bring together work done to date and identify appropriate actions to move forward to engage the community in a discussion of local housing issues and possible responses.

5.0 Options

5.1 Council may:

(as recommended by staff)

(a) Receive for information, the report from the Manager of Community Planning titled 'Housing Action Plan', dated June 12, 2012.

(or, alternatively)

(b) Request further information.

Author: [Signature]
COUNCIL REPORT

Date: June 11, 2012
From: Stephen Mikicich, Senior Community Planner
and Geri Boyle, Manager of Community Planning
Subject: Transitioning to an Investigation of the Potential of Coach Houses in West Vancouver

RECOMMENDED THAT:

1. The report from the Senior Community Planner and the Manager of Community Planning titled, “Transitioning to an Investigation of the Potential of Coach Houses in West Vancouver”, dated June 11, 2012, be received for information; and

2. As Council has identified Housing and Neighbourhood Character as one of its strategic priorities, an examination of “Coach Houses” shall be the policy focus for the District’s efforts in exploring new housing types in 2012 – 2013.

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to present key findings from implementation of the Housing Pilot Program during 2010 – 2011, including the challenges for realizing built housing prototypes as ‘pilot projects’. This report recommends that an examination of “Coach Houses” become the policy focus for the District’s efforts in exploring new housing types in 2012 – 2013. The details of this program would be modeled in part on the District’s successful secondary suites program.

This report should be considered in conjunction with the report from the Manager of Community Planning, titled “Housing Action Plan”, dated June 12, 2012.

1.0 Background

1.1 Prior Resolutions

May 30, 2010 – Council received for information the final report of the Housing Pilot Program Working Group.

December 14, 2009 – Council selected two pilot projects for sites at 2614 Ottawa Avenue and 6801 Hycroft Road, and directed staff to advance the Housing Pilot Program, including working with the proponents of the selected pilot projects to initiate required development applications. Council also directed staff to report back on when recommended pilot projects for 6801 Marine Drive and 1155 Keith Road could be undertaken.

November 16, 2009 – Council received for information a staff report which included Terms of Reference for the Housing Pilot Program Working Group, an overview of short-listed Expressions of Interest for undertaking pilot projects, and selection criteria for detailed proposals.

1.2 History

During 2007 – 2008, the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing confirmed public interest in trying out new ideas through a limited number of ‘pilot projects’. From a housing perspective, this meant an exploration of new housing ‘prototypes’ that could address community concerns over limited housing choice and affordability, and would be designed to fit with the established character of West Vancouver neighbourhoods.

The Housing Pilot Program Working Group was appointed by Council in 2009 and charged with the task of developing the program's objectives, and undertaking a pilot project selection process. This included a call for Expressions of Interest, an invitation to submit detailed proposals, and recommendations to Council.

In December 2009, Council selected two of four proposals recommended by the Working Group and staff to proceed as ‘pilot projects’ starting in 2010. These projects are described in Section 4.2, and detailed in Appendices ‘A’ and ‘B’.

2.0 Policy

2.1 Policy

OCP Policy H 4.1 reads:

"Allow for the examination of new housing prototypes in Existing Neighbourhoods through a District of West Vancouver led housing pilot program which:

(a) would allow for new housing prototypes consistent with the community's desire for improved housing choice, for housing that is sympathetic to a site's natural features and minimizes site alteration, and for housing designed to fit with established neighbourhood character;"
(b) would involve the selection of projects(s) by Council following a formal open selection process;

(c) would include a formal evaluation of projects upon completion of construction to understand the effectiveness of a project in meeting community objectives and to inform the development of policies, regulations and processes related to housing and neighbourhood character;

(d) may include projects which require a rezoning, development permit, and/or variance permit, in which case the approval process provided for in the Local Government Act shall apply and no amendment to this Official Community Plan shall be required; and

(e) provide opportunities for public involvement including, but not limited to, access to project information, site tours upon completion, and participation in the evaluation process."

3.0 Balanced Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC INITIATIVES</th>
<th>2012 MILESTONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3.1 Implement the recommendations of the Community Dialogue on Neighbourhood Character and Housing Working Group</td>
<td>▪ Evolve Pilot Projects Program to emphasize Coach Houses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.0 Discussion

4.1 Coach House Potential in West Vancouver

Since the call for expressions of interest for undertaking a pilot project was issued in September 2009, staff has continued to receive regular enquiries from residents from all areas of West Vancouver who are interested in building a coach house. These requests come from all areas of the community including Ambleside, Dundarave, British Properties, Altamont, Eagle Harbour, Sentinel Hill, Cedardale and Cypress Estates. Most of these enquiries are from residents wishing to downsize on their own property, accommodate an older or younger family member, provide purpose-built housing for people with specific needs (e.g., limited mobility), or create a rental unit.

While coach houses are not currently permitted in West Vancouver, it is anticipated that a small number of potential coach house 'prototypes' may still be realized through:

1 Staff typically receives one to three coach house inquiries per week.
2 With the exception of three strata coach houses in the "Hollyburn Mews" development (CD 47 zone).
1. Implementation of the Pilot Project at 2614 Ottawa Avenue. This proposal provides for a detached secondary suite in the form of a rear yard coach house; and

2. Future rezoning applications for infill housing in the block bounded by Esquimalt Avenue, 20th Street, Fulton Avenue, and 21st Street. As defined under OCP policy BF-B 13.1, infill housing types in this block may include: smaller single-family dwellings, coach houses, duplexes, triplexes, and or combinations thereof. The first approved rezoning in this block (2031, 2047 and 2063 Esquimalt Avenue) includes three coach houses as part of a nine-unit strata development known as “Hollyburn Mews” (currently under construction).

A broader examination of coach house potential in West Vancouver is considered appropriate, given ongoing community interest in this type of housing. This examination could take advantage of built coach house examples in West Vancouver (as described above), but would focus on the coach house experience in other jurisdictions:

- Other municipalities in Metro Vancouver are facing similar challenges to those in West Vancouver – i.e., how to provide for improved housing choice and affordability, and introduce appropriate new housing types to meet the needs of the community. Several of these municipalities now have policies and regulations in place to allow for coach houses.

- There are also lessons to be learned from jurisdictions further afield, particularly in Washington State, where a number of communities already allow coach houses, and several ‘cottage’ type housing developments have been built.

Key questions to be addressed in this examination are:

- For whom is this type of housing most appropriate?
- What are the typical design issues and neighbour impacts associated with coach houses, and how can these be mitigated?
- Should coach houses provide a home ownership opportunity, or should they be rental only?
- Should they be allowed on a District-wide basis, only in certain areas, or only under certain conditions?
- What are the parking implications?

---

3 This block is designated for future infill housing development under OCP Policy BF-B 13.1, and is designated a Development Permit Area with corresponding form and character guidelines.

4 Metro Vancouver municipalities that have developed policies and/or regulations to allow coach houses include: Delta, Langley Township, North Vancouver City, North Vancouver District, Pitt Meadows, Port Moody, Richmond, Surrey, and Vancouver.
Transitioning to an investigation of the Potential of Coach Houses in West Vancouver

- Should there be different standards or regulations for coach houses on sites with or without a rear lane, or on corner sites?
- How appropriate are coach houses given the context and character of individual neighbourhoods?

This investigation of coach house potential is a component of the proposed Housing Action Plan. Work specific to coach houses would be undertaken in three phases:

1. Research and preparation of background information on coach houses, including a discussion paper on lessons learned from other jurisdictions;
2. A community engagement program including: public displays and special events, presentations, questionnaires, tours, and evaluation of completed projects; and
3. If the engagement program confirms broader community interest in coach houses as a new housing form in West Vancouver, development of draft policies and regulations.

4.2 Housing Pilot Program

The primary objective of the Housing Pilot Program was to enable the construction of a small number of new housing 'prototypes' in West Vancouver neighbourhoods to:

1. address the community's desire for improved housing choice and affordability;
2. explore appropriate sustainable building practices; and
3. examine neighbourhood character issues associated with new house construction, such as site alteration, scale and massing of new development.

Completed projects would undergo a community evaluation process, and the findings would help to inform the development of future District policies and regulations pertaining to housing and neighbourhoods. In January 2010, District staff began working collaboratively with the selected pilot project proponents to review preliminary design concepts, resolve servicing issues, determine required approvals, address other site-specific issues, and initiate neighbourhood consultation.

4.3 Selected Pilot Projects

Four pilot project proposals were recommended by the Working Group in November 2009. Two of these (as described below) were selected by Council in December 2009; and the remaining two (sites located at 6035 Marine Drive and 1155 Keith Road) were to be considered at a future date. The two pilot projects
selected by Council in December 2009 were put forward by property owners wishing to downsize to a smaller house on their own property. These proposals are described below:

Pilot Project #1: 6801-6803 Hycroft Road

The site for this pilot project included two adjacent parcels: a developed lot at 6803 Hycroft Road, and an adjacent remnant lot at 6801 Hycroft Road (as shown in the map below). The proposal was to build a small footprint house of approximately 1,500 sq.ft. on the undeveloped portion of the property. This three-level structure was designed to both accommodate the needs of this ‘empty nester’ couple, and to fit onto an odd-shaped small lot.

In order to create a suitable building site, it was proposed that the remainder lot be enlarged through a lot line adjustment (subdivision). This would be contingent on rezoning approval to:

- enable the lot area of 6803 Hycroft Road to be reduced to a minimum 9,000 sq.ft.; and
- provide for a smaller than minimum-sized lot at 6801 Hycroft.

The property owners withdrew from the Housing Pilot Program in June 2010, citing concerns over costs they had incurred to date for professional services, anticipated high costs for servicing the new lot, growing opposition to the project from a next door neighbour, and general uncertainty over the development approvals process.

Conceptual illustrations and an overview of this project’s history are provided in Appendix ‘A’.
**Pilot Project #2: 2614 Ottawa Ave.**

The owners of 2614 Ottawa Avenue (who reside next door at 2602 Ottawa) originally purchased this site to preserve their view, and have maintained the existing 1930s character cottage as a rental property. The site is a 64' x 145' lot with mature plantings and rear lane access. The owners plan on retaining and renovating the existing house, and are proposing to build a modest-sized (< 1,000 sq.ft.) coach house in the rear yard – to provide greater housing options for their three-generation family.

As the property owners are not proposing subdivision, and the existing house does not contain a secondary suite, the proposed coach house is considered a detached secondary suite. Approval of a Development Variance Permit (DVP) is required to provide for ‘detachment’ of the secondary suite from the main house, and to establish an appropriate building envelope for locating the coach house in the rear yard.

The timing of this project has been impacted by:

- A Zoning Bylaw amendment (adopted March 2011) to eliminate the requirement for ‘owner occupancy’ for properties containing secondary suites\(^5\); and
- The property owners’ personal matters over the past two years.

As a result, the property owners have only now (June 2012) submitted their application for a DVP. Conceptual illustrations from their original pilot project proposal, an overview of the project’s history, and notes on preliminary neighbourhood consultation are provided in Appendix ‘B’.

---

\(^5\) Prior to this bylaw amendment, implementation of this pilot project would have required rezoning of the subject property.
Status of Other ‘Recommended’ Proposals

1155 Keith Road: The proposal for this property was to enlarge and renovate an existing bungalow, and to build a second detached dwelling of approximately 1,100 sq.ft. in the rear yard.

The applicant’s intention was to develop a design concept through a collaborative process with District staff, so the proposal did not include the same level of detail as other recommended projects. The property owner remained interested in the Housing Pilot Program through 2010, but has since sold the property. It is presently listed for sale by the subsequent owner, including preliminary plans for a custom-built new house.

6035 Marine Drive: The proposal for this vacant property was to develop the wide, shallow site (289-feet x 56 feet) with four detached strata units of 1,000 – 1,500 sq.ft. each, with a common driveway, shared parking and elevators, and walkways between units.

The owner remains interested in undertaking a pilot project, but has modified his proposal based on further consultation with neighbourhood residents. The new concept is to subdivide the property into two lots, and to build two smaller houses, with a focus on flexible design and green building features.

4.4 Findings from the Housing Pilot Program

While the Housing Pilot Program has not yet resulted in a built housing prototype, the pilot project selection process and staff implementation of the first two pilot projects have highlighted some key issues:

Issue #1: Uncertainty for Property Owners

‘Selection’ of a pilot project by Council did not provide any guarantee of development approval; rather, it meant that the project could proceed to the development approval stage, in accordance with OCP Policy H 4.1. Consequently, continued property owner interest in the Housing Pilot Program has been tempered by uncertainty inherent in the development approval process.
To address this issue, Council may wish to limit future pilot project proposals to surplus District-owned lands, where the District:

- assumes the risks;
- can directly engage local residents in shaping future development on these lands to ensure fit with neighbourhood character, and to mitigate potential impacts on neighbours\(^6\); and
- can impose green building requirements through implementation of sales agreements.

**Issue #2: Costs of Development**

Given the age of much of the District’s infrastructure, the issue of required infrastructure upgrades typically arises with new construction. Consequently, the feasibility of developing a new housing prototype can be significantly impacted by servicing costs.

**Issue #3: Public Consultation**

The Housing Pilot Program Working Group made a clear distinction between higher level community ‘engagement’ in the Program, and more direct neighbourhood ‘involvement’ in the individual pilot projects. The question the District must consider is whether community engagement means ‘consulting’ with neighbours or ‘empowering’ neighbours to veto a pilot project.

**Issue #4: Addressing Neighbourhood Character**

The intent of the Housing Pilot Program was to allow for the exploration of new housing prototypes that fit with established neighbourhood character – something that cannot be regulated in the case of new replacement houses.

While the District has more control over municipal land, one of the key challenges for addressing public concerns over ‘un-neighbourly’ development and loss of neighbourhood character is divided staff responsibility for various permitting processes related to buildings, boulevard encroachments, and trees on public land. As part of the Housing Pilot Program, staff has been examining how these processes could be better integrated.

Staff has also worked with local residents to draft a neighbourhood character statement\(^7\) for the small residential enclave around the pilot project at 2614

---

\(^6\) e.g., as has been done with new lots created at the former Horseshoe Bay Fire Hall site, 23rd Street and Ottawa Avenue, and currently in process at 26th Street and Marine Drive

\(^7\) The concept of a “neighbourhood character statement” is modelled after a “Statement of Significance” (SOS). An SOS is a brief document which serves as an information tool for interpreting heritage resources (i.e., statement of heritage value and description of character-defining elements) and for guiding conservation efforts.
Ottawa Avenue, as a starting point for understanding the project’s ‘fit’ with established homes, views, and vegetation.

**Issue #5: Thinking ‘Out of the Box’**

Implementation of the Housing Pilot Program requires the involvement of staff from various District departments. One of the challenges for pilot project delivery has been the difficulty of staff to step away from established practices – i.e., to challenge policies, regulations and procedures, and to start thinking ‘out of the box’ for cost-effective equivalencies, etc., to support the pilot projects.

**Issue #6: Lack of a Clear Focus**

The original intent of the Housing Pilot Program was to allow for the exploration of a variety of infill housing types in keeping with the findings of the Community Dialogue. Given the complexity and uncertainty of the development approval process, the program goals became out of sync with the District’s ability to implement the pilot projects, and the public’s capacity to appreciate the purpose of these projects.

Further, during the proposal stage, ideas for new housing ranged from modest-sized backyard coach houses to multiple-unit rowhouses, but most could be classified as a ‘coach house’ (alternatively referred to as: a laneway home, granny flat, or carriage house). Consequently, the Housing Pilot Program became synonymous with coach houses. It would therefore be appropriate to identify coach houses as the focus of further work on infill housing types.

**4.5 Sustainability**

A fundamental component of social sustainability is the availability of appropriate housing forms to meet the diverse and changing needs of the community. The intent of the Housing Pilot Program was to provide a forum for thoughtful examination of possible new housing types for improving housing choice and affordability, and to examine a variety of issues related to neighbourhood character – to ensure proper integration of new housing types in established areas.

This report outlines an alternative approach for meeting the intent of the Housing Pilot Program, through a broader community engagement program that is not entirely dependent on building new housing prototypes in West Vancouver.
5.0 **Options**

5.1 Council may

*(as recommended by staff)*

- Receive for information the report from the Senior Community Planner and the Manager of Community Planning, titled “Transitioning to an Investigation of the Potential of Coach Houses in West Vancouver”, dated June 11, 2012; and

- Establish an examination of “Coach Houses” to become the policy focus for the District’s efforts in exploring new housing types in 2012 – 2013.

*(or, alternatively)*

- Receive the staff report for information, and request further information.
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UPDATE ON PILOT PROJECT #1: 6801-6803 HYCROFT ROAD
June 7, 2012

APPENDIX ‘A’

Note: This pilot project was withdrawn by the applicants in June 2010 and is no longer active. The project history is provided for information only, and documents some of the key lessons learned in trying to implement an ‘on-the-ground’ pilot project.

Description

This pilot project proposal was to build a modest-sized (± 1,500 sq.ft.), small footprint house on its own small lot – as an infill housing opportunity that would allow the property owners to ‘downsize’ within their own neighbourhood. The site included two legal parcels: 6803 Hyacroft Road (a developed lot of ± 11,683 sq.ft.) and 6801 Hyacroft Road (a vacant remainder lot of ± 2,073 sq.ft.) To create an appropriate building site, the properties were proposed for re-subdivision (lot line adjustment), subject to rezoning approval.

Project Status

Key technical issues related to this pilot project have included: slope instability, driveway access to the proposed building site, site servicing, and related costs. Rationalizing the physical challenges of this site with: (a) the District’s servicing requirements, and (b) the owners’ dream of building a modest-sized house for future down-sizing did prove challenging – particularly for the project’s financial viability.

During the review process, the property owners expressed growing concern over the upfront costs they were incurring for design and consulting expertise, without any guarantee that the pilot project could proceed to construction – that is, project implementation was still subject to public input, and District approvals for rezoning and subdivision. At that time (June 2010), Council had not yet amended the OCP to include policy required to implement the Housing Pilot Program.
The first potential 'show stopper' for this project was the District's proposed servicing requirements for the project, which included significant off-site works related to aging neighbourhood infrastructure in addition to the specific needs of this project. However, Planning staff and the property owners were able to come up with a more cost-effective servicing solution so that the project could remain financially feasible.

In response to the property owners' nervousness about the development approvals process, staff had proposed 'staggering' required approvals to help reduce uncertainty and perceived risks as the project moved forward:

- Step 1: OCP Amendment, followed in sequential order by:
- Step 2: Rezoning;
- Step 3: Subdivision; and
- Step 4: Building Permit

On June 7, 2010, Council introduced the OCP Amendment bylaw (Step #1 above) and set the date for a Public Hearing. A number of comments and questions raised at this meeting made the property owners' feel even less certain about the development approvals process, and the District’s commitment to advancing the Housing Pilot Program. Shortly thereafter, they withdrew from the Program.

**Neighbourhood Consultation**

During project review by staff, the site's next door neighbours expressed strong concerns over potential overview and privacy impacts on their house, which directly abuts the Hycroft Road right-of-way. In response, the project team worked with District staff to revise the design and siting of the proposed house, minimize driveway encroachment into the right-of-way, and examine opportunities for additional tree retention.

While the dialogue between neighbours was positive at the outset, and they seemed to be reaching a consensus – unfortunately, discussions deteriorated and they came to an impasse. As a consequence, the neighbour became strongly opposed to any construction at 6801 Hycroft Road.

Once the property owners withdrew from the Housing Pilot Program, a public meeting previously scheduled for June 22, 2010 was cancelled.
UPDATE ON PILOT PROJECT #2: 2614 OTTAWA AVENUE
June 7, 2012

Description

Pilot Project #2 is located at 2614 Ottawa Avenue. The site is a 64 x 145 lot with an existing 1930s character cottage, mature plantings, rear lane access, and water view. The proposal is to build a modest-sized (< 1,000 sq.ft.) detached coach house in the rear yard — potentially, as a down-sizing opportunity for the property owners, accommodation for family members, or a rental suite.

Project Status

Staff have met with the proponent team on several occasions, and have provided input on various alternative design concepts. Site development and servicing issues have also been discussed — including vehicle access, parking, fire safety, upgrading of site services, and storm water management.

As the property owners are not proposing subdivision, and the existing house does not contain a secondary suite, staff considers the proposed coach house as a ‘detached’ secondary suite. The requirement for owner occupancy of properties containing secondary suites would have necessitated rezoning of the subject property. However, as the Zoning Bylaw has since been amended to eliminate this requirement, the project can be implemented through a Development Variance Permit (DVP). A DVP would provide for detachment of the 'secondary suite' from the main house, and would establish an appropriate building envelope for locating the coach house in the rear yard. The property owners submitted a DVP application on June 1, 2012.
Neighbourhood Consultation

Public consultation has been initially focussed on the immediate neighbours, living a mini-neighbourhood enclave of seven properties (see Neighbourhood Context map below). This 'enclave' is home to those residents who could be most impacted by the introduction of a coach house to the lane environment, and who staff anticipates would have a higher level of interest in the planning, design, and evaluation of this pilot project. Two 'enclave' meetings were held in December 2010 and January 2011:

Meeting #1: December 15, 2010 (6 of 7 properties represented)

- At this first neighbourhood meeting, the property owners presented their coach house concept for 2614 Ottawa Avenue, including why they thought this was an appropriate housing form, how it met their family’s needs, and what they had considered in the design process.

- Neighbours did not indicate any opposition to the proposed coach house, noting that it is sensitively-design and sited, with respect to existing views and landscape features.

- Concern was, however, expressed over the potential proliferation of coach houses – without regulatory and design controls. Staff explained that this would be a prototype only; the ability to build such housing in the future would still be subject to public debate, and would require Council approval of proposed changes to District land use policies and regulations.

- Opinions were mixed regarding the architectural design concept – i.e., preference for either a modern design which contrasts with the existing house (current proposal), or a more traditional design which more closely matches the design of the main building.

- The focus of the discussion shifted away from the particulars of the pilot project to the character of the lane and the small enclave of private properties. It was felt that, to fully appreciate 'fit' of new development, there had to be a greater understanding of neighbourhood character, and those elements that contribute to character. Some neighbours felt that the planning context for the pilot project should take into account potential alternatives to demolition and replacement of houses under existing zoning for the enclave as a whole.

- Neighbours expressed concern over 'monster houses' being built in Upper Dundarave, and the negative impacts on privacy and views experienced by other residents in the area. There was general agreement that neighbourhood character was being eroded by the status quo – that is, by existing zoning provisions which enable builders to maximize allowable building size. By comparison, the coach house concept for 2614 Ottawa provides an opportunity to 'break up' building bulk over two separate structures.

- Neighbours appreciated that the Housing Pilot Program provides an opportunity to do something other than the status quo, with a strong focus on character retention.

Meeting #2: January 12, 2011 (4 of 7 properties represented)

- At this meeting, neighbours had a more focussed discussion on neighbourhood character, including review of a 2006 report by other Upper Dundarave residents who
were concerned about changing neighbourhood character and had called for a neighbourhood plan for this area.

This discussion yielded a draft neighbourhood context and character statement (see below), that will serve as an information tool during implementation of the pilot project.

**Neighbourhood Context**

*The Larger Neighbourhood*

This pilot project is located in the western portion of Upper Dundarave; more specifically, within the neighbourhood bounded by Rodgers' Creek on the west and Marr Creek (25\textsuperscript{th} Street) on the east. It includes properties from the south side of Haywood Avenue to the north side of Palmerston Avenue (see Neighbourhood Context map below).

The neighbourhood was developed in a ‘gridiron’ pattern, based on subdivision plans from 1909 - 1912. Most of the lots have a north-south orientation, with a typical lot frontage of 64 feet, and depths of 120 feet. 26\textsuperscript{th} Street is roughly centred along a ridge running south from Hollyburn Mountain, with steep slopes on either side.

*Mini-Neighbourhood Enclave*

The site of this pilot project is also part of a distinct ‘enclave’ within the larger neighbourhood. It is one of seven lots in the eastern part of the 2600-block of Ottawa and Nelson Avenues, which are served by a partially-open rear lane. To the west of these properties, the lane right-of-way is unopened and is used as an informal trail connection to 27\textsuperscript{th} Street.

Given that it is unpaved and ‘dead ends’ about 250 feet from 26\textsuperscript{th} Street, the lane has a semi-rural character, and is seen as more of a pedestrian amenity for local residents. There are no tall fences or hedges to inhibit visibility and interaction between neighbours on either side of the lane.
Character-Defining Elements

*The Larger Neighbourhood:*

- A gridiron subdivision that doesn’t feel like a grid, because of the underlying topography, vegetation, and varied houses
- Semi-rural roadways without curbs or sidewalks
- Lanes and lane rights-of-way used as pedestrian trails
- Prominent ridge along 26th Street, with steep slopes on either side
- Views oriented to the southwest (west of 26th) or southeast (east of 26th)
- Modest scale of original and renovated houses
- Houses originally designed to fit a site’s natural features – i.e., with no grade alteration and retention of rock outcroppings in gardens
- Sense of privacy
- Subdued light
- Balance between distant views and privacy
- Southern views framed by vegetation
- Green boulevards extending to edge of road
- Pleasing landscape character
- Remnants of second growth rainforest environment, including mature fir trees with ground layer of salal, fern and ivy
- Glacial till with variety of rock sizes from pebbles to boulders, with granite outcrops
- Traditionally modest scale of development with generous setbacks
- Typically low (< 4ft) retaining walls of dry-laid field stone or rough hewn granite

*The Mini-Neighbourhood Enclave*

- Topography sloping to the south and west
- Partially-open rear lane providing vehicle access to only these seven lots
- Deeper lots on this block (145 ft) than elsewhere in the neighbourhood
- Mature trees and gardens
- Modest-sized houses of various age, including some that have been enlarged or renovated
- Water views framed by mature vegetation
- Pleasant outlooks over adjacent gardens and green space
- Distinct community feel
- Quiet and privacy

*The Rear Lane*

- Unpaved
- Trees and vegetation
- Lack of tall fences or hedges encourages interaction between neighbours
- Continues as an informal pedestrian connection west of the ‘enclave’
- Communal area / shared public space for enclave residents
In addition, residents provided their thoughts regarding threats to established character and their visions for the future of their mini- and larger neighbourhoods:

**Threats to Established Character**

- Redevelopment that is not in keeping with established scale of traditional development:
  - New houses built to maximum size
  - Extensive site modification to accommodate larger houses; rather than houses being designed to fit indigenous site characteristics
- Introduction of more hard surface paving
- More cultivated landscapes with non-indigenous plant species
- ‘Privatization’ of boulevards and lane rights-of-way through encroachment onto public property
- Transformation of whole pockets within the neighbourhood through redevelopment, resulting in an altogether ‘new character’ – e.g., south side of 2600-block Nelson Avenue
- Shift from renovations and additions to existing houses, with retention of established landscapes to ‘clear-cutting’ of trees and replacement of existing houses with much larger ones
- Loss of ‘neighbourliness’ through lack of communication between builders and neighbours, and new development that does not consider impact on neighbours

**Residents’ Objectives for the Enclave and the Larger Neighbourhood**

- To allow for consideration of alternatives to ‘monster house’ development under existing zoning and other regulations – such as infill units and possible subdivision of larger lots to allow for a second modest dwelling on an existing property
- To ensure more sensitive siting of new houses – with respect to views, privacy and sunlight
- To preserve and enhance the unique lane environment