## DISTRICT OF NORTH VANCOUVER **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

# Click on icon to listen to the complete Council Meeting



Minutes of the Committee of the Whole Meeting for the District of North Vancouver held at 7:05 p.m. on Tuesday, November 19, 2013 in the Committee Room of the District Hall, 355 West Queens Road, North Vancouver, British Columbia.

Present: Mayor R. Walton

> Councillor R. Bassam Councillor R. Hicks Councillor M. Little

Councillor D. MacKay-Dunn

Councillor L. Muri Councillor A. Nixon

Staff: Mr. B. Bydwell, General Manager – Planning, Properties & Permits

Ms. S. Haid, Manager – Sustainable Community Development

Ms. S. Dal Santo, Section Manager – Planning Policy

Ms. N. Letchford, Deputy Municipal Clerk

Mr. P. Chapman, Social Planner

Ms. S. Berardo. Confidential Council Clerk

Mr. D. Veres, Planning Assistant Mr. K. Zhang, Planning Assistant

#### **ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA** 1.

1.1. November 19, 2013 Committee of the Whole Agenda

## **MOVED by Councillor MURI SECONDED by Councillor MACKAY-DUNN**

THAT the agenda for the November 19, 2013 Committee of the Whole be adopted as circulated, including the addition of any items listed in the agenda addendum.

#### **CARRIED**

#### 2. **ADOPTION OF MINUTES**

### 2.1. November 5, 2013 Committee of the Whole

**MOVED by Councillor MURI SECONDED by Councillor NIXON** 

THAT the minutes of the November 5, 2013 Committee of the Whole meeting be adopted.

#### **CARRIED**

#### 3. REPORTS FROM COUNCIL OR STAFF

#### 3.1. Coach House Discussion Paper

File No. 13.6410.01/000.000

Ms. Susan Haid, Manager – Sustainable Community Development, advised that the purpose of the Coach House Discussion Paper is to respond to growing community interest, to research what other municipalities are doing, to examine district policy and development conditions, to provide criteria for suitable properties, and to identify a controlled gradual start up process. Ms. Haid sought Council's feedback on a recommended approach to enable an initial step to consider development of Coach Houses in the District.

Mr. Phil Chapman, Social Planner, advised that a coach house is defined as a detached secondary suite, is smaller in size and the design usually complements the main residence.

#### Coach house benefits include:

- Supports neighbourhood character;
- Makes use of existing infrastructure;
- Adds to housing diversity;
- Increases rental stock;
- Supports ageing in place;
- Encourages multi-generational living;
- Provides additional income to owners; and,
- Provides ground-oriented rental housing for young or single parent families unable to purchase.

#### Coach House concerns include:

- Parking and traffic;
- Building height;
- Loss of privacy;
- Garage space conversion;
- Tenure
- Processing fees and development costs; and,
- Cost to build.

Council queried if the owner is required to live on the property and if there is a way to enforce this. Staff advised that the owner is required to live on the property as is the current policy for secondary suites.

### Lessons learned from other municipalities include:

- Lot shape, siting requirements/setbacks and parking are often limiting factors;
- Can work with or without lanes;
- Building height is a key factor in reducing neighbourhood impact; and,
- Clear, comprehensive, and enforceable development guidelines is key to maintaining neighbourhood character.

#### Proposed Coach House Development Criteria include:

- No density change, up to the same size permitted for secondary suites, only on lots 50 ft. or wider with lanes, on corner lots 50 ft. or wider, or on lots over 10,000 sq. ft. with or without a lane;
- Allowing only a suite or coach house but not both;
- Limiting height to one-and-a-half stories (fifty percent of ground floor area on second level);
- Requires additional off-street parking space (three in total);
- Requires owner to live on property;

- Coach houses cannot be strata titled and sold separately;
- Requires a minimum twenty foot separation between the house and coach house and minimum five foot from lane or rear property line;
- Meets other Zoning and Environmental requirements including storm water management; and,
- Requires early and on-going consultation with adjacent neighbours.

#### Suggested approach for a Coach Housing Program:

- Council use the development variance permit process to vary the location of the secondary suite on the lot; and,
- Staff draft a couch house development and design guide for the public.

### Approach advantages and uptake:

- Development criteria limits the pool of qualified lots able to support coach housing;
- Owners can self-determine if they qualify;
- Development Variance Permit process is more timely and less expensive;
- Development Variance Permit process keeps control with Council;
- Development Variance Permit process limits Council involvement; and,
- Program will be reviewed in two to three years.

Mr. Chapman advised that staff expects between five and twenty-five applications per year.

#### Council Discussion:

- Commented that the development variance permit process is the preferred approach;
- Expressed concern with loss of privacy;
- Made the comparison of mega houses to Coach Houses;
- Noted that Coach Houses allow the ageing population to stay in their neighbourhood;
- Expressed concerns with on-street parking;
- Commented on the importance of flexible design criteria; and,
- Remarked that Coach Houses are preferred over underground basement suites.

#### Public Input:

- Commented that Coach Houses cannot be restricted in designated Town Centres;
- Queried whether property taxes would increase;
- Complimented staff on the high quality of the staff report; and,
- Commented that Coach Houses have been implemented successfully in other jurisdictions.

# MOVED by Councillor HICKS SECONDED by Councillor MURI

THAT it be recommended to Council:

#### THAT Council:

- 1. Receive the report of the Social Planner dated November 7, 2013 entitled Coach House Discussion Paper for information; and,
- 2. Direct staff to consult on the preferred approach to Coach Houses and report back to Council on the results of the consultation and potential implementation steps.

#### **CARRIED**

#### 4. PUBLIC INPUT

## 5. RISE AND REPORT

# MOVED by Councillor HICKS SECONDED by Councillor BASSAM

THAT the November 19, 2013 Committee of the Whole rise and report.

Mayor	 Municipal Clerk
(8:57 pm)	
CARRIED	