

## **Document 7 – Consultation Details**

### Notification and Consultation Process

Notification and public consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Public Notification and Public Consultation Policy approved by City Council for Zoning By-law amendments.

The consultation process involved a variety of outreach methods:

#### September 2015

- Online Discussion Paper released
- Questionnaire accompanied the discussion paper, drawing over 400 responses
- Public Service Notice, media coverage via an Ottawa Citizen article, Rogers TV interview, twitter and councillor columns.

#### December 2015

- Online “As-we-heard-it” report published on the questionnaire results

#### February 2016

- Online Discussion Paper released, providing the Guiding Principles and Draft Recommendations
- Direct comments received, drawing over 350 comments.

#### April 2016

- Online “As-we-heard-it” report published on the consultation results

#### January 2016 – June 2016

- Ongoing stakeholder meetings, with individual community associations, the GOHBA Urban Infill Council, and the Federation of Community Associations (FCA.)

June 23, 2016 - July 22, 2016

- Summaries of the Official Plan Amendment, Zoning Amendment, Site Plan Control By-law Amendment and Development Charges amendment were circulated to community groups and interested stakeholders citywide by email on June 23.
- The materials were also posted on the project web page on June 23.
- Advertisements were placed in English in the EMC papers citywide on June 23 and in French in Le Droit on June 24. Stakeholders were given until July 22 to submit comments.

#### Public Comments and Responses

##### (a) Comments related to height, building footprint, setbacks and lot coverage

- a1. The limit on coach house dwelling size should be higher than 40% of the principal dwelling unit and of lot coverage. A higher number e.g. 50% would still maintain the character of local streetscapes, but allows homeowners to build structures that are large enough to be economically sound as well as viable for their occupants. (There are high fixed costs associated with building a coach house.)

Response: 40% is consistent with the current approach to secondary dwelling units within the main dwelling, where the SDU is limited to 40% of the main dwelling unit's floor area.

- a2. Coach houses require two bedrooms to be viable designs, since, by the time most couples are in their 50s, 60s, 70s or 80s, they need two separate rooms.

Response: The proposed coach house regulations balance the ability to develop a reasonably-sized secondary dwelling against concerns of compatibility with the existing built environment. They permit a coach house large enough for a two-bedroom unit provided the principal dwelling and rear yard are over a certain size threshold.

- a3. Eavestrough overhang onto my property could be an issue.

Response: Building regulations do not allow eaves or eavetroughs to project beyond the property line.

- a4. Under the grandfather clause, would a homeowner be allowed to increase the height/footprint of an existing accessory building to be converted to a coach house?

Response: If located in the rear yard, an existing accessory building would be allowed to expand to the dimensions permitted for a new coach house. If located in a yard other than the rear yard, an existing accessory building would only be permitted to convert to a coach house within the envelope and massing of the existing building. (In this context "existing" refers to a building in existence at the initiation of the Coach Houses study, i.e. September 14 2015.)

**(b) Comments related to trees**

- b1. Without serious engagement by the Planning Department with Forestry Services, in the context of the Urban Forest Conservation Plan and existing tree conservation bylaws, the coach house amendment will lead to a new and possibly massive decline in backyard trees and spaces on residential properties for trees.

Response: The net proportion of rear yards that are permitted to be occupied by coach houses and accessory buildings is not proposed to be any higher than the current (50% of the yard) limit on accessory buildings. Distinctive trees are governed by the Tree By-law.

**(c) Comments related to access**

- c1. Access to the backyard or where the coach house is located could be an issue.

Response: The proposed zoning will require a walkway of not less than 1.2m width, with 2m vertical clearance, leading from the coach house to a public street or travelled lane.

- c2. I think there needs to be a discussion surrounding barrier-free design for these coach houses, such as the minimum standard of VisitAbility. Seeing as our Older Adult Plan is promoting adaptable, age-friendly homes in the PGM 2016 mandate, this only seems to make sense in my opinion.

Response: Accessibility in building construction is regulated by the Building Code, and is outside the direct purview of zoning.

**(d) Comments related to privacy and amenity areas**

- d1. It's a shame that no roof-top amenity areas are going to be allowed. A small private rooftop patio would be a boon to the mental health of any coach house resident.

Response: Given the permitted proximity of coach houses to neighbouring properties, it was determined that a rooftop amenity area would present unacceptable compromises to privacy. Restricting coach houses to 40% of the rear yard means that a significant amount of rear yard greenspace will be left for the enjoyment of both the principal dwelling inhabitants and those of the coach house.

- d2. Concerned about noise if a coach house is in the far back yard of my neighbourhood.

Response: Given that back yards are already used for a wide range of activities, Staff does not believe that locating a residential outbuilding in the back of the rear yard would exacerbate noise issues that may now occur, and may even mitigate them by providing a barrier between the neighbouring lot and any on-site noise. The provisions of the Noise By-law continue to apply in situations of noise disturbances originating from a rear yard.

**(e) Comments related to parking**

- e1. Front yard parking should be permitted (including an additional driveway) as long as it is provided by hardscaping and not asphalt.

Response: Allowing front yard parking, whether in association with a coach house or otherwise, would be inconsistent with long-standing planning priorities for urban development.

- e2. Concerned about parking in such situations.

Secondary dwelling units are already exempt from minimum parking requirements, and this has not led to significant problems. Considering that any given house will be allowed either a secondary dwelling unit or a coach house, Staff does not anticipate any significant issues with the latter.

- e3. Why is there parking requirements for coach houses, but not legal secondary basement suites?

Response: The proposed zoning does not require parking for coach houses.

**(f) Comments related to servicing (see also (k), Comments related to coach houses in the rural area)**

- f1. There is still no provision in this document for more environmentally friendly technologies. The water and sanitation requirements should be allowed to be satisfied with approved environmental systems such as rainwater collection, contained composting toilets, solar panels, etc. There should be a provision that allows these things once appropriately inspected and approved on a case by case basis.

Response: Building servicing, and the adequacy thereof, is the purview of the Building Code. Zoning is not able to supersede these requirements.

- f2. Will the City consider lot layout and waste water designs where it is better to connect waste water directly to the sewer rather than through the existing house system?

Response: Staff continues to recommend that development of coach houses must not lead to new service laterals.

- f3. Will internet access be impacted, or neighbour's internet speed?

Response: A coach house introduces a single household and is unlikely to impact on internet service, certainly no more than would a secondary dwelling unit which is already permitted.

**(g) Comments related to mobile or modular Coach Houses**

- g1. Recommend that Tiny Houses on Wheels as a recognized form of Coach House. Tiny Houses in Wheels are houses built on a strong trailer frame. While they are movable on occasion, they are of superior construction to RVs and other mobile homes, and are generally beautiful. The current proposals limit the height of Coach Houses to 3.6 m, which is too short to permit standard height Tiny Houses on Wheels. We therefore propose that the City amend the proposal to allow a height of 4.25 m for Tiny Houses in Wheels.

Response: The coach house amendment is intended to provide for permanent structures. A dwelling on wheels is considered a mobile home. From a zoning standpoint, all that can be done is to either allow or disallow mobile homes to meet the definition of a coach house. Staff's recommendation is to not allow mobile homes to do so.

- g2. You mentioned mobile homes would not be allowed, but what about modular homes? If the modular home was put on top of a foundation then it would no longer be mobile.

Response: The distinction between a mobile home and other dwellings is that a mobile home is designed to be mounted on its own chassis. The Zoning By-law does not distinguish between modular and typical wood-frame construction.

**(h) Comments related to financing and taxes**

- h1. How is the city planning to determine the tax increase so that people considering adding a coach house can accurately predict what their increased operating costs would be?

Response: This question is beyond the scope of zoning. Property taxes are based on property values, which in turn are assessed by the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation. It is to be expected that taxes will go up for a property that adds a coach house

- h2. Has the city had any consultations with insurance companies and/or mortgage companies related to the impact adding a coach home would have on one's ability to secure financing or insurance?

Response: This question is beyond the scope of zoning.

**(i) Comments related to where and how many coach houses will be permitted**

- i1. The proposed by-law still only permits one additional dwelling, meaning only a coach house or a unit in the main residence but not both. Both should be permitted, at least in certain circumstances.

Response: Given the goal of gradual intensification in what are otherwise single-unit zones and single-unit housing forms, Staff does not recommend allowing more than one second unit per lot. The appropriate location for sites with more than two units would be the R3, R4 or higher zones.

- i2. Pleased to see that duplexes are now expressly included among the properties eligible to add a coach house arrangement.

Response: Staff acknowledges receipt of this comment.

**(j) Comments specific to Rockcliffe Park**

- j1. Oppose allowing Coach Houses in Village of Rockcliffe Park because they will increase densities beyond those intended by existing zoning and planning policies.

Response: Staff recognizes the existing prohibition on secondary dwelling units in Rockcliffe Park, as well as the limits on density in the former Village. These principles are consistent with an exception that would prohibit coach houses in Rockcliffe Park, and it is on this basis that Staff recommends that coach houses not be permitted in that area.

- j2. Oppose allowing Coach Houses in Village of Rockcliffe Park because they will detract from the heritage character of the area and/or will be inconsistent with the Heritage Conservation District plan for the area.

Response: Staff respectfully disagrees that the Heritage Conservation District is grounds for disallowing coach houses. The zoning already permits substantial accessory buildings such as garages, sheds, gazebos etc. within the stringent lot coverage limits in Rockcliffe, and allowing outbuildings that are habitable is not a significant difference in this regard. Heritage concerns are properly, and will continue to be, governed by the Heritage Act and by-laws enacted under that legislation.

- j3. It is not in accordance with good planning practice allow coach houses in the Village of Rockcliffe Park. It will destroy the integrity of this area by reducing the open space fabric and crowding the dwelling footprints in this area.

Response: It is on the grounds of density and existing prohibitions on secondary dwelling units, not on open space, that Staff is recommending that coach houses be prohibited in Rockcliffe. As noted above, the zoning already permits substantial accessory buildings such as garages, sheds, gazebos etc. within the stringent lot coverage limits in Rockcliffe.

- j4. I am writing in support of the proposed zoning on coach houses. I have been a resident of Rockcliffe for several years now, and have seen quite a few MEGA houses being built. My preference would be to allow the construction of coach houses which prefer aesthetically pleasing and functional alternatives to the current construction of massive homes. Coach houses can add charm and architectural character to a neighbourhood in addition to obvious functionality. Overall, the ratio of house: yard needs to

remain low to allow the continued existence of our beautiful green spaces in Rockcliffe. However, I believe that the addition of coach houses will allow for extended family or other housing alternatives for families in our neighbourhood and allows for potentially affordable housing options.

Response: After due consideration, and taking into account the existing planning intent to restrict density and to prohibit secondary dwelling units in Rockcliffe Park, Staff recommends not allowing coach houses in the former Village of Rockcliffe Park.

- j5. Many people seem to think that the alternative to carriage houses is the status quo. I doubt it. On the largest Rockcliffe lots the alternative is more likely to be very large (monster) houses. There is one example in Rockcliffe that is so large that it looks more like a hotel than a single family residence. I would rather see traditional houses supplemented where appropriate by carriage houses in the rear.

Response: Staff acknowledges receipt of this comment but recommends not allowing coach houses in the former Village of Rockcliffe Park.

- j6. No cars are ever parked on the streets in Rockcliffe Park for a very long time here (some during the day - never at night). First of all, this brings a unique cachet to our neighbourhood: Secondly, most roads are not large enough to allow for parking without it becoming a hazard for other automobiles. If we authorize secondary dwellings, where will the additional cars park?

Response: Coach houses are not proposed to be permitted in Rockcliffe Park.

**(k) Comments related to coach houses in the rural area**

- k1. Support allowing coach houses in rural areas (defined as those lots/lands serviced by private well and septic system.) Rural property owners (including local farmers) are some of the most disadvantaged persons living in the national capital region; they need extra income provided by coach houses and the city needs to add to its farm-stay network in Ottawa-Carleton.

Response: The proposed zoning will allow coach houses in the rural area and on private services.



- k2. Concerned that the proposed rules are unduly costly for coach houses in the rural area. Requiring site plan control or hydrogeological studies for a coach house is excessive. Issues such as sufficiency of water supply and septic capacity as well as nitrate dispersion can be handled by requiring that coach house development in rural areas be accompanied by an engineering report that demonstrates these issues can be satisfactorily managed

Response: The requirement for site plan control and hydrogeological studies is proposed to ensure an adequate level of review for coach houses in unserviced areas.

- k3. There should not be a property size minimum required for using septic and well water with a coach house. If the City insists on a minimum size, it should be lower than 0.8 hectares. That is very restrictive.

Response: The 0.8 ha minimum lot size is consistent with the City's latest Official Plan (OP) direction (recently supported by an OMB decision) that each residential lot should not be less than 0.4 ha. Placing two residences on one 0.8 ha lot is the equivalent (in contaminant load) to having two lots of 0.4 ha each.

- k4. If there is an existing septic system and well that meet capacity already, a hydrogeological study should not be required. These are very expensive to obtain and time consuming. If a system meeting the total required capacity has already been installed then why must a further study be completed – was this issue not already addressed when the system of that size was installed?

Response: The issue is not sewage system capacity but the provision of a safe water supply to new residents over the long term. It is essential that the water quantity and quality meet Provincial requirements and that the new or expanded sewage system not unduly contaminate the environment (including the water supply).

Any approval going through the City must meet the rules in place at the time so as to provide a consistent level of protection for future residents. It is therefore essential that new residences have the same level of review, whether this is the creation of new lots through the subdivision process, or severance, or the addition of Coach Houses. This review can only be effected through a Planning Act application. A simple rural-based Site Plan that provides for a hydrogeological review is the least onerous mechanism. The hydrogeological report would have to meet standard

procedures including a review, among other things, of hydrogeological sensitivity.

- k5. A majority of the area within the City of Ottawa is located in rural communities since amalgamation. I take exception to this report which rejects rural lots and provided as its reason that it would be an inconvenience for the conservation authorities to review and approve.

Response: This comment refers to an earlier consultation document. Coach houses are now proposed to be permitted in the rural area.

- k6. Regarding Development charge in rural areas: This background study suggests applying only the transit charge to coach houses, in an effort to support the ongoing commitment to Light Rail Transit and to recognize that the tenants of these units are more likely to utilize public transit. What about places where there is no public transit such as in Constance Bay?

Response: The City collects transit development charges on a city-wide basis so the rates are applied in all areas since rural residents benefit from less congested roads and the use of park and ride facilities.

## Community Organization Comments and Responses

### Federation of Community Associations

Comment from FCA	Response
<p>Community Associations throughout Ottawa are concerned about the City's current Coach House proposal. The proposal is "one size fits all". There is little regard for individual community character, the character of surrounding properties, the protection of trees and other vegetation on abutting properties, or for the environment. The proposal appears not to respond to certain legal requirements, consider the intent of the Infill II By-law to "leave a sufficient amount of open space in the middle of the block for air and sunlight penetration, preservation of permeable surfaces and existing vegetation", or consider that Ottawa cannot afford to lose the limited amount of urban forest that remains.... Coach Houses might be a good fit in some locations, but this proposal does not address the concept of appropriate "fit" and "location"... Thus, the task is to define the considerations that make a Coach House an appropriate application for the individual site. Urban and Rural areas should have different parameters to determine appropriateness.</p>	<p>Please see the detailed responses to individual comments below.</p> <p>Many individual comments submitted by FCA were also repeated by individual Community Associations; in these cases, to avoid repetition, we have responded to them alongside FCA's comment.</p>
<p>90cm (instead of 1.2m) is sufficient for a walkway to a coach house. Recommend permeable materials; the goal should be to reduce hardscaping and impact on greenspace. (Similar comment from Champlain Park CA.)</p>	<p>1.2m was selected on the basis of being wide enough for a double-wide stroller or a mobility device with someone walking alongside.</p>

<p>At present, the Coach House proposal gives no consideration to protecting mature trees on the subject lot or on abutting lots. Does not address potential conflict with the law on Boundary Trees (Trees Common Property, Forestry Act R.S.O. 1990, c.F.26, 10.(2) or protection of property on abutting properties. (Similar comments from Champlain Park CA, Civic Hospital NA, Katimavik Hazeldean CA.)</p>	<p>Removal and protection of mature trees is governed by the Tree Protection By-law 2009-200 and is not directly governed by the zoning. Future reviews of the Tree Protection By-law may raise the standards for tree protection if this is deemed appropriate. Zoning restrictions on the size of, and yard coverage by, accessory buildings and coach houses are intended in part to discourage the unnecessary cutting of trees, by placing a certain amount of the rear yard "off limits" for building a coach house or shed.</p>
<p>Ontario Building Code requires that any excavation be undertaken in such a manner to prevent damage to adjacent property, existing structures, utilities, roads and sidewalks at all stages of construction</p>	<p>Zoning does not supersede other legislation; construction will still have to comply with the Ontario Building Code.</p>
<p>Coach house walls must not be on a property line; 1m maximum setback should not apply. (Similar comments from Champlain Park CA, Katimavik Hazeldean CA, Old Ottawa East CA.)</p>	<p>Staff respectfully disagrees with this point. It is desirable to allow coach houses to be built close to the lot line in order to maintain a substantial contiguous open space. Staff further notes that fences up to 213 cm are already permitted along property lines. The presence of a neighbouring building on the property line, provided there are no windows facing the neighbouring property and given a maximum wall height of 3.2 m, is not materially different from a fence to justify requiring a further setback.</p>
<p>The Coach House proposal focuses on privacy intrusion and overlook.</p>	<p>Privacy intrusion and overlook are among the issues addressed by the proposed zoning, but not exclusively.</p>

<p>The maximum 50% yard coverage (combined coach house and accessory buildings) is too large for lots in the urban and village areas. (Similar comment from Champlain Park CA.)</p>	<p>The zoning by-law already provides for up to 50% of the yard to be occupied by accessory buildings. Including coach houses in this coverage limit is consistent with existing practice. Staff do not see any compelling planning reason to reduce allowable yard coverage from the current 50% allowed for all accessory buildings.</p>
<p>The Coach House proposal does not in any way address open space and preservation of existing vegetation.</p>	<p>Staff respectfully disagrees; including coach houses in the 50% yard coverage limit for accessory uses (as well as the 40% yard coverage limit for the coach house) leaves the majority of the rear yard open.</p>
<p>In urban and village areas, definition/limit on lot coverage should include Coach House plus all accessory buildings plus decks and porches. (Similar comment from Champlain Park CA.)</p>	<p>Homeowners are already permitted to build extensive patios and other hardscaping in their yards; Staff does not believe it is appropriate to impose restrictions in this regard on the basis that an accessory building will be habitable.</p>
<p>Municipalities should assess where second units may be appropriate in the primary dwelling versus the ancillary structure. (Similar comments received from Champlain Park CA.)</p>	<p>The proposed zoning serves this goal by establishing standards for coach houses. If the coach house can meet these standards, it is appropriate for the site and if not, it is not permitted. The question of whether a secondary dwelling unit or a coach house (assuming the latter can meet the zoning standards) is left for the property owner to decide.</p>
<p>More consultation is required. (Similar comments from Katimavik Hazeldean, Champlain Park.)</p>	<p>Staff believes that the consultations on the Coach House proposal since September 2015 have adequately captured the views of all stakeholders. Additional consultation has been undertaken since spring 2016 specifically because of the lack of appeal rights under the Planning Act.</p>

<p>By-laws relating to Infill must be part of the decision-making process. (Similar comments received from: Civic Hospital NA.)</p>	<p>Infill One related to front yard treatments and driveways; Infill Two was concerned with the height and massing of main buildings, not accessory buildings or rear yard coverage. The zoning by-law already provides for up to 50% of the rear yard to be occupied by accessory buildings, and Infill Two did not change this. The proposed amendment includes coach houses in that calculation to ensure that, for instance, a rear yard does not have 50% of its area covered by accessory buildings plus another 40% by a coach house.</p>
<p>In Urban and Village areas the maximum height [should be] 3.6 metres; Restrict height to one storey. (Similar comments received from Champlain Park CA, Rothwell Heights.)</p>	<p>After due consideration, staff has revised the proposal to limit coach houses in the urban area to 3.6 m height; the possibility of a two-storey coach house as-of-right in the urban area has been removed. Furthermore, this height limit is accompanied by a limit of 3.2 m height for the exterior walls to ensure that the 3.6 m overall height serves its purpose, i.e. to enable peaked roofs, not to allow more massive flat-roofed structures.</p>
<p>Proposed conversion of existing accessory structures must be subject to review to ensure that they do not have a negative impact on abutting properties and the community. Grandfathering provisions as circulated are extreme. Allow the potential for conversions but do not make this "as of right." (Similar comments from Champlain Park, Old Ottawa East, Rothwell Heights.)</p>	<p>Staff has reviewed the grandfather clause and reduced its scope. The proposed grandfather clause now provides that an oversized existing (as September 14, 2015) accessory building in the rear yard may not be expanded but may still be converted to a coach house within the pre-existing massing, provided the dwelling unit itself does not exceed 80 m<sup>2</sup> (urban) and 95 m<sup>2</sup> (rural) in floor area; and that an existing (again as of September 2015) accessory building in a yard other than the rear yard may be converted to a coach house within</p>

	<p>the massing of the existing structure.</p>
<p>With maximum footprint 95 m<sup>2</sup> (1024 square feet) and a permitted basement, this is not a secondary dwelling unit. This is a house. (Similar comments from Champlain Park CA.)</p>	<p>The proposal has been amended so that a basement does not create additional height permission. The size of coach houses in the urban area is much more likely to be constrained by either the 40% of the rear yard or the 40% of the main building footprint, than to reach the 95 m<sup>2</sup> limit. However, upon due consideration, Staff does recognize that even in those rare cases, 95 m<sup>2</sup> is too large for the urban area, and proposes a limit of 80 m<sup>2</sup> for coach houses in the urban area (the upper limit in the rural area would remain at 95m<sup>2</sup>.)</p>
<p>In the case of lots served by a travelled public lane, how can adding a coach house justify adding an additional driveway?</p>	<p>After due consideration, Staff concurs with this point. The proposed zoning has been amended to establish that establishing a coach house does not allow any new driveways.</p>
<p>Door location should be assessed for each proposal.</p>	<p>Staff believes that any issues relating to door placement can be addressed through zoning. It is proposed to prohibit entrances on any wall within 4 m of a facing property line, except where that property line abuts a travelled rear lane.</p>
<p>What are the implications of not having coach house dwelling units count towards density control requirements?</p>	<p>This provision would have minimal effect. However, after due consideration, Staff recommends deleting this provision as it does not support current planning goals.</p>

<p>No basement should be allowed, to ensure that the concept of “coach house” is respected and to reduce the potential for damage to vegetation on the subject and abutting properties. (Similar comments from Champlain Park CA, Riverside South CA, )</p>	<p>The possibility of a 4.0 m coach house with a basement in Residential zones has been removed. Basements are not prohibited outright.</p>
<p>Coach Houses may not be appropriate for locations where they will cut off light and air to part of an abutting property or damage landscaping. Each site will be different. Therefore, it is important to ensure that appropriate restrictions are in place. The proposal does not address potential degradation of air quality (loss of greenspace and trees on the subject and abutting properties, fireplace and HVAC emissions) or unwanted noise (e.g.: air conditioners). (Similar comments from Champlain Park CA, Riverside South CA)</p>	<p>Coach houses in the urban area will be limited to 3.6 m in height, enough for a single-storey structure. In the rural area, where two-storey coach houses would be permitted, they would be restricted to lots of 0.8 ha (two acres) or more. Given these restrictions, as well as yard coverage limits, light and air are not significantly compromised.</p>

### **Bel Air Community Association**

Concerned about impact on parking, especially if coach houses are not required to provide a parking space. By-law enforcement is understaffed and cannot adequately police illegal parking

Response: Secondary dwelling units are already exempt from providing parking; extending the same consideration to coach houses is consistent with the current practice which has not caused undue problems. Residents (of coach houses or otherwise) who park on the street have the same rights and limitations as other users.



## Carleton Landowners' Association

<b>Comment from Carleton Landowners' Association</b>	<b>Response</b>
I am encouraged by the City's inclusion of the rural lots on private services for the construction of Coach Houses.	Staff acknowledges receipt of this comment.
<p>The proposal specifies that a Site Plan Control process be used for privately-serviced lots in the rural area, and that this will include a hydrogeological study, as required by Section 5.2.6 Policy (iii) of the Official Plan. I don't see anything in the <i>Planning Act</i> or the Official Plan that requires that a hydrogeological study be performed. The proposal offers no information as to the objectives of such a requirement which I find to be inconsistent with the Planning Act's objective of allowing Coach Houses in municipalities. As expressed earlier [Feb.28 2016] I am confident that we can all agree that allowing Coach Houses for residents on septic and well water poses no more risk than allowing them on communal and City services. People on private services are directly affected by the health and safety of those systems and it is in their best interests to maintain them in good order, and they do. In terms of capacity, introducing a couple more people onto a private system by Coach House is no different than introducing those same people into the main residence.</p>	<p>Consultation with Infrastructure Services and Design Branch concluded that any approval going through the City should have to meet the rules in place at the time so as to provide a consistent level of protection for future residents. It is therefore essential that new residences have the same level of review, whether this is the creation of new lots through the subdivision process, or severance, or the addition of Coach Houses. This is also the strong opinion of our Conservation Authority Partners. In order to ensure that we receive hydrogeological reports we require some type of Planning Act application, and a simple rural-based Site Plan is the least onerous mechanism.</p>

<p>Why are coach houses to be prohibited in floodplains? It seems unreasonable that the addition of a Coach House to a lot with an established dwelling on a floodplain would affect the control of flooding. Request that this restriction be removed.</p>	<p>Staff believes the rationale for prohibiting development in a floodplain to be self-evident.</p>
<p>Support allowing coach houses in rural areas on private services (well and septic.) Coach houses are a viable solution for an aging generation to be able to remain in or near their homes.</p>	<p>Staff acknowledges receipt of this comment.</p>
<p>Consider allowing coach houses on privately-serviced lots in the urban area.</p>	<p>Given the urban densities and smaller urban lot sizes, Staff maintains that the zoning should not permit privately-serviced urban lots to have coach houses.</p>

### **Carlington Community Association**

We are disappointed that the allowed minimum house size is still in a relationship to the footprint of the principal dwelling, resulting in very small dwellings due to the small houses in our neighbourhood. We had regarded the proposal as an opportunity to add affordable housing units in the neighbourhood without changing the streetscape.

### **Champlain Park Community Association**

<b>Comment from Champlain Park</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>No guarantee that a coach house will be put to the use intended by the legislation or other ideal uses e.g. "mom cave", "man cave", home office and studio. Given the high likelihood of alternate uses, where it is deemed appropriate for a coach house to be built, its owners must not negatively affect their immediate neighbours, the surrounding</p>	<p>The initiative to permit coach houses does not assume that they will be put to some of the example uses e.g. to house elderly relatives or boomeranging children, or as habitable accessory uses to the main dwelling. It is understood that coach houses may well be rented out to different households, including people with no relationship to the primary dwelling</p>

<b>Comment from Champlain Park</b>	<b>Response</b>
community and the environment.	occupants. To seek to prevent or limit this, or to restrict coach houses on the basis that it is a possibility, would not be consistent with good planning principles.
Windows should face the principal residence unless the lot is very wide. To be determined: a distance from the property line where windows on other walls will not affect the privacy of neighbours in abutting yards;	The proposed zoning prohibits windows on any wall that is closer than 4m from the facing property line.
All stormwater runoff to be retained on the property.	Grading and drainage are verified at the building permit stage.
Rooftop structures: skylights should be allowed, but not parapets, cupolas, etc.	After due consideration, these ornamental features are proposed to be allowed, however they will be subject to hard limits to ensure that they do not significantly change the massing of the building or create more interior space.
Recommend not allowing projections into side or rear yards under 3m.	Given the possibility of designing a coach house to locate within 1m of the lot line, Staff respectfully disagrees with this recommendation.
Canopies and awnings: no closer than 2.0 m to rear and side yards.	Given the possibility of designing a coach house to locate within 1m of the lot line, Staff respectfully disagrees with this recommendation.

<b>Comment from Champlain Park</b>	<b>Response</b>
Two storey: Do not allow; or, clearly define in what very limited, exceptional circumstances this would be appropriate, so it cannot be rubber-stamped by the Committee of Adjustment. (Similar comment from Civic Hospital NA.)	The proposed zoning will restrict coach houses in the urban area to one storey through the height limit of 3.6m. Guidance for when a two-storey coach house may be considered by the Committee of Adjustment is included in the proposed Official Plan Amendment, the main criterion being a very large lot or rear yard and no intrusion on neighbouring properties' privacy.
No driveway extension to coach house. Agree that coach houses share the principal residence's driveway.	Staff acknowledges this comment. Creating a coach house in no way implies the right to create driveways that would not otherwise be permitted for the main dwelling.
Door should face principal residence unless the lot is very wide. To be determined: a distance from the property line where a door on other walls will not affect the privacy of neighbours in abutting yards.	It is proposed to prohibit entrances on any wall within 4m of a facing property line, except where that property line abuts a travelled rear lane.

**Civic Hospital Neighbourhood Association (CHNA)**

<b>Comment from Civic Hospital Neighbourhood Association</b>	<b>Response</b>
Transparent windows: There are references to transparent windows in the document, in relation to the minimum 4-metre setback “where transparent windows are proposed”. Since glass can be switched out, the language should be tightened up to prohibit any window openings – transparent or otherwise.	Staff have confirmed with Building Code Services that minimum distance from the lot line applies whether openings are transparent or not. The reference to transparent windows has been removed; now it is any window that will trigger the minimum 4m setback from the side or rear lot line.

<b>Comment from Civic Hospital Neighbourhood Association</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>Has the city considered specific regulations around Coach House placement so that the Coach Houses are always in closer proximity to the primary residence than the primary residences of adjoining properties?</p>	<p>The proposed zoning does not contemplate such a rule. Zoning according to the proximity of buildings on other lots is problematic. The zoning as proposed is considered adequate to address privacy concerns.</p>
<p>Should a homeowner be able to request a limit on the number of Coach Houses abutting his or her property so as not to be walled in?</p>	<p>No such rule is contemplated for this admittedly extreme case. In any case, minimum separations from the main building and limits on yard coverage make it unlikely that a given coach house will occupy the entire lot line. As noted previously, people often willingly wall in their own yards with fencing. Fences up to 213 cm are already permitted along property lines. The presence of a neighbouring building on the property line, provided there are no windows facing the neighbouring property and given a maximum wall height of 3.2 m, is not much different.</p>
<p>Official Plan policy should not only specify what the Coach House initiative is designed to achieve but also specify variances that should be carefully examined or instances when Coach Houses are inappropriate, to ensure that the Committee of Adjustment is well positioned to assess any request against these criteria.</p>	<p>The proposed Official Plan policy gives guidance in this regard.</p>
<p>Has the city considered any specific requirements for approval of 2 Coach Houses on lots smaller than 0.8 hectares to assist the CoA?</p>	<p>Allowing multiple coach houses on a lot is not provided for by the zoning or the Official Plan.</p>

<b>Comment from Civic Hospital Neighbourhood Association</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>With coach houses being permitted on townhouse lots, is crowding a concern? Has the city created visual depictions of a row of Coach Houses aligned with townhouse dwellings?</p>	<p>The risk of crowding is mitigated by the limits on yard coverage, i.e. 40% of the rear yard area. In the specific example of townhouse lots, which are typically narrow. A 6 m wide townhouse lot with a 10 m rear yard would have 60 square metres, of which 40 percent is 24 m<sup>2</sup> (about 260 square feet.) Any townhouse lot that's small enough that crowding might be an issue, won't practically be able to have a coach house; and any townhouse lot big enough to allow it, would be big enough that crowding would not be an issue.</p>
<p>Why is the Coach House wall setback of 1 metre along a rear yard or interior yard a maximum? Why is it not a minimum?</p>	<p>The Building Code prevents any windows on a wall 1 m or less from a lot line. If a coach house is to be built closer than 4 m to the lot line, the zoning seeks to ensure that no windows would be located in such a wall that could impact privacy. By stipulating that EITHER you're within 1 m of the lot line (in which case the building code will prevent windows on that wall), or else 4+m away (in which case you're far enough from the line that windows won't be a privacy concern) the neighbour's privacy is protected.</p>
<p>Servicing from the existing building: There are existing secondary buildings on lots in some downtown neighbourhoods (small commercial garages and body shops) in which the service connections such as electricity are provided directly and likely billed separately to the secondary structure. How will this policy deal with situations in which a property owner</p>	<p>The proposed zoning will still require that servicing be from the main building. However, in unusual cases such as described here, a variance may be appropriate.</p>

<b>Comment from Civic Hospital Neighbourhood Association</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>would like to turn this secondary structure into separate housing? Will this be grandfathered? Will the existing services have to be reconnected with the primary residence?</p>	
<p>Water and wastewater services are to be provided from the primary dwelling. Are hydro, natural gas &amp; oil treated the same?</p>	<p>Hydro Ottawa has indicated that only one connection per lot will be permitted.</p>
<p>What, if any, are the implications of a Coach House not being considered a planned unit development?</p>	<p>The implications are minor; this is essentially a technical point. Planned Unit Development is a specific land use that allows multi-building developments on a single lot, usually under condominium tenure. PUDs are subject to Site Plan Control and are only permitted in higher-density residential zones.</p>
<p>Would the permitted projections above the height limit be those listed in Section 64 of the Zoning By-law?</p>	<p>After due consideration, the proposed zoning has been amended so that permitted projections for coach houses will be restricted to chimneys, flagpoles, and small skylights and ornamental features such as domes or cupolas.</p>
<p>CHNA strongly suggests that the City strike a temporary, joint City of Ottawa / FCA Committee or Working Group to review the next to final draft of the Amendments to tease out any potential loopholes or pitfalls that could be exploited, resulting in unintended</p>	<p>Consultation has been undertaken to gather stakeholder views on the matter. The technical exercise of writing the zoning has been undertaken by Staff to ensure that the resulting zoning permits what is actually intended and does not open undesirable</p>

<b>Comment from Civic Hospital Neighbourhood Association</b>	<b>Response</b>
adverse impacts on existing city neighbourhoods. Would the City be open to such a Committee?	loopholes.
Rules or guidelines around “character” and “streetscape” are applied to Infill. CHNA wonders if the City will be specifically referencing similar rules / guidelines in these amendments?	Infill deals with streetscape character, but this is generally about the front yard, particularly about the location of parking and driveways. Since coach houses are to be located in the rear yard, issues of impact on the streetscape are not really relevant. Even in the case where a coach house is to be located in the back yard of a corner lot (which yard abuts the street) the provisions of Infill 1 are not directly relevant; under the proposed zoning, building a coach house does not create any additional rights to driveway openings.
Maximum height: Newly built Coach Houses in the downtown core should be no more than 1 storey as the impact of an increased number of 2-storey dwellings in older residential neighbourhoods would reduce the already low levels of sunlight in some neighbourhoods thereby affecting the already stressed urban greenery. Two-storey Coach Houses should only be permitted in accessory structures that fit the criteria for re-purposing into Coach Houses and that are in place (grandfathered) as of December 31, 2015.	Coach houses in the urban and village residential zones would indeed be limited to 3.6 m in height even if the main house is higher than this. So the fact that the main house might be two storeys would still not allow the coach house to be that high. Existing two-storey accessory structures to be converted to coach houses have their existing massing above the height limit grandfathered.



<b>Comment from Civic Hospital Neighbourhood Association</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>Grandfathering clause: There are some very large existing accessory structures in the downtown core that are well above the maximum footprint of 95m<sup>2</sup>. How does the city envision that these structures would be converted? Can ½ of an existing structure be re-purposed into a Coach House?</p>	<p>The proposed zoning provides that larger, pre-existing accessory structures may still be converted to coach houses notwithstanding their size. The dwelling unit in a coach house may be no more than 80 m<sup>2</sup> floor area in the urban area (95 m<sup>2</sup> in the rural area.) This is to ensure that the intent of the zoning is maintained, i.e. that a second unit that is clearly secondary to the main dwelling can be established.</p>
<p>Has the city’s fire department been consulted as to its concerns with respect to Coach Houses that might be located in inaccessible back yard locations?</p>	<p>Development will still have to meet the building and fire codes, which ensure minimum standards to protect life safety.</p>
<p>Parking Yards &amp; Driveways / Parking: While one part of the document indicates that any existing landscaped area cannot be paved (Parking), in another area (Parking Yards and Driveways), “a new driveway may only be created in a rear yard that did not contain a driveway prior to a Coach House being established” thereby potentially paving an existing landscaped area. Are these two amendments consistent?</p>	<p>Staff has reviewed the proposed zoning and eliminated the possibility of a second driveway. Coach houses should not allow more paving or driveway openings than would be allowed for a single dwelling.</p>
<p>Has the city studied the impact of a Coach House being on or within 1 metre of the rear property line?</p>	<p>Back yards often have opaque fences screening them from their neighbours. In this respect, there is little difference between the back/side wall of a neighbour’s coach house (with no windows per Building Code requirements) and an opaque fence on the same line.</p>
<p>CHNA is on record as supporting intensification in the downtown core and</p>	<p>Staff acknowledges receipt of this comment.</p>

<b>Comment from Civic Hospital Neighbourhood Association</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>generally supports this approach to “gentle” intensification. We believe that all parties to the development of new policies must apply extra rigor to these processes to ensure that these new policies accomplish their goals and do not inadvertently introduce unintended, negative impacts on communities and citizens.</p>	

**Greater Ottawa Home Builders' Association**

<b>Comment from GOHBA</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>Housing affordability is the biggest obstacle in our industry. Therefore both secondary dwelling units and coach houses should be permitted on the same property.</p>	<p>Staff recommends that, at this time, zoning regulations be aligned with the new provisions of the Planning Act, namely, that only one second unit, either a secondary dwelling unit or a coach house but not both, be permitted on any given property.</p>
<p>We remain convinced that coach houses should be permitted on lots with duplexes.</p>	<p>The proposed zoning allows a coach house on a lot with a duplex.</p>
<p>Please confirm the standardization of development charges for secondary dwelling units and coach houses.</p>	<p>Coach houses will be subject only to the public transit component of the development charge, which will be calculated on the basis of an apartment dwelling.</p>
<p>We remain concerned about the rigidity of rules about pre-existing accessory buildings, the relocation of existing parking, and regulations to do with landscaping and walkways.</p>	<p>The grandfathering of existing accessory buildings to be converted to coach houses has been scaled back from earlier proposals, which were widely felt to be too generous. Rules around the relocation of existing parking, landscaping and</p>

	walkways are deemed necessary to maintain compatibility and reduce impacts of new coach houses on the surrounding context.
Limitations on the location of front doors appear unworkable.	The proposed setback requirements are designed to ensure that doors and windows are not located too close to a facing neighbouring lot line (i.e. ensuring that they are at least 4 m away.) Other than that restriction, Staff feels that there are enough workable options for entrances and windows on a coach house in conformity with the proposed zoning.

### Hydro Ottawa

<b>Comment from Hydro Ottawa</b>	<b>Response</b>
The Owners shall be responsible for servicing the buildings within the property. Only one service entrance per property shall be permitted.	It is the owner's/builder's responsibility to ensure that they meet Hydro Ottawa's standards and conditions for electricity connections. These comments will be included in the How-To Guide for Creating a Coach House, to be produced later this year.
Non-standard service installations shall be brought up to current standard as per Hydro Ottawa Conditions of Service, Section G-0, note 13.	See above.
The Owner is to contact Hydro Ottawa if the electrical servicing of the site is to change in location or in size. A load summary will be needed for the technical evaluation.	See above.

<b>Comment from Hydro Ottawa</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>The Owners shall ensure that no permanent structures are located within the "restricted zone" defined by Hydro Ottawa's standard OLS0002. The "restricted zone" surrounds poles and overhead lines, and extends five metres (5.0 m) in all directions of the conductor. The "restricted zone" extends a further two-metre (2.0 m) outward from a vertical line drawn straight down from the conductor to ground level. The "restricted zone" is defined along the full length of the overhead line. This standard complies with the requirements of the Ministry of Labour's Occupational Health &amp; Safety Act, the Ontario Building Code, and the Ontario Electrical Safety Code.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>There shall be no mechanical excavation within 1.5 m of any Hydro Ottawa underground plant unless the exact position of plant is determined by hand digging methods. Direct supervision by Hydro Ottawa forces, and protection or support of the underground assets shall be at the Owner's expense.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>Owners are encouraged to contact Hydro Ottawa prior to building the secondary dwelling unit to discuss servicing requirements.</p>	<p>See above.</p>

## Katimavik Hazeldean Community Association

Comment from KHCA	Response
<p>Allowing Coach Houses may eventually lead to clusters of one storey suites in the adjacent back and side yards. This we imagine will become an intermediate stage in the process of proceeding to the construction of full scale multi-storey apartment buildings.</p>	<p>Allowing coach houses is not intended as a prelude to apartment buildings; such uses still require different zoning. Indeed coach houses are proposed as an alternative to more dramatic forms of intensification, by allowing a relatively gentle and gradual introduction of units into an area without replacing existing building stock.</p>
<p>Access walking lane should be a minimum of 1.2 m as specified in the proposal. Furthermore the lane must be clear of utility meters, air conditioners, etc.</p>	<p>The proposed zoning requires a minimum 1.2 m wide walkway from the coach house to the public street or travelled rear lane.</p>
<p>KHCA requests that the setbacks for Ottawa Coach Houses be at least the current 7.5 m in all directions. Ideal is to not allow any window/ glass-door in Coach House, if neighbour's window/ glass-door is in the line of vision within less than 12 m.</p>	<p>Staff believes these standards to be excessive and would prohibit coach houses on all but the very largest lots.</p>
<p>In all present zonings, there are yard setback requirements.... Keeping the sanctity of yard setback requirements and within the presently allowed spaces takes away all the complications of new rules and a mushroomingly cluttered landscape... nuisance and eyesore for all neighbours and viewers. Moreover privacy would be lost in liveable spaces while this does not happen with garden sheds and car garages however close these low height structures may be to the lot line.</p>	<p>Staff respectfully disagrees with this point. It is desirable to allow coach houses to be built close to the lot line in order to maintain a substantial contiguous open space. Privacy is protected by prohibiting doors and windows on walls closer than 4m to the facing lot line.</p>

<b>Comment from KHCA</b>	<b>Response</b>
A roof-top patio or deck must be prohibited on the Coach House.	Under the proposed zoning, rooftop patios and decks are prohibited on coach houses.
It seems that the reason to ignore requiring additional parking space is such as to allow Coach Houses being built where there is limited space in the wish to promote intensification.	Parking is already not required for secondary dwelling units; applying the same rule to coach houses is consistent with existing practice. It is also desirable to avoid creating an obligation to remove greenspace for an additional parking space.
Recommend that a coach house must occupy no more than 35% of the backyard.	The proposed zoning limits coach house footprints to 40% of the back yard; Staff believes this is an appropriate limit.
Un-even or non-rectangular lots and corner lots need to observe the standard definitions of front, side and backyards.	Irregular lots are not exempt from the zoning definitions of front, side etc.
The proposed height requirement of 3.3 meters must be counted from the grade level at the site. The Coach House proposal mistakenly counts from the grade at the existing main building. In short, height should be counted same way as for a fence; that is, from grade.	In the Katimavik-Hazeldean area (i.e. outside the area affected by Infill Two), grade "means the average elevation of the finished level of the ground adjoining all the walls of a building." Height is then calculated according to that grade. The proposed maximum height of 3.6 m (outside walls not to exceed 3.2 m) would be measured on that basis.
If the goal is affordability, a more affordable structure is achieved by an extension to the existing structure, rather than a detached building, as well as avoiding expensive finishes (granite countertops etc.)	The proposed zoning allows the choice of either a secondary dwelling unit (part of the main structure) or a coach house. The homeowner can decide which approach is more practical and economical for his/her site.

## Manotick Village Community Association

"Please confirm that prohibition of a Coach House 'on privately serviced lots in the urban area' does **not** also include privately serviced lots in rural villages; but rather, the 'NOT permitted' strictly refers to lots inside the urban boundary."

Response: This is correct. Permission to build coach houses in the rural area is by reference to "Area D on Schedule 1" in the Zoning By-law, this being the entire rural area including the villages.

## Old Ottawa East (OOE) Community Association

Comment from Old Ottawa East	Response
There are still a number of less onerous rules where travelled rear lanes exist, e.g., a row house lot which would otherwise not be able to accommodate a coach house or the allowance of windows on walls very close to rear lot lines. But in many cases such lanes are very narrow and there is still quite a high potential for privacy invasion issues.	A travelled rear lane provides some distance from the nearest facing property, comparable to the minimum 4 m setback for walls that contain windows or doors.
Maximum height: We applaud the proposed change to maximum height and new limitation generally to a one-storey building. However the height for accessory structures should be measured from an existing base elevation ("existing average grade" per Infill Phase 2.	The effect of Infill Two is to alter how "grade" is defined and calculated in this part of the city (and becomes referred to as "existing average grade"); this different calculation then affects the definition of height. In Old Ottawa East, the permitted height of an accessory building would be calculated based on the existing average grade as it applies to the main building.
We remain concerned that a single solution is being proposed throughout the urban area, with no recognition of the many differences between communities. What might be appropriate in some areas of the City with relatively large lots will not necessarily work in other parts of the	Staff believes that the proposed zoning provisions, in particular the limits on yard coverage and footprint relative to that of the main dwelling, are sufficient to ensure that coach houses fit in with their context.

Comment from Old Ottawa East	Response
<p>City, such as Old Ottawa East, where lot sizes are typically much smaller. The OOECA does not support Coach Houses in our high net residential density neighbourhoods. Secondary dwelling units should be encouraged, but Coach Houses need very sensitive regulations.</p>	
<p>What criteria are set out for allowing two-storey coach houses on lots smaller than 0.8 hectares? (Similar comment from Rothwell Heights Community Association.)</p>	<p>The proposed zoning and policy environment permits two-storey coach houses as-of-right in the rural area, and may permit them in the urban area subject to a minor variance. (Notwithstanding earlier iterations of the proposal, the proposed zoning now ties the permitted height to whether it is in the urban or rural area, not to the size of the lot.) Criteria in the proposed Official Plan policy include: The coach house contains all of its habitable space above a garage; the coach house is in no circumstances taller than the primary home; the proponent can demonstrate that the privacy of the adjoining properties is maintained; the siting and scale of the coach house does not negatively impact abutting properties; significant trees and plantings are preserved on the subject property; and any streetscape character impacts are addressed through the Coach House design and siting.</p>
<p>Why are coach houses being allowed to have projections (such as eaves) into side and rear yard setbacks while more onerous rules are applied generally to accessory structures (such as small gardening sheds).</p>	<p>Section 65 (Permitted Projections into Required Yards) provides that "Where no yard setback is specified, the provisions of Table 65 do not apply." Since coach houses are not subject to a minimum setback but a maximum setback (where there are no doors or windows on the wall in question)</p>



<b>Comment from Old Ottawa East</b>	<b>Response</b>
	this provision comes into effect.
We do not understand why the City feels it is appropriate to set out criteria for allowing two-storey coach houses in some circumstances and then specifically identifying the Committee of Adjustment as the ultimate decision maker.	The proposed criteria are intended to provide guidance to the Committee of Adjustment regarding when a variance from the one-storey urban height limit should be considered.

**Rideau Valley Conservation Authority**

<b>Comment from Rideau Valley Conservation Authority</b>	<b>Response</b>
Hardening of surfaces through additional buildings and driveways/parking spots will increase stormwater runoff in speed and quantity. This has direct impacts on flooding, erosion and existing infrastructure. In areas with existing municipal stormwater services and/or master servicing plans, impervious areas have been identified to support infrastructure sizing to protect residents, private property and natural systems. It is our understanding that this will be managed by building code services in the same way any currently permitted auxiliary structure would be reviewed and dealt with.	This is correct.

<b>Comment from Rideau Valley Conservation Authority</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>Privately Serviced Properties: There has been significant pre-consultation with the Conservation Authorities and Ottawa Septic System Office on the potential to provide for coach houses on properties serviced by one or both private water wells and sewage systems. The current proposal indicates that these properties shall be brought under the Site Plan Control by-law to ensure that the private service(s) are sufficient to support an additional dwelling, that sufficient space is available to meet required setbacks and that there shall be no adverse impacts on adjacent lands/properties.</p>	<p>This is correct.</p>
<p>Private individual and communal sewage systems are designed, approved and built to service a specific design flow based on the characteristics of the connected structures (fixtures, bedrooms, square footage etc.) The addition of secondary dwelling units in any form will alter this calculated design flow. We note that in addition to the review of the hydrogeological study, there are requirements under the Ontario Building Code as it relates to the design of private sewage systems and application and review by the Ottawa Septic System Office. On properties supported by communal sewage systems which have design flows over 10,000 L/day, this review must be undertaken through the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change.</p>	<p>The proposed zoning does not supersede any other regulations, including the Building Code and septic regulations.</p>
<p>The proposal indicates that servicing arrangements shall be confirmed through the submission of a hydrogeological study. We presume that the hydrogeological study shall</p>	<p>This presumption is correct.</p>

<b>Comment from Rideau Valley Conservation Authority</b>	<b>Response</b>
be scoped and reviewed by City of Ottawa staff.	
<p>The City of Ottawa has a significant number of existing communities affected by the floodplains of local rivers, as shown under the floodplain overlay of ZBL S.58. We request that clarification should be provided that this prohibition will apply in both the floodway and flood fringe overlay areas. Increased occupancy, such as a secondary dwelling unit, above what is established in the underlying zone is not supportable in either floodplain or flood fringe areas.</p>	<p>The proposed zoning has been amended to clarify that coach houses are prohibited in both the "floodway" and "flood fringe" components of the floodplain.</p>

**Riverside South Community Association**

<b>Comment from Riverside South</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>Every community has unique characteristics which need to be recognized and accommodated for when implementing the type of zoning provision as proposed in this study. Riverside South a suburban community represents a mix of housing types generally on smaller lots. The community is relatively new with a young tree cover in most cases. The disturbance of the lots to construct these accessory structures including the required services could cause some of this vegetation to be damaged. Privacy concerns would be another obvious issue</p>	<p>Staff believes that the proposed zoning provisions, in particular the limits on yard coverage and footprint relative to that of the main dwelling, are sufficient to ensure that coach houses fit in with their context.</p>

<b>Comment from Riverside South</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>with the smaller lots. A “one size fits all” citywide secondary dwelling in accessory structure zoning By-law would not accommodate for the type of constraints and parameters of this community.</p>	
<p>The inclusion of these secondary dwelling units in accessory structures as proposed would diminish the amount of open green space available on our housing lots and make it very difficult to add or increase tree and/or vegetation cover on these smaller lots.</p>	<p>Permitting coach houses does not imply a requirement to build one.</p>
<p>Lot coverage value should apply only to rear yard area of the principal residence; it should not include the side yard area leading to the Coach House.</p>	<p>The 40% yard coverage limit does indeed apply to 40% of the yard in which the coach house is located (usually the rear yard.) It does not include side yards etc. in the calculation.</p>
<p>The Riverside South Community Association (RSCA) agrees with the comments and concerns outlined in the Federation of Citizens’ Associations of Ottawa (FCA.)</p>	<p>See responses to FCA comments.</p>

## Rockcliffe Park Residents' Association

Comment from Rockcliffe Park	Response
<p>Allowing coach houses in Rockcliffe Park would diminish its heritage character and be in contravention of its status as a Heritage Conservation District.</p>	<p>After due consideration, Staff has recommended that coach houses not be permitted in Rockcliffe Park. However, this recommendation is not based on the heritage argument being advanced. Rather, the exclusion of coach houses is proposed solely for consistency with the established planning and zoning intent for the area, specifically the existing limits on density (measured and capped in dwelling units per hectare to two decimal places) and the existing prohibition on secondary dwelling units.</p>
<p>The Ontario Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) on intensification states that in the pursuit of intensification, "Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved." It defines "cultural heritage landscapes" to include heritage conservation districts. All Rockcliffe Park's governing documents identify the essence of its cultural heritage landscape as its richly landscaped, heavily treed, park-like setting and open spaces. The Rockcliffe Park Secondary Plan (RPSP) speaks of the intent to "protect the present environment, including the spatial relations between buildings, and to conserve and restore the quality of the landscape." Furthermore, it states, "Council shall encourage the retention of grounds, gardens, trees and plantings which contribute to the integrity and sense of setting of houses on their own</p>	<p>As noted above, Rockcliffe Park's heritage status is not a consideration in our recommendation. Heritage is regulated under the Heritage Act; planning and zoning, under the Planning Act; and there is nothing inherently counter to heritage considerations in allowing coach houses.</p>

<b>Comment from Rockcliffe Park</b>	<b>Response</b>
lots as well as on public streets."	
<p>While accessory buildings—garages and garden sheds—are permitted in the RPHCD, the contention that coach houses would therefore be acceptable if subject to the same rules as other accessory buildings misses the point. Coach houses would be an entirely new permitted use, and would result in more accessory structures than would otherwise be the case. Each coachhouse, one by one, would inevitably diminish the heritage character essential to the RPHCD—its greenspace and open space.</p>	<p>Staff respectfully disagrees with this logic. However, as previously noted, after due consideration, Staff has recommended that coach houses not be permitted in Rockcliffe Park to be consistent with established planning and zoning intent for the area, specifically the existing limits on density (measured and capped in dwelling units per hectare to two decimal places) and the existing prohibition on secondary dwelling units.</p>



## Rothwell Heights Property Owners Association

Comment from Rothwell Heights	Response
<p>The draft document indicates a maximum footprint for a coach house of 95 m<sup>2</sup> (assuming principal dwelling unit footprint and yard area permit); and reference to a “...maximum cumulative floor area of accessory use of 55 m<sup>2</sup> as measured from the exterior walls of the use within the building...” Do planners intend that a proposed coach house could include accessory uses within the coach house structure that would allow a larger footprint for the combined coach house / accessory use building? Or does the structure containing the separate secondary dwelling unit become the “coach house”, and is therefore no longer an accessory structure?</p>	<p>In short, the latter. After due consideration, Staff has determined that the reference to cumulative accessory use not exceeding 55 m<sup>2</sup> is redundant with respect to such uses occupying part of a coach house. A coach house is not permitted to occupy more than 40% of the yard in which it is located; and the yard may not be more than 50% covered by total footprint of coach houses and accessory buildings. A coach house may contain only a dwelling unit, or it may also contain accessory uses; in either case, the building is regulated under the coach house rules.</p>
<p>Seeking clarity regarding where and under what circumstances two-storey coach houses are to be permitted. Are they restricted to locations with access to a travelled public lane, those with an <u>existing</u> detached garage, conversion of existing two-storey structures etc.</p>	<p>Under the proposed zoning, two-storey coach houses are restricted to (a) the rural area; (b) the urban area only where a minor variance is granted by the Committee of Adjustment, which decision is informed by the Official Plan policies introduced by this study (which in turn are designed to address the concerns raised by Rothwell Heights and others); or (c) where an existing two-storey accessory building is proposed to be converted to a coach house.</p>
<p>In the case of a two-story coach house, does the height limit refer to the height of the dwelling unit part of the building, and not the building as a whole?</p>	<p>Height limits are in metres and apply to the entire building, not just the dwelling unit. Number of storeys is indirectly limited by the height in metres (3.6 m is enough for one storey but not two; 6.1 m is enough for two storeys.)</p>



<b>Comment from Rothwell Heights</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>Parking Yards and Driveways: The draft document indicates driveway extensions will be permitted to serve a garage or carport that is part of a coach house in the urban area. But there is no mention that the garage or carport has to be <u>pre-existing</u>, i.e. a “grandfathered structure”. Does this mean that a two-storey coach house could be permitted in any backyard in the urban area (assuming adequate space), if the first storey is a garage and approval is given by Committee of Adjustment? This seems to be one possible interpretation, because of allowing driveway extensions to serve a (presumably new) garage in a coach house. But an alternative interpretation might be that a two-storey coach house is generally not permitted in the urban area (re: maximum height limits), unless there is an existing garage or carport that is rebuilt as a two-storey coach house (the grandfathering clause). Which is intended?</p>	<p>The proposed zoning restricts coach houses to one storey in the urban area; it does not allow an existing one-storey detached garage to be rebuilt as a two-storey coach house. (It does allow an existing two-storey accessory building to be converted or rebuilt within its existing massing as a coach house.) With respect to driveways more broadly: coach houses should not and do not result in any additional permissions regarding paving or driveways that are not already permitted for the dwelling in the absence of the coach house. Conversely, driveways are already permitted to be located or extended into in the rear yard, so there is nothing to prevent a driveway from being extended to a two-storey coach house (dwelling above a garage) in the rear yard-- provided that a two-storey coach house is permitted, which is only the case as of right in the rural area or subject to a variance in the urban area.</p>
<p>While understanding the interests in grandfathering existing structures, we are strongly against new, two-storey secondary residential structures in back yards for many reasons.</p>	<p>The proposed zoning restricts coach houses to one storey in the urban area. The criteria for considering a variance from this requirement are designed to address the concerns raised by Rothwell Heights and others.</p>

<b>Comment from Rothwell Heights</b>	<b>Response</b>
<p>The definition of a “coach house” describes a separate dwelling unit - either in its own building (a one-storey building), or in a building containing an accessory use. The draft document states that a coach house (i.e. the separate dwelling unit) is not an accessory use. But if the coach house is in a building containing an accessory use (e.g. garage), is the whole structure then a “coach house” and the garage is no longer an accessory use building?</p>	<p>This interpretation is correct. More specifically, a coach house (whether it contains only a dwelling unit, or a dwelling unit plus some accessory use such as a garage) is not regulated by Section 55 (Accessory Uses and Structures) but rather by the section specific to coach houses. (Note that the proposed zoning has altered and streamlined the definition of a coach house, while maintaining its intent and effect.)</p>