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’.\(^1\)

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.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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
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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
couch 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,

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>
<tr>
<td>Objectives:</td>
<td>▪ To provide for the successful integration of coach houses with the built form and landscape character of existing neighbourhoods;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ To minimize site alteration and retain natural site features;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ To promote a high standard of design, construction and landscaping; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ 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>▪ 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>

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.
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ADOPTED by the Council on [Date].

__________________________  ________________________________
Mayor  Municipal Clerk
DISTRIBUTION OF WEST VANCOUVER
750 17TH STREET, WEST VANCOUVER, BC V7V 3T3

COUNCIL REPORT

Date: April 14, 2014
File: 13-2515-02

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 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.
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

**(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).

---

\(^3\) 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 westvancouveriTE.
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?)

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:

- Yes 98%
- No 15%
- Not Sure 19%
- No Response 7%]

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 WVV 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)

- No Response: 12%
- Not Sure: 19%
- No: 26%
- Yes: 43%

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

- No Response: 13%
- Not Sure: 23%
- No: 16%
- Yes: 48%

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

- No Response: 16%
- Not Sure: 17%
- No: 17%
- Yes: 50%
f) Maximum 4.57m (15ft) for one-storey buildings and maximum 6.4m (22ft) for two-storey buildings

![Pie chart showing responses]

- No Response: 13%
- Not Sure: 19%
- No: 15%
- Yes: 59%

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]

- No Response: 14%
- Not Sure: 11%
- No: 19%
- Yes: 56%

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

![Pie chart showing responses]

- No Response: 14%
- Not Sure: 6%
- No: 21%
- Yes: 59%

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 neighbor.
• (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 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 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 Amblewood 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: 1400 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 (1740 Orchard Way). Therefore that lane is like "our street". We are very concerned that with the inevitable redevelopment of Palmerston 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.
## APPENDIX ‘D’
(To APPENDIX ‘C’)

### 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>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>No change</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>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>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>A minimum separation of 4.9 metres (16 feet) between the principal dwelling and the detached secondary suite.</td>
<td></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>No change</td>
<td></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>