

**1. HOUSEKEEPING ZONING BY-LAW AND OFFICIAL PLAN AMENDMENTS
FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COACH HOUSES**

**MODIFICATIONS D'ORDRE ADMINISTRATIF AU RÈGLEMENT DE ZONAGE
ET AU PLAN OFFICIEL VISANT LA CRÉATION D'ANNEXES
RÉSIDENTIELLES**

AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

That Council approve:

1. the housekeeping amendments to the Official Plan dealing with Coach Houses as detailed in Document 1; and
2. the housekeeping amendments to the Zoning By-law dealing with Coach Houses as detailed in Document 2.

PLANNING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS AS AMENDED

That Council approve:

1. the housekeeping amendments to the Official Plan dealing with Coach Houses as detailed in Document 1 as amended by the following:
 - Part B of Document 1 – Official Plan Amendment is amended by replacing item (b) in section (2) with:

b) Section 3.1 (1) (i) is amended by replacing its second sentence with the following text:

“An application to allow a height of up to two storeys through a minor variance may be considered in accordance with the considerations noted in h. above, only where the coach house contains a garage for the parking of a motor vehicle within its footprint.”;
2. the housekeeping amendments to the Zoning By-law dealing with

Coach Houses as detailed in Document 2 as amended by the following:

a. replacing clause e) with the following:

(e) Amend Section 142(7)(b)(ii) by replacing it with the following: "3.6 metres, except for a coach house with a flat roof which has a maximum building height of 3.2 metres"

b. adding the following clauses:

(i) Amend sub clause 142(7)(a)(iii) by replacing it with the following:

"despite (ii), where the building containing a coach house also includes a garage containing a parking space established in accordance with Part 4 of this By-law, the building may have a maximum height of 6.1 metres.";

(j) Amend section 142(14) by adding a new clause, (c), as follows:

"when located on a property in Areas A, B or C of Schedule 1, must not be a shed style roof";

3. that there be no further notice pursuant to Subsection 34 (17) of the Planning Act.

RECOMMANDATIONS DU COMITÉ DE L'AGRICULTURE ET DES AFFAIRES RURALES

Que le Conseil approuve :

1. les modifications d'ordre administratif au Plan officiel ayant trait aux annexes résidentielles, comme l'expose en détail le document 1 ; et
2. les modifications d'ordre administratif au Règlement de zonage ayant trait aux annexes résidentielles, comme l'expose en détail le document 2.

RECOMMANDATIONS DU COMITÉ DE L'URBANISME, TELLES QUE MODIFIÉES

Que le Conseil approuve :

1. les modifications d'ordre administratif au Plan officiel ayant trait aux annexes résidentielles, comme l'expose en détail le document 1, telles que modifiées par ce qui suit :
 - Partie B du document 1 – La modification au Plan officiel est modifiée par le remplacement du point b) de la section 2 par ce qui suit :
 - b) La section 3.1 (1) (i) est modifiée par le remplacement de la deuxième phrase par le texte suivant :

« Les demandes visant, au moyen d'une dérogation mineure, l'aménagement d'un bâtiment d'un maximum de deux étages pourraient être envisagées, sous réserve de leur conformité aux éléments mentionnés au point h. ci-dessus, seulement si l'annexe résidentielle inclut dans sa superficie un garage pour le stationnement d'un véhicule automobile. »;
2. les modifications d'ordre administratif au Règlement de zonage ayant trait aux annexes résidentielles, comme l'expose en détail le document 2, telles que modifiées par ce qui suit :
 - a. L'alinéa (e) est remplacé par :

(e) Modification du sous-alinéa 142(7)(b)(ii), qui est remplacé par ce qui suit : « 3,6 mètres, sauf pour les annexes résidentielles ayant un toit plat, dont la hauteur maximale permise est de 3,2 mètres »
 - b. Les alinéas suivants sont ajoutés :
 - (i) Modification du sous-alinéa 142(7)(a)(iii) par son remplacement par ce qui suit :

« nonobstant (ii), si le bâtiment doté d'une annexe

résidentielle inclut également un garage comprenant un espace de stationnement aménagé conformément à la partie 4 du présent règlement, le bâtiment peut être d'une hauteur maximale de 6,1 mètres. »

(j) Modification du paragraphe 142(14) par l'ajout d'un nouvel alinéa (c), comme suit :

« s'il se trouve sur une propriété des secteurs A, B ou C de l'annexe 1, ne peut être un toit en appentis »;

3. **Qu'en vertu du paragraphe 34(17) de la Loi sur l'aménagement du territoire, aucun nouvel avis ne soit donné.**

DOCUMENTATION/DOCUMENTATION

1. Director's report, Economic Development and Long Range Planning, Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development Department, dated 6 April 2017 (ACS2017-PIE-PS-0058)

Rapport du Directeur, Développement économique et Planification à long terme, Direction générale de la planification, de l'infrastructure et du développement économique, daté le 6 avril 2017 (ACS2017-PIE-PS-0058)
2. Extract of draft Minutes, Planning Committee, 27 June 2017

Extrait de l'ébauche du procès-verbal, Comité de l'urbanisme, le 27 juin 2017
3. Summary of Written and Oral Submissions, to be issued separately with the Council agenda for its meeting of 23 August 2017, as part of the Summary of Oral and Written Public Submissions for Items Subject to Bill 73 'Explanation Requirements'

Résumé des observations écrites et orales, à distribuer séparément avec l'ordre du jour de la réunion du 23 août 2017 du Conseil, comme faisant partie du Résumé des observations orales et écrites du public sur les questions assujetties aux « exigences d'explication » aux termes de la Loi 73.

**Report to
Rapport au:**

**Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee / Comité de l'agriculture et des affaires
rurales**

May 4, 2017 / 4 mai 2017

and / et

Planning Committee / Comité de l'urbanisme

May 9, 2017 / 9 mai 2017

and Council / et au Conseil

May 24, 2017 / 24 mai 2017

Submitted on April 6, 2017

Soumis le 6 avril 2017

Submitted by

Soumis par:

John Smit ,

Director / Directeur,

**Economic Development and Long Range Planning / Développement économique
et Planification à long terme**

**Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development Department / Directions de
la planification, de l'infrastructure et du développement économique**

Report Author / Auteur du rapport:

Emily Davies, Planner II / Urbaniste II, Community Planning / Planning Policy

(613) 580-2424, 23463, Emily.Davies@ottawa.ca

**Ward: CITY WIDE / À L'ÉCHELLE DE
LA VILLE**

File Number: ACS2017-PIE-PS-0058

**SUBJECT: Housekeeping Zoning By-law and Official Plan Amendments for the
implementation of coach houses**

**OBJET: Modifications d'ordre administratif au Règlement de zonage et au
Plan officiel visant la création d'annexes résidentielles**

REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1. That Agricultural and Rural Affairs Committee / Planning Committee recommend Council approve the housekeeping amendments to the Official Plan dealing with Coach Houses as detailed in Document 1;**
- 2. That Agricultural and Rural Affairs Committee / Planning Committee recommend Council approve the housekeeping amendments to the Zoning By-law dealing with Coach Houses as detailed in Document 2;**
- 3. That Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee / Planning Committee approve the Consultation Details Section of this report be included as part of the 'brief explanation' in the Summary of Written and Oral Public Submissions, to be prepared by the City Clerk and Solicitor's Office and submitted to Council in the report titled, "Summary of Oral and Written Public Submissions for Items Subject to Bill 73 'Explanation Requirements' at the City Council Meeting of 24 May 2017," subject to submissions received between the publication of this report and the time of Council's decision.**

RECOMMANDATIONS DU RAPPORT

- 1. Que le Comité de l'agriculture et des affaires rurales et le Comité de l'urbanisme recommandent au Conseil d'approuver les modifications d'ordre administratif au Plan officiel ayant trait aux annexes résidentielles, comme l'expose en détail le document 1 ;**
- 2. Que le Comité de l'agriculture et des affaires rurales et le Comité de l'urbanisme recommandent au Conseil d'approuver les modifications d'ordre administratif au Règlement de zonage ayant trait aux annexes résidentielles, comme l'expose en détail le document 2 ;**
- 3. Que Comité de l'agriculture et des affaires rurales et le Comité de l'urbanisme donne son approbation à ce que la section du présent rapport consacrée aux détails de la consultation soit incluse en tant que « brève explication » dans le résumé des observations écrites et orales du public, qui sera rédigé par le Bureau du greffier municipal et de l'avocat général et soumis au Conseil dans le rapport intitulé « Résumé des observations orales et écrites du public sur les questions assujetties aux 'exigences**

d'explication' aux termes du projet de loi 73 », à la réunion du Conseil municipal prévue le 24 mai 2017 à la condition que les observations aient été reçues entre le moment de la publication du présent rapport et le moment de la décision du Conseil.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report recommends a series of housekeeping amendments that clarify the intent of the recently-approved coach house policy and zoning provisions. A number of issues with the implementing Official Plan policy and Zoning By-law performance standards have come to the City's attention and require clarification. The proposed amendments will adjust a number of policies in the Official Plan and implementing provisions in the and Zoning By-law to reflect Council's original intent.

Note that a separate report will be brought forward to the Agricultural and Rural Affairs Committee to respond to a motion which was passed by Council directing staff to re-examine the planning processes and requirements for coach houses on privately serviced lots in the rural area.

Assumptions and Analysis

Coach houses are detached secondary dwelling units that can be built on low-density residential properties city-wide. The policy and zoning modifications for coach houses were approved by Council in October 2016. Since then, a number of issues related to the implementing provisions have come to the City's attention. This report addresses these issues through the recommended amendments to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law as set out in this report.

Public Consultation

Public consultation through the legislated requirements under the Planning Act has been completed, and a summary of the comments received and the staff response is included in Document 3.

RÉSUMÉ

Le présent rapport recommande une série de modifications d'ordre administratif qui visent à clarifier le sens des politiques et des dispositions de zonage relatives aux annexes résidentielles et récemment approuvées. Quelques questions entourant l'application de la politique du Plan officiel et des normes de rendement du Règlement de zonage ont été portées à l'attention de la Ville et doivent être clarifiées. Les

modifications proposées permettront d'adapter un certain nombre de politiques du Plan officiel et de dispositions de mise en oeuvre du Règlement de zonage, afin de tenir compte de l'intention d'origine du Conseil.

Il convient de noter qu'un rapport distinct sera présenté au Comité de l'agriculture et des affaires rurales pour donner suite à une motion adoptée par le Conseil et qui enjoignait le personnel de réexaminer les processus de planifications et les exigences entourant les annexes résidentielles aménagées sur des lots viabilisés par des services privés dans le secteur rural.

Hypothèses et analyse

Les annexes résidentielles sont des unités d'habitation secondaires isolées qui peuvent être construites sur des propriétés résidentielles de faible densité partout sur le territoire municipal. Les modifications de politique et de zonage visant les annexes résidentielles ont été approuvées par le Conseil en octobre 2016. Depuis, un certain nombre de questions entourant les dispositions de mise en oeuvre ont été portées à l'attention de la Ville. Le présent rapport aborde ces questions par le biais des modifications recommandées au Plan officiel et au Règlement de zonage, comme il est décrit plus loin.

Consultation publique

Une consultation publique a eu lieu conformément aux exigences prévues par la *Loi sur l'aménagement du territoire*, et une synthèse des commentaires reçus et des réponses du personnel est fournie dans le document 3.

BACKGROUND

In January 2012, the Province passed the *Strong Communities Through Affordable Housing Act*, which made changes to the *Planning Act* requiring municipalities to allow for secondary dwelling units both within the primary home and detached from the primary home. These changes were brought forward by the Province in an effort to increase the amount of affordable housing.

In October 2016, the Staff recommendations to permit coach houses were approved by Council and provide a policy and regulatory framework to permit coach house throughout the city, in the urban area, rural area and villages.

DISCUSSION

The following series of amendments address issues with the implementing coach house provisions within the Official Plan and Zoning By-law. These amendments were brought to the City's attention since the adoption of the coach house package on October 26, 2016. Below is a summary of each proposed amendment:

Official Plan Amendment Summary:

The proposed Official Plan amendments adjust existing policy in Section 3.1 of the Official Plan to allow coach houses as an appropriate form of secondary infill housing. The proposed amendments address three clarification issues that have come to the City's attention since the coach house package was approved.

Table1: Proposed Official Plan Amendments

Official Plan Section and Policy Number	Description of Change
Section 3.1, Policy 1	<p>Amend the following policies on secondary dwelling units in Section 3.1:</p> <p>Section 3.1, Policy (1)(b): A coach house in conjunction with a townhouse dwelling will only be permitted where the lot containing the townhouse has direct frontage on two public streets, or on a public street and a travelled public lane.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amend this policy to allow all townhouse lots that can provide direct pedestrian access from a coach house to a public street to qualify to build a coach house. Currently, under the provision as worded, a coach house must have frontage on two public roads. However, a number of scenarios have come to the City's attention where end-unit townhomes have a large back yard with direct access to a street. In these circumstances where direct pedestrian access can be provided, they are considered as appropriate. <p>Section 3.1, Policy (1)(i): The Zoning By-law will limit the coach</p>

	<p>house to a height of one storey for lots in the urban area. An application to allow a height of up to two storeys through a minor variance may be considered where, in addition to the considerations noted in h. above, the coach house is proposed to contain all of its habitable space above a garage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Amend this policy to allow two-storey coach houses to contain habitable space on the main level. Where a two-storey coach house is provided, maintain the requirement that a garage is required on the main level, however additional habitable space may be included on the main level within the footprint of the structure. As the provision is currently worded, a two-storey coach house can have habitable space in the basement, no habitable space on the main level and habitable space on the second floor. From an operations perspective it does not make sense to prohibit habitable space on the main level. To ensure good interior flow, habitable space should be permitted on the main level to connect a possible basement and second storey together.
--	---

Zoning By-law Amendment Summary:

The proposed Zoning By-law amendments adjust existing performance standards within Section 142 of the Zoning By-law to allow coach houses as an appropriate form of secondary infill housing. The proposed amendments address clarification issues that have come to the City's attention since the coach house package was approved.

Table2: Proposed Zoning By-law Amendments

Type of Amendment	Description of proposed change
Where Permitted, Section 142 (4)	<p>Clarify that a coach house in the rural area on lots that are 0.8 ha or larger may locate anywhere on the lot, provided the unit meets minimum setbacks, and not be restricted to the rear yard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This proposed amendment addresses the reality that larger rural lots

Type of Amendment	Description of proposed change
	<p>are configured differently than smaller urban or village lots and a coach house could locate in a variety of spots on the lot. In most circumstances the location of the new coach house will be restricted based on the existing and proposed locations of the private services. Allowing the coach house to locate anywhere on a rural lot that is 0.8 ha or larger addresses these varying needs. Further, on larger rural lots there is the ability to locate coach houses without affecting community character, unlike in the urban area where the original provision is intended to maintain neighbourhood character.</p>
<p>Where Permitted, Section 142 (5)(d)</p>	<p>Clarify that a coach house on a townhouse dwelling lot must only provide direct pedestrian access from the coach house to a public street or travelled laneway and will not require direct access to two public roads.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This proposed amendment builds on the above proposed Official Plan amendment. The current Zoning By-law provision is worded to prohibit any end unit townhouse dwelling from being permitted a coach house, where it does not have access to two public streets or a public street and a travelled lane. Several scenarios have come to the City's attention where large end-unit townhouse lots can provide direct pedestrian access from the new backyard coach house unit to a public street, however do not have access to two public streets to meet the qualification provision.
<p>Maximum Size and Accessory Uses, Section 142, (9)</p>	<p>Clarify that the maximum permitted footprint of a coach house excludes an accessory use that serves the primary dwelling, which does not need to be included in the coach house footprint calculation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The current Zoning By-law provision is worded to require that the area of any accessory use serving the main dwelling (e.g. a garage or storage area) and is part of a one-storey coach house building, be counted as part of the footprint of the coach house and applied against the maximum permitted coach house size. It was not the intent of the maximum permitted coach house size to include an

Type of Amendment	Description of proposed change
	<p>accessory use to the principal dwelling unit. Accessory uses are regulated by Section 55 of the Zoning By-law. Lot coverage provisions associated with coach houses and accessory uses are provided in Section 142 (10). The proposed clarification will exclude an accessory use which serves the primary dwelling from being included in the maximum permitted coach house footprint calculation.</p>
<p>Maximum Height, Section 142 (7)(b)(ii)</p>	<p>Adjust the maximum wall height provision in the urban area to 3.2 m in height for all flat roof construction types.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The current coach house maximum height provisions for properties in the urban area include a maximum wall height. This provision requires amendment as it does not work for any roof type except a flat roof. In the case of a coach house with a gable, mansard, gambrel or shed roof, if built to the maximum permitted height of 3.6 metres measured to the mid-roof line, the structure results in two elevations having a wall that extends from the ground to the highest peak in the roof that will exceed the current maximum permitted wall height of 3.2 metres. These roof types would therefore be in contradiction with the current Zoning By-law provision as written, or the proposed building would have to have an outermost wall height that is significantly lower than 3.2 metres. A lower interior wall height than 3.2 metres was not the intent of the provision and would significantly affect the construction practices and livability of the coach home interior.
<p>Setbacks: Rear and interior lot line, Section 142 (8)</p>	<p>Remove the application of a maximum setback in the rural area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The current setbacks for the rear yard and/or interior side yard include a maximum setback of 1 metre where no windows are proposed on a wall that faces the interior or rear lot line. This provision is appropriate for the urban area where lots are small, however in the rural area there should be flexibility for the rear and interior side yard setbacks of a coach house. The proposed Zoning

Type of Amendment	Description of proposed change
	By-law provision will add flexibility for locational requirements in the rural area.
Driveways, Section 142, (12)	<p>Clarify that the driveway provisions only apply to the urban area and allow a driveway to extend to a coach house where the coach house contains a garage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Currently the performance standard is applied city-wide. Rural lots, however, may be given an increased level of flexibility for driveway locations and expansion given their large lot size and increased demand for automobile transportation.- Further, in the urban area, currently the extension of an existing driveway to a coach house is not permitted. The proposed Zoning By-law provision will allow an existing driveway to be extended, within its width, toward a coach house where the coach house contains a garage.

The above proposed amendments provide the required clarification to address implementation issues for coach house development. Coach houses are meant to be an affordable form of detached secondary dwelling units. The above City initiated amendments will reduce the need for clients to obtain a minor variance through the Committee of Adjustment to address these issues thus increasing the level of affordability.

Provincial Policy Statement

The proposed housekeeping amendments are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014.

RURAL IMPLICATIONS

The above information provides increased flexibility for coach house development in the rural area. The proposed amendments will allow coach houses to be built with less restrictive provisions thus supporting the need for accessory housing in the rural area.

CONSULTATION

Notification and consultation was undertaken in accordance with the Public Notification and Public Consultation Policy approved by City Council for the applicable amending By-laws. A variety of community groups provided comments on the report, mainly with no issues or comments. There were also a number of residents who commented with no issues or comments. Please see Document 3 for a summary of the feedback received.

COMMENTS BY THE WARD COUNCILLORS

This is a City-wide report – not applicable.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no legal impediments to the adoption of the recommendations in this report.

RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

There are no risk management implications in association with the recommendation in this report.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no direct financial implications.

ACCESSIBILITY IMPACTS

There are no accessibility implications in association with this report.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

This section is OPTIONAL. If applicable, this section must explain how the report recommendations will potentially impact land, air and water quality, public health, green space, protected or environmentally sensitive areas, trees, habitat, resource use, energy use and greenhouse gas emissions. It should also indicate compliance with City, Provincial and Federal environmental policies, standards, regulations and legislation.

TERM OF COUNCIL PRIORITIES

This report addresses the following Term of Council Priorities:

HC3 – Create new affordable housing options

ES1 – Support an environmentally sustainable Ottawa

HC1 – Advance equity and inclusion for the City's diverse population

SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

Document 1 Official Plan Amendment

Document 2 Details of Recommended Zoning

Document 3 Public Consultation

DISPOSITION

Zoning and Interpretation Unit, Policy Planning, to prepare implementing by-laws and forward to Legal Services.

Legal Services to forward implementing by-laws to City Council.

Circulation Services Unit, Planning Services, to undertake statutory notification.

Document 1 - Official Plan Amendment

INDEX

THE STATEMENT OF COMPONENTS

PART A – THE PREAMBLE

Purpose

.....Pg # ??

Location

Basis

PART B – THE AMENDMENT

Introduction.....

Details of the Amendment

PART C – IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation and Interpretation

PART A – THE PREAMBLE

Purpose

The purpose of this amendment is to revise the Official Plan policy with regards to coach houses. There are 3 amendments proposed to address issues that have come to the attention of the City when implementing the coach house policies.

Location

This amendment applies to residential properties City wide which have a single family dwelling, semi detached dwelling, duplex dwelling or townhouse dwelling on their lot and are seeking to build a coach house on their property.

Basis

This amendment addresses issues that have come to the attention of the City of Ottawa with regards to the current Official Plan policy which is in place to allow a coach house. A coach house is a detached secondary dwelling unit that can be built city wide on low density residential lots.

The first amendment seeks to allow coach houses on townhouse lots which can provide direct pedestrian access from a public road to the coach house unit. The second amendment seeks to allow habitable space on the main level of a two storey coach house.

PART B – THE AMENDMENT

1. Introduction

All of this part of this document entitled Part B – The Amendment consisting of the following text constitute Amendment No. **XXX** to the City of Ottawa Official Plan.

2. Details

The following change is hereby made to the City of Ottawa Official Plan:

- a) Section 3.1 (1) (b) is amended by adding and deleting the following text:

*A coach house in conjunction with a townhouse dwelling will only be permitted where the lot containing the townhouse ~~has direct frontage on two public streets, or on a~~ **can provide direct pedestrian access from the coach house to a public street and or** a travelled public lane.*

- b) Section 3.1 (1) (i) is amended by adding and deleting the following text:

*The Zoning By-law will limit the coach house to a height of one storey for lots in the urban area. An application to allow a height of up to two storeys through a minor variance may be considered ~~where, in addition~~ **in accordance** to the considerations noted in h. above., ~~the coach house is proposed to contain all of its habitable space above a garage~~*

PART C – IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation and interpretation of this Amendment shall be in accordance with the policies of the Official Plan for the City of Ottawa.

Document 2 – Details of Recommended Zoning

THE AMENDMENT

This document details the recommended zoning amendments to implement the applicable Official Plan policy.

- c) Amend Section 142 (4) by adding the text “for lots less than 0.8 hectares” after the text “in the rear yard”;
- d) Amend Section 142 (5)(d) by adding the text “or can fulfill the requirements of s.142 (11).” after the text “or a public street and a travelled lane”;
- e) Amend Section 142 (7)(b)(ii) by adding the text “for flat roof building types” after the text “walls not to exceed 3.2 metres”;
- f) Amend Section 142 (8) (c) (i) by adding the text “Within Areas A, B and C on Schedule 1,” before the text “where the interior side lot line abuts a travelled lane or where no entrance or window faces the interior side lot line, the maximum permitted setback is 1 metre”;
- g) Amend Section 142, (9) by adding the following text “excluding an accessory use which services the primary dwelling and the coach house building” after the text “The **footprint** of a building containing a coach house”;
- h) Amend Section 142, (12) by adding the following text “Within Areas A, B and C on Schedule 1” before the text “No new driveway may be created in association with a coach house”. Further add the text “except where a coach house contains a garage a driveway may be extended to the coach house” after the text “No new driveway may be created in association with a coach house”.

Document 3 - Public Consultation

Purpose

This document provides an overview of the comments received and the staff response (where applicable) for the proposed amendments to the coach house implementing documents, Official Plan and Zoning By-law.

Community Group Comments		
Organization / Name	Comment	Staff Response
Greater Ottawa Home Builders' Association	No concerns.	N/A
The Riverside South Community Association	No objections.	N/A
Preston Street BIA	<p>Comment 1: Are coach houses allowed in R4 zoned areas?</p> <p>Comment 2: Why do you need a garage, if you want a two storey coach house? In R-4 for instance, heights of 4 stories are allowed</p>	<p>Comment 1: They are allowed City wide on all lots with: a single family dwelling; semi-detached, duplex and in some instances a townhouse. R4 zoned lands where these uses are located therefore can have a coach house.</p> <p>Comment 2: In the urban area all 2 storey coach houses require a CofA minor variance application as only 1 storey is permitted as-of-</p>

		<p>right. The policy is set up to require a garage as a component of the 2 storey coach house and this was in part to address parking needs and the smaller floor space area intent of a coach house</p>
<p>Old Ottawa East Community Association</p>	<p>Comment 1: objections to two of the proposed modifications. The principle behind our objection is that we do not believe two storey coach houses are at all appropriate for the inner city wards, and we do not want to see any exceptions to this position. We further suggest that the proposed changes are not all corrections of errors or omissions but in the matter of changes in height and permissions for two storey buildings, a change in approach after consultation that clearly rejected the direction. Finally, the support of two storey coach houses in the mature neighbourhoods is in direct contradiction of the accepted purposes for rear yards negotiated with community associations during the consultations around the Infill 2 By-law.</p> <p>Comment 2: We also note that the City Staff Report (Document 7 - provided for the October 11, 2016 PC meeting and October 26 Council meeting) response to community comments arguing against two storey coach houses was "The</p>	<p>Comment 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9: The department understands that the Old Ottawa East Community Association is opposed to the two storey height limit when the coach house package was approved in October of last year. In the urban area coach houses are permitted to have an as of right height one storey. Any proposal for a two storey coach house would be subject to a Committee of Adjustment approval. This requirement has not changed through the housekeeping amendment.</p> <p>The proposed housekeeping amendments are City initiated modifications to</p>

	<p>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." Again we ask why has the staff position changed? The change is not in the nature of a clarification, but rather a change in policy.</p> <p>Comment 3: The notion of rear yards as private amenity spaces is significantly compromised by the presence of coach houses. However, provided that there is only overlook on the immediate rear yard, one can say that the owner of the principal dwelling has made a choice, which is their prerogative.</p> <p>Comment 4: When a coach house extends beyond a generous 3.25 m in wall height, and certainly if constructed over a garage as a two storey accessory building, it permits overlook into adjacent yards, preventing those owners from having any choice in the private nature of their amenity spaces. OOECA does not find this acceptable.</p> <p>Comment 5: We are also concerned that the intent of the existing policy, to restrain the temptation to inappropriately</p>	<p>the set of implementing provisions to allow coach houses. The 3.2m max wall height amendment clarifies an issue the department has faced when interpreting this provision for peak roofs. Where a coach house has a peak roof, the two walls which are non-peak can be built with the maximum wall height of 3.2 - however the two peak walls will extend past the 3.2 to the complete top of the peak. In all building roof types, except a flat roof, there will be one or more peak-walls which extend taller. This specific housekeeping amendment recognizes this to alleviate the need to go to the CofA for an anomaly type adjustment.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>maximize the area of habitable space and mass of a two-storey coach house, is greatly compromised by the change proposed which allows habitable space on the main level as well as the second storey, and which excludes an accessory use from inclusion in the maximum permitted coach house size calculation. Accordingly, OOECA objects to the proposed Official Plan revision in Section 3.1 Policy (1)(i) that proposes the acceptance of a coach house built over an existing garage. When the previous statement upholds the restriction of Coach Houses in the urban area to one storey how can this exemption be seen as reasonable?</p> <p>Comment 6: OOECA requests that the reference to permitted coach houses over garages in Section 3.1 Policy (1)(i) be struck from the proposal.</p> <p>Further to the discussion of height, OOECA objects to the arbitrary permission of wall heights to increase beyond 3.2 m. There is a confusion in the discussion between wall height and roof height, which is used to emphasize the false assertion that acceptable wall and ceiling heights cannot be achieved.</p> <p>Comment 7: There is also the assumption that all roof types must be permitted, which is not warranted. The purpose of the Coach House is to provide a secondary dwelling in an</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>accessory building on a lot. Limiting the roof types to flat, low-slope shed, or hip roofs will maintain the secondary character of the dwellings and not encourage increases of height for internal uses that may facilitate overlook of neighbours' yards.</p> <p>Comment 8: OOECA requests that the proposed revision in Zoning Section 142 (7)(b)(ii) to the allowable wall heights of Coach House walls be struck from the proposal.</p> <p>Comment 9: Finally, after passing the Coach House By-law so recently with all of the community consultation behind it, it seems that one month for community associations to reply to a disjointed set of revisions is an abuse of process. It appears that last minute favours are being introduced to legislation, without consultation and without adequate time for community association review and discussion. We deserve better service from our planning department.</p>	
<p>Champlain Park Community Association and the Federation of Community Associations</p>	<p>Comment 1: changes affecting the rural area. No concerns.</p> <p>Comment 2: changes affecting the urban area. One item Driveways, Section 142 (12), stands out. I now understand that this change is directed primarily at the rural area, where allowing a driveway to extend to a Coach House seems reasonable. We support the change for the rural</p>	<p>Comment 1: Received.</p> <p>Comment 2: Staff have included a proposed change within the Zoning By-law performance standard to only allow a driveway extension in the urban area where a garage is a component of</p>

	<p>area, and would appreciate it if the language in the By-law could somehow reflect that the rural area is the focus. We are concerned about unintended consequences in the urban area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In the Urban Area, the City's goal is to get people out of their cars and onto transit.• A recent CBC article quoted Stephen Willis as supporting Ottawa's policies that promote reduction in parking spaces within the urban area.• No additional parking is allowed for an in-home secondary dwelling unit. This also must be the case for a Coach House in the urban area, where lots are much smaller, and where a full driveway extending to the rear of a lot would eat up permeable land, damage vegetation on the subject and adjacent lots, encourage extra car-use and parking and increase the potential for noise and fumes to affect abutting property owners. <p>The change is intended to allow a driveway extension to a Coach House only if a garage is a component of the Coach House. You suggested that construction such as this would be unlikely in the urban area. If it's unlikely, and if the intent of the change is not to</p>	<p>the coach house.</p>
--	---	-------------------------

	<p>promote this type of construction, then language to this effect would be very welcome.</p>	
--	---	--

Resident Comments	
Comment	Staff Response
<p>Comment 1: Support to allow coach houses on rural property to locate anywhere on the lot and not be restricted to the backyard.</p> <p>Comment 2: Requests the City to consider allowing a coach house which is located in the rural area and contains a garage to have a separate new driveway instead of extending the existing driveway. As it may not be possible to extend an existing driveway because of an inability to construct a driveway over existing buried services such as electricity and telephone cables, water well or septic pipes etc. Or the preferred location of the coach house on the rural lot makes extending the existing driveway illogical or infeasible. If the rural property owner can demonstrate that extending the existing driveway is not logical or feasible, a new separate driveway to the coach house garage should be optionally permitted</p>	<p>Comment 1: received.</p> <p>Comment 2: Proposed to include the suggested edit regarding driveway flexibility in the rural area.</p>
<p>Comment 1: 142 (8) (c) (i) says: “where the interior side lot line abuts a traveled lane or where no entrance or window faces the interior side lot line, the maximum permitted setback is 1 metre”. My townhouse has 1.2 m side yard and 6 m back yard setback according to R4z zoning, but 142 (8) (c) (i) prescribes 1m maximum setback. Does the Coach House by-law overrule setbacks prescribed by the zoning requirements?</p> <p>Comment 2: In many new townhouses the 1.5 metre right of way along side and rear yards may be required to be</p>	<p>Comment 1: Yes, for the coach house structure only.</p> <p>Comment 2: This is not needed in the coach house Zoning By-law provisions, right of ways are legal instruments that are enforced and maintained through private legal</p>

provided including mine. May 142 (8) (c) (i) be amended so that to accommodate the need for 1.5 metre right of way? For example I would suggest to include a provision that would sound like: *...the maximum permitted setback is 1 metre, but not less than the right of way required alongside and rear yards.*

Comment 3: In the amendment proposal of 142 (12) it was proposed to clarify the permission to allow an existing driveway to be extended, within its width, toward a coach house. In some cases it would be more logical to extend the driveway not straight, but sideways. In my case it would look not like an extension, but like an attachment of a new driveway. To cover this and other similar cases I would suggest to clarify such kind of instances and include provision like: *...a new driveway may be provided towards a coach house that is connected to existing driveway. Such an extension must not be wider than existing driveway.*

Comment 4: Currently, according to 4 (a) coach houses are allowed only in rear yards. In my case the coach house can be easily fit in the side yard. Such a location has many benefits including proximity to services, shorter pathway and driveway, less expenses, and more sustainability. I would suggest to allow coach houses in urban areas side yards when side yards are big enough to accommodate coach houses.

Comment 5: Some lots, like mine may have irregular shapes with less than 90 degrees angles at some corners. Because of this it may be impossible to maintain 1 m maximum setback requirement through the whole length of both coach house walls converging in one angle. Also, if one side of rectangular building would follow along one setback line, and the building corner would only touch another 1 m maximum setback line at one point, it is not

agreements and typically registered on title.

Comment 3: The existing wording does not prohibit a driveway to curve, provided it is no wider than the original width.

Comment 4: Thank you for the comment – however this request is beyond the scope of the housekeeping modifications addressed in this report and would be best considered as part of the review for coach houses that will be undertaken in 2 years. Your suggestion could impact the community character of neighbourhoods and the privacy of adjacent neighbours and therefore would need to be comprehensively assessed outside a housekeeping amendment process.

Comment 5: There is an option to have a 4 metre setback – but the area between 1m and 3.99m is essentially a “no build zone”. An proposal to build

<p>clear if windows would be allowed on both sides of such a building corner or not. Can you clarify how to deal with such a situation?</p> <p>Comment 6: It would be nice to include provision that would allow alternative access to coach houses from public pathways if any around, in addition to mandatory access from public driveway. This would provide more privacy to main and coach house residents and additional means of egress.</p>	<p>within this area, would require a minor variance through the Committee of Adjustment.</p> <p>Comment 6: The purpose behind the 1.2m required pathway from a public road is for Pedestrian access and emergency personnel. Emergency personnel need direct access in the event of an emergency. While the suggestion may be satisfactory for pedestrian access, it could cause confusion for emergency personnel.</p>
<p>Comment 1: The proposed Coach House will be serviced by the existing well that services the principle dwelling. (perhaps this would meet the conditions of "communal water" in the quote above). Rationale: Adding a secondary dwelling within the existing residence would also share the same water supply; and does not require site plan control.</p> <p>Comment 2: The proposed Coach House will be located within an existing Accessory Structure that is already serviced by a pre-existing well water supply. When the number of fixtures in the Accessory Structure will be equivalent after the conversion. Rationale: The pre-existing Accessory Structure and water demand are equivalent after conversion to a Coach House.</p> <p>Comment 3: Why impose complex process, and cost (potentially a new well, and required sealing of the existing</p>	<p>Comment 1, 2 and 3: Comment received and considered as part of the supplementary report to the Agricultural and Rural Affairs Committee on alternative rural process options to allow coach houses that will be brought forward on early summer 2017.</p>

<p>well), a cost exclusively applied to rural taxpayers needlessly. It is clearly in the interest of the landowner to have a water supply that meets their requirements, why police it? - I tend to question the requirement for Site Plan Control which seems an excessive burden in both time and expense to rural landowners - in particular for the circumstances noted above.</p>	
<p>Comment 1: Alternative septic technologies should be considered as viable solutions for lots in the rural area which are less than 0.8 hectares</p> <p>Comment 2: A smaller lot should be supported in the rural area to qualify to build a coach house</p> <p>Comment 3: Remove Site Plan Control application process for lots in the rural area.</p> <p>Comment 4: Remove the requirement for a hydrogeological study requirement for lots in the rural area and consider a lower cost version.</p>	<p>Comment 1, 2, 3 and 4: Comment received and considered as part of the supplementary report to the Agricultural and Rural Affairs Committee on alternative rural process options to allow coach houses that will be brought forward to ARAC in the early summer of 2017.</p>