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Explanation

Innovation and Contribution to the Profession:

The City of Ottawa has pioneered an approach to allow detached secondary dwelling units, termed coach houses, in a way that no other Canadian municipality has done. Ottawa is unique in that we have an urban, suburban and rural landscape under one municipal umbrella. Each of these areas has a variety of planning related considerations which require tailored planning approaches. The City of Ottawa is the first major urban municipality to allow coach houses in such a broad manner by allowing them on all low density residential lots, City wide, without minimum lot area restrictions (except rural unserviced lots require 0.8 hectares). By not having a minimum lot size for serviced lots, paves the way to allow “tiny homes” on small lots while meeting the Ontario Building Code construction practices. Tiny homes is a growing movement nationwide and will be a hot topic of discussion as trends move forward. The Ontario Building Code sets the stage for minimum room sizes and construction practices and the City of Ottawa has embraced the tiny home movement through the allowance of coach houses without a minimum lot or unit size performance standard, under the coach house permission umbrella. The architectural renderings included with this submission (Appendix 17) provide for an example of a “tiny home” which meets the minimum room sizes as required under the Ontario Building Code. Further the permissions to allow coach houses also permit these dwelling units on all types of lots: corner lots, laneway lots and interior lots thus opening the door coach houses City wide. Most other Canadian municipalities tie the permission for a detached secondary dwelling unit, coach house, to laneway lots only. Ottawa is unique in that we have opened the door to allow all low density residential lots with municipal servicing to qualify to build a coach house.

This project is very important to the profession as it provides a real life example of how discrete infill secondary housing can be integrated into existing communities while respecting the privacy concerns of adjacent neighbors and meeting emergency services requirements for access. The variety of amendments undertaken to allow for coach houses considered the community responses and comments in-depth to create the best possible performance standards for our urban, suburban and rural areas. Given the extensive consultation that was undertaken the coach house concept was accepted and encouraged in neighborhoods throughout Ottawa.

Methodology:

This project was conceived in the early parts of 2015 when the City of Ottawa began to do internal research on the idea of allowing detached secondary dwelling units. The project was formally launched in September 2015 to the public with the release of a Discussion Paper (Appendix 1) to introduce the coach house concept and the considerations for setting up acceptable performance standards. A Questionnaire (Appendix 2) was provided, alongside the Discussion Paper, for the public to weigh in
on a variety of planning related considerations. The Questionnaire results (Appendix 3) were then posted in November 2015 which included 430+ responses to the Questionnaire. The results provided feedback on how to allow for coach houses in the City of Ottawa. The feedback also demonstrated that the idea of coach houses was widely accepted throughout Ottawa’s urban, suburban and rural communities. In January 2016 a Draft Recommendations Paper (Appendix 4) was released to introduce the City’s first attempt at possible performance standards to allow for coach houses. The paper was open for public comment for a two month period, during which time rounds of community association presentations were completed to get direct involvement and feedback. In April 2016 the feedback from these meetings and the paper, was released to the public through an “As We Heard It” summary document (Appendix 5). The City received over 130 submissions which covered 350+ topic areas related to the possible implementing coach house performance standards. The feedback received was internally evaluated and in most instances resulted in direct changes to the draft recommendations. The final City position was released in June 2016 with an Official Plan Amendment summary (Appendix 6), a Zoning By-law Amendment summary (Appendix 7), a Development Charged By-law Amendment rationale (Appendix 8), and a Site Plan Control By-law summary (Appendix 9). These summaries went on formal circulation over the summer of 2016 and rose to the implementing Committees in October of 2016. The Agricultural and Rural Affairs Committee (Appendix 10), the Planning Committee (Appendix 11) and Council (Appendix 12 & 13) all heard the issues and considerations of the coach house project in the month of October 2016. The package of amendment as proposed by staff was approved in its entirety without change. This was in part due to the extensive community consultation efforts (Appendix 14) that went into crafting the appropriate set of policies, implementing performance standards and applicable planning processes and fees for building future coach houses.

Clarity of Goals and Objectives:

The City of Ottawa has become the leading subject expert on detached secondary dwelling units through the wide application of “coach houses” in urban, suburban and rural scenarios. This wide application required an understanding of the complex servicing needs of municipally serviced lots (urban and suburban) and privately serviced lots (rural and villages) to craft a policy and performance standards structure for City wide application. The City of Ottawa has created an internal knowledge base on how coach houses can support the growth needs of the City while maintaining privacy of adjacent neighbors and respecting community character.

The goal of this project was to implement Ontario’s Planning Act provision to allow for “ancillary secondary dwelling units” and the objectives of the project were to do so in a manner that was inclusive and sensitive. The coach house project addressed inclusiveness by allowing all areas of the City; urban, suburban and rural by not including a minimum lot size for municipally serviced lots. The City of Ottawa also addressed inclusiveness by consulting a wide array of constituents throughout the
project process, including; landowners, architects, designers, community associations and real estate agents. The coach house permission also address the sensitive nature of introducing an additional dwelling unit onto a property by setting up a variety of Zoning By-law performance standards. These include: restricting the height to one storey in urban and suburban areas thus reducing overlook and respecting privacy; a maximum setback for coach house walls which face an interior or rear lot line of 1 metre to eliminate the possibility of windows facing adjacent neighbors, and where windows are desired including a minimum of 4 metre setback to allow sufficient space to respect the privacy concerns of adjacent neighbors.

**Implementation:**

Currently, the coach house project remains in its implementation phase. The City produced and released a “How to Plan Your Coach House in Ottawa” guide (Appendix 15) in November 2016. This guide provides residents answers to many of the frequently asked questions during the coach house planning process. The guide further walks clients through all of the applicable “pre-planning” considerations, including servicing, privacy, trees, location, and so forth. An array of architectural renderings is included in the document to assist homeowners with understanding the implementing performance standards. The guide has remained a steady resource for the vast range of clients interested in building coach houses.

The City is also actively involved in promoting the coach house project permissions to residents through the presence at local trade shows, including the Home and Remodeling Show (Jan 19-22, 2017), and the upcoming Cottage and Backyard Show (March 3-6, 2017) and Home and Garden Show (March 23-26, 2017). These shows are allowing the City to connect with residents at off-business hour times to be able to answer coach house related inquiries. At the Home and Remodeling Show, the City fielded over 700 inquiries on the coach house project from local residents.

Further the City has completed a variety of successful media interviews with the Ottawa Citizen, Metro, CBC, CTV, CFRA and Rogers. These media outlets are allowing the project to reach a larger audience to introduce the new coach house permissions.

Lastly, the City has created an internal process to guide residents through the formal application process. The City has set up the means to allow for “pre-application consultation” meetings where residents meet with internal experts. These meetings are intended to occur before a coach house if fully planned to go over the application paperwork required, the servicing connection requirements and the Ontario Building Code practices. The City has an internal dedicated Plumbing Inspector who is assigned the task of reviewing urban servicing connections to ensure the connection and capacity is sufficient from the primary home to the coach house. This pre-application consultation process is allowing residents the ability to understand the municipal process involved with applying for a coach house.
Overall Presentation:

The coach house project target audience included a wide array of constituents, including developers, architects, designers, individual landowners, community associations, real estate agents, councilors and internal City departments. The material that was prepared and publically released through the project phases was all peer reviewed by a non-planning expert to ensure that the content was understandable and digestible. Prior to the initial launch of the coach house project, in-depth research was completed on the detached secondary dwelling unit idea. This research resulted in a variety of “considerations” for the public to evaluate through the release of the first Discussion Paper (Appendix 1).

Each of the papers, summaries and documents released by the City included a variety of graphics to help the public understand the concept of the coach house project. All of the initial graphics were completed in-house to illustrate the concept of a coach house and display the different planning considerations required to set up appropriate performance standard permissions. Once the performance standards were approved, an external architect was retained by the City to develop formal renderings for the “How to Plan Your Coach House in Ottawa” (Appendix 15) guide. This was done to ensure that initial concept plans would meet the Ontario Building Code with regards to required construction practices. These renderings are the real back-bone to beginning to understand how a coach house could be integrated on a lot in the urban, suburban or rural scenarios in the City of Ottawa.

Public Engagement:

Throughout the project the City used an approach which involved online promotion and direct contact to large organizations (media, community associations and realtor associations) who could reach larger audiences. This approach yielded a massive amount of direct involvement from a wide array of constituents, including developers, architects, designers, individual landowners, community associations and real estate agents. These constituents remained the City’s direct brainstorming “committee” and provided feedback throughout the year long process. The City of Ottawa found that the online approach appeals to busy populations who cannot attend a typical public “open house” held at a community center. The online approach also allowed for a larger number of out-reach points throughout the project phases.

The City of Ottawa also established a working group called the “urban infill committee” which comprised of external architects, designers and builders. The intent of this committee was to inform the appropriate Zoning By-law provisions to ensure that they made sense from a built-form perspective.

Specifically the “As We Heard It” report back documents at critical milestones in the project were extremely well received. People loved to see that the City of Ottawa heard them and that their points were being considered. This process required a little more
work on the City’s end to thoroughly document all communication and then in turn translate the text, make the text accessible, post the text online and relay all of the project updates to the internal distribution list. The City maintained an internal distribution list throughout the project that reached to over 700 contacts by the end of the project.

Sustainability:

This category is where the coach house project really shines. The coach house project will have a positive impact on the day-to-day lives of Ottawa residents who require a little extra income or need to fill a family housing gap. There are a variety of multi-generational housing needs that current land-use planning permissions do not satisfy. What the City has heard loud and clear is that to be able to build a second detached dwelling unit on a residential lot appeals to a variety of family needs. The coach house permissions appeal to persons with disabilities, seniors and middle age residents who bear the burden of care. The cost of seniors and disability accommodations are on the rise and the availability of seniors housing is becoming scarcer with the aging population. Coach houses will help to assist these issues by allowing families to build housing on their land for this vulnerable population. Further the coach house permissions appeal to older children who are finding it difficult to break into the costly homeownership market.

Through the coach house permission, the City of Ottawa choose not to regulate the occupancy of a coach house therefore allowing the coach house to be rented out to provide for an influx of affordable housing within established communities. This influx of affordable housing will allow for income generation for homeowners and additional housing in communities that otherwise wouldn’t have detached residential units available for rent. The coach house permissions directly contribute to the quality of life of City of Ottawa residents by allowing for a variety of housing needs for all types of situations. The City of Ottawa has also demonstrated good governance to be the first Ontario municipality to tackle this sensitive topic of detached secondary dwelling units. The City of Ottawa has set the stage for Canadian municipalities to allow for wider permissions of secondary housing in urban, suburban and rural scenarios that meet the needs of vulnerable populations.
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Executive Summary

The City of Ottawa, through the Province’s *Strong Communities through Affordable Housing Act 2011*, is required to allow for secondary dwelling units in accessory structures within the Official Plan. The Official Plan is the municipality’s long-term policy plan to direct growth. Secondary dwelling units in accessory structures could be a permanent little dwelling unit in a backyard or a little apartment above a detached garage.

Currently the City of Ottawa has Official Plan policy and Zoning By-law provisions to allow for secondary dwelling units within primary residential buildings (houses) but not within accessory structures (sheds or detached garages). Secondary dwelling units in accessory structures will be termed “Coach Houses”, in an effort to depict little apartments in rear yards or units above a detached garage.

This Discussion Paper introduces the provincial and municipal regulatory framework, proposes a definition for Ottawa, reviews the benefits of secondary dwelling units in accessory structures and reviews some of the primary issues associated with allowing secondary dwelling units in accessory structures. There are many different approaches for allowing Coach Houses in residential zones. In the Discussion Paper, the City has highlighted what are seen as some key matters for consideration in developing Official Plan Policies and zoning regulations for Coach Houses.

A Questionnaire accompanies this Discussion Paper to obtain public feedback to assist with creating the appropriate regulations to allow for this form of housing as-of-right within residential zones to meet the requirement of the Province for municipalities to permit this form of housing.
Background

Introduction
Secondary dwelling units in accessory structures are self-contained residential units detached from the primary residential building and will be called “Coach Houses” in the City of Ottawa. This type of infill housing is a discreet way to achieve affordable housing and density in existing neighbourhoods. This Discussion Paper will explore the options to permit Coach Houses though municipal regulatory tools, mainly the Official Plan and Zoning By-law. This Discussion Paper will also serve as background research to aid the City of Ottawa with determining what type of policy and implementing Zoning By-law performance standards are appropriate.

Coach Houses are essentially a small house or apartment in a backyard or above a detached garage. A Coach House is intended to be ancillary and subordinate to the primary dwelling unit, meaning they must be smaller and not take away from the character attributes of the existing home.

Provincial Legislation
The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) has identified affordable housing as a fundamental need in developing communities. Ontario’s commitment to affordable housing extends to a broad range and type of housing, including secondary dwelling units. Permitting these units represent one subset of tools available to municipalities in providing affordable housing within communities. The MMAH therefore made changes to the Strong Communities through Affordable Housing Act in 2011 requiring municipalities to develop or enhance policies in their Official Plans to allow secondary dwelling units. These new provisions require municipalities to permit secondary dwelling units within single detached, semi-detached and townhouse dwellings as well as ancillary structures. Through these permissions the municipality may regulate the criteria related to location, form and intensity of the unit.

The changes to the Strong Communities through Affordable Housing Act were implemented into the Province’s Planning Act. The Planning Act is provincial legislation providing the approval authority for municipalities with respect to City planning and growth needs (for example the legal requirements surrounding Official Plans, subdivisions, condominiums, etc.). This amendment came into effect on January 1, 2012 and includes the following additions to Section 16 of the Planning Act:

Second unit policies
(3) Without limiting what an official plan is required to or may contain under subsection (1) or (2), an official plan shall contain policies that authorize the use of a second residential unit by authorizing,

(a) the use of two residential units in a detached house, semi-detached house or rowhouse if no building or structure ancillary to the detached house, semi-detached house or rowhouse contains a residential unit; and

(b) the use of a residential unit in a building or structure ancillary to a detached house, semi-detached house or rowhouse if the detached house, semi-detached house or rowhouse contains a single residential unit. 2011, c. 6, Sched. 2, s. 2

These changes therefore require municipalities to establish the permissions to allow for secondary dwelling units as-of-right in Official Plans. It is also noteworthy to point out that this provincial policy also restricts the number of secondary dwelling units to one. This means you can either have one unit within your primary home or one unit within an accessory structure, but not both. These changes to the Planning Act also affect the appeal rights regarding secondary dwelling units, as follows:

No appeal re second unit policies
(24.1) Despite subsection (24), there is no appeal in respect of the policies described in subsection 16 (3), including, for greater certainty, any requirements or standards that are part of such policies. 2011, c. 6, Sched. 2, s. 3 (1).
The appeal rights are therefore restricted, in two manners:

- A municipality's decision to allow for a secondary dwelling unit within the Official Plan and Zoning By-law may not be appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board; and
- An individual or homeowner applying to create a secondary dwelling unit on their property are also exempt from appeals, relating to the performance standards allowing secondary dwelling units, to the Ontario Municipal Board.

This provides greater certainty for municipalities and applicants who wish to put in place provisions and/or apply for a secondary dwelling unit on private property.

There are further provincial requirements relating to the construction standards of a secondary dwelling unit, such as the Ontario Building Code and the Fire Code Act. As part of this Discussion Paper these supplementary Acts will not be explored in detail.

**City Framework**

**Official Plan**

The City of Ottawa currently permits secondary dwelling units within primary residential buildings in the Official Plan. The Official Plan identifies secondary dwelling units as a type and form of intensification, resulting in an increase in residential units. The Official Plan further identifies secondary dwelling units as an appropriate form of affordable housing and they are generally permitted land uses in all residential zones throughout the City of Ottawa. These types of uses are further identified as appropriate in all primary residential buildings which have a detached, semi-detached, duplex building, or townhouse. Although there is strong support for secondary dwelling units within residential buildings, currently the Official Plan requires, through section 3.1(1), that secondary dwelling units above a detached garage (a type of accessory structure) require an amendment to the Zoning By-law. Zoning By-law amendments are costly and time consuming. This current Official Plan requirement provides a stand-alone barrier for home owners seeking to develop a secondary dwelling unit in an accessory structure.

**Zoning By-law**

The Zoning By-law sets forth detailed performance standards to implement the Official Plan policy requirements with regards to secondary dwelling units. These performance standards are requirements that a homeowner must meet in order to be permitted to build a secondary dwelling unit within the primary home. However these performance standards do not include any discussion or implementing provisions with regards to allowing secondary dwelling units in accessory structures.

It is noteworthy to add that the City of Ottawa’s Zoning By-law does permit “garden suites”. Municipalities are required to provide permissions garden suites as directed by the Planning Act. To qualify for placing a garden suite on your property, the unit must be mobile or portable in nature, meaning no foundation (for example, a mobile home). Further, these types of residential units are only permitted where a site-specific temporary Zoning By-law allows one. This means that a homeowner would have to apply for and be approved for a costly Zoning By-law amendment to permit this type of temporary dwelling unit. The intention of the Planning Act provisions to permit secondary dwelling units in accessory structures is different in nature, whereas the unit could be permanent and be allowed as-of-right (without requiring a costly Zoning By-law amendment).

After a review of the Official Plan and Zoning By-law it has been determined that to implement the requirements under the Planning Act to permit secondary dwelling units in accessory structures, an amendment is required to both the Official Plan and Zoning By-law.
Benefits of Detached Secondary Dwelling Units in Ottawa

There are many benefits to permitting secondary dwelling units in Ottawa. The benefits are not specific to whether the unit is contained within the primary dwelling or in an accessory structure. The benefits are described below and apply to all forms of self contained dwelling units which homeowners manage independently.

Intensification

Secondary dwelling units support the City’s intensification goals by bringing additional housing into established neighbourhoods. They also provide for a very discreet way to accommodate intensification, often having minimal impact on public spaces, like the street or sidewalks. Including a unit on an already provided lot also helps to reduce the pressure for urban boundary expansions to accommodate the City’s growing population.

Affordable Housing

The number of affordable housing units has been slowly decreasing over the last ten years. The needs of affordable housing is measured based on households spending up to 30% of their gross annual household income on housing related costs. In 2001, 65,620 households were paying more than 30% of their gross household income on housing. This has now increased, to 80,000 households in 2011. With new affordable housing units on a decline and household growth on the rise, this will continue to leave many Ottawa residents paying more than 30% of their gross household income on housing. Typically, the rents of secondary dwelling units are lower than that of traditional rental housing and therefore provide for additional affordable housing for Ottawa’s vulnerable sector.

Age in Place and Family Housing

The City of Ottawa has an approved Older Adult Plan. As part of this plan one of the core goals is to increase the housing available for seniors. Secondary dwelling units provide the ability to live independently in the same home or property as family or downsize into a smaller subsidiary unit while remaining within the same community.

Mix of Demographics and Income Levels and Use of Amenity

Secondary dwelling units are an excellent way to encourage a mix of demographics and income levels within single family dwelling communities. Often in these communities only those residents in a position to purchase a home are able to live in the community. Further, by broadening the population base in a community allows for more efficient use of city resources, for example parks and recreation facilities.

Assisting in Homeownership Costs

The average home price in Ottawa is has been increasing. In 2013 the average price for a new single family detached dwelling was $510,000, an increase of 26.8% over the past decade. Secondary dwelling units allow homeowners to supplement their incomes and further the affordability of their homes.
A Legal Definition for Ottawa

Across Canadian municipalities, there are many different terms that are used to describe a detached self-contained dwelling with its own kitchen and bathroom facilities, as well as its own entrance.

The City of Ottawa already has two separate definitions within the Zoning By-law for ancillary self-contained dwelling units with their own kitchen and bathroom facilities: “secondary dwelling unit”; and “garden suite”. The definition of each is as follows:

**Secondary Dwelling Unit**: means a separate dwelling unit subsidiary to and located in the same building as an associated principal dwelling unit; and its creation does not result in the creation of a semi-detached dwelling, duplex dwelling, three-unit dwelling or converted dwelling.

**Garden Suite**: means a one-unit, self-contained and portable detached residential structure that is ancillary to and on the same lot as a detached, linked-detached or semi-detached dwelling, and excludes a trailer as defined herein.

The City of Ottawa also has a definition for “accessory” which is used in conjunction with the City’s current Zoning By-law performance standards for Section 55 – Accessory Use Buildings and Structures. This section of the City’s Zoning By-law sets forth the performance standards to allow for accessory use, buildings and structures (for example a garage or shed) in all zones (residential and/or non-residential). The definition is as follows:

Accessory means aiding or contributing in a secondary way to a principal use to carry out its function, and having regard to this definition:

- an accessory use is a land use that is accessory to a principal use;
- an accessory building is a building that houses an accessory use;
- an accessory structure is a structure, that is not a land use, but is accessory to a principal use and this definition is broadened to include tower antennas and satellite dishes.

In creating a Zoning By-law definition for a secondary dwelling unit within an accessory structure, the City of Ottawa is influenced by the current definitions in place and the structure of the language used in Ontario’s provincial legislation, the Planning Act. Unlike the term “Coach House,” the term “secondary dwelling unit” is currently used in both the City and provincial legislation and best represents a subordinate and accessory additional house. The City therefore proposes to term these new units, within municipal regulatory tools only, as “secondary dwelling units,” but to market them in the community and online as Coach Houses. The term Coach Houses is a term that is widely known across Canada to depict a small house or apartment in a backyard or above a detached garage. This term is much easier to digest and understand than a sub-set of the current regulatory “secondary dwelling unit” definition.

The City of Ottawa’s current Zoning By-law definition for a secondary dwelling unit therefore needs to be clarified in order to accommodate the appropriateness of the use in an accessory structure. The City of Ottawa proposes an amendment to the Zoning By-law to define a detached secondary dwelling unit, as follows:

**Secondary Dwelling Unit, Type A**: means a separate dwelling unit subsidiary to and located in the same building as an associated principal dwelling unit; and its creation does not result in the creation of a semi-detached dwelling, duplex dwelling, three-unit dwelling or converted dwelling.

**Secondary Dwelling Unit, Type B**: means a separate dwelling unit detached from a principal dwelling unit and located on the same lot; and its creation does not result in the creation of a new lot.

This proposed definition differentiates between a secondary dwelling unit within an existing home and one that is subordinate and accessory to the primary dwelling unit.
Types of Coach Houses

The provincial regulatory framework, Section 16 of the Planning Act, allows for secondary dwelling units in accessory structures to be either purpose-built (a brand new structure) or by retrofitting an existing structure.

Second unit policies

(3) Without limiting what an official plan is required to or may contain under subsection (1) or (2), an official plan shall contain policies that authorize the use of a second residential unit by authorizing,

(a) the use of two residential units in a detached house, semi-detached house or rowhouse if no building or structure ancillary to the detached house, semi-detached house or rowhouse contains a residential unit; and

(b) the use of a residential unit in a building or structure ancillary to a detached house, semi-detached house or rowhouse if the detached house, semi-detached house or rowhouse contains a single residential unit. 2011, c. 6, Sched. 2, s. 2

The way the regulation is worded, it does not differentiate between the two different approaches to achieving a new unit. Therefore new Coach Houses can be in the form of purpose-built mini apartments within backyards (a new structure) or by retrofitting an existing accessory structure (for example, a garage or shed) into a living space. Retrofitting an existing structure, like a rear yard detached garage or shed, into a Coach House may serve to be a little challenging. These structures will need servicing, namely: water / well, waste water / septic, electricity and gas. In many instances these services will not be in place for an existing accessory structure and will need to be provided for any habitable space. Further retrofits will need to meet the requirements of the Ontario Building Code, with regard to building construction standards. Retrofitting an existing structure may require significant upgrades to comply with the Ontario Building Code. Each retrofit is different and prospective owners / builders will need to assess the extent of required upgrades individually with the City of Ottawa’s Building Code Services Department.

Both types of Coach Houses, purpose built or retrofit, will need to meet the same Zoning By-law performance standards, with regards to setbacks, maximum height requirements, lot coverage and so forth. Therefore the following “issues” are applicable irrespective of the type of Coach House sought.
Issues to Consider When Permitting a Coach House

There are many matters to consider in developing a policy approach and Zoning By-law framework to permit secondary dwelling units in accessory structures. As part of Discussion Paper, the primary considerations the City is taking into account are as follows:

• Where in the City a Coach House should be allowed, for example: rural, suburban or urban locations.
• The appropriate lot type and size to permit a Coach House, for example: a small lot or a large lot or a single family home lot or a duplex lot.
• The appropriate location the Coach House should be placed on the lot, for example: the side yard or rear yard.
• The appropriate height of the Coach House, for example: 1 storey or 2 storeys.
• The appropriate proximity to adjacent yards, for example: close too adjacent neighbours property lines or far from adjacent neighbours property lines.

• The appropriate size of a Coach House, for example: large or small.
• The desirable design attributes of the Coach House, for example: window and entrance placement.
• How these units will be serviced, for example: in the urban area with municipal water and sewer and in the rural area with private septic and well.

Each of these issues is discussed below. A questionnaire will be available from mid-September 2015 to mid-October 2015 to solicit feedback on each of these issues. The information collected will be used by the City to inform a set of proposed Zoning By-law performance standards that the public can consider for future adoption.
Location in the City

The City of Ottawa is one large amalgamated city, including a rural segment, a suburban segment and an urban segment. The current Zoning By-law provisions allow for secondary dwelling units, contained in a primary residential use building (the home) in all areas of the City: rural, suburban and urban.

Each of these geographic areas of the City has different circumstances that will impact the viability of a Coach House. For example, the lot sizes and services (water and septic) vary depending on the location and context. The City will consider the merits of permitting Coach Houses in all three geographic areas: rural, suburban and urban.
Lot Type

The current Zoning By-law provisions to allow secondary dwelling units contained in a primary residential use building (the home) are currently permitted in the following residential uses: single family dwellings; semi-detached dwellings, duplex buildings, and in townhouses.

The City has determined that the City will therefore consider the merits of permitting a Coach House on: single family dwelling lots; semi-detached dwelling lots, and duplex building lots. Due to limited developable exterior space, townhouse lots may not be suitable for a Coach House. The three common urban lot types being considered for allowing coach houses are illustrated below.

The images above display the typically urban lot sizes for the different residential uses, however given the vast nature of the city (containing rural, suburban and urban) lot sizes in different locations vary greatly:

- Urban lots are typically small in nature and compact;
- Suburban lots built on Greenfields after the millennium are typically small and compact versus suburban lots built pre-millennium are typically provided more land and have larger setbacks between homes; and
- Rural lots within villages are typically 1 to 2 acres in size, given the requirements for private septic systems, and progressively get larger as they spread out from the villages.
**Location on the lot**

There are many different locations on a lot where a Coach House could be permitted. The City is considering four different scenarios:

- A Coach House facing a rear yard laneway;
- A Coach House in the rear yard of a lot;
- A Coach House adjacent to the primary dwelling unit; and
- A Coach House located on a corner lot facing a street.

The options above can be applied to each of the different types of residential uses: single family dwelling lots, duplex dwelling lots and/or semi-detached dwelling lots. The commonality between each of the different locations on the lot is that despite the type of residential use, the lot must have enough vacant space to accommodate a separate standalone unit.

---

LANEWAY SDU | REAR YARD SDU | ADJACENT SDU | CORNER LOT SDU
---|---|---|---
![Diagram showing different SDU locations on a lot](image)

SDU= SECONDARY DWELLING UNIT
Height

The provincial regulations which allow secondary dwelling units in accessory structures state that the new unit must be ancillary to the primary residential home. This implies that the size and height of the unit should be subordinate to the primary home, in other words smaller. Today’s Zoning By-law performance standards, for residential zones, allocate that for the majority of single family neighbourhoods the maximum height is 8.5 metres. This is to allow for two residential storeys with a pitched roof and 1 metre of foundation.

The height of a new Coach House should be considered in relationship to the scale of the existing home. This could result in Zoning By-law performance standards which require a Coach House to be a fraction of the main buildings height. Or alternatively, require the Coach House to be a maximum height, always.

The City is considering three different maximum heights for a Coach House:
- 3.0 metres with a flat roof or 3.5 metres with a pitched roof; or
- 4.5 metres; or
- 6.1 metres.

Each of the options could be appropriate in different circumstances, for example rural lots and laneway lots might be appropriate to have a higher height versus dense urban lots, a lower height might be more appropriate.

### 3.0 / 3.5 metres

3.0 metres is a typical “storey” within a residential construction building. This height allows for a foundation, standard floor to ceiling height and additional space for the required building materials and mechanical equipment (for example the ducts, fire separation, joists, drywall etc). If the proposed Coach House were to have a flat roof, a 3 metre maximum height is possible. If the Coach House were to have a pitched roof, additional height is required, at 3.5 metres. The 3.0 / 3.5 metre height limit creates a living space which has minimal overlook into adjacent yards, as it only slightly protrudes past the height of a typical fence.
4.5 metres

4.5 metres is the Zoning By-law’s current height maximum for an accessory building or structure (for example a detached garage or shed). This means that in today’s residential zones there may be existing accessory structures which are 4.5 metres tall. A permitted height of 4.5 metres could allow for a 1 ½ storey Coach House. This could result in a standard first level and a second level open loft area. The 4.5 metre height limit creates a living space which has some overlook into adjacent yards, as it slightly protrudes past the height of a typical fence.

6.1 metres

6.1 metres allows for a two storey Coach House. This height maximum would typically be appropriate where a Coach House is above a detached garage or shed area. This height limit is above what is permitted today for an accessory structure (for example a garage or shed), being 4.5 metres. The 6.1 metre height limit would create overlook, on the second level into adjacent yards, as it does protrude past the height of a typical fence. Given this, a two storey Coach House may only be appropriate in very specific circumstances, for example on large rural lots and/ or on lots which face rear laneway's.
Proximity to Adjacent Yards
The placement of a Coach House in relation to neighbouring property lines is seen as a key element to be considered. The City’s Zoning By-law currently has standards (otherwise known as “setback provisions”) in place to require the separation of structures from adjacent property lines. Below are some images displaying the placement and proximity of detached accessory structures on existing properties within the City of Ottawa:

These images display accessory buildings (for example a detached garage or shed) which are built today in the rear yards of residential properties. With regards to building a Coach House, the proximity of the new unit to the interior side yard and rear yard property lines is considered most critical. See the above images for the location of the interior side yard and rear yard property lines.
In accordance with the Ontario Building Code, any wall of a structure which is less than 1.2 metres (approximately 4 feet) away from a property line cannot have windows on that wall. This means that the walls of a Coach House which are located close to a lot line will have no windows and increase the privacy of adjacent neighbours. On the other hand, any wall of a structure which is more than 1.2 metres away from a property line may have windows on that wall, if they choose to. This means that Coach Houses which are located further away from lot lines may include windows which can impact the privacy of adjacent neighbours.

The required Zoning By-law performance standard determining the appropriate proximity to adjacent yards can be determined based on the level of privacy sought for immediately adjacent properties.
Size of a Coach House

The maximum size of a Coach House is another key element for consideration. Under the regulations we have today, the maximum size of an accessory building and/or structure (for example a detached garage or shed) is measured by using two criteria:

- A maximum size of 55 square metres (approximately 592 square feet), and
- No more than 50% of the yard in which the unit is located.

The Zoning By-law provision has been set up with these two separate but complementary criteria so that it can be applied to small lots as well as large lots. For example large lots will have no problem meeting the 50% of the yard requirement and will therefore max out at the 55 square metre threshold. On the other hand, a smaller lot may occupy 50% of the yard and result in a much smaller structure than the maximum 55 square metres.

These provisions have been working seamlessly for residential accessory use buildings and structures, however these provisions may or may not be appropriate for buildings which house people, like a Coach House.
Design

New Coach Houses will allow for a full range of architectural approaches and building forms, from traditional to contemporary. Due to limitations in the Planning Act, Zoning By-law's in Ontario cannot regulate building materials. Therefore design considerations can only be encouraged. The City of Ottawa’s approach for influencing urban design and building materials is through the creation of “Design Guidelines”. A Design Guideline for Coach Houses could include special attention to upper storeys, window locations, configuration of the unit, views to public and private spaces, landscaping and so forth.

Site Servicing

Servicing a Coach House with electrical, gas, sewer and water connections may serve as a standalone financial barrier to introducing a new Coach House or retrofitting an existing structure into a Coach House. The requirements for servicing a unit with electrical and gas connections must be investigated on a lot-by-lot circumstance with individual service providers. Gas and Electrical hook-ups require a separate process from the City’s Zoning By-law provisions and standards.

Urban Properties:

Regarding water and sewer connections, the City does permit, through the Ontario Building Code, that a detached structure be serviced by way of connections from the main house. The City is therefore considering tied connections as a core requirement to permitting a Coach House on urban lots. This would ensure the Coach House cannot be severed from the main house in the future as a standalone legal parcel.

Rural Properties:

Generally a rural property would be serviced with water by a well and serviced with sewer by a septic system. Regarding septic connections, the Ottawa Septic System Office regulates and issues permits according to Part 8 of the Ontario Building Code; Septic Permits. Rural properties with private septic would therefore be required to meet the standard for capacity and sizing of a new Coach House through this office. Regarding water capacity, generally an engineer report of an existing well’s capacity or a new well’s water flow would be required to ensure that the Coach House can be adequately serviced with water. This would be a requirement upon obtaining a Building Permit for a Coach House.
Conclusion

Permitting secondary dwelling units in accessory structures is a requirement set forth from the province under the Strong Communities through Affordable Housing Act, 2011 and the Planning Act. The City is therefore determining how to permit these forms of housing, which will be called “Coach Houses” in the City of Ottawa. It is proposed to allow Coach Houses, under certain circumstances, within the municipal policy and regulatory framework set out through the Official Plan and Zoning By-law. The Zoning By-law has many tools it can utilize to determine how and where a Coach Houses would be appropriate.

Next Steps

Discussion Paper and Questionnaire, public feedback sought
Sept 2015

Propose performance standard options to allow Coach Houses
Jan 2016

Open house and information session on selected draft options
March 2016

Release of final draft study recommendations
April 2016

Staff report to Committee and Council
May 2016

The issues explored within this Discussion Paper are intended to provide an overview of the considerations for permitting/regulating this new form of housing. The City has produced a Questionnaire in order to solicit feedback from the public on issues surrounding Coach Houses. The questionnaire is available from mid-Sept 2015 to mid-October 2015. The feedback obtained from this questionnaire will be utilized to create proposed Official Plan policy and Zoning By-law performance standards to permit Coach Houses into the future within Ottawa’s residential neighbourhoods.
Questionnaire

INTRODUCTION

Let us know what you think about the allowing the building of coach houses in Ottawa.

Before starting this questionnaire please read the discussion paper: Coach Houses. The questionnaire should take 10 to 15 minutes to complete. All questions are optional and you may skip any questions without answering them. Thank you for your participation, your comments will help shape the future of coach houses in Ottawa.

Background

The province of Ontario, under the *Strong Communities through Affordable Housing Act*, requires municipalities to allow secondary dwelling units in accessory structures (for example an apartment in a detached garage or a purpose-built rear yard separate apartment). The City of Ottawa is conducting a study to determine under what circumstances these units should be permitted. The City will be calling these new units Coach Houses. The term Coach House is to represent a smaller accessory apartment which is in addition to a principal dwelling unit.

This online poll is to get public feedback on specific issues with allowing Coach Houses. The feedback generated from this online questionnaire will help to determine the applicable zoning regulations that are considered for the next phases of the study.

If you have questions about this survey or the consultation process of the coach houses project please contact:

Emily Davies, Planner
City of Ottawa
Planning and Growth Management Department
613-580-2424, ext. 23463
E-mail: emily.davies@ottawa.ca
1. What is your postal code?

2. The proposed definition of a Coach House / secondary dwelling unit in an accessory building is:

Secondary Dwelling Unit, Type B: means a separate dwelling unit detached from a principal dwelling unit and located on the same lot; and its creation does not result in the creation of a new lot.

Would you be interested in building a Coach House on your property?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe
- Other: _______________
3. Would you have concerns with a Coach House being built in your neighbourhood?

- Yes, please comment on your concerns: ____________________________
- No: __________________
- Maybe: _______________
- Other__________________
4. What parts of the City do you think are appropriate locations to accommodate a Coach House? Check all that apply.

a. Rural  
b. Suburban  
c. Urban  
d. Other ____________

ALT TEXT: This image shows a map of the City of Ottawa, highlighting the three geographic areas: urban area, suburban areas and the rural area.
What type of lots do you think could accommodate a Coach House? Check all that apply:

- Single family home lots
- Semi-detached lots
- Duplex lots
- Any lot which has enough space in the rear yard
- Other ___________________

ALT TEXT: This image shows three different lot types, a single family dwelling lot, a semi-detached dwelling lot and a duplex lot. Each lot type shows an idea of where a detached secondary dwelling unit could be placed.
6. Where on the lot do you think a Coach House should be built? Check all that apply.

   a. Facing a rear laneway  
   b. In the rear yard (backyard) of a residential home  
   c. Adjacent to the primary home, in the side yard  
   d. On a corner lot, in the side yard  
   e. Other ____________

ALT TEXT: This image shows 4 different locations on a lot where a detached secondary dwelling unit could be accommodated: facing a rear laneway, in the rear yard, adjacent to an existing home or on a corner lot.
What do you think should be the maximum height of a Coach House?

a. 3 metres. This is 1 residential storey.

b. 4.5 metres, the same height of an accessory structure (garage or shed). This is 1 ½ residential storeys.

c. Maximum height should vary depending on the location in the city. Explain _______

d. Maximum height should vary depending on the lot size. Explain: _______________________

e. Maximum height should vary depending on the height of the main house. Explain: _______

f. Other _________________________

ALT TEXT: This image illustrates a detached secondary dwelling unit at a maximum height of 3 meters in relation to an existing home.

ALT TEXT: This image illustrates a detached secondary dwelling unit at a maximum height of 4.5 meters in relation to an existing home.
8. When do you think a a two-storey, 6.1 metre Coach House should be allowed? Check all that apply
   a. Adjacent to a rear laneway
   b. On a corner lot. Explain: ______________________
   c. On a large rural lot
   d. No, a two storey Coach House is not appropriate in Ottawa. Explain:________
   e. Yes, in other circumstances. Explain: ______________________

ALT TEXT: This image illustrates a detached secondary dwelling unit at a maximum height of 6.1 meters in relation to an existing home.
9. If a Coach House were to be built on your next door neighbour’s property, would the proximity of the Coach House to your property lines be a concern for you? Please explain.

a. Yes. Explain: ________________________
b. No. Explain: _________________________
c. Maybe. Explain: ______________________
10. How far do you think a Coach House should be built away from a residential property line?

a. Less than 1.2 metres (4 feet), to not allow windows facing a neighbour’s property
b. More than 1.2 metres (4 feet), to allow windows facing property neighbour’s property. How far specifically? ____________________
c. Other ________________

ALT TEXT: This image displays an air photo of a residential property with a detached accessory structure.

Additional info box: The exterior walls of a Coach House which are located less than 1.2 metres away from a property line are not permitted to have windows on that wall. Not having windows increases the privacy of adjacent neighbours.
11. The City’s current Zoning By-law standard with regards to the maximum size of an accessory structure, utilizes two criteria:

- A maximum of 55 square metres in any circumstance; and
- A maximum of 50% of the yard in which they are located.

Large lots will have no problem meeting both criteria and maxing out the top size of 55 square metres. However, smaller lots may max out a top size at less than 55 metres square, because their yards are smaller. Assuming that no Coach House should occupy more than 50% of the yard, what do you believe should be the maximum permitted size of a Coach House?

a. 55 square metres (592 square feet)
b. Smaller than 55 square metres (592 square feet)
a. Larger than 55 square metres (592 square feet)
b. Other. Explain: _______________________________

ALT TEXT: This image shows a detached secondary dwelling, with a maximum size of 55 square metres unit in the rear yard of a property.
12. Would you be willing to be contacted in the future for discussions around Coach Houses?
   
a. Yes, please provide name, address, email, phone number, postal code
b. No
c. Unsure

13. Comments ___________________________________________

Thank You!

Thank you for taking the time to fill out the Coach House Questionnaire. Your input is very valuable and will help provide direction to The City of Ottawa on the topic of Coach Houses. The Questionnaire will officially close on October 14th, 2015 and the results will be posted online mid-November.

If you have questions about the study, or wish to be added to the project e-mail list, please contact:

Emily Davies, Planner
City of Ottawa
Planning and Growth Management Department
613-580-2424, ext. 23463
E-mail: emily.davies@ottawa.ca

The next steps of the project are as follows:

Propose performance standard options to allow Coach Houses Jan 2016
Open house and information session on selected draft options March 2016
Release of final draft study recommendations April 2016
Staff report to Committee and Council May 2016
Coach House Study – Online Questionnaire Results
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The province of Ontario, under the Strong Communities through Affordable Housing Act, requires municipalities to allow secondary dwelling units in accessory structures (for example an apartment in an attached garage or a purpose built rear yard separate apartment). The City of Ottawa released a Discussion Paper and Questionnaire on September 14, 2015 to determine under what circumstances these new units should be permitted. The City is calling these new units Coach Houses. The term Coach House is to represent a smaller accessory apartment which is in addition to the principal dwelling unit.

The questionnaire solicited public feedback on specific issues with allowing Coach Houses. The feedback generated from the questionnaire will help to determine the applicable zoning regulations that are considered for the next phase of the study. The questionnaire closed on November 6, 2015 and during that period, 436 questionnaires were received.

The questionnaire responses which were received spanned the whole City of Ottawa, from rural communities, to the suburbs to downtown urban areas. There were 165 respondents who provided their postal codes and the below map displays the locations of the responses.
RESULTS SUMMARY

Question 1:

Would you be interested in building a Coach House on your property?

The majority of respondents, 60%, who answered this question answered ‘yes’ they are interested in building a Coach House on their property. There were 12% of respondents who are not interested in building a Coach House and 21% of respondents are contemplating the idea. The main themes of the comments which were provided for the “other” category are the following: they do not own property; their property is too small; or they already have a coach house on their property.
Question 2:
Would you have concerns with a Coach House being built in your neighbourhood?

The majority of respondents, 77%, who answered this question answered ‘No’ they do not have concerns with a Coach House being built in their neighbourhood. There were 12% of respondents who indicated they may be concerned if a Coach House were to be built in their neighbourhoods and 9% of respondents are concerned. The main themes of the comments which were provided for the “other” category are the following: Coach Houses are not appropriate for townhouses; Coach Houses must be in character with the neighbourhood; Coach Houses should look like garages; and if large trees were to be removed there would be a concern.
Question 3:

What parts of the City do you think are appropriate locations to accommodate a Coach House?

This question resulted in 80% of respondents thinking that all three geographic areas: urban, suburban and rural, are appropriate locations for Coach Houses. The dissenting 20% of respondents believe that none of the three geographic areas are appropriate places for Coach Houses. The main themes of the comments which were provided for the “other” category are the following: that all locations are appropriate; only locations near transit; only where the lot sizes permit a Coach House; and industrial areas are also appropriate locations.
Question 4:

What type of lots do you think could accommodate a Coach House?

This question resulted in 90% of respondents thinking that single family home lots are the most appropriate lot types for Coach Houses. Duplex lots and semi-detached lots are also viewed as appropriate lot types to permit a Coach House, with 60% and 54% of the respondents choosing these lot types as appropriate. The main themes of the comments which were provided for the “other” category are the following: all the lot type choices are appropriate; it depends on the lot size and type; none of these lot types are appropriate; only rural lots; only suburban lots; and industrial lots are also appropriate.
Question 5:

Where on a lot do you think a Coach House should be built?

This question resulted in approximately 80% of respondents thinking that a Coach House facing a rear laneway or in a backyard are the most appropriate locations to accommodate a new unit. Adjacent to the primary home and/or on a corner lot are also viewed as appropriate locations to permit a Coach House, with 64% and 74% of the respondents choosing these locations as appropriate. The main themes of the comments which were provided for the “other” category are the following: all these lot types are appropriate; all of these locations are appropriate; any space that is accessible to seniors; it must be far from the home; anywhere that it meets the intent of the Zoning; on industrial lots; none of these locations are appropriate.
**Question 6:**

What do you think should be the maximum height of a Coach House?

This question resulted in approximately 63% of respondents thinking that the maximum permitted height of a Coach House should vary on a variety of factors; the location on the lot, the size of the lot and the height of the main home. This question contained a “comment box” open for general comments to the question, which received 87 comments. The top response was that a two storey Coach House is also appropriate. The main themes of the remainder of the comments are the following: any Coach Houses should have to go through a minor variance process; the height should be flexible and up to the owner to decide; Coach Houses should be also allowed below grade; an allowance should be made for increased height when on corner side yard lots; Coach Houses should be allow above garages; allow flexibility in the height; don’t limit the height; and the same height of the primary home.
Question 7:
When do you think a two-storey, 6.1 metre Coach House should be allowed?

This question resulted in approximately 75% of respondents thinking that a two storey Coach House is appropriate in the rural area; 58% of respondents thinking that a two storey Coach House is appropriate on a rear laneway and 50% of respondents thinking that a Coach House is appropriate on a corner lot. These results indicate that over the majority of respondents believe that two of the three locations; on a laneway and on a rural lot, could be appropriate places for a two storey Coach House.
Question 8:

If a Coach House were to be built on your next door neighbour’s property, would the proximity of the Coach House to your property lines be a concern for you?

This question resulted in almost an equal split; 37% of people have no concerns with the proximity of a Coach House; 36% of people do have concern with the proximity of a Coach House and 27% may have concerns with the proximity of a Coach House. This question contained a “comment box” open for general comments to the question, which received 174 comments. The top two responses were that it would depend on if privacy was impacted, this relates to window placement, height, and noise. The second most common comment was: it would depend if the Coach House would take away the sunlight in my backyard. The main themes of the remainder of the comments are the following: it would depend on the circumstances (height, location, size, etc); fire hazard and emergency access; rental housing increased crime; it would not bother me, it’s not my property!; views should not be impacted; if its under the same permissions for sheds/garages that’s okay; privacy fences should be required; setbacks should be appropriate; parking would be a concern; if large trees are removed; if it means less urban sprawl I’m okay with them; and need permeable surfaces.
Question 9:
How far do you think a Coach House should be built away from a residential property line?

This question resulted in approximately 50% of respondents preferring to have any new Coach Houses built within 1.2 meters of a property line, so as to prohibit windows overlooking in adjacent properties. The dissenting 38% of respondents believe that any new Coach Houses should be built further away than 1.2 meters of a property line, so as to allow a separation distance from the neighbour’s property lines. The main themes of the comments which were provided for the “other” category are the following: depends on the size of the property; depends on the location of the neighbours home; more than 1.2 metres is okay if glazed windows are provided; same setbacks as currently permitted for detached garages; on the property line to prevent a waste of space; same distance as the primary home requirements; far enough to reduce noise; Coach Houses should not be allowed; be flexible in the provisions; and allow creativity.
Question 10:

Assuming that no Coach House should occupy more than 50% of the yard, what do you believe should be the maximum permitted size of a Coach House?

This question resulted in almost an equal split, 37% of respondents believe that the maximum size of a Coach House should be the current allowance for a detached accessory structure, at 55 square meters. However, 35% of respondents believe that the maximum size of a Coach House should be bigger than 55 square meters. The main themes of the comments which were provided for the “other” category are the following: the maximum size should depend on the size of the lot; 1000 sq ft should be the maximum size; only use the 50% yard requirement; maximum size should be a percentage of the lot size up to a maximum unit size; larger units should require a greenroof; the bigger the better; 75% of the backyard should be allowed to be occupied by a Coach House; only 25% of the backyard should be allowed to be occupied by a Coach House; 800 square feet should be the maximum; two storeys should be allowed where reasonable; less than 50% of the main dwelling footprint should be the threshold; senior couples require more than 1000 square feet; 55 square meters is too small.
The end of the questionnaire allowed people to leave general comments.

173 people left general comments at the end of the questionnaire. The majority of commenter’s provided overwhelming support for the idea of Coach Houses. The top ten main comments were:

1. Coach Houses are needed for inter-generational living. They will allow ageing people to downsize while remaining in their community. They will allow ageing parents the ability to live near their kids and be independent. They will allow older children, who can’t afford to buy a home, the ability to have their own space.

2. Coach Houses will help to off-set the cost of living and allow people to buy into neighbourhoods or supplement their income

3. Denser living and intensification is supported

4. Coach Houses will be great at increasing the affordable housing options

5. Design of the Coach House is very important

6. Ensure sufficient greenspace and that mature trees are protected

7. Don’t be overly too restrictive in the Zoning provisions

8. Tiny homes should be permitted a review of the Ontario Building Code requirements should be completed

9. Existing structures should be grandfathered and permitted to convert into Coach Houses

10. Parking requirements need to be evaluated
Thank You!

Thank you for taking the time to read the Coach House Questionnaire results. The input collected is very valuable and will help provide direction to The City of Ottawa on the topic of Coach Houses.

If you have questions about the study, or wish to be added to the project e-mail list, please contact:

Emily Davies, Planner
City of Ottawa
Planning and Growth Management Department
613-580-2424, ext. 23463
E-mail: emily.davies@ottawa.ca

The next steps of the project are as follows:

- Propose performance standard options to allow Coach Houses Jan 2016
- Open house and information session on selected draft options March 2016
- Release of final draft study recommendations April 2016
- Staff report to Committee and Council May 2016
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Introduction

Secondary dwelling units in accessory structures are self-contained residential units detached from a primary residential building. The Planning Act requires that these units be permitted by municipalities in their official plans. In response to this requirement, the City of Ottawa has initiated a study to determine where and how to accommodate these units. The units will be referred to as Coach Houses for the purpose of this study.

The study was initiated by the City in the fall of 2015 with the release of the Coach House Discussion Paper and online questionnaire. The Guiding Principles and Draft Recommendations contained in this paper build on the information released in the first Discussion Paper and the results obtained from the questionnaire.

The Guiding Principles set a high-level strategic direction for detailed recommendations for Official Plan policies and Zoning By-law regulations.

Part 1 of this paper describes the Guiding Principles and Part 2 sets out draft recommendations for Official Plan policy direction and proposed Zoning By-law changes that are consistent with the Guiding Principles. Examples in Part 2 graphically depict the effect of the proposed recommendations and how a new Coach House could integrate into a residential community.
Discussion Paper and Questionnaire Summary

The City of Ottawa released a Discussion Paper and questionnaire on September 14, 2015 to determine under what circumstances Coach Houses should be permitted. The questionnaire solicited public feedback on specific issues with allowing Coach Houses. The public feedback generated from the questionnaire assisted in determining the applicable Official Plan policy and Zoning By-law regulations that are included in this paper. The questionnaire closed on November 6, 2015 and during that period, 436 replies were received.

The responses received spanned the whole city, from rural communities, to the suburbs and downtown urban areas. The following are key highlights of the questionnaire responses:

- 60 per cent of respondents would be interested in building a Coach House
- 77 per cent of respondents would not be concerned with a Coach House being built in their neighborhood
- 80 per cent of respondents believe that a Coach House is appropriate in all geographic areas of the City (urban, suburban and rural)
- 90 per cent of respondents believe that a single family home is the most appropriate residential use to accommodate a Coach House
- A primary concern of respondents is maintaining the privacy of adjacent neighbours
- Another primary concern is reducing shadowing impacts and maintaining sunlight penetration into adjacent neighbours’ rear yards
- The City has a number of properties that are served by public rear lanes called laneway lots. These lots could accommodate a new dwelling unit above a detached garage resulting in a two storey Coach House.

A full report providing details of each question within the questionnaire is available on the project webpage ottawa.ca/coachhouses.
PART 1: Guiding Principles for Coach Houses

Context

The Province of Ontario, through the Planning Act, stipulates that:

...An official plan shall contain policies that authorize the use of a second residential unit by authorizing,

(a) the use of two residential units in a detached house, semi-detached house or rowhouse if no building or structure ancillary to the detached house, semi-detached house or rowhouse contains a residential unit; and

(b) the use of a residential unit in a building or structure ancillary to a detached house, semi-detached house or rowhouse if the detached house, semi-detached house or rowhouse contains a single residential unit. 2011, c. 6, Sched. 2, s. 2.

The City of Ottawa’s Official Plan and Zoning By-law currently respond to the direction provided in a). The focus of this initiative is to establish Official Plan polices and Zoning By-law provisions that respond to direction b).

The Planning Act, while requiring municipalities to allow secondary dwelling units in accessory structures, does not provide details on the circumstances or conditions under which they are to be permitted. This is left for municipalities to determine.

The Guiding Principles below provide a framework for defining the circumstances and conditions for establishing Coach Houses. The principles draw from a variety of information including:

- The Planning Act direction requiring Coach Houses to be secondary to the principal use
- To ensure appropriate fit within a community and on a lot
- Reflect input received through responses to the September 2015 Questionnaire.

The principles are intended to be translated into Official Plan policy, which will provide direction for Coach Houses and will serve as the frame of reference for defining the Zoning By-law provisions for Coach Houses.
Principles

Principle 1 - Form of Intensification
Coach Houses will serve as a gentle form of intensification for residential properties that are developed on a lot with a detached dwelling or semi-detached dwelling to provide an option to allowing a secondary dwelling within accessory structures.

Principle 2 - Secondary to Principle Dwelling
Coach Houses will be limited in size (maximum footprint and height) to ensure that they are clearly secondary and ancillary to the principal dwelling in terms of their size relative to the principal dwelling and that sufficient rear yard amenity area will be retained for both the principal dwelling and the Coach House dwelling.

Principle 3 - Remain as an Accessory Structure
Coach Houses will be required to remain as an accessory structure, be on the same lot as the principal dwelling and will not be able to be severed to provide for a separate lot for the Coach House.

Principle 4 - Integration with Urban Context
Coach Houses will be designed and located to ensure no undue adverse impact on adjacent development with regards to matters such as privacy, shadowing and overlook. Additionally, they will not negatively impact the streetscape character of the neighbourhood or will integrate with the existing streetscape character in the case of corner lots or lots having a secondary frontage on a rear lane.

Principle 5 - Servicing
Water and sanitary servicing for Coach Houses will be provided from the principal dwelling, which will be required to be serviced by a public or communal service system.
Explanation of Principles

Principle 1
Principle 1 is consistent with Section 16, 3(b) of the Planning Act, which indicates that properties developed with a detached house, semi-detached house or row house could also accommodate a Coach House. However, the Planning Act does not specify which forms of residential properties permit a Coach House. On most lots where the principal dwelling is a row house, Coach Houses would be inaccessible from the street and would be located on lots of a size that would present challenges to ensuring that they can be developed in a way that appropriately fits in the rear yard of a row unit without unduly impacting adjacent properties. As such, Coach Houses are not recommended to be located on a lot containing a row house.

Principles 2 and 3
Section 16 3(b) of the Planning Act states that any new Coach House must be ancillary to the primary home. Principle 2 reflects this direction and provides for Coach Houses to be smaller than the principal dwelling to ensure that the Coach House will be ancillary to the primary home. Principle 3 requires that a Coach House be an accessory structure on the same lot as the principal use.

Principle 4
Principle 4 provides for Coach Houses to be designed and located such that they will not adversely impact adjacent lands, that they will fit well on a property without diminishing the availability of amenity space and that they will integrate with the overall fabric of the community with respect to streetscape character.

Principle 5
To reinforce that Coach Houses are to be ancillary/secondary to the principal dwelling on a lot, Principle 5 requires that water and sanitary servicing be provided by way of connections to the services provided for the principal dwelling and that these must be public or communal service systems.

While consideration was given to allowing for Coach Houses to be located on lots with private services, through discussions with the City’s engineering staff and the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority it was concluded that the challenges to allow for this would be significant from a review and approval perspective and would create undue risks related to water quantity, water quality and capacity constraints for private septic systems and possible increased nitrate loading.
PART 2: Draft Recommendations

The draft recommendations have been developed within the framework of the Guiding Principles set out in Part 1. Comments received on the draft recommendations will be considered in finalizing the Official Plan policy directions and zoning provisions that will be brought forward to Planning Committee and City Council for consideration. The recommendations are broken down into two parts:

a) Official Plan policy, which will provide the overarching high-level policy direction for Coach Houses. This policy direction incorporates the Guiding Principles to establish a framework for the regulatory provisions that will be set out in the Zoning By-law.

b) Zoning By-law provisions, which will set out the detailed requirements that individual properties must meet for the development of a Coach House

The Official Plan policy and Zoning By-law provisions work together to create a set of regulations that guide how Coach Houses can be introduced into Ottawa’s residential communities.

Proposed Official Plan Policy Changes

The Official Plan provides the following policy direction to allow secondary dwelling units in Section 3.1, Policy 1:

Where the Zoning By-law permits a duplex dwelling existing as of June 25, 2008, or a detached, semi-detached, or townhouse dwelling, a secondary dwelling unit within these dwellings will also be permitted. Standards may be established in the Zoning By-law to govern compatibility with the main dwelling and surrounding land uses. The Zoning By-law will determine the conditions under which a secondary dwelling unit may be created in an accessory building. [Amendment #10, August 25, 2004]

Furthermore, the Official Plan also makes reference to secondary dwelling units in Section 2.5.2, Policy 10:

Secondary dwelling units in detached, semi-detached and townhouse dwellings, and duplex buildings (existing as of July 17, 2013) are permitted in all parts of the city in accordance with Section 3.1. [Amendment 10, August 25, 2004]

The current policies are focused on secondary dwelling units within existing dwellings though Policy 1 in Section 3.1 also provides direction for the Zoning By-law to incorporate regulations for Coach Houses. To provide a more fulsome policy context for Coach Houses, it is proposed that Policy 1 in Section 3.1 and Policy 10 in Section 2.5.2 of the Official Plan be amended as follows:

Policy 1, Section 3.1
Secondary Dwelling Units and Coach Houses

1. A secondary dwelling or a Coach House may be established in accordance with a) and b).
a) Where the Zoning By-law permits a duplex dwelling existing as of June 25, 2008, or a detached, semi-detached, or townhouse dwelling, a secondary dwelling unit within these dwellings will also be permitted. Standards may be established in the Zoning By-law to govern compatibility with the main dwelling and surrounding land uses. [Amendment #10, August 25, 2004]

b) Where the Zoning By-law permits a detached, linked detached, or semi-detached dwelling and that dwelling is located on a lot where public services or communal services for both water and wastewater are provided, a Coach House may be established. Standards may be established in the Zoning By-law to ensure that a Coach House will be clearly secondary and ancillary to the primary dwelling and to govern compatibility with the main dwelling and surrounding land uses. This is to ensure no undue adverse impact for adjacent development and compatibility with neighborhood and streetscape character. Once established, a Coach House may not be severed from the lot accommodating the primary dwelling.

Policy 10, Section 2.5.2

Secondary dwelling units in detached, semi-detached and townhouse dwellings, and duplex buildings (existing as of July 17, 2013) and Coach Houses on lots occupied by a detached, linked detached or semi-detached house where the lot is served by a public or communal water and wastewater system, are permitted in all parts of the city in accordance with Section 3.1. [Amendment 10, August 25, 2004]

Proposed Zoning By-law Changes

The proposed Zoning By-law changes will allow a Coach House to be established where it meets the proposed Zoning By-law provisions below. The recommendations include a new zoning definition for Coach House™ and specific provisions related to Coach Houses in Section 5 of the Zoning By-law. These will complement the current zoning definitions and provisions that are currently in the Zoning By-law for secondary dwelling units.

The proposed definition and specific provisions for Coach Houses reflect the Guiding Principles that were presented in Part 1 and align with the proposed Official Plan policies for Coach Houses. In addition to the definition and specific provisions, other sections of the Zoning By-law are also proposed to be amended to give effect to the overall directions for Coach Houses dealing with accessory buildings and flood plain development.

Definition for Coach Houses

New definition to be added to Section 1 - Definitions in the Zoning By-law:

Coach House: Means a separate dwelling unit detached from a principal dwelling unit located either in its own building or within an existing accessory building and on the same lot as the principal dwelling.
Accessory Building Provisions
To be amended to include in Section 55 of the Zoning By-law that a Coach House will not be considered an accessory building.

Flood Plain Overlay Provisions
To be amended to identify that a Coach House will not be permitted to be developed on any portion of a lot subject to the flood plain overlay.

Provisions for Coach Houses:
The following provisions are recommended to be added to Section 5 – Residential Provisions:

Where Permitted
A Coach House dwelling is permitted on any lot occupied by a detached, linked detached or semi-detached dwelling, where that dwelling type is a listed permitted use, provided:

(a) it does not change the streetscape character along the street on which the principal dwelling fronts
(b) it is serviced from the principal dwelling unit on the lot, which must be serviced by a public or communal water and wastewater system
(c) it must be located on the same lot as its principal dwelling unit
(d) it must be located in the rear yard of the principal dwelling or in the case of a lot with frontage on both a street and a public lane, it must be located in the yard adjacent to the public lane

Where Not Permitted
A Coach House dwelling unit is not permitted on a lot serviced by a private well and septic system.

Maximum Number
A maximum of one Coach House dwelling unit is permitted per principal dwelling unit in the case of a detached, linked detached and semi-detached dwelling, and cannot be located on a lot where the principal dwelling also has a secondary dwelling unit, garden suite or any rooming units within the principal dwelling on that lot.

Size
A Coach House dwelling unit must not be greater in size than 40% of the footprint of the principal dwelling unit on the lot, up to a maximum footprint of 95 m², and may not exceed a lot coverage of 40% of the yard in which it is located.
**Height**

A Coach House dwelling unit may be of a height of one storey, to a maximum height of one storey, except:

a) for lots with access from a travelled public lane, or where the coach house is located within a detached garage where the use of the garage for parking is being retained and the Coach House dwelling is to be located above the garage, in which case the building accommodating a Coach House can be two storeys.

**Located Within a Detached Garage**

Where a coach house is located within a detached garage, the parking space provided by the detached garage must be retained either within the detached garage or on the lot of the principal dwelling and in conformity with the zoning by-law provisions for the location of required parking.

**Setbacks**

- Minimum required setback from front lot line does not apply as a Coach House must be located in the rear yard of the principal dwelling.
- Minimum required setback from a corner side lot line same as for the principal dwelling
- Maximum rear yard setback where no windows are proposed on the rear wall or where the rear lot line abuts a lane 1m
- Except where the rear lot line abuts a lane, the minimum required rear yard setback where windows are proposed on the rear wall 4m
- Maximum interior yard setback where no windows are proposed on the side wall 1m
- Minimum required interior yard setback where windows are proposed on the side wall 4m

**Accessory Building Provisions**

Although a Coach House is not considered an accessory building, the provisions regulating accessory buildings as set out in Section 55, Table 55 clause (4) will apply to Coach Houses. Those provisions require a Coach House to be a minimum 1.2 m from any other structure on the property.
A Coach House combined with all other accessory structures would not be allowed to exceed the existing land coverage limit, which is an aggregate coverage of 50% of a required rear yard.

**Permitted Projections**
The provisions related to permitted projections (Section 65) and permitted projections above the height limit (Section 64) apply to Coach Houses. However, a roof top amenity area will not be permitted on a Coach House.

**Location of Entrance**
The doorway entrance to a Coach House is limited to locations that are not facing and closer than 4 m of any lot line, unless the lot line in question borders a travelled lane.

**Minimum Access Route**
An unobstructed 1.2 m wide access must be provided from a public street or travelled lane to the Coach House. This access may comprise a driveway.

**Parking, Yards and Driveways**
The principal dwelling and Coach House dwelling must share the parking area and yards provided for the principal dwelling unit, and no new driveway may be created. In the case of lots served by a travelled public lane, a new private approach or driveway may only be created in the yard that did not contain a driveway prior to a Coach House being established.

No parking is required for a Coach House dwelling, but where provided, parking must be in conformity with the parking provisions of the by-law, and must not be located in the front yard. Despite this, a parking space for a Coach House unit may be located on a driveway that passes through a front yard to a garage, carport or other parking space, and may be in tandem in the driveway.

The creation of a Coach House must not eliminate a required parking space for the principal dwelling unit.

The creation of a Coach House must not lead to the paving of any existing landscaped areas in order to create more parking.

**Density Limits do not apply**
Coach House dwelling units will not be limited by, nor included in, any density control requirement, including for example, number of dwelling units and unit per hectare counts.
Example 1 - Urban Lot with Rear Lane

Urban Lot with rear lane

Lot size:
8 x 30 metres = 240 m²

Rear yard:
8 m x 12 m = 112 m²

Maximum rear yard coverage:
112 m² x 40% = 44.8 m²

Maximum footprint of Coach House:
84.5 m² x 40% = 33.8 m²

Proposed Coach House:
31.5 m²

Proposed Coach House rear yard coverage:
100/112 m² x 31.5 m² = 28%
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Example 2 – Urban Lot with No Rear Lane

Urban Lot
No rear lane

Lot size:
15 x 30 metres = 450 m²

Rear yard:
14 m x 15 m = 210 m²

Maximum rear yard coverage:
210 m² x 40% = 84 m²

Maximum footprint of Coach House:
125 m² x 40% = 50 m²

Proposed Coach House rear yard coverage:
100/210 m² x 50 m² = 24%

Proposed Coach House:
50 m²
Example 3 – Corner Lot

**Corner Lot**

**Lot size:**
20 x 35 metres = 680 m²

**Rear yard:**
17 m x 20 m = 340 m²

**Maximum rear yard:**
340 m² x 40% = 136 m²

**Maximum footprint of Coach House:**
224 m² x 40% = 89.6 m²

**Proposed Coach House:**
87.8 m²

**Proposed Coach House lot coverage:**
100/340 m² x 87.8 m² = 26%
Plus accessory structure (car port) 35%

20 x 35 metres
Conclusion

Permitting secondary dwelling units in accessory structures is a provincial requirement under Section 16 of the Planning Act. The City has initiated a study to determine how to permit this form of housing, and has drafted proposals to amend the Official Plan and Zoning By-law. These are grounded on a set of Guiding Principles that reflect the intention of the Provincial legislation, feedback obtained through the Discussion Paper and questionnaire released in September 2015 and technical input.

The City is seeking input on the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law changes set out in this paper. Please provide your feedback to the undersigned planner by February 29, 2016.

Staff anticipates bringing the final proposed amendments to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law to Planning Committee and Council for consideration in the spring 2016.

Feedback

If you have any questions about the study or wish to comment, please contact:

Emily Davies, Planner
Planning and Growth Management Department
City of Ottawa
110 Laurier Ave West
Ottawa, ON K1P 1J1
Tel: 613-580-2424 ext. 23463
Fax: 613-580-2459
Email: emily.davies@ottawa.ca
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Secondary Dwelling Units in Accessory Structures

As We Heard It Report - Guiding Principles and Draft Recommendations

Released April 2016

Zoning, Intensification and Neighbourhoods
Policy Development and Urban Design Branch
ottawa.ca/coachhouse
BACKGROUND

The province of Ontario, through the Strong Communities Affordable Housing Act, requires municipalities to allow secondary dwelling units in accessory structures (for example an apartment in an attached garage or a purpose built rear yard separate apartment). The City is calling these new units Coach Houses. The term Coach House is to represent a smaller accessory apartment which is in addition to the principle dwelling.

The City of Ottawa released a discussion paper and questionnaire on September 14, 2015 to determine under what circumstances these new units should be permitted. The questionnaire closed on November 6, 2015 and during that period 436 responses were received. The responses were utilized to inform the policy and zoning recommendations for how to allow Coach Houses in Ottawa. A supplementary paper, titled Guiding Principles and Draft Recommendations was prepared January 26, 2015. The paper provided the initial Staff direction for how to allow Coach Houses in Ottawa. The directions in the paper were open for public comment until February 29, 2015. During this time 130 submissions were received providing 354 comments over a variety of topics.

This report includes both a summary of the comments received as well as the unedited comments received from residents, included as Appendix A.
CONSULTATION SUMMARY

The Guiding Principles and Draft Recommendations paper invited general comments from the public via email, fax or phone. The comments were welcomed on any topic to help further shape what should be Staff’s final position on the policy and Zoning By-law provisions for how to allow Coach Houses in Ottawa. The comment period commenced with the preparation of the paper on January 26, 2015 and closed February 29, 2015. During this time 130 submissions were received providing 354 comments over a variety of topics.

During the comment period, 107 comments of support were received and 11 comments of objection. Many of the comments of support were requesting a variety of changes to the performance standards which would allow Coach Houses.

Top Comments:

The comment period resulted in 236 comments on the draft recommendations. Of these comments, 152 were spread over six themes. These six top themes are discussed below to provide more detail on the direction that commenter’s sought to the policy and Zoning By-law direction released by the City’s Guiding Principles and Draft Recommendations paper.
1. Coach Houses on private services - 41 comments

**Proposed Provision:** Where Not Permitted A Coach House dwelling unit is not permitted on a lot serviced by a private well and septic system

A total of 41 comments were received on this topic. Of the comments received, 40 requested permissions for allowing Coach Houses on lots which are privately serviced. These requests for the most part recognized that water quality and quantity would need to be confirmed to determine the suitability of a Coach House. The remaining one comment requested that small lots in the urban area which are privately serviced not be permitted to build Coach Houses due to the impacts on ground water quality and quantity.
2. Maximum size of a Coach House - 30 comments

Proposed Provision: Size A Coach House dwelling unit must not be greater in size than 40% of the footprint of the principal dwelling unit on the lot, up to a maximum footprint of 95 m², and may not exceed a lot coverage of 40% of the yard in which it is located.

A total of 30 comments were received on this topic. Of the comments, 13 requested that the proposed 40% footprint requirement be increased and 7 comments requested that the proposed 40% footprint requirement be reduced. There were also 6 comments received noting many Ottawa residential communities have large lots but small post-war bungalows. These small primary home footprints would restrict the ability to build a viable Coach House and the comments requested alteration to the staff position to account for small footprint primary homes.

There were 4 additional comments regarding maximum size, as follows:

- One comment: Add a minimum unit size requirement for a Coach House
- One comment: The existing provisions are adequate
- One comment: Base the 40% requirement on the principle residents permitted building footprint not the existing building footprint
- One comment: Coach Houses should be permitted to build to 1 ½ storeys or 4.5 metres tall
3. Maximum height of a Coach House - 26 comments

**Proposed Provision: Height** A Coach House dwelling unit may be of a height of one storey, to a maximum height of one storey, except: a) for lots with access from a travelled public lane, or where the coach house is located within a detached garage where the use of the garage for parking is being retained and the Coach House dwelling is to be located above the garage, in which case the building accommodating a Coach House can be two storeys.

A total of 26 comments were received on this topic. Of the comments, 12 requested that Coach Houses be permitted to build to 2 storeys tall in all circumstances and nine comments requested that Coach Houses be permitted to build only to 1 storey tall. There were five additional comments regarding maximum height, as follows:

- One comment: The maximum height should in no circumstance exceed the primary home’s height
- One comment: The maximum height should be expressed in metres not storeys
- One comment: The maximum height should vary to address privacy needs of adjacent homes
- One comment: Additional text is required to address overshadowing and privacy
- One comment: Concern that a 2 storey Coach House could reduce privacy and increase shadowing especially if the primary dwellings are not 2 storeys.
4. Include a grandfathering clause for existing structures - 21 comments

No Proposed Provision Provided.

A total of 21 comments were received on this topic. All 21 comments requested that a grandfathering clause be included in the Zoning By-law provisions to allow existing accessory structures which do not meet the provisions to be permitted to convert into a Coach House structure. These requests highlighted that in many circumstances there are existing structures built on residential lots that would benefit from being permitted to convert into a Coach House. In some circumstances these existing structures may not meet the provisions as outlined in the Draft Recommendations and should therefore be grandfathered.
5. Permit Coach Houses on properties with a duplex - 19 comments

Proposed Provision: Where Permitted A Coach House dwelling is permitted on any lot occupied by a detached, linked detached or semi-detached dwelling, where that dwelling type is a listed permitted use, provided:

(a) it does not change the streetscape character along the street on which the principal dwelling fronts

(b) it is serviced from the principal dwelling unit on the lot, which must be serviced by a public or communal water and wastewater system

(c) it must be located on the same lot as its principal dwelling unit

(d) it must be located in the rear yard of the principal dwelling or in the case of a lot with frontage on both a street and a public lane, it must be located in the yard adjacent to the public lane

A total of 19 comments were received on this topic. All 19 comments requested that a property which has a duplex as the primary dwelling also be included in the Zoning By-law provisions to allow a Coach House structure. These requests highlighted that the first Discussion Paper included in the analysis lots with duplex’s however then excluded these lot types from the Draft Recommendations. Further the comments pointed out that duplex’s are currently permitted to build a secondary dwelling unit within the primary dwelling unit and should also be extended the same permissions for Coach Houses.
6. Permit both a Coach House and a secondary dwelling unit within the primary home - 15 comments

Proposed Provision: Maximum Number A maximum of one Coach House dwelling unit is permitted per principal dwelling unit in the case of a detached, linked detached and semi-detached dwelling, and cannot be located on a lot where the principal dwelling also has a secondary dwelling unit, garden suite or any rooming units within the principal dwelling on that lot.

A total of 15 comments were received on this topic. Of the comments, 14 requested that qualifying properties be permitted to have both a Coach House and a secondary dwelling unit within the primary home. These requests highlighted that the City’s policy is supportive of intensification and should therefore be supportive of means to discretely intensify some of the lowest density areas in sensitive ways. The remaining one comment requested that either a Coach House or a secondary dwelling unit be permitted, but not both.
Remaining Comments

The remaining 84 comments span 19 different topic areas which request consideration for inclusion in the final staff position on how Coach Houses should be permitted. The topics will be discussed in general below:

1. Technical requests - 11 comments

   • A variety of technical comments were received:
     o Do not permit future variances to the adopted Zoning By-law provisions;
     o Two suggestion were made on how footprint should be measured;
     o A 2 storey Coach Houses should be permitted a portion on the ground level;
     o Include a minimum lot width to qualify for a Coach House;
     o Density transfers should not be permitted;
     o Overhangs should be permitted;
     o Density limits should apply;
     o Ensure Coach Houses do not interfere with the natural drainage;
     o Clarification on the location of an entrance needs to be provided;
     o Two semi-detach units under the same ownership should be permitted to build a Coach House per unit; and
     o Underground wiring should be required.

2. Setbacks - 11 comments

   • The draft recommendations included a number of setback provisions. Comments were received stating: support of the 1 metre maximum setback; requesting setbacks between 1-4 metres be permitted and any windows within this distance be required to have opaque glass to address privacy concerns; the proposed maximum 1 metre setback would impact neighbours properties and complicate maintenance; and setbacks should be flexible to address on-site needs, for example: trees which need protection, grading, gardens, sunlight, etc.

3. Parking - 9 comments

   • The draft recommendations included a number of parking provisions. Comments were received stating: enough on-site parking should be provided for the Coach House unit to address already stressed on-street parking; the City should allow on-site parking; and requests made that the City should not require on-site parking.
4. Trees - 7 comments

- The Draft Recommendations did not discuss tree protection. There were however comments received regarding trees: ensure that trees are protected as development has a negative impacts on private trees; building Coach Houses will impact the minimum spaces required for trees; and thought should be given to creating a tree maintenance By-law.

5. Yard Coverage - 6 comments

- The Draft Recommendations included a provision to have maximum yard coverage of 40% of the yard in which the Coach House is located. Two comments were received suggesting this is not enough of a percentage; and three comments suggesting that this was too much of a percentage. The remaining comment requested a re-examination of the permitted yard coverage to allow for a viable space for landscaping, trees and amenity area.

6. Location - 8 comments

- The draft recommendation included a provision that Coach Houses are only appropriate in the rear yard of a lot. Comments were received stating: that the rear yard may not always be the most appropriate location for a Coach House. For some lots the side or front yard may be an appropriate location for a Coach House. Further building a Coach House in the backyard may decrease privacy and therefore other locations should be considered.

7. Servicing - 5 comments

- The draft recommendations included a provision to require a Coach House to connect to municipal water and sewer via the connections already provided to the principle dwelling. Comments were received stating: off the grid solutions should be permitted; direct connections and new City laterals should be permitted; servicing connections from the primary home to the Coach House should be sought in order to prohibit severance; and investigation should be done if Coach Houses can be supported on existing city services.

8. Allow for basements - 4 comments

- The draft recommendations did not include a discussion around the allowance of basements for Coach House units. Comments were received to support the allowance of basements for Coach House units.

9. Projections - 3 comments

- The draft recommendations included a provision to allow permitted projections into required yards and above the height limit, with the exception of roof top patios which are proposed to be prohibited. Comments were received which: agree that no roof top amenity space should be permitted; and also to prohibit the use of projections that would increase the size of a structure.
10. **Definition of a Coach House - 3 comments**
   - The draft recommendations included a proposed definition for Coach Houses. Comments were received which: suggest including “tiny home” in the definition; and that the term should be changed to ancillary secondary dwelling unit.

11. **Green Infrastructure - 3 comments**
   - The draft recommendations did not include a discussion around green infrastructure. Comments received requesting: that a rebate system for buildings which incorporate green technologies be included.

12. **Co-existence with the Infill Bylaw - 3 comments**
   - The draft recommendations did not include a discussion around the Infill 1 and 2 By-laws. Comments received requesting consideration be given as to how the Coach House study coordinates with the intent of these By-laws. Further a request was provided to hold off on the adoption of Coach Houses until the appeals for Infill 2 are complete.

13. **Development Charges - 2 comments**
   - The draft recommendations did not include a discussion around development charges. Comments received requesting the City to address what the development charges will be for a Coach House. Further, Coach Houses and secondary dwelling units within a home should have a similar development charge and the fee should be affordable to meet the intent of the *Strong Communities through Affordable Housing Act*.

14. **Accessible Design - 2 comments**
   - The draft recommendations did not include a discussion around accessible design. Comments received to request inclusion of a minimum standard for accessible design for Coach Houses.

15. **Character - 2 comments**
   - The draft recommendations included a discussion around character. Comment received stating: developers destroy character for profit and the common good needs to be protected. A further comment that all references to character should be removed so as to not cause confusion with the intent of the Infill By-laws.

16. **Access - 2 comment**
   - The draft recommendations included a provision requiring a 1.2 metre pathway from a Coach House to a public road. Comments received requesting that this requirement must be coordinated with the Infill By-law requirements.
17. **Noise - 1 comment**

- The draft recommendations did not include a discussion around noise. A comment was received expressing concern for a Coach House adding to noise pollution.

18. **Home Based Business - 1 comment**

- The draft recommendations did not include a discussion around the home based business provisions. A comment was received requesting that alternate uses of a Coach House should be expressly prohibited.

19. **Occupancy - 1 comment**

- The draft recommendations did not include a discussion regarding occupancy of a Coach House. A comment was received expressing concern that Coach Houses will be used for student residences.
Appendix A

Coach House Public Consultation: Draft Recommendations Paper

Comments Received from February 1 – March 4, 2016

- Coach Houses should be permitted in the rural area on private services
- Support for permitting Coach Houses
- What will the Development Charges be?
- Only permitting properties to have either a Coach House or a secondary dwelling unit within the home, but not both – Comment: I THINK TO TRULY ANIMATE OUR COMMUNITIES, THE CITY SHOULD ALLOW BOTH—IT WILL ESPECIALLY HELP ELDERS WHO A) WANT COMPANY B) WHICH IMPROVES THEIR SECURITY AND C) BOOSTS THEIR INCOME. REMEMBER, THE AVERAGE CPP PAYOUT TODAY IS JUST $550/MONTH. TRY LIVING ON THAT! ALSO, YOUNG PEOPLE BUYING HOMES NEED THE EXTRA INCOME TOO
- Coach Houses should be allowed up to 50% of the footprint of the primary home to a max 95m2
- Coach Houses should be allowed in the rural area on private services
- Pleased with the consultation and support for permitting Coach Houses
- The definition should be changed to meet the National Building Code. A Secondary Dwelling Unit should be a "secondary suite" and a Coach House should be a "Secondary Dwelling Unit".
- My only concern is the one storey and 95 metres square. It is not a viable project to build and get a reasonable rent. Need the ability for a second storey and minimum 140 metres square
- I have an issue with not allowing coach houses on properties that are serviced by wells and septic systems. I presently live on a property that is 2.55 acres on a septic system and well. While you can get building permits to construct new homes on ¼ acre and ½ acre lots in the country with wells and septic systems, I cannot build a coach house on a lot that is 2, 3 or 4 times larger than what can be ok’ed today for a new home. This restriction does not make much sense and in fact seems discriminatory against people who live in the country
- CH should be permitted in the rural area on private services
- That eliminates people on the fringe of Ottawa wouldn’t it? and they likely have more land or territory – and it seems to me like those in Riverside South, or Barrhaven or places like that (but maybe they have different zoning that I don’t know about) would be in the perfect situation to encourage a coach house without bothering neighbours…
As an owner of a property that has a secondary dwelling unit (recently legally built and rented), I am disappointed to see that one of the guiding principles of the proposed new bylaws will limit intensification to either one (coach house) or the other (secondary dwelling unit). It seems to me that if the city is truly interested in promoting intensification, then such limits should not be part of the new legislation. Rather, instead of blanket limitations, I would suggest special conditions needing to be met for those property owners wanting both types of units (additional property dimension/access regulations). For example, having a dedicated parking space and common yard space made available with a minimum separation distance between the main house and coach house. In my example, my rental bungalow has a 2 bedroom basement apartment with a separate 3 bedroom unit upstairs. The property already has two separate driveways, ample street parking and is on an oversized lot (irregular but roughly 70x150ft). There are no issues with Hydro Ottawa infrastructure or sewers (new in the 1980s). Being a 1950s neighbourhood, lots are large and houses well-separated. I could foresee, at some future time, adding a coach house to this property and still leaving half of the large back yard available as a shared space for all tenants. There would be considerably more room in this example than offered by many of the apartments/rental houses I've lived in and importantly, would meet the intensification mandate.

- Ottawa has a large rural component. Coach House should be allowed in the rural area.
- There may be pre-existing homes with secondary units inside (basement for example) with ample space for a second yard coach house, there may also be a need for it (i.e. a couple with both sets of parents or family members requiring separate spaces...)
- Finally, I would like to recommend a consideration for a rebate system that rewards buildings that incorporate green technologies - from HVAC to electricity (solar/wind) to passive solar design and water/sewage reduction systems. The rebates could be in the form of municipal tax reduction to permit costs etc...
- Also, there may be homes for which the rear yard is NOT adequate, however, a side yard or front yard size may be adequate as long as it follows the single story/second story principle... also, there may be pre-existing front yard garage that could be converted or added to in order to make use of a coach house...
- As for building heights, if I were to offer a preference, it would be for something in the vicinity of 6m. Either 6m to the height of a parapet wall or eave on a flat roof or 6m to the mid-point on the slope of a pitched roof. That sort of height should accommodate 2-storey garage-under-dwelling arrangements with a flat roof or 1-storey building with a steeply pitched roof
- Coach Houses should not be permitted on any lot that does not fully comply with all current zoning restrictions
- They have an existing detached building which has been present since before the 1960's. There once was a kitchen and bathroom in the structure but no longer there today. They would like the Coach House project to recognize existing structures as complying with the ZBL provisions.
I think there needs to be a discussion surrounding barrier-free design for these coach houses, such as the minimum standard of VisitAbility. Sustainability often discusses energy efficiency and a reduced strain on infrastructure but it needs to include affordability and some type of Universal Design (VisitAbility being the easiest to implement and most cost-effective). Suppliers like Guildcrest and Bonneville could easily produce a VisitAble coach house to fit your proposed specifications.

I am curious as to why we are limited to only one story and not a particular height limit like "4 metre in height including roof". Does this mean a tiny home ("coach house") can't have a loft?

Is there a distinction between tiny homes and coach houses or is Ottawa region grouping them together? I will read the larger document in detail but have watched many videos of tiny homes that are on wheel - is this also classed under 'coach house' or are we strictly limiting them to those built on solid permanent foundations?

The situation I'm envisioning in my foreseeable future is both my mother, and mother in law both wanting to live with me. The more options I have available if that happens, the better.

For older properties in the city (smaller home footprint on 50+ lot frontage) your restrictions do not provide for a viable size of coach house.

Larger rural properties have the further restriction of being on well and septic. Looks like status quo to me. I guess the province forced this study on the City of Ottawa.

The height allowance concerns me. Although the new building has conformed to city permits, the allowing of an extra story would make the building much higher and would take away from the family-neighbourhood single bungalow feel of this community.

Also, the building allowance for 'rear yard only' does not take into consideration that a building close to the back neighbour's property would impact the privacy of the neighbour. i.e. the building in my neighbour's back yard is very close to my property and added residents in this building would impact my privacy and quality of life.

It seems to me that allowing 40% of the rear yard to be developed in this way is excessive. To allow the development of a yard for single-family use is very different than giving over 40% to an extra household.

Only allowing coach houses in rear yards does not make sense for corner lots. As an example, my house at XXXX has a huge side yard because I am on a corner lot. On such lots, it would make sense to allow for coach houses on side yards. I reviewed the example on page 16. I would still like to leave the comment that I believe coach houses ought to be permitted on side yards of corner lots, as well as in rear yards, depending on how the house is placed on the lot. My address is XXX. If you look that up in the city databases, you will see that my rear yard is tiny and my side yard is huge. My property does not resemble the example on page 16. Consequently, I would like to officially leave the comment that coach houses ought to be permitted in side yards of corner lots, depending on the configuration of the corner lot.

I would like to see the city allow properties with single family homes and semi-detached homes that have legal secondary dwelling units to build coach houses (without having to change the zoning from say R1 to Duplex). If the property meets all of the city's requirements then I see no reason not to allow it.
• Can you clarify how the footprint of the main dwelling is defined? I have a house with a car port where the car port is a drive through. There is a common roof ...is the area under the covered carport part of the footprint?

• Also, in terms of the coach house being above the garage is there anything from preventing part of the unit being on the same level as the garage? I am thinking in terms of a ground level entry, mudroom, washroom, laundry, etc...

• On a large lot object to not being able to do a Coach House on private septic and well. They have 17 acres. A lot of land around the house. Elderly wants to move into the Coach House and daughter in the primary home.

• Can parked airstreams/mini-houses/trailers count as Coach Houses? Note that parked trailers are typically off-the-grid (i.e. no running water & not permanently connected to the electrical system), so would not be connected to the main house’s services. However, they would also not be connected to City Services on their own either.

• We are all for the proposed Coach House amendments to the Zoning for our City. I see this as a great solution for housing independent elderly parents or for the latter’s potential to earn rental income as they age.

• I am a big fan of the concept, and think the policy recommendations are reasonable and in line with both the province’s and the city’s desire and need to encourage growth through 'gentle density', especially in urban areas in walkable proximity to transit, services, retail, and employment.

• First off I think this is a great initiative and I have been impatiently awaiting coach housing in Ottawa since I first saw it in Vancouver a few years ago. You draft recommendations look very good.

• I have only one area of concern wrt the proposed principals and bylaw amendments. It has to do with the notion that the coach house "must be serviced from the principal dwelling unit on the lot, which must be serviced by a public or communal water and wastewater system". I get the latter (public services) but, I do not understand the rationale behind requiring that servicing to absolutely go through the principle dwelling. In my case, it would increase costs considerably, quite likely require an upgrade to my existing systems, increase construction impact on neighbours, disrupt my tenant/income from them - and carry risks inherent to connecting to/burdening a much older system.

• Specifically, my corner duplex (zoned for quadruplex and very recently, for small commercial) has a large detached garage that I have often thought could be a great coach house. The house was built 1950 as a duplex. But, to connect such a coach house to the city water and sewage via the main house does not make sense in my case. In addition to considerable extra expense to make the necessary plumbing changes, which would necessarily disrupt the current tenant on the lower level, it would be risky to burden those older systems with the increased volumes. Further, to connect to the water/sewerage system on the adjacent street (less that 3 meters away would be much, much simpler, quick and more logical in this case.)
• Very excited to see the city allowing secondary dwelling units in the near future. Building a new garage with a one bedroom apartment on my property is something I was planning on starting this coming spring. As I began to do some research, I was surprised to find out that this is not yet permitted, but possibly will be soon.

• We agree that the maximum size of a coach house needs to be increased beyond 55 square meters to allow for adequate living space. Also, when considering its relative size to the primary residence, over 50% of the primary residence would fair considering that it is also a living quarter and, a single story (if above a garage). For example, we currently have a 1000 square foot house but would like to build, at minimum a 650 square foot accessory living space. This would be in keeping with small studio apartments.

• We feel that in the R4N-C zone 6.1 meters is appropriate, and would allow for a coach house above a garage. While creating an overlook into the neighbour’s yard, this second level is in keeping with the apartment buildings that surround our property. Also, while we have a residential lot, it faces a busy street, so we feel that a two story dwelling is appropriate for this lot.

• Since we would be converting an existing detached garage, it's close to our side yard line. We understand the desire to not have windows on the side yard line but we feel that smaller windows, closer to the roof, would allow for light to enter the coach house without sacrificing privacy for the neighbours. It should be noted that our neighbour on this side is a two-story multi unit apartment building with with windows facing our home. The lot at the rear lot line is also a two storey apartment building. These factors should be taken into account when determining how close we can build to our side and rear lot lines.

• We feel that we should be permitted to use either the side yard or the backyard. Side yard is preferable when renting to tenants because the tenants could access the coach house by using a shared driveway, rather than having the tenants go through our back yard.

• We feel that in the city centre, the coach house should be serviced by the same means as the primary residence. It should not be considered a standalone legal parcel.

• The only further comment that I can provide is the example of my previous home in Navan: I was located on a 2 acre estate subdivision lot. My septic treatment system was sized for a larger home than what was there, the well provided endless water. I often thought building a coach house for my mother at that house. A coach house was easy to accommodate in that situation as I could have used the existing well and septic. Please consider adding a clause for country homes “where well and septic are sized accordingly”.

• This is a great initiative by the city.

• Height should be limited to not exceed primary house. Privacy & noise (of the coach out residents, and the neighbours) can easily be address by other means then restricting height.

• Below and above ground options (garage, dwelling, etc) should be kept as open as possible (not restricted in the bylaw) to fit the requirements of the larger City.

• Wondering why the no coach house if there is already a basement suite? I would think with idea of providing more living spaces in and around Ottawa, it would be a better usage of limited area, no? I just want to know why this is a no.

• Minimum lot width to permit a coach house in Hintonburg should be 50 feet. Only on lots with single family or semi-detached homes meeting the minimum lot width.

• Prohibit the provision of parking for the new unit. Cf proposed small-scale commercial zoning.
- Height and overlook a concern – need to maintain the principle of Infill II – the higher the height, the greater the set-back, for all yard requirements, not just rear yard. For Hintonburg, the height limit should be 4.5 m
- Tree protection is a concern – the by-law should address this by protecting an area sufficient to allow mature trees to survive and flourish.
- Permission to establish a coach house must not be construed as an as-of-right density increase which can be added to the principal residence through a variance at the C of A.
- Limiting the height of a Coach House to the same number of stories as house facing the street unless the unit is above a garage of facing a public laneway, which will allow for a two storey Coach House
- Permitting properties to have a Coach House and a secondary dwelling unit within the home
- Limiting the size of the Coach House to 140% of the footprint of the primary home up to a maximum of 95 metres square
- We have reviewed the Coach House Guiding Principles and Draft Recommendations Paper. In our opinion and as supported by the noted public response, privacy is the primary concern. Although we presume this draft recommendation to be worded in more generic terms, we do not support a height restriction relative to building storeys. We do however; support a dimensioned limit (5.0m for example) regardless of the inclusion or exclusion of a garage. While we understand the additional storey permitted may be an incentive for better streetscapes through reduced private access from right of ways and reduced garage doors facing right of ways, we feel privacy concerns are not consistently addressed through all Coach House building types (with garage or without).
- Furthermore, we feel Coach House size determined by 40% of the footprint penalizes lots with smaller dwelling units. In typical Ottawa neighbourhoods, dwelling unit footprints range from 600sf to 800sf translating into a undersized 240sf to 320sf Coach House. In most cases, with a smaller dwelling unit these lots have larger backyards that be more appropriate and would support a Coach House in a less intrusive way. While it is understood that the Coach Houses must remain secondary to the principle dwelling units we support the implementation of a regulation similar to the calculation for a secondary dwelling unit (Section 133 (5)) provided it does not exceed the maximum rear yard coverage limitations.
- I like the idea of a ‘coach house’ being an option that persons may build on their property, and believe that the vast majority of your team’s recommendations are good.
The only concern I have is with the permitted height of the coach house: I believe, under no circumstance, should an accessory secondary dwelling be greater than one-story in height. The current draft suggests an exemption would be made in the case that the lower level is retained as a garage. Once a person is able to build above one-floor, privacy is impeded upon, which I believe is frankly unacceptable for the city to support. That one detail, I believe, could lead to a lot of problems with neighbours choosing to build these secondary units.

Consider a single home in one of Ottawa's many 1960's developments. Many of these homes (often smaller bungalows) in these areas have detached garages at the back of the property. If a person chooses to build a secondary unit atop this garage, they will be able to do so, from my understanding. This creates a 'watchtower' effect, where this taller structure now sits with clear views of everyone's backyards. What's more, their is very limited solutions for these neighbours to create privacy - fences can be no higher then 7', and shrubs and trees can only do so much. The city should allow these structures on the condition of a one story height limit, without exemption. Further, as the plan moves forward, details of this should be made more clear, and arguably, nothing greater then ~12' in height should be permissible.

I would officially like to voice my opinion about the proposed zoning. I am in absolute favor of the City of Ottawa allowing detached secondary dwelling units. I've owned a house in Alta Vista since 1985 and have thought several times that this would be great addition to my property. I think it would be very beneficial to the city and to property owners.

Thanks again for getting back to me. In looking a little closer at my property (XXX) I have some questions/concerns. I understand that the intent of the maximum coach house footprint being no greater than 40% of the primary home footprint is to ensure that the coach house doesn't "compete" with the size of the primary home and get too big for the lot. I agree with the intent and wouldn't at all want to put a structure in my yard that is too large, in relative terms. In my case the footprint of the primary house (30'1" x 26'1" - 784 square feet) is relatively small compared to the lot and the surrounding houses. There is currently no garage on my property. The lot is 4745.5 square feet (property report attached).

By the current proposed coach house zoning, that would limit me to a 313 square foot footprint. I could design a tiny bachelor apartment, but it would almost not be worth it. I have no desire to make the primary house any bigger. I'm wondering if there could be some sort of exception or additional language that would allow cases like mine to bump up the percentage to 50 or 60. Even at 50%, that would only give me 392 square feet, but when the apartment is that small, every square foot counts.

In favour of the 1 metre maximum setback

Allow for a 1 1/2 storey - Another great way to help people in my situation would be to allow a half story (per the attached zoning ordinance D-21 - "Half Story. An area immediately under a sloping roof which has the point of intersection of the top line of the rafter and the face of the walls not to exceed three (3) feet above the top floor level, the floor area of which does not exceed two-thirds of the floor area immediately below it, and does not contain any independent apartments."), like my house (picture attached). My opinion is that it allows for charming spaces with character within the roof structure and since it does not add any additional exterior wall height, allowing it would not be contrary to the to the intent of the proposed coach house zoning size limits - especially if the structure is only one story above grade.
As you may appreciate, I am completely taken aback by staff’s draft recommendations to prohibit coach houses on lots serviced privately, thus effectively excluding most all of rural Ottawa. You are likely aware that the city will not bring city services into rural Ottawa. In this regard, I would request that you please forward to me the technical rationale provided by both city staff and the RVCA for being against coach houses on lots services privately. I am especially interested in why it would be ok to build “houses” on private services but not “coach houses”.

Upon review of the proposed draft paper last week, we are very disappointed to see that coach houses/secondary dwellings will not be permitted on lots with private services (well and septic). With the amount of large lots in the West Carleton-March ward, I would love to see an amendment to this by-law to allow for coach houses on lots like ours. We are situated on a very private 2.2 acre lot, with ample space for a coach house. We have enough space to place the coach house in a variety of different locations, with the intention of tying into existing services or introducing a smaller, secondary, septic tank. Due to the size of our lot, I fail to see how this would negatively affect any neighbouring properties or cause any concern for the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority.

Would I be able to build a coach like the one in the picture on a lot with a bungalow???
I ask because the questionnaires seemed to link height of coach house to height of main house and yet the resulting document seemed silent on this point. Personally I think One should be able to build 2 storey coach house (parking on main) on a lot with a bungalow

Is one allowed 'overhangs' or car ports off garage without affecting size calculation

Why is size limited to 40% of main building? Isn't the rule for accessory buildings 50% of back lot? Shouldn't it be the same? Even 95% of the main house should be acceptable. After all, the accessory unit within a house just has to be smaller than main unit. otherwise, re:size, there a lot of small bungalows on huge lots near the city centre and transit hubs with R1 zoning. These would be perfect for intensification under this type of zoning. However, your restrictions may be too severe for these areas in order to balance the downtown lots. Perhaps zoning overlays for these areas could be established with more accommodating (read larger footprint) zoning to allow for intensification where the infrastructure could handle it better and there would be little disruption to neighbours

The summary document seemed to be silent on corner lots. Can I build a coach house on a side lot if it's a corner lot? Can there be parking and street entrance to the coach house/garage from the side street? If not, why not? Many houses have garages that do this.

My husband and I live in Ottawa and have been considering the option of “living tiny” and joining the Tiny House Movement, but are aware of the zoning bylaws that restrict permanent parking and residence in such houses. I’m very interested in your Secondary Dwelling Units study for this reason and note that the release of the final draft and recommendations is coming out February/March 2016.

On the way home I was wondering about the idea of allowing rural properties the same opportunity. I am not familiar with the Septic Office position but usually septic are done based on number of users, outlets etc. The coach house idea is to connect to the main house servicing, that would put extra stress on most septic systems, very few are build in large enough to support added expansion. So the solution could work if the new septic is build to support main and coach house. This would be doable in rural setting with large lots and
space to account for lot coverage limitation and necessary distances between septic and well. In privately serviced urban areas the same concept might be more difficult to institute. Those lots are usually smaller than 1/2 acres (on average 1/3 acre) needed for self sustaining lots. How to accommodate new septic, coach house and keep the lot coverage at the required 15%? Many wells in those areas would not allow for added stress of second dwelling. Distances are difficult to keep already. I have looked over the proposed coach house ideas again.

I have to admit that you made the right decision stating that coach houses will be prohibited on privately serviced properties. You should however add the wording" in urban areas". Planners tend to forget that there are about 16 communities within the city of Ottawa boundaries that are privately serviced. Although that might be some exemptions, they are usually under the 1/2 acres requirements Most properties in our area are about 1/3 acres or less. Even if the septic office agrees and well have sufficient water supply, they will not qualify under the lot coverage that states 15% maximum lot coverage and we will be constantly appearing before the COFA. We are already having problems with developers pushing the coverage boundaries. This proposal would create serious environmental concerns, drainage issues etc.I do not foresee the same problem in rural areas however where lots are usually bigger.

Based on original assumption (of being excluded) we did not really participate in a debate and now have a precious little time left to advise other communities that the rules have changed. It seems that you are delegating the decision to the septic office. But it's more complex than issuing septic permit. Before you decide to include urban privately serviced areas, proper studies should be done to ensure that environmental issues are properly addressed

- Increase the max size of a Coach House - Images are submitted.
- Allow 2 storey coach houses permitted it is not taller than the primary home.
- Allow more flexibility for the setbacks, to be between 1-4m if they install frosted glass windows when a coach house is within 4m of a property line
- Will there be a numerical height limit to the one storey maximum and to the 2 storey maximum in an existing detached garage? One storey on top of a basement that comes above grade, would still be considered one storey. A storey could be 8’ or 10’ (or any number really!) plus when 3’ or so of basement space is projecting above grade and add onto that half the height of the roof… means it might be helpful to have a maximum number along with the one storey maximum. Same with someone adding a second storey to a detached garage.
- I believe you have done a reasonable job to reflect community concerns while implementing the policy mandated by the province. Keep up the good work!

Although some members at the FCA meeting felt 480 responses was a low participation, you should be very pleased with the 480 responses you received regarding the Coach Houses coming to Ottawa. This is an excellent response rate. I understand most of the responses supported the coach house concept.
• A final concern was that residents of adjacent homes believe the residents of coach houses will peer into their backyards. Since these are only single storey homes there is not a great deal more opportunity to peer at neighbours yard from the coach house than there is from simply being in the backyard of a home. Coach houses over garages would tend to be in the front yard and should not present an opportunity to look at neighbours in their backyards.

• With my experience as the owner/property manager of the XXX, I find retired couples and single seniors are content and quite comfortable living in homes of 684 sq.ft. At one time in the past that was the maximum size of homes that could be moved on the roads of Ontario. Over the years that size has increased and people are also pleased with larger homes in the 900 sq.ft. range. At the meeting there was representation that homes should be smaller. With my experience of residents being comfortable in the 684 sq.ft. home is evidence that the appropriate policies you proposed can permit coach houses of this size. (although the configuration will be different than those in a mobile home.) I would be concerned if there were significant reductions in the proposed home areas as it may be too restrictive to encourage senior parents to abandon 2000 sq.ft. homes to come to a smaller size home in the rear yard of their children. I do believe it will be difficult to convince empty nesters and seniors to downsize to too small of a home. I am sure they will enjoy living with enough space without making them feel confined or restricted

• We’re interested in building a carriage house on our property as an in-law suite. We have been reading about the proposed regulations, and have noticed it wouldn’t be allowed on rural properties with septic/wells. We’re on almost three acres in the east end (Cumberland), and wondering if there is an exception if the carriage house has its own holding tank? Will there be exceptions like this, as it seems the rural lots have the most room for these kind of initiatives

• Limiting the height to one story eliminates the opportunity for a creative architectural balance with the existing dwelling, in my case the existing building is two storey with an attached single storey room that slopes to a storey and a half. A coach house design for my property could very nicely accommodate a partial second storey which would result in a more aesthetic appearance to the adjacent neighbours. Will the city reconsider the limitation to a single storey based on a case by case review of the design submission?

• I see the guidelines have been tightened on the footprint size from 50% to 40% and that the stand alone coach house can only be one story in height. Are these criteria cast in stone now?

• I contacted you last year to discuss my property on Bronson Ave that currently has a residential duplex as well as a commercial one story 450sf (approx.) garage at the rear. The property was changed recently to “traditional main street” zoning. The garage currently has its own gas and hydro meters. The water feed is central and comes from the main house. When I’m reading over the guiding principles, I don’t see anything about existing structures. Are they going to be grandfathered in? I would very much like to start the conversion of the garage as soon as possible.

• Ensure there is a grandfather clause in the new Zoning By-Law for existing structures. Please make note of my opposition to the duplex portion of the new Zoning By-Law proposal as well as a grandfather clause for existing structures to senior management so they may consider a change.
We are long-time residents of Pineglen/Grenfell Glen, an urban community with wells and septic, located in Nepean. Our wells serve us well and the water is quality is excellent. We hope to keep it this way for future generations. Coach houses are not appropriate for our community, being in essence urban in location. Coach houses would put great stress on existing wells and the aquifer system. Further, the footprint for coach houses at 40% would be another huge stress for our exiting homes, given existing wells. We have already experienced wells going dry due to construction drilling, etc. in the past. Please do not lump our community in with rural communities outside the Greenbelt. Coach houses are not appropriate for Grenfell Glen.

I have been following the media information on Coach Houses in Ottawa and I am in full support of this idea. Living in Ward 18, Alta Vista, this is an ideal ward for this type of program with large lots and a substantial number of original home owners from the 1960's that as they age would benefit from being able to remain on their own property but in a simpler living accommodation.

In regard to the above, while in general the creation of coach houses appears to be a good initiative, and I appreciate the thought given in regard to not permitting additional front yard car parking.

Front yard parking restrictions: The City of Ottawa tends to easily accept owners significantly widening their front yard parking, even if the kerbs are not altered. Perhaps the bylaw should also be clear about limiting the widening of parking areas as the result is an asphalt jungle, which we already have too much of.

Please would you send me additional information on the discussions with Rideau Valley Conservation Authority about this for rural lots with private water/sewer services. I would like to understand how it was concluded that Coach Houses should be inapplicable in the rural area. Some rural properties have plenty of land with perfectly fine and abundant water supply that were either constructed with septic systems that are now larger than needed for the number of occupants, or can be easily and economically extended if necessary. Consequently a blanket restriction on all rural properties is inappropriate and unacceptable.

I'm sending this email for two reasons; 1. To indicate my strong opposition to the disallowance of coach houses being built on duplexed lots. 2. To ensure there is a grandfather clause in the new Zoning By-Law for existing structures. Please make note of my opposition to the duplex portion of the new Zoning By-Law proposal as well as a grandfather clause for existing structures to senior management so they may consider a change.

I think coach houses are a great idea because it helps address housing for seniors or possibly others. I see no reason why they should not be permitted in rural areas if local code requirements are met for water (well or central service) and septic (private or central service). Emergency access may also need to be considered.

Ensure there is a grandfather clause in the new Zoning By-Law for existing structures. Please make note of my opposition to the duplex portion of the new Zoning By-Law proposal as well as a grandfather clause for existing structures to senior management so they may consider a change.
I wish to register my objection to the fifth principle embodied in the above mentioned report stating that coach houses are to be prohibited on privately serviced lots. The rationale for this seems to be based on (1) the need for resources to review applications and (2) the opinions of staff from the RVCA.

1. In regard to the first rationale, it would seem that a user-pay system would be a simple solution if the additional taxes redeemed from a secondary dwelling are insufficient.

2. In regard to the second rationale, as a past member of the public advisory committee of the RVCA, I know that the RVCA performs a valuable service in protecting the natural resources of the Rideau watershed, but this position seems to be an overreach of their mandate especially regarding privately-serviced lots which are nowhere near watercourses. The issue of possible water table depletion cannot be a serious consideration as additional drawdowns would be insignificant for a small dwelling. Moreover, there are precedents for adjacent houses sharing wells with no significant problems. In terms of possible pollution from septic fields, there are already many safeguards for this and there is also the simple solution of having septic holding tanks (without fields) which would be pumped as needed at the owner’s expense.

The word "prohibit" is an extremely strong term to use in reference to privately serviced lots when they are generally larger than urban lots and much better suited in terms of privacy, size and access to accommodate a secondary dwelling. To make this prohibition one of the "guiding principles" seems also an unnecessarily intransigent position. Rural Ottawa taxpayers do not receive the same level of services afforded urban dwellers and receive only a relatively small rate adjustment to compensate. Even if delivery costs are somewhat higher for rural areas, we are entitled to receive the same attention in terms of reviews and permits, and the blanket prohibition of coach houses smacks of a "we don’t want the additional bother" attitude. I ask that you and other staff look more carefully at this issue and devise the conditions under which coach houses would be permitted on self-serviced lots.
• Your recent plan to integrate the building of Coach Houses in Ottawa raised a serious problem that has been around Manotick for many years. That is not being allowed to build extra housing on lands that are under threat by water quality and nitrate overloading. This is correct. The City’s Planning Dept. and the MVCA both state correctly that building where services are provided by well and septic tanks will decrease water quality and increase nitrates. This is obvious. Larger more remote properties with well and septic tank service could likely handle Coach Houses and be looked at on an individual bases. The provincial 'Clean Water Act' places the responsibility of clean water on the City. You can not downgrade this responsibility just because you want to build more and larger homes or building new Coach Houses. This would also be foolish risk financially for the City if a serious problem developed. The City says it can not afford to provide water and sewer services to the rest of Manotick. This is incorrect. Why: Home prices are going down in Manotick by approximately 2.0 - 2.5% per year as per Market Value Assessments for the last 4 year period. Even with the City's 2.5% yearly tax increase, our actual municipal taxes have remained almost the same for the last 4 years. The new 4 year assessment coming up looks like it will be the same or actually worse due mainly to water and sewer not being provided. If this was not the case and water and sewer were provided the tax base would be approximately 10% higher today. To put these numbers into perspective, Manotick's tax revenue is now ~$6.0m. If water and sewer were provided this would raise to ~$7.0m due to not losing assessment and the homes now having water and sewer. If 10% of Manotick residents built a Coach House an additional ~$240,000. of tax revenue would be realized. This would increase tax revenue in total to ~$7.24m per year or an ~17% increase rather than a yearly -2.5% decrease per year. On top of this water revenues would also be realized. The City's choices are: Do nothing and watch house prices continue to devalue and the resulting tax base deteriorate by approximately 2.5% per year. Also, risk being responsible to rectify an expensive serious health issue. OR Provide water and sewer at an appropriate cost and then start receiving 17% more tax revenue plus water charges and not have to worry being held responsible for a poor water quality problem.

• For Coach Houses in the unserviced part of Manotick only if municipal services are extended to this area.
It has come to my attention that people in rural areas would like to be able to build coach houses on lots that are privately serviced by well and septic system. While I understand that rural lots may be large and without neighbours at the moment, the urban lots which are privately serviced were without neighbours when many of the older homes were built. Now these lots are part of a grid of city streets. Larger homes are replacing the original buildings and lot coverage, larger septic beds, distance between well and neighbouring septic systems, possibility of water contamination and water quantity are all concerns for area home owners. If an exception is considered to allow coach houses on privately serviced rural properties, regulations must ensure that coach houses can only be added where the home owner has adequate land mass for well and septic to support the home and coach house needs, now and in the event of future development of adjacent lots. In other words, lot sizes greater than the ½ acre currently required for private servicing. Page 8 “Coach Houses - Guiding Principle and Draft Recommendations, January 2016. While consideration was given to allowing for Coach Houses to be located on lots with private services, through discussions with the City's engineering staff and the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority it was concluded that the challenges to allow for this would be significant from a review and approval perspective and would create undue risks related to water quantity, water quality and capacity constraints for private septic systems and possible increased nitrate loading. Developers with privately serviced lots seem to be able to convince the committee of adjustments to increase the allowable size of new homes relative to the recommended lot coverage. Is there a way to ensure that lot coverage can never exceed the guidelines on privately serviced lots? I understand that rural home owners may have adequate land for coach houses on privately serviced lots. At the same time, regulations must ensure that privately serviced urban lots are guaranteed regulations that protect the water quality and quantity.

How will maximum height be measured on slopping lots? It should be measured on how the grading was approved initially. Drainage is a concern. 2 storeys should not be allowed.

Supports basement in a Coach House

Should be 800sq ft total. And the 40% should be reduced to 30%
There should be a minimum unit size for small bungalows - comments: I was surprised, then, to discover the draft recommendation regarding coach houses in Ottawa fails to deliver, in whole or part, on every one of these points. The Ontario government, when passing the Strong Communities through Affordable Housing Act, did not intend coach houses to be exclusive to the very rich. Yet this draft aims to make construction foolishly impractical for anyone not in a mansion on an estate lot. The absurdity of the document finds its peak on page 16, where a typical house is depicted at 4822 square feet((!!)) and situated on a parcel of land three times bigger than a normal urban lot. Houses built up to 1975, which includes most of intra-Greenbelt Ottawa, had an average size of 1050 square feet. In this document, even the smallest example house (on page 12) is over 1800 square feet, nearly twice that 1975 benchmark. I'm not sure where Ottawa's planners are living, that they envision a "normal house" and a six-bedroom villa springs to mind. Back here in Ottawa, there are thousands of houses like mine. My lot is 60x45' with a two-storey, three-bedroom house of very ordinary layout. These proposed regulations would permit a one-storey coach house with a footprint of 293 square feet. That leaves 255 square feet of living space after subtracting exterior walls. By way of comparison, a parallel parking spot in Ottawa has a regulated minimum area of 216 square feet. This proposal is far too strict and does not reflect the expressed desires of Ottawa's taxpayers or the Ontario legislature. The document says a coach house should be "clearly ancillary to the principal dwelling." I totally agree! And it's possible to achieve that without limiting most of the urban core to a tiny box containing just a bed and prison-style toilet. A more sound and egalitarian proposal would make 600-square-foot coach houses possible in all but extraordinary cases. This would entail meaningful relaxations of limits regarding height, footprint, driveway relocation, and corner lot setbacks.

I do find the responses very interesting, especially around a significant number of recommendations to permit these in the Rural regions as well... I do have a concern that it is not treating all Rural residents with the same luxury of these units, by limiting it to those on Communal or City services only, I'm not sure what the number is but I would bet that over 50% of Rural residents in the city limits are on Well and Septic or Municipal Water and Septic not on community services, and therefore wouldn't be allowed these Coach Houses. Surely, large septic systems with double tanks and or holding tanks would suffice, as well as Water wells, especially on lots of more than 1.98 acres. We would appreciate to stay on the mailing list and participate in the next steps. We inquired about created a second dwelling on our property, and were never informed about the Coach House proposed changes and were told the only option was a granny suite for now more than 2 years occupation. We fall into the aging population with a 29 and 12 year old at home and were looking for a way to build a small dwelling that our son could occupy until we retire and then we would move into the Coach House, our property is just over 2 acres and on well and septic...from what I've just read and City house on a 30' lot could possible add a Coach house, yet our property which is on a much larger lot of 295' x 301' would not??
- Coach house must not eliminate a required parking space for the principal dwelling unit/Coach House dwelling must share the parking area and yards provided for the principal dwelling unit/no new driveway may be created/No parking is required for a Coach House dwelling, but where provided, parking must be in conformity with the parking provisions of the by-law, and must not be located in the front yard. – I found this section confusing, please clarify. What if all the available parking spaces are used and there is a need for a parking space for the individual(s) in the Coach House

- I read the paper on Coach Houses and wanted to comment that I am supportive of the idea. It’s a great way to get infill going

- First, I’ve seen some existing houses with large lots where the lot has been split in half, then someone builds a full sized house on the second half, effectively building two full sized houses on a single lot. With this being a currently possible situation, it seems inappropriate that the couch house would be limited to 40% of the footprint of the main dwelling.

- Regarding the rear yard coverage maximum of 40%, again, this seems inappropriate with this other situation in place.

- The first example you use is a typical lot in Hintonburg - 8 x 30m. These are very small lots already and people have been concerned for some time about the loss of rear yards and the massing of some of the new buildings. There should be a minimum lot size required - much larger than the 8 x 30 metres in your proposal.

- The setback of 0.5m on both sides and 0 at the back would impact neighbouring properties

- Concern expressed that density limits do not apply

- The Infill II guidelines were looking at the lack of backyard space- this seems to run counter to that initiative. I still have not had a reply to that question - other than they are 2 different initiatives. But they conflict.

- Support for permitting Coach Houses - this will increase property value

- Overall, I am very pleased with the guiding principles and recommendations included in the Paper. As noted in the summary, the consultation has thus far indicated widespread support for the Coach House project, and I think that staff's recommendations to Council should emphasize flexibility in the zoning and other regulations in order to encourage this form of intensification in a way that works for our citizens.

- My second general comment relates to existing structures. Some coach houses may end up being built on existing accessory structures. In our city's older neighbourhoods, these buildings may be legally non-conforming or otherwise out of step with current rules (setbacks, etc.). Given that these same neighbourhoods offer some of the best opportunities for intensification, I would urge city staff to consider providing guidance in their final report to council that addresses how the rules would be applied to existing structures. As I noted above, the setback requirements could pose significant challenges in smaller lots in the downtown core. I would encourage staff to recommend flexibility on these requirements, whether that is through the regular committee of adjustment process or another development process. One suggestion would be that existing buildings be allowed to retain their current footprint regardless of the setback rules, without having to apply for an adjustment.
My other comment relates to servicing. While I understand the underpinnings behind principle 5 and its related provisions, I am concerned that this may be unduly burdensome in certain cases. For example, in the case of a corner lot (as depicted on p. 16 of the Paper) if the depth of the lot is long, extending water and sewage through the principal dwelling and yard to the coach house could be much less efficient than providing that access from the intersecting street, and would greatly increase the disruption of constructing the coach house. In addition, such a setup could have significant impacts on home insurance rates, as long lines could increase the possibility of sewage backups or blocked water access. Given that the proposed amendment to the Official Plan (on p. 10 of the paper) already prohibits severing a coach house from the main property, I suggest that staff recommend certain flexibility for the servicing of the coach house.

I fully agree that coach houses should not negatively impact streetscape or neighbourhood character. I also note, however, that the Paper explicitly recommends 2 storey coach houses when placed over an existing accessory structure. Given that principle 4 states that there should be "no undue adverse impact on adjacent development with regards to matters such as privacy, shadowing and overlook" - I encourage staff to recommend flexibility on this matter for two storey coach houses.

Hi I had been following this last year through the initial questionnaire & the corresponding Discussion Paper. My concern here is the draft study recommendations that dismisses without explanation the ability to construct Secondary Dwelling Units or Coach Houses on rural properties & farms that are serviced by privately owned wells & septic systems (page 11). This approach contradicts what was presented in last year’s discussion paper where we were assured that rural properties would be included with the additional caveats of having to show proof that wells & septic systems met the standards for capacity and sizing. These added requirements made & still make sense to me. What doesn’t make sense is why Ottawa Recommendation has reversed this on us. Can you please explain what lead to the reversal of allowing rural residencies to be included in this new zoning by-law & whether proposed new by-law will have wording to exempt the rural property owners that already have secondary Dwelling Units constructed.

I agree with coach houses being allowed to be built on city serviced lots but I also want to see that option extended to the rural villages and areas. We live in Manotick and many of the properties, some over an acre, could certainly sustain another small residence. Septic systems should not be a problem as they are all rated based on bath and bedrooms and the rules would continue to apply.

It is very important to allow seniors to continue to live in their community. This could reduce the stress and financial strain on families needing to assist aging parents. It would also allow "starter homes" for young people who also preferred to live in their home community.

A Coach House dwelling unit is not permitted on a lot serviced by a private well and septic system. I believe this section should be expanded to take into consideration and specify the minimum lot size. I live in the rural City of Ottawa and have a private well and septic system but also have 97 acres and don’t feel it will affect the water quantity, water quality and capacity constraints for private septic systems and possible increased nitrate loading if the conditions are to only allow a one time coach house.

In an aging farming community it is not uncommon but economical for the family to stay and
I have explored the potential for designing coach houses with several prospective clients. Our preliminary work using the proposed revision to the zoning bylaw has resulted in every project being terminated due to the insufficient floor area of an allowable coach house (derived from the proposed 40% of primary dwelling footprint). If the City of Ottawa is to make significant strides toward its goals of intensification through bylaw provisions allowing coach houses, then such provisions should allow a detached secondary dwelling with a footprint greater than 40% of the primary dwelling. I suggest 60% as a more realistic limit, or an allowance for 2 story buildings on a footprint of only 40%

Appreciate knowing maximum square feet the coach can be + will the city of Ottawa purchase the lands and lots and the coach homes, can the housing stabilizing work for low and moderate income persons, for rental and homeownership.

"It appears that your home has footprint of approximately 26 feet by 32 feet, or 832 square feet. The proposed by-law would allow a coach house dwelling no greater than 40 percent of the footprint of the principal dwelling. Therefore, the maximum floor area of a coach house on your property would be 333 square feet. Although there is a possibility that my interpretation of the proposed bylaw may not be correct, or that the proposed bylaw may be amended, it appears that you would not be able to achieve your project goal in terms of secondary dwelling unit size." Are you able to comment on this? The reason we ask is, if the City is planning to go ahead with the 40% of the footprint of the principal dwelling, we will not be participating in this initiative. We do have enough yard space to house a bigger secondary unit but our home itself is a modest size. If you stick to 40% you are severely limiting applicants, as only very large homes would be allowed to build coach houses that would be viable living quarters. This also negates your objective to provide means of affordable housing for home owners and renters, as the only people who would be able to build an adequate secondary dwelling would in fact, already be wealthy enough to have a home that has enough square footage. For example, a 1400 square foot primary residence would only allow for a 560 square foot secondary residence! Also, if you objective is to promote infill development as a step toward improving the dynamism of our urban places and toward improving the overall sustainability of the environments, and minimizing urban sprawl, then you need to take this by-law into account when pertaining to city lots. A lot that could house a 1400 square foot home and a 560 square foot residence would be quite large for a city lot. Our question then is this, what is the city's stand on this bylaw? Does it make a difference if we attached the secondary unit as an addition to the house? Does it then qualify as coach house or instead as a secondary attached dwelling? Why is it that the City allows contractors/developers to build massive duplexes that are three stories height, that fully occupy lots (that are the same size as ours that once had a small home) but inhibit others with bylaws from building a 600 square foot 2 storey coach house? If the duplexes are allowable, how is a coach house potentially problematic due to it's size and height? This discrepancy doesn't really make sense to me. Are you able to explain? It seems that if we really wanted to comply with the City's current bylaw and build affordable housing, we would tear down our home and build a 3 story apartment building instead... That would make a neighborhood of apartment complexes. These current bylaws seem to support wealthy industry and not necessarily residents of the neighborhood. We recognize that this is process. We were really excited about this initiative as it has worked very well in other progressive cities. However, from our
perspective, as individuals who would be working with these by-laws, it very inhibiting. We know that you want to see the success of this initiative as much as we do. We’d love to hear your thoughts on the matter Emily. It will be a determining factor in whether or not we choose to proceed.

- Thank you for all of the good work on your Coach Houses: Guiding Principles and Draft Recommendations Paper. Overall we applaud the policy direction and the clarity of the draft language for the proposed amendments. The Draft Recommendations Paper does a very good job of conciliating various perspectives on this policy issue.

- I have one minor technical language point regarding the draft bylaw amendment as it pertains to semi-detached lots. This is because not every semi-detached dwelling unit is on its own lot. Often in the city of Ottawa more than one semi-detached unit is situated on one extra large lot. Does the current draft amendment mean that in situations where multiple semi-detached dwelling units are on one lot and one of these semi-detached dwelling units already has a secondary dwelling unit in its basement that none of the neighbors can have coach houses in their back yards? If this is indeed the case, may I make a recommendation that the draft wording be slightly adjusted, perhaps along the lines of: Throughout the city of Ottawa there are situations where two or more semi-detached homes are technically on one lot.* These tend to be older stock two story homes which are less suitable than ground floor coach houses for an aged family member and/or a family member with a disability. Currently the state of the law allows for one secondary dwelling unit within each one of these semi-detached homes regardless of the number of semi-detached homes on the lot; these tend to be in the basement and are therefore less conducive to two groups that the provincial coach house legislation is directed to assisting. Grateful if the City could please address this one technical omission, as it will have a real impact on real people whom the legislation is meant to assist, as well as others. I applaud your work on the Coach House file as it will lead to improvements in affordable housing, reduced health care costs, reduced welfare costs, increased density and more humane accommodation for the elderly and persons with disabilities.

- I own XXX in Sandy Hill. It is a registered duplex (up/down) freestanding property with a garage off a common lane-way in the backyard. I’ve often dreamed about building on top of the garage and adding a suite. As I read the material online I am a bit confused if I could apply to build a coach house atop the garage facing into the laneway. Also am I restricted to the current footprint (~19’ x 19’) or can I build larger. As you can see it is also offset on the property at an angle to allow parking - could the second level cantilever out to square this off (and add cover bike parking underneath)? Lastly as I understand it if I was to add a basement suite to my existing building, thus making it a triplex, I would not be eligible for the coach house? even though there is 4 parking spots and there is no exterior change to the structure (except egress windows).
• I must confess that I am surprised that these dwelling would not be allowed on residential properties serviced by well and septic systems. It appears that a rural property could easily meet all of the principles except the one for servicing and I fail to see the reasons for excluding these properties on that basis. There is no good reason why a well or a septic system could not service a Coach House as well as the primary dwelling. According to the Discussion Paper and Questionnaire Summary, it appears that there is support for such dwellings in rural areas. Indeed, this type of structure would help significantly in situations where seniors want to remain in their own community adjacent to their families. A Coach house in a rural area would have less impact on adjacent neighbours in terms of privacy and shadowing impacts.

• My question now becomes. Is a communal system saying that a coach house must share Septic and well with the primary residence thus communal. Or does this completely stop anyone that has a private well and septic system from having a coach house. If the intent is to stop anyone having septic and well from having a coach house I would have to suggest this as short sited on behalf of the City. When we look at the area the city covers and that availability of space that is available for coach houses, it becomes clear that number of rural estate lots that are in the city that could easily accept a coach house without effecting neighboring properties, snow removal, existing parking or transportation routes, water and sewer availability is vast and affordable housing and intensification could be achieved with little to no City Infrastructure changes.

• We believe that coach houses should be permitted on rural properties as well as farms within the boundaries of the city of Ottawa. To exclude rural properties would be to disadvantage rural property owners and farmers to whom additional income from such secondary dwelling units can sometimes be the difference between success and failure.

• We also believe that regulations should be drafted which permit both secondary dwelling unit and in-home apartment. Don’t make it either/or because if you do, you will not only unnecessarily restrict the supply of affordable housing, you will return Ottawa to the situation that existed before second units were allowed within existing dwellings where many such apartments were both illegal and unsafe.

• I have read the draft regs and have some questions/comments. The footprint of my home is 24 by 33 on a 35 x 95 corner lot. In feet. Seems under the draft I would be able to build 300 sq ft approx over my detached garage. I see Vancouver base size on lot size. Not house footprint Are the Ottawa draft regs an incentive to over development? IE expand my house and get a bigger coach house? Could it not just be based on lot size. I ask this because I wish to build about 450 sq feet over my detached garage on a corner lot. Which will have less impact on neighbours than many of the development in Old Ottawa South to date. Am I correct I can't do under draft regs? It seems in my case(I'm asking) that over building my house is my option. Maybe we can have an either or clause and lot size only be an option for coach houses. Look forward to hearing from you.

• I just read about the questionnaire on coach houses that the city posted last year. I never heard of it at the time and wish to submit my comments. I am against coach houses for the following reasons: Ottawa should wait and let other municipalities try them first and see how they pan out. Why be the guinea pig?
1. If a coach house is built in a backyard that means that the neighbours on either side will lose their privacy if the windows overlook their gardens. Some coach houses would block out the sun from a neighbours garden. This is already a big problem with the additions and monster houses that are replacing older homes.

2. With intensification in Ottawa we are already losing green space and coach houses will mean an even greater loss of green space and thus fewer birds and other wildlife. I despair when I see so much land be covered over with structures and patios and wonder hoe the rain gets into our land!

40% the size of the main house can be quite large. I think this is pushing intensification too far.

I live in the Glebe and see how developers can destroy the streetscape and it is done for profit not for the common good.

Request to reduce D/C's to $2,500 across retrofits and purpose built units

Allowing CH on private services should be the owners responsibility to prove adequate water and septic can be provided

Allowing only one unit seems to succumb to intensification. Intensification is needed in downtown areas, remember that our downtown communities used to house many more people. These units are considered low impact forms of housing. Both should be permitted on a lot. In R3 and R4 neighbouroods densities are meant to be higher, new zoning should encourage the max number of units possible in any combination of orientations so long as they conform to zoning envelopes

A CH should be allowed on any residential lot which can comfortably fit it and meet the ZBL provisions. Why just limit CH's to singles and semi's? The City can benefit from a CH on a lot regardless of the type of residential use on the land.

All references to streetscape character should be removed. This term is only applicable to Infill By-law areas and is confusing.

The mature neighbourhoods bylaw only allows for one walk way in a front yard. This would not allow an additional walk way to be added for a CH. These provisions need to be revised.

The max size of a CH should be limited to the permitted area of a primary dwelling NOT the existing area. For 2 storey CH's part of the ground floor should be able to be used as livable area (if the garage is smaller).

2 storeys should be allowed everywhere, on retrofits or new structures, on any location within the setbacks.

If an existing garage can be renovated to allow for a CH, they should be able to do so. Would the city respect the non-conforming status of an existing accessory building if it's size, location, etc were to be replaced with a CH?

Setbacks should be more flexible. Allow for all ranges of setbacks to protect existing gardens, sunlight a special tree, etc. If the City were to require a privacy fence then setbacks for a 1 storey dwelling are a non-issue.
I was all for these until it was changed, not to include them in the rural areas. We have a large rural lot and feel this would be great for my dad. The truth of the matter is that the city dumps more sewage into the river in a year than all the homes in the rural area put together with up to date systems. My brother has a farm with 1,300 acres and is not allowed to put a second house on it, inside the city limits on Trim road, not even for hired help! Something does not seem right or fair to me

While the RPCA acknowledges the provincial requirements to expand access to secondary dwelling units on a property, we have concerns with the current proposal for allowing secondary dwelling units in accessory structures. We feel there are a relatively high number of lots within our community that have the potential for one of these types of coach houses. We have also been contacted directly by a number of residents who have great concerns with this proposal. As noted in the discussion paper, secondary dwelling units can be a good way for property owners to supplement their income given the high price of housing and, therefore, increasing property taxes. We see this as an indication of potential popularity in developing these types of structures. As you are no doubt aware, any distinctive change to the nature of a subdivision a generation after it has been planned and constructed is often met with resistance from people who have, over many decades of residence, become accustomed to the look and feel of their neighbourhood. The currently proposed maximum coach house size is certainly a distinct change.

Currently, the largest accessory structure that can be considered on a lot is 55m² (590 ft²), which is fairly large and already fairly contentious. It is roughly equivalent to a four-car garage. The current proposal increases that maximum allowance to 95m² (1020 ft²) provided there is occupancy of the structure. Over a thousand square feet is a very large space. This footprint does not account for the potential of a second floor in certain cases and does not yet seem to include provisions against basements. One thousand square feet can accommodate three bedrooms rather easily. Two thousand using a basement could accommodate six just as easily. In short, a one thousand square foot footprint is easily the size of a small house with significant potential occupancy. This shouldn’t be surprising since this footprint proposal is nearly twice as large as a four car garage. We hope that, based on these concerns, the City will: Limit the footprint of these structures to no larger than what is currently allowed (55m²);

Even at a maximum yard coverage of 40%, compared to the 50% currently allowed for accessory structures, these structures will dominate the rear yard vistas. Not only will they cut off sight lines, they have every potential to impact existing, and in our community well established, trees. It is widely known that infill development has had a negative impact on the urban forest which is already under significant threat from external forces such as the emerald ash borer. Without substantive protection for existing trees, many more will be lost and that greatly impacts the character of a community.
• Occupancy remains a concern for us, be it with respect to parking, traffic, stress on roads and sewers, etc. The bigger the footprint, the greater we foresee the stress. Increased density comes in many forms and we want to ensure that any proposed works do not exceed the design assumptions made for the original construction. While we are aware that densification is a goal for the City, we want to make sure it is done right. We already have had complaints about houses being converted into student residences as new owners seek to convert a family home into a rental income property. In areas where public transportation is easy, it isn’t so bad, but in many parts of our community every extra apartment means an extra car on the road almost all the time and the community just wasn’t designed with that in mind.

• I wish to express my strong objection to a significant ‘change of direction’ that has appeared (since Discussion Paper) in the Guiding Principles and Draft Recommendations Paper - that now recommends prohibiting Coach Houses in the rural area. Specifically, Principle 5 requires that water and sanitary servicing be provided by way of connections to the services provided for the principal dwelling and that these must be public or communal service systems. This “Principle 5” is extremely heavy-handed, unnecessary, and unreasonably unfair to rural residents who wish to take advantage of the benefits arising from addition of a Coach House to a rural property. At page 19 of the earlier Discussion Paper (under “Rural Properties”) it was stated that: “ …. Rural properties with private septic would therefore be required to meet the standard for capacity and sizing of a new Coach House through this office. Regarding water capacity, generally an engineer report of an existing well’s capacity or a new well’s water flow would be required to ensure that the Coach House can be adequately serviced with water. This would be a requirement upon obtaining a Building Permit for a Coach House...” That approach appeared to appropriately recognize that such additions (where the property was on private well/septic) would have to pass the normal checks-and-balances of the existing Building Permit process. This seemed entirely reasonable. The new “Principle 5,” however, has abandoned any sense of reasonableness towards a rural land owner. The current Building Permit process that is used for Property Development matters incorporates adequate ‘principles’ and procedures to guide the approval for Coach Houses when dealing with Private Wells and Septic. There is no need for further such restrictions for Coach Houses. The Guiding Principles and Draft Recommendations must be amended to permit Coach Houses in the rural area – subject to the checks-and-balances that exist within the current Building Permit process. Furthermore, because of the discussion over different treatment of the Rural Property Owners, this matter must be referred to ARAC prior to it going to Council for discussion.

• I am sending this email in support of allowing the construction of new or conversion of existing buildings into what is termed "coach house". My husband and I are searching out a rural property where we plan on building a house and a separate detached garage with potential for living space above it for my son should he decide to live on our new property

• Since the property would be rural and not serviced by city sewer or water, it would be necessary to service the external building by septic and well. Since the City of Ottawa has taken over a large rural area they have been infringing on the country way of life. Allowing for coach houses in residential areas serviced by sewer and city water but not in the rural area that require a well and septic would be discriminatory. I don’t see any common sense in not allowing it for rural areas as well. You must allow for coach houses in rural areas serviced by well and septic in any new zoning by law regarding them.
The municipal and provincial direction is wonderful, I just wish for it to capture fully this opportunity for a homeowner to both have a coach home, and a secondary dwelling unit. I'm happy to meet and discuss with yourself or others on this point if helpful. I truly feel its important enough we don't miss this opportunity, and that we explore it fully. I'm requesting that we permit the allowance of coach houses where secondary dwelling units already exist or that both may co-exist. Existing homeowners with secondary dwelling units are already competent in dealing with tenancy, and providing affordable housing for others. I don't believe the provincial mandate was such as to restrict the density increase in this manner, as it would impact the basis of the initiative, which is to add more affordable housing. Especially that you'll find some homes with significant rear yards, or excess yards, that will be caught up in this, when they would be perfect candidates by any level of evaluation.

I would be the first in line to benefit from this option but we can't because our house is to small to add a "coach house" that would be livable. Because of the 40% limitation our coach house would only be 388sq feet which is to small to event consider even though we have a high lot. So the way I see it, every home owner in our neibourhood in being discriminated because most of us have high lots with houses under 1000 sq feet. Why not replace this rule by; "The secondary dwelling or coach house has to be smaller or not greater in seize than the principle dwelling and not cover more than 50% of the lot on which if is built." This would allow more elderly small home owners such as I to subsidize our income so we can stay longer in our houses. We've been wanting to do something like this for a long time but always been stopped in our tracks by this stupid 40% limitation. I know that this email won't change match but I just had to vent it out. All the members of my community (Cardinal Heights) would greatly appreciate that you at least mention our concern about this 40% regulation to your committee. I have one more question that maybe you can answer. In the case of a bungalow with an attached garage does the garage count as footprint.

It is unfortunate that the general public has not been made aware that the latest version of "Coach Houses - Guiding Principles and Draft Recommendations Paper" discriminates against the city's rural residents by prohibiting Coach Houses in areas that rely on wells and sceptic systems. My reaction to the first Discussion Paper was very positive as I saw Coach Houses as a possible solution for the growing number of seniors in my own community of West Carleton. Many are no longer able to maintain their home in an isolated area and are not able to sell due to the slow real estate market. They would be able to move into a Coach House and have a family member take over their home. One goal of the city's Older Adult Plan is to provide more housing options to meet the needs of seniors and that should include rural seniors but in West Carleton the only seniors' residence we have is no longer reserved for local residents and I am told by one lady who applied to go in there that she would have to wait 2 years. The seniors' situation in West Carleton is growing more desperate each year and with our aging population the situation will only get worse. Cutting them out of this opportunity is like pouring salt on an open wound. Please reconsider your decision and make one based on the needs of rural seniors who want to age in the community where they live for as long as possible.
• Had I heard about the study undertaken by your department on behalf of the City of Ottawa, I would have responded, and my response would have been against the suggestion of secondary dwellings on current properties as outlined. However, since only 436 people of an estimated population of 900,000 residents of the City of Ottawa did answer the survey questions, I believe that I am not alone in missing out on the opportunity to reply to the survey questions asked.

• Limit any size, with no variances allowed. The City of Ottawa is suggesting that these structures be allowed to be 95m² or 1020 square feet; having a larger footprint than many of the houses in this older neighbourhood; a neighbourhood which does have large lots. At present, the largest accessory structure on a lot is 55m² or 590 square feet which is still quite large.

• Allow for one storey, no basement - no exception. Renderings show these secondary structures to be one storey high. It wouldn’t take long before variances allowed for two storeys, if in fact a one structure was all that was supposed to be allowed by the city. A potential second floor would turn the secondary residence into quite a large structure, potentially providing people with the opportunity to create a rooming house (or two-including the main structure) for students as opposed to what could be referred to as a ‘granny flat’. And what about a basement to house a furnace etc.? This would also raise the height of the structure, plus potential for more occupants. There should be no basement or second storey. Provide those affected by these potential secondary structures the opportunity for fair and reasonable input, without having to go to the OMB. The residents of adjacent houses have property rights as well.

• Examine whether additional services will be able to successfully add on to the existing infrastructure. In the insurance policy for this residence, there is an additional cost for ‘high sewer backup area’, neighbours on other streets have suggested that they had to pay extra money to install some equipment for sewer backup protection or pay additional insurance. Would existing services accommodate the additional draw on already over-taxed or over extended services? Will this figure into locations being allowed for coach houses?

• Require underground wiring. Wires for electricity? Cable? Telephone? Pipes or tanks for gas or oil? The main structure will not provide effective heating and cooling sources. A heating and cooling representative noted that for every elbow there is a 10% loss of heat/cool air. Heating with electricity? Not likely. This is Ottawa where it can be very hot and very cold. Set strict parameters and keep them.

• Protect the existing trees. When there is infill housing the first things to go are the trees. What protection will be included for the local trees? Thus far, there isn’t any visible protection with infill across the city. Create a tree maintenance by-law, not one of tree replacement.

• Incorporate rules with regard to on-street parking. Infill housing in centretown, with subdivided, thus smaller lots, ensure that it is difficult to find on-street parking. (Then up go the proliferation of restricted parking signs.) If there is a secondary structure, include on-site parking as a requirement.
The greatest concern is regarding the proposed maximum size of the coach houses and its impact on the environment. A maximum size of 40% of the footprint of the primary home up to a maximum of 95 square metres (1,000 sq ft) is too large for a coach house to be built in an urban/suburban Ottawa backyard. Rather, a maximum of essentially half that, 20-25% of the footprint of the primary home up to a maximum of 46 sq metres (500 sq feet) is a much more reasonable size and footprint. I had the experience (as did other small families) of living in a home of 580 square feet for years and it was plenty of space for a modest, fully equipped home, including living room, dining room, full kitchen, 1 roomy bedroom, plenty of storage in 2 separate walk-in closets and 1 full bathroom. Some of my fellow members in my community association have only lived in large houses for decades and were surprised that a complete, comfortably spaced home can be well under 600 square feet, in fact there are much smaller "complete" homes that have everything needed in half that size and are 28 sq metres (300 square feet) in total size.

Our backyards need to have the space for large trees to thrive in order to provide us with their maximum, vital benefits. Most important, healthy trees clean the air we breathe and produce oxygen. According to the World Clean Air Forest Initiative, healthy trees filter out Carbon monoxide, lead, nitrogen dioxide, ozone, particulate matter (smallest lethal particles) and sulfur dioxide. A healthy tree can reduce dust particles in the air by as much as 7,000 particles per litre of air. Ottawa needs more healthy, large trees, not less. However, trees need significant space both above ground and underground in order to thrive. I recently attended the City of Ottawa Urban Forest Management Plan conference (Nov 2015) and according to one of their experts, the largest trees provide exponentially more clean air and other benefits than medium or stunted trees. It is vital not just to have healthy trees, but healthy large, maximum sized trees in Ottawa. I spoke with the City of Ottawa Forestry Services and consulted with the guidelines of the City of Regina - and learnt that 10 metres is the minimum space needed between shade trees (maple, ash, elm, linden, willows, poplar and birch). Forestry Services (Ottawa) also recommends that ideally large trees be at least 10 metres away from building (coach house) foundations. Other landscaping will need extra space, such as 8 metres between crab apples, cherries, spruce, and any other ornamental tree species. Smaller plants, flowers, hedges and shrubs will need more space to be out of the shade of the canopy of the larger trees. Additionally, trees need significant space underground of permeable soil, specifically at least 9 cubic metres for one large tree for the root system, and additional amounts for other trees and landscaping. Please note that 75% of Ottawa's urban tree canopy is on private land, only 25% is on public land. Therefore, preserving and increasing trees on private land needs to be a priority of the City of Ottawa. Therefore, to improve our environment and leave enough space for much needed trees and other vegetation, limiting the size and footprint of the coach houses to a smaller maximum of 20-25% of the footprint of the primary home up to a maximum of 48 square metres (500 sq feet) will greatly help provide needed space for healthy, large trees to thrive. This way, the trees will give us their full benefits of cleaning the air of micro particulate matter and other airborne hazards, storm water reduction, providing oxygen, providing wildlife habitat, noise reduction, energy conservation (shade in summer, screen against wind), and increase the physical and psychological well being of all Ottawans.
The other concern I have regarding coach houses is the likely increase in noise pollution. I encourage the City of Ottawa to take steps to help reduce the noise impact of coach houses. As already mentioned, further limiting the size of coach houses will give a greater buffer against noise and will help reduce this problem. It would also be helpful to require all new built homes, including coach houses (also apartment buildings, indeed all buildings) to be built with materials having superior noise reduction and/or noise absorption qualities. Another, very useful measure would be to strengthen the noise bylaws, such as increase the penalties for violations of the noise bylaws and increase the enforcement of the noise bylaws. Noise complaints need to be dealt with much more effectively. Also, it would be very helpful to lower the noise level standards that would be required to enforce noise bylaws. As we live in a more crowded city, noise pollution will become an increasing problem and neighbours of coach houses, coach house inhabitants, primary home inhabitants and all Ottawans will need greater protection from noise and require more enforceable noise bylaws.

I am the Co-chair of Champlain Park Community Association. We are a Participant in the Ontario Municipal Board case regarding the Infill II By-law. Champlain Park worked intensively - and collaboratively - with the Planning and Growth Management Department in developing this By-law. Having reviewed the current proposal regarding Coach Houses, I see potential for a serious conflict between what is being proposed and the provisions in the Infill II By-law which deal with protection of rear yards. I noted this last fall when I responded to the survey on Coach Houses. Given that there is an active OMB case, and that the Coach House proposal appears to conflict with the intent of the Infill II rear yard provisions, I strongly urge that the Coach House proposal not proceed until after the OMB case is settled, and until these concerns are addressed.

First, the January 2016 Draft suggests preference for single storey coach houses, with exceptions given for lots with access to a public lane. If such a structure is to be built in a back yard, we agree strongly with the requirement for a single storey coach house, and have its maximum height defined as 4.5m - similar to an accessory building. This requirement for single storey in the back yard is because of its impact on the privacy of adjacent neighbours. By restricting structure height to one storey, some privacy concerns are mitigated, and privacy enhancement strategies (such as hedges) remain possible. Please note that we are not alone in our concerns about privacy arising from a new coach house, as your questionnaire (Fall 2015) indicated such was a primary concern of respondents. Also, it is useful to note that single storey structures offer easier (and preferred) access for older people and for those with physical limitations. If one purpose of secondary dwelling units is to offer living options to our growing population including an aging demographic, then single storey units are strongly preferable. Second, we recommend that if a two-storey coach house is allowed on a property, it be restricted to a location which would result in the building being roughly aligned with the houses on the street, with windows appropriately placed in the building to minimize visual intrusions of neighbours’ yards (usually front and back walls, like nearby primary residences). We do not support a new two-storey coach house in a back yard, because of (1) significant loss of neighbour privacy, and (2) loss of natural ground cover for driveway construction to the back yard garage. As urban intensification continues, permeable ground cover will become more valuable for storm water control. Also, the proposed bylaw is intended to focus on increased housing, not on increasing garage space; therefore, encouraging new two-storey coach houses in back yards is expanding the purpose of these structures beyond the Planning Act’s intent. Third, the draft recommendations suggested
options for a two-storey coach house for lots with access to a travelled public lane or adjacent street. In these circumstances, we can see there may be benefits of permitting a two-storey coach house. However, we recommend limiting window placements to address the privacy concerns of adjacent neighbours.

- Finally, we recommend that careful consideration be given to alternative uses that these secondary structures will be put to. Specifically, we request explicit description of permitted and prohibited alternative uses, and how bylaw officers can differentiate between the two when asked to, when, for example, a possibly illegal business is disturbing many neighbours.

- I've reviewed the paper. I would like to know if basements would be permitted? I would like to suggest that basements be permitted.

- Would a rear lane that is green space and not travelled (except for dog walking) allow the coach house to sit on the lot line as example one seemed to suggest?

- In Centretown front yard parking is not desirable and if we give access to construction in our backyards not only are we losing green space we are also encouraging on street parking.

- These are my concerns, I do not have any solution other than maybe for core, already intensified, urban areas there needs to be some form of ban by neighbourhood of were coach houses can be built.

- My concerns in Centretown are of conflict we have in allowing valuable green space to be converted into housing and further no reassurance that this will not be converted into substandard living conditions under the affordable housing banner.

- Only this morning did I become aware of the City's study on changing By-laws to allow the building of “Coach Houses”. As a 65 year old single woman there's much discussion in my family on where I'll spend my senior years and how I will be cared for. As the owner of both sides of a semi-detached house, on a large property and with a sizable detached double garage, it was imagined that converting this garage into a living space for me would be the ideal answer. Over the last 28 years, I have raised five daughters in this family home. One of my daughters and her family live in the house beside me and another daughter would love, at some point, to own my side, the house that they all grew up in. Keeping our family together and knowing that I will be close by and taken care of in my "old age" is our greatest wish. I'm sure there are many other seniors who would greatly benefit from living on the same property as their children and yet maintain some privacy and independence. I sincerely hope that the City agrees and that Coach Housing will be possible in the near future.

- Just want to say that I support the project, and it includes homes in urban and rural area's that have private wells.

- I would like to state my opinion for the Feb. 29 deadline that I do not agree to allow these additions on the lots of single homes. They would crowd the yards and therefore more noise and lack of privacy. I believe that we pay enough taxes to keep the residential zonings as they are.

- I fully support coach houses and am in agreement with the guiding principles as developed.
- My preference is a maximum height of 4.5 M which would allow a potential loft space as well as providing a potentially open roomier feel for an otherwise smaller dwelling. The trade off of an additional 1.5 metres in height is not enough to significantly affect neighbours given the lot setbacks that are proposed.

- In your explanation of Principle Five, you cite that information provided by both the City’s engineering staff and the Rideau Valley Conservation Authority, allow you to conclude that large challenges would result in granting approvals, that undue risk would be created to water quantity and quality, and that private septic systems might not be able to handle increased capacities and that increased nitrate loading may occur. I suggest that this vague terminology and over-simplified logic(?) merely facilitates the City in finding a means to ostensibly justify its goal of disallowing the placement of coach houses in the rural area. Obviously, in the situation where the septic system of a primary residence is not adequately sized to also accept the flow from a coach house, then the property owner could upgrade his or her system (to an adequate capacity). And, the City could include constraints on property size and setbacks to ensure that nitrate loading is adequately controlled. Furthermore, should the coach house be proposed to be connected to a well, either a dedicated well or alternatively the well serving the primary residence, the City could merely require that, prior to granting approval, certain criteria be met, such as: satisfactory well water quality tests and pump tests that demonstrate adequate aquifer capacity. You are requested to keep in mind that some coach houses will be proposed on properties that are 20 or 200 acres in size and in these situations it is very unlikely that water quality (or quantity) or nitrate loading will be a problem with a maximum of two families (one in the primary residence and one in the coach house) residing on such a large property. There are currently enclaves in the suburban and rural areas where houses are situated on 1/3 or 1/2 acre lots and the homes are served by both private wells and septic systems. As such, it is put forth that large rural lots could easily accommodate a primary dwelling and a coach house with an appropriate well(s) and septic system(s). However, I note again that it is effectively obvious from the text of your latest Coach House document that the city, at this time, has no intention of allowing coach houses in the rural area. Accordingly, I do not at-all anticipate that my suggestions will be taken into account. Nonetheless, I once again submit that you give this issue reconsideration and that you modify your approach to the issue of allowing coach houses in the rural area. Doing so, might at least give an appearance that you have taken note that 80% of the respondents to your survey proposed almost the exact opposite of the course upon which you have selected to embark. I would also like to suggest to you that I feel that, in almost any future test situation, it is unlikely that the OMB would support the City’s currently proposed position - which effectively amounts to a blanket prohibition of coach houses in the rural area. Accordingly, it might well be worth the effort to endeavour to attempt to resolve this matter before it grows in both scope and complexity. As I currently reside in the rural area, I hear lots of chatter amongst the neighbours of how the people running the City do not understand the differences between the urban area and the rural area. I must say that after being so surprised at your latest document concerning coach houses, I now feel that I better understand their position.
• The allowable maximum size of the unit, about 1000 square feet, is, we feel, large by the standards both of other residences in the city and secondary units in other jurisdictions. We feel a smaller size, more in line with a one bedroom apartment of about 750 – 850 square feet, would be sufficient to address the stated objective.

• We feel the two-storey height of a unit over a garage is unwarranted (except possibly in the case of the garage being directly on a laneway). The city’s restriction in the normal case to one storey should apply regardless, since the goal of that limitation is to preserve the privacy of neighbors property.

• We are not sure how coach houses will affect parking requirements, especially if a garage can be removed and a coach house erected in its place. Restricting the size of the coach house, so it presents less opportunity for occupancy by a family requiring two or more vehicles should help. In the interests of limiting on street parking, we feel there should be some provision that requires adequate on-lot parking for some number of vehicles, possibly the number of dwelling units plus one.

• We wish to avoid the use of “projections” to provide any increase the size of the structure. It should be clear that the area of any projection is included in calculation of the built area of the structure. particularly in the case of a two storey unit, a “Juliet balcony” or emergency exit should not be permitted to obviate requirements prohibiting glazing.

• Again on the issue of privacy, we would like to see some provision to account for siting of the coach house in the case where the landscape has a significant difference in elevation between neighboring properties. Our concern is that windows on the coach house would have direct sight lines into neighboring back or side yards, or the neighboring houses themselves.

• Garden Suite Footprint: The permitted footprint should be based on the area of the yard in which the Garden sweet is constructed and not based on the footprint of the existing dwelling. Why not apply the same regulations that are applied to accessory structures like detached garages but accommodate slightly larger areas? You can imagine that in the case of a wartime home on a standard size lot, the permitted % area of the principal dwelling may be too small to accommodate the minimum building code requirements for room sizes etc.

• The good points are that the height limit would generally be limited to 1 story and that coach houses would not be allowed if there was an existing accessory building other than a garage under certain circumstances. In some areas coach houses could be a useful addition to living spaces. Can there be a realistic height limit imposed for 2 storey garages that deals with the actual ridge height above existing grade rather than the height at mid roof line which is the current method. This would lead to more reasonable heights for privacy and shadowing concerns. I would also like there to be a realistic maximum height for single story coach houses with the same rational as for the 2 story garages noted in the above point. If you can only have a 7 foot high fence why should you be allowed to build a much higher coach house that could lead to shadowing problems.
A loss of mature trees in inner city areas where even if the tree was on an adjacent property the coach house excavation/construction could irreparably damage the root system/overhanging foliage resulting in the loss of trees in neighbours property (there is no mention of this that I could see even though it is a stated concern and policy of the City’s to preserve mature trees)

Many existing garages are not framed for a second story addition. Would the garage be allowed to be demolished and rebuilt as a 2 story building in the same or a different footprint

Adding coach houses to inner city lots will decrease the amount of green space in inner city areas if the coach houses are allowed to take up the proposed maximum square footage. The larger the house the larger the coach house and corresponding decrease in non permeable surface

No basements were mentioned in the coach house info that I saw. If there is a basement would it be included in the overall maximum square footage. If not why not as it would be costly to do a basement if you were not going to create useful, occupied space

The maximum of 1 meter from the lot line in some circumstances implies that you can build closer to the lot line - if so how do you allow for property maintenance? Should this not be a minimum rather than a maximum

Re Definition for Coach Houses – For clarity, consider: the deletion of the term “Coach Houses” and replace with “ASDU”; add reference to “a self contained single storey residential unit with kitchen and bathroom facilities”; delete “or within an existing accessory building” and provide another terminology and definition for a second unit above a public laneway parking garage

The Guiding Principles for ASDU’s are useful but not complete and not sufficiently tested and vetted. Suggestion: There appears to be a fundamental conflict between the proposed ZBL changes and all of the good intentions and efforts that have gone in to Infill 2 (By-law 2015-228) and the "long semi" setback provisions of Infill 1 (By-law 2012-147). The proposed ZBL changes grossly contradict Principal 4 and By-law 2015-228, which have intent for a private realm in rear yards, with sensitivity to shadowing, site line privacy, overlook, noise, spillover of light, micro-climate conditions and maintaining a “green island” character inside each residential block c/w retention of the urban forest and critical root zone requirements. All of these objectives as well as the related considerations found in the Urban Design Guidelines for Low-rise Infill Housing should be added to Guiding Principles

Re Where Permitted – For clarity, fit and to ensure no undue adverse impact on adjacent lots, consider: in (a) to add “the rear yard character or” after the words “it does not change”; and add a provision stipulating “an ASDU or second unit above a laneway parking garage is permitted only where the lot depth is greater than 33 metres and the lot area is greater than 533 square metres”.

Re Size – For reasonable second unit minimum footprint size, consider: adding a minimum footprint size of 33 square metres
• Re Height – • A base for height measurement is not indicated. Consider building height base measured in a similar manner as per By-law 2012-147: Building height must be measured using the existing average grade. Existing average grade for an AUDU must be calculated prior to any site alteration and based on the average of grade elevations taken along both side lot lines at the rear lot line, and at the minimum required rear yard setback of the zone in which the lot is located.
  • A maximum height for one storey ASDU is not indicated. The floor of an ASDU need not be higher than 0.4 m above existing average grade; the top plate of the wall need not be higher than 2.5 m; and the distance from the wall top plate to the top of a flat roof or the mid-point of sloped roof need not be more than 0.9 m. Consider 3.8 m to be the maximum ASDU height.
  • A maximum height for a second unit above a laneway parking garage is not indicated. The parking garage floor should not be much higher than grade. Allowing for a short ramp up from grade, the garage floor need not be higher than 0.2 m above existing average grade; the top plate of the wall need not be higher than 2.5 m; the insulated 2nd floor assembly need not be more than 0.3 m; the top plate of the wall need not be higher than 2.5 m above the floor assembly; and the distance from the wall top plate to the top of a flat roof or the mid-point of sloped roof need not be more than 0.9 m. Consider 6.4 m to be the maximum height for a second unit above a laneway parking garage

9. Re Location Within a Detached Garage – The proposed wording does not reflect the intent. Although parking garages are more often than not just storage spaces for items other than parking vehicles; and although By-law 2012-147 does not require a parking; and although virtually all municipalities who have proposed or have enacted zoning by-laws pursuant to the Planning Act directive regarding ancillary second unit have regulated an additional parking spot for the second unit, this proposed ZBL provision explicitly indicates the parking garage need not be retained for vehicle parking. This is to say a two storey ancillary dwelling unit is permitted. Consider the exasperating incompatibility of this provision for lots on public laneway. This two storey provision invites inappropriate intensification. A two storey unit may be workable on very large lots, but certainly not on the typical small OOE lots backing on public laneways

• Re Setbacks – Re Location of Entrance: Suggest defining the term “Travelled Lane”.
  Suggestion: Reconsider a less than 4 m setback, if an entrance doorway faces a travelled lane
• Minimum required setback from front lot line: Although an ASDU must be located in a rear yard, consider a rear yard setback provision for through lots equal to the minimum front yard setback.
• Minimum required setback from a corner side lot line: Consider, for at least discussion purposes, By-law 2012-147 and By-law 2015-228 corner side yard setback provisions.
• Maximum rear and side yard setbacks: The proposed maximum setbacks do not address private realm compatibility criteria, nor constructability, maintenance and, in the case of laneway ASDU’s, snow storage. Consider deleting maximums and analyze regulations that fit for various urban, suburban and rural lot sizes.
  Suggestions – min 2.4 m setback from principal dwelling; min 2.0 m setback from a rear yard public laneway, if no windows (Note: By-law 2012-147 parking reg for lanes); min 4.0 m setback from rear lot line and interior lot line, if windows; and no part of a wall or roof may be located above a 45 degree angular plane projecting upwards from the rear or side property lines, at the elevation 1.5 m above existing average grade, towards the rear yard. (Note: the
1.5 m above existing average grade is approximately the height of a standing adult’s eyes and approx 0.6 m below the max height of a fence.)

- Re Permitted Projections: Agree with no rooftop amenity. Consider reviewing the balconies, decks, stoops, landing, platform and step projection provisions. (Note: the By-law 2015-228 privacy considerations for bay windows and separate decks.)

- Re Minimum Access Route: Consider increasing the unobstructed 1.2 m wide access to 1.5 m, so as to allow for a future fence installation adjacent to a property line. Also consider a driveway obstructed by a vehicle, which cannot be moved in the case of an emergency and therefore may be obstructing the unobstructed 1.2 m wide access.

- 15. Re Parking, Yards and Driveways: The City’s “no parking required” for less than the first 12 residential units will be straining the availability of on-street parking in several neighbourhoods, including those in OOE. On review of numerous other municipal second unit provisions, there does not appear to be any that do not require one additional off-street parking space for the second unit. Important consideration and suggestion: For each and every neighbourhood, the City must scrutinize the negative impacts of the “no parking required” provisions.

- Support for allowing Coach Houses. there is a definite lack of affordable living space (apartments, etc.) for seniors in our area. My parents are on a waiting list for the seniors’ apartments in Osgoode and Metcalfe, and have been on the list for about two years … and, let’s be honest, I don’t put much into their chances of getting one of these units since there are so many people in the same position as my parents.

- Regarding proposed limitations on the placement of coach houses located on private services. Where Not Permitted: A Coach House dwelling unit is not permitted on a lot serviced by a private well and septic system”. The former RMOC and most of the rural lower tier municipalities supported a similar initiative in the 1980’s and 90’s with the installation of independent granny flats. Due to zoning restrictions prohibiting multiple dwellings on most properties an agreement was required to be registered on title and renewed at 10 years intervals. The program benefitted rural residents by allowing extended family members to remain in close proximity. Servicing was not an issue provided the proponents could satisfy Ontario Building Code requirements for water supply and sewage system capacity. Considering the proposed restrictions on the size of the coach houses, meeting the requirements on private services would not be prohibitive, particularly where most units would encompass one bedroom and 1 full bathroom. Restricting the installation of coach houses to properties solely on the basis of availability of municipal services ignores the success of past programs and essentially deprives rural residents of the same opportunity as their urban and sub-urban counterparts.
• Where coach houses are developed along laneways, we need to make room for trees and breathing spaces between buildings. We don’t want to repeat the early laneways which were tight, repetitive and without any green. Where it is new construction on a laneway, ensure there is sufficient room between the coach house and laneway to include landscaping, such as flower boxes, shrubs or small trees. Consideration should also be given to ensure there is sufficient room for on-site snow storage.
• Allowing sufficient space between the existing building and the coach house for private outdoor amenity space for both dwellings as well as enough room to plant a tree if wished. This is mentioned briefly in Principle 2 which might be further explored and expanded to determine how much space is sufficient.
• To ensure that existing fencing or living hedgerows between lots are not compromised as a result of coach house development. Principle 4 touches on this however we think it should be further developed. A minimum, not a maximum setback would better protect any existing fencing or hedges.
• To ensure that neighbouring side and rear yards are not overshadowed or visible from upper windows (reducing privacy) as a result of the coach house being too high or too close to the property line. Principle 4 might be further expanded to include this point.
• Finding ways to encourage preservation of existing mature trees in rear yards where coach houses are to be developed. In the light of our emerging urban forest policy, this point might be further developed and explored with forest policy staff. You may wish to add another principle to address this issue.
• Encouraging an improvement (rather than a detriment) to existing streetscapes and neighbourhood landscaping as a result of coach house development, through improved architectural detailing, additional tree planting and improved general landscaping in laneways and rear yard amenity spaces. This may require an additional principle
• We recommend the size in relation to the available space be re-examined to ensure there will be a suitable sized yard remaining for private amenity use, landscaping and potential tree planting. Example 3 layout would be particularly problematic for these considerations, even though the available rear yard coverage is only 35%. We suggest a minimum setback be determined from the rear of the main building to the nearest coach house wall or driveway. The City of Vancouver guidelines below show in some detail their recommended setbacks between buildings, including a reduced footprint where trees are to be preserved
• Height – additional text and provisions could address overshadowing and privacy
Setbacks – We recommend removing the maximum rear and interior (side) yard setbacks of 1m (where no windows are proposed on the rear wall, or where the rear lot line abuts a lane). The proposed maximum will compromise fencing, hedgerows, neighbouring trees and is likely to exacerbate the visual impact on neighbours as well as reduce neighbourhood tree cover. If the wall is to be constructed a maximum of 1m from the property line, excavations for foundations will extend beyond the setback and will certainly destroy fencing, trees and shrubs along the property line and possibly even encroach onto neighbouring property. Any building projections or roof overhangs would also encroach on neighbouring property. It may also affect drainage patterns. The proposed maximum setback of 1m to the rear laneway will remove any chance of tree planting or other landscaping in the laneway. This could be resolved by replacing the maximum setbacks with minimums. In the case of the North Vancouver example below, there is a minimum setback of 1.22m between the coach house and the side lot lines for a one storey coach house, and 2.44m for a two storey. The minimum building separation between the coach house and the principal house, including porches and balconies is 6.07m and the minimum setback to a rear lot line or laneway is 1.52m for one storey, or 3m for a two storey.

PRINCIPLE 5 - SERVICING: Your decision to not to allow Coach Houses on lots with private services (well and septic) is unwarranted and discriminatory. Most urban lots with private services are much larger than lots serviced by public/community service systems (Our lot, like many in our Greely West subdivision, for example, is a half acre with more than enough space to accommodate a properly sized Coach House). It also seems to me that the excuse given by City's engineering staff ("challenges to allow for this would be significant from a review and approval perspective") simply tells me that they are not up to doing, or do not want to do more, of what they are hired to do...aw, schucks, more work, eh! The RVCA reasoning is also without merit...if the addition of Coach House requires a separate well dug or a larger capacity septic system then, the homeowner should be permitted to install such upgrades. You should know, of course, that the RVCA is responsible for inspecting septic systems and ensuring compliance with the current regulations and Building Code. However, since the Golden Rule applies here ("Them that has the gold, makes the rules"), I don't suppose I'll see any movement on this point by the City planners and engineers. 3. PRINCIPLE 5 - SERVICING: Throughout your paper no mention is made of the need to comply with requirements of the building code or for the installation/provision of electrical services or heating services in a Coach House. These are as important as water and sanitary services. 4. PRINCIPLE 5 - SERVICING: In addition to comment 3., no mention is made to any consultation/discussions made with other city organizations, e.g., paramedics, fire&rescue, police, etc. These organizations should be consulted before the policy/regulations on Coach Houses is finalized.
For example, your statement on Setbacks refers to a "Maximum", when, in my view, the term should be "Minimum". In any case, the distances proposed as setbacks are quite frankly too short. If I understand your Example 1 the setbacks include 0.5m ("max. 1 m"), that's about 18". Do you think a neighbour (or firemen/paramedics) would agree to having a building within 18" of their property line? If I was faced with such an issue, I would sue the City and the neighbour for encroachment. Frankly, your Example 1 of a proposed 31.5 m² on an 8x30 m (24' x 90') lot is a rather silly attempt to demonstrate a push for more "intense" "intensification" in the core....since it will only apply to those with City services, i.e., small/standard-sized lots. The proposed Coach House would have dimensions of ~5mx6m (15'x18') or ~3mx10.5m (9'x32')...how is anyone to live/stay in such a small "house", given that they would need "services", etc. (Would a homeowner's cabana adjacent to their swimming pool be defined as a Coach House?).

You would only be inviting a move to developing slums and, I'm sure, irritating those people neighbouring Coach Houses. The best solution would be just to allow homeowners to enlarge their primary house, add-on the required space to accommodate another individual. That would be easier to do than to construct a separate Coach House and have to run essential services (water, sewer, electrical) to an obviously small "house". The issue of setback allowances is also a matter to discuss with officials of the Fire Department/Paramedics/Ambulances. Firemen need sufficient space to allow them (and their equipment) adequate access to structures in case of fire or other emergencies. Paramedics, I'm sure would also be concerned about lack of ease of access to Coach Houses. Your example 2 shows a 1.2m setback (that's about 43")...hardly adequate for firemen/paramedics to easily access the illustrated Coach House.

This impact could be particularly extreme for properties with rear lane access. In these circumstances it would be possible for a property owner to have 6m tall, 2 storey coach houses constructed on all sides of his/her rear yard. While no windows would be allowed to overlook the property if the Coach Houses were built within 1m of the property line, a 6m high blank wall would essentially appear as a solid fence and could severely restrict sunlight, which is likely to have a considerable negative effect on vegetation and trees, and the ability to enjoy one’s rear yard. We are also concerned that the City is considering a "maximum" rather than the more standard "minimum" set-back provisions in certain cases, i.e., where no windows are proposed on side walls or rear walls, the "maximum" rear yard and interior yard set-backs are 1m. Our understanding of the current requirements for interior yard and rear yard setbacks of accessory structures is that a minimum of 0.6m (or 2') is typically required. Such a provision ensures that there is sufficient space on the property owner’s site to allow for construction and maintenance activity. We would expect that at least this much setback would be needed when habitable space is being constructed and maintained. An additional inconsistency is the height allowance of a Coach House, i.e., a fence can be no higher than 7' whereas a Coach House has no height maximum (a maximum of 2 storeys could easily be 6m high).
• We are concerned that Principle 4 of the Guiding Principles for Coach Houses document, which indicates that Coach Houses "will be designed and located to ensure no adverse impact on adjacent development with regards to matters such as privacy, shadowing and overlook", is not being respected with the current recommendations. A single storey Coach House may respect the principle of "no adverse impact", depending on lot size, location, setbacks and height of the structure. However, the potential for a 2 storey Coach House to be built less than 1m from property lines could have significant negative impact on neighbouring properties, in particular, with respect to shadowing.

• Fundamentally there is a conflict between the Coach House proposal, and all of the good intentions and effort that has gone in to Infill 2, most particularly the idea of a private green island inside each residential block.

• Please share my comments. I think this is a wonderful project.

• I support coach houses – there is an good example in the urban area built at the back of a house on the North side of Waverley street between Bank and O'Connor Streets. I think it charming – particularly an benefit to housing perhaps an elderly person(s) or single person. It is evident older parts of the urban area of the City do not have sufficient affordable housing. Building affordable coach houses would allow elderly persons, to be closed to services, facilities, shopping, health care and perhaps safe walking for those who have mobility and accessibility issues. This is not to the exclusion of other ages but as a contribution to our society. I understand the City of Ottawa has joined in with other with the purposes of becoming an elderly friendly city. Coach house may provide our city with – the opportunity of building affordable housing by permitting the construction of allowing coach house to be built. I can see the benefits on my street as a means of accommodating our elderly McGillivray street in Old Ottawa East where I live there are 3 elderly couples (one couple now in their 80s, another in their late 70s), 3 elderly seniors (2 women and 1 man) within a block radius.

• PRINCIPLE 5: I believe that a blanket ban on the installation of any coach housing on lots with private water, septic or both is too simplistic a solution. To support such a principle because "the challenges to allow for this would be significant from a review and approval perspective and would create undue risks related to water quantity, water quality and capacity constraints for private septic systems and POSSIBLE (emphasis mine) increased nitrate loading" is excessively simplifying and generalizing the issue while resorting to POTENTIAL issues as an excuse to avoid making the effort to examine applications on a case-by-case basis in order to determine which of them in fact could be benign and therefore permitted. If this principle were in fact valid, how could the City today possibly consider the application to build one more building of any kind anywhere in rural Ottawa? Obviously, that is not the case. More development in rural Ottawa is routinely considered and approved, where appropriate. The same should be the case for Coach Housing. Therefore, I sincerely believe this principle is flawed and recommend it be removed. Clearly, environmental considerations cannot be overlooked for Coach Houses, but a blanket moratorium on the possibility is too extreme and not the answer.

• Opposes the bylaw permitting coach houses in areas with heritage character, such as Rockcliffe Park. Heritage Conservation District Plan for Rockcliffe Park involved consultation and confirming the unique history and character of the community. This is a park-like setting and placing coach houses into existing yards would reduce greenspace, diminishing the defining park-like character of Rockcliffe Park.
• 1 member is not a big fan (of Coach Houses): The member does not like the idea of having a dwelling detached from the existing home and situated in a corner of someone’s backyard. The member prefers to have the City allow for additions to existing dwellings, be it on top of an existing house or attached at the back, but not to allow it to be a separate house in a backyard. The member believes it is a wrong direction for the City to go in because it is going to open up a new can of worms, i.e., allowing people to gain money by renting out the Coach Houses is where the problem will begin. The member believes some people may take advantage of the situation when a principle dwelling is sold and no one has any use for the Coach House going forward -- the member is afraid opportunists will see Coach Houses as money makers and rent them out, thus becoming an illegal rental unit, but will take their chances until they get caught.

• There is an issue specific to Kemp Park, which is the need to ensure the Coach House does not interfere with the natural drainage on the property, and does not negatively impact the drainage on the adjacent properties. Councillor Deans is aware of the drainage issue in Kemp Park. There is not a specific provision about ensuring proper drainage in the proposal.

• The rear yard and interior yard Setbacks should be expressed as minimum requirements not maximums.

• It is possible that a 2-storey Couch House (under Height, pg. 12) could impact both the principle dwelling and adjacent dwellings with respect to privacy and shadowing/sunlight, especially if those dwellings are not also 2-storey homes. The members would appreciate confirmation from the City that the existing principle zoning bylaws would still apply and would prohibit changes that would result in the blockage of sunlight, etc.

• The members would appreciate clarification on the Location of Entrance provision on pg. 13, as it is not clear where the doorway entrance could be positioned on a Coach House if the doorway cannot face or be closer than 4 m of any lot line.
Official Plan Amendment Proposal Summary

File Number: D01-01-15-0002 Date: June 24, 2016
Owner/Applicant: City Initiated Agent/Consultant: City-initiated

Site Location:
The proposed amendments will affect residential lands City wide.

Overview of the Proposed Amendments:
The proposed amendments implement the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing changes to the Strong Communities through Affordable Housing Act which resulted in changes to Section 16 of the Planning Act. These changes require municipalities to develop or enhance policies in their Official Plans to allow secondary dwelling units within single detached, semi-detached and townhouse dwellings as well as ancillary structures.

The City currently allows secondary dwelling units within primary residential use buildings but not within ancillary (accessory) structures. The proposed amendments include an Official Plan amendment to Sections 3.1 and 2.5.2 to allow for detached secondary dwelling units, which will be termed “Coach Houses” in Ottawa.

Official Plan Amendment Summary:

The proposed amendment adds an additional policy to the Official Plan’s “Generally Permitted Uses” to allow Coach Houses as an appropriate form of secondary infill housing. This new policy direction will allow for detached small infill housing, Coach Houses, on existing qualifying residential lots throughout the City. Further, the proposed Official Plan policy includes direction for permitting Coach Houses on privately-serviced lots through a Site Plan Control process. This requirement for Site Plan Control is proposed in order to confirm site servicing arrangements and suitability of a Coach House on privately-serviced lots via a hydrogeological study, as required by Section 5.2.6, Policy 2 (iii) of the Official Plan.

Changes to sections 3.1 and 2.5.2 in respect to Secondary Dwellings Units made by OPAs 140 and 150 will also be repealed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Official Plan Section</th>
<th>Existing Policy</th>
<th>Description of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 3.1</td>
<td>Policy 1</td>
<td>Replace the existing policy on secondary dwelling units in Section 3.1 with a policy that provides for the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Allow either a secondary dwelling unit or a coach house on lots that have a detached, semi detached, duplex or rowhouse dwelling;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Restrict the instances where a coach house can be built on a townhouse lot to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Allow coach houses on urban or village lots that are serviced by a public or communal system; or on rural lots that are 0.8 hectares or greater and are serviced by a private well or septic system, subject to a Site Plan Control application;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Set out criteria through which two-storey coach houses on lots smaller than 0.8 hectares may be considered. Set the maximum height at 2 storeys in such cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Prohibit any future severance of a coach house from the principal dwelling; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Establish a limit of only one additional second unit per residential lot, either a secondary dwelling unit or a coach house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2.5.2</td>
<td>Policy 10</td>
<td>Amend Section 2.5.2 Policy 10 by including Coach Houses as an appropriate type of housing in all parts of the City.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Official Plan Amendment

The Official Plan is hereby amended:

a. Replace Section 3.1, Policy 1 as follows:

“Secondary Dwelling Units and Coach Houses”

1. Where the Zoning By-law permits a detached, semi-detached, duplex or townhouse dwelling, a secondary dwelling unit or a coach house may be established. The Zoning By-law will establish criteria to govern compatibility of these units with the main dwelling and surrounding land uses.

2. Notwithstanding policy 1 above, the following applies:

a. Where a duplex dwelling is permitted by the Zoning By-law, a secondary dwelling unit will only be permitted in a duplex dwelling that existed as of July 17, 2013.

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

c. A coach house will only be permitted where the primary home does not contain a secondary dwelling unit and the primary dwelling is located on:

i. a lot in a public service area and only where public or communal services for both water and wastewater services are currently provided to the main dwelling, or

ii. a lot that is 0.8 ha or greater in size and is located in the rural area or village and where:

• the primary dwelling is serviced by a private water and wastewater system and the coach house will share either the water or wastewater system with the main dwelling; or.

• the primary dwelling is serviced by one public or communal service (water or wastewater) and one private service, and the coach house will share the public or communal service with the main dwelling; and

• A coach house in these situations will be subject to site plan control.

d) A coach house must be smaller than the primary home and the Zoning By-law will set forth the appropriate maximum permitted size.

e) A coach house may not be severed from the lot accommodating the primary dwelling.
f) The Zoning By-law will limit the coach house to a height of one storey for lots smaller than 0.8 ha. An application to consider a height of up to two storeys may be considered in the following circumstances:

i) The coach house faces a travelled public lane and includes a garage, or

ii) The coach house includes a garage, and

iii) The coach house is in no circumstances taller than the primary home, and

iv) 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.

b. Remove Section 2.5.2, Policy 10 and replace with the following:

Secondary dwelling units and Coach Houses in detached, semi-detached, townhouse, and duplex dwellings are permitted in all parts of the city in accordance with Section 3.1.

Implementation and Interpretation

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

Approval Timelines & Authority:
The target date the proposal will be considered by the City’s Planning Committee on Sept 13, 2016 and by Agricultural and Rural Affairs Committee on October 6, 2016.

Further Information:
Please contact the undersigned planner or go to the project webpage at:
www.ottawa.ca/coachhouses

Notification and Submission Requirements:
If you wish to be notified of the adoption of the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments, or of the refusal of a request to amend the official plan, you must make a written request (i.e., return the attached comment sheet) to the City of Ottawa.

If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to the City of Ottawa before the proposed Official Plan amendment is adopted, the person or public body is not entitled to appeal the decision of the Council of the City of Ottawa to the Ontario Municipal Board.
If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to the City of Ottawa before the proposed Official Plan amendment is adopted, the person or public body may not be added as a party to the hearing of an appeal before the Ontario Municipal Board unless, in the opinion of the Board, there are reasonable grounds to add the person or public body as a party.

Please provide any comments to the undersigned planner by July 22, 2016.

Tim Moerman, Planner
City of Ottawa
Planning and Growth Management Department
110 Laurier Avenue West, 4th floor
Ottawa, ON K1P 1J1
613-580-2424, ext.13944
Facsimile: 613-580-2459
tim.moerman@ottawa.ca
Zoning By-law Amendment Proposal Summary

File Number: D02-02-15-0021
Date: June 24, 2016
Owner/Applicant: City Initiated
Agent/Consultant: City-initiated

Site Location:
The proposed amendments will affect residential lands City wide.

Details of Proposed Amendments:
The proposed amendments implement the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing changes to the *Strong Communities through Affordable Housing Act* which resulted in changes to Section 16 of the *Planning Act*. These changes require municipalities to develop or enhance policies in their Official Plans to allow secondary dwelling units within single detached, semi-detached and townhouse dwellings as well as ancillary structures.

The City currently allows secondary dwelling units within primary residential use buildings but not within ancillary (accessory) structures. The proposed amendments include Zoning By-law Amendments to Sections 133 allow for detached Secondary dwelling units, which will be termed Coach Houses in Ottawa.

Zoning By-law Amendment:
The proposed Zoning By-law amendments introduce Coach Houses as a permitted residential use for properties that have a detached, semi-detached, linked detached, duplex or rowhouse dwelling as the primary dwelling on the lot. Changes to Section 133 (Secondary Dwelling Units) will provide the performance standards to allow Coach Houses. Supplementary changes are required throughout the By-law to ensure that existing provisions do not conflict with this new permitted use, including a change to Section 139 to allow for two walkways. The below table provides a summary of the proposed amendments which include new provisions similar in effect to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Amendment</th>
<th>Description of proposed change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Add definition for “Coach House”:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Means a separate dwelling unit detached from a principal dwelling unit located either in its own building or within a building also containing an accessory use and on the same lot as the principal dwelling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclude</td>
<td>Add provision which states that a Coach House is not considered to be an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Provisions</td>
<td>accessory use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibit Coach Houses in the Floodplain</td>
<td>Add provision to prohibit Coach Houses in the floodplain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow Permitted Projections Above the Height Limit</td>
<td>Add provision to allow permitted projections above the height limit for Coach Houses, but exclude roof top amenity areas from all Coach House buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow Permitted Projections into Required Yards</td>
<td>Add provision to allow permitted projections for Coach Houses into required yards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where Permitted</td>
<td>Add a provision to allow a Coach House dwelling on any lot occupied by a detached, semi-detached, linked detached, duplex or rowhouse dwelling, where that dwelling type is a listed permitted use, provided that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the primary home is serviced by a public or communal water and wastewater system and the Coach House must obtain water and wastewater services from the primary dwelling; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- the Coach House is located on the same lot as its principal dwelling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On lots smaller than 0.8 hectares in size, the coach house must be located in the rear yard of the principle dwelling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Despite the above:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In the case of a lot with frontage on both a street and a travelled public lane, the coach house must be located in the yard adjacent to the travelled public lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In the case of a lot with a rear yard less than 5 meters in depth, the coach house can be located in the side yard provided one of the walls of the coach house is on or within 1 metre to the rear property line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• On lots 0.8 hectares or greater and located in the rural area, the coach house may locate anywhere on the lot, subject to the setbacks under the applicable subzone, and may be serviced by a private well or septic system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where Not Permitted</td>
<td>Add a provision to prohibit a Coach House on privately serviced lots in the urban area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Number</td>
<td>Add a provision to only allow a maximum of one Coach House dwelling unit per principal dwelling unit. A Coach House cannot be located on a lot where the principal dwelling also has a secondary dwelling unit, garden suite or any rooming units within the principal dwelling on that lot.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Maximum | Add a provision to restrict the maximum size of a Coach House as follows:
Size

The coach house must not:

a) have a footprint exceeding 40% of the footprint of the principle dwelling unit on the lot

b) exceed a lot coverage of 40% of the yard in which it is located

c) exceed a footprint of 95 m²

If the primary home is less than 100 m² in footprint, a coach house of up to 50 m² is permitted, and must not exceed 40% of the yard in which it is located.

Footprint Size

Add a definition for footprint, as follows:

**Footprint** means the area of the ground floor of a building, measured from the exterior of the outermost walls, including an attached garage but excluding any projections or accessory buildings.

Maximum Height

Add a provision to restrict the maximum height of a Coach House as follows:

In the urban and village areas:

1) maximum height not to exceed the building height of the existing primary dwelling; and

2a) where no basement is provided, maximum height of 3.6 metres; or

2b) where a basement is provided, maximum height of 4.0 metres, with maximum height of the outer walls not to exceed 3.6m.

In the rural area outside of village areas:

1) maximum height not to exceed the building height of the existing primary dwelling; and

2a) where the living area of the coach house is entirely located on the second storey above a detached garage, maximum height of 6.1 metres; or

2b) in all other cases, maximum height of 4.0 metres.

Setbacks: Rear lot line in the urban area

Add a provision to establish a maximum rear yard setback of 1 metre, for lots in the urban area, where no windows are proposed on the rear wall or where the rear lot line abuts a lane.

Setbacks: Interior lot line in the urban area

Add a provision to establish a maximum interior yard setback of 1 metre, for lots in the urban area, where no windows are proposed on the wall.

Setbacks: Corner side lot line

Add a provision to require a minimum required setback from a corner side lot line to be the same as for the principal dwelling.

Setback: Rear lot line

Add a provision to require a minimum rear yard setback of 4 metres where transparent windows are proposed on the rear wall, except for a rear lot line.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setbacks: Interior lot line</th>
<th>Add a provision to require a minimum interior yard setback of 4 metres where transparent windows are proposed on the side wall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combination of Coach House and Accessory Use, Buildings and structures</td>
<td>Add a provision for lots in the urban and village areas setting a maximum coverage, for a Coach House combined with all accessory buildings, of 50% of the yard in which they are located, with a maximum cumulative floor area of the accessory use of 55 m² as measured from the exterior walls of the use within the building. Add a provision for lots in the rural area setting a maximum coverage of 5% of the total lot area for a Coach House combined with all accessory buildings, with a maximum cumulative floor area of the accessory use of 150 m² as measured from the exterior walls of the use within the building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of Entrance</td>
<td>Add a provision requiring the doorway entrance to a Coach House to be limited to locations that are not facing any lot line, unless the lot line in question borders a travelled lane, or the Coach House is set back further than 4 m from said lot line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Access Route</td>
<td>Add a provision requiring a minimum 1.2 m wide access from a public street or travelled lane to the Coach House. This access may comprise a permitted driveway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Yards and Driveways</td>
<td>Add a provision requiring the principal dwelling and Coach House dwelling to share the parking area and yards provided for the principal dwelling unit, and prohibiting the creation of a new driveway. Despite the above, a driveway is permitted in the following circumstances: • Where a garage or carport is provided as part of the Coach House, in the urban and village areas, an extension of an existing driveway is permitted and in the rural area a new driveway is permitted. • In the case of lots served by a travelled public lane, a new driveway may only be created in a yard that did not contain a driveway prior to a Coach House being established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking: Requirements</td>
<td>Add a provision to not require parking for a Coach House dwelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking: Paved areas</td>
<td>Add provision to clarify that the creation of a Coach House must not lead to the paving of any existing landscaped areas in order to create more parking, except in the case where a new paved area leads to a garage or carport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density Control Limits</td>
<td>Add provision to clarify that Coach House dwelling units will not be limited by, nor included in, any density control requirement, including for example, number of dwelling units and unit per hectare counts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Grandfathering Clause | Add provision to allow an accessory structure existing as of December 31, 2015 to be allowed to convert in part or in whole to a Coach House, up to a maximum footprint of 95 m², and to be exempt from the following clauses: • Maximum size: The coach house must not: a) Be greater in size than 40% of the footprint of the principle
b) Exceed a lot coverage of 40% of the yard in which it is located

- Where permitted:
  On lots smaller than 0.8 hectares in size, the coach house must be located in the rear yard of the principle dwelling.

- Maximum height:
  A coach house on lots in the urban area and villages cannot be taller than the existing primary dwelling, up to a maximum height of 3.6 metres for coach houses without a basement or 4.0 metres for coach houses with a basement.

A coach house on a lot in the rural area cannot be taller than the existing primary dwelling, up to a maximum height of 3.6 metres, or 6.1 metres for a coach house that contains a garage.

- Setbacks:
  The setbacks are as follows for lots within the urban area or villages:
  - Rear and interior side lot line: 1 metre maximum OR 4 metre minimum
  - Corner side yard: same as principle dwelling

  The setbacks are as follows for lots within the rural area:
  - Rear and interior side yard setbacks: 4 metre minimum

Further add a provision where an existing structure is located within 1 to 4 metres from a rear lot line or an interior side lot line, any existing glazing on those walls will be required to be translucent or such windows to be closed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Unit Development</th>
<th>Add a provision to clarify that adding a Coach House to a property is not considered a Planned Unit Development.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 139</td>
<td>Add a provision to allow for a walkway to a coach house, as follows: A walkway that is neither abutting nor adjacent to a driveway or existing walkway, on the same lot as the one on which the coach house is located, and that does not exceed 1.25 metres is permitted: a) on a corner lot, or b) extending from the end of an existing interior side yard driveway back to a coach house, or c) that leads from the walkway, that accesses the main entranceway of the principal dwelling, around the dwelling to the entranceway of the coach house, or d) in the case of an interior lot with a minimum 15-metre lot width, a walkway leading from the right-of-way and located further away than 5 metres from any existing walkway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approval Timelines & Authority:
The target date the proposal will be considered by the City’s Planning Committee on Sept 13, 2016 and by Agricultural and Rural Affairs Committee on October 6, 2016.

Further Information:
Please contact the undersigned planner or go to the project webpage at:
www.ottawa.ca/coachhouses

Notification and Submission Requirements:
If you wish to be notified of the adoption of the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments, or of the refusal of a request to amend the official plan, you must make a written request (i.e., return the attached comment sheet) to the City of Ottawa.
If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to the City of Ottawa before the proposed Official Plan amendment is adopted, the person or public body is not entitled to appeal the decision of the Council of the City of Ottawa to the Ontario Municipal Board.

If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to the City of Ottawa before the proposed Official Plan amendment is adopted, the person or public body may not be added as a party to the hearing of an appeal before the Ontario Municipal Board unless, in the opinion of the Board, there are reasonable grounds to add the person or public body as a party.

Please provide any comments to the undersigned planner by July 22, 2016.

Tim Moerman, Planner
City of Ottawa
Planning and Growth Management Department
110 Laurier Avenue West, 4th floor
Ottawa, ON  K1P 1J1
613-580-2424, ext.13944
Facsimile: 613-580-2459
tim.moerman@ottawa.ca
City of Ottawa

Development Charge

Background Study

Amendment to the definitions for “coach house” and addition of a new category and rate

City of Ottawa

June 16, 2016
Introduction

The purpose of this document is to satisfy the requirements of the Development Charges Act (1997). The legislation requires the preparation of a background study to support an amendment to the City of Ottawa Development Charges By-law (2004-2981).

This background report provides the rationale to support a change to the definitions section of the By-law and an addition of a new category. The proposed change will define a new unit type known as coach house. Based on the service requirements, occupancy characteristics and affordability direction from the province, a coach house is to require a lower level of service from that of other dwelling types.

The report provides a background of the provincial direction, a description and definition of the unit type and a rationale for the type of appropriate development charge for a coach house.

The public consultation carried out in preparation of this report consisted of meetings with City Staff and representatives of the Greater Ottawa Homebuilders Association. Consultation with the general public will be undertaken through the mandatory meeting to be held by the Corporate Services and Economic Development Committee.

Background

The City of Ottawa Development Charges By-law was adopted under the Development Charges Act (1997) as a means to recover the service related costs for new growth.

The province made changes to the Strong Communities Through Affordable Housing Act (2001) requiring municipalities to authorize second units in detached, semi-detached and row houses, as well as in ancillary structures. The Strong Communities Through Affordable Housing Act is the provinces foundation for long-term commitment to affordable housing and requires a wide range of actions to improve the affordable housing system. The Act resulted in changes to the Planning Act to enhance second unit provisions, whereas requiring municipality to allow for attached and detached second units as an appropriate form of affordable housing.

The City of Ottawa currently permits second units, termed secondary dwelling units, within certain types of primary residential buildings in all residential zones. However our policy structure and current Zoning By-law provisions do not allow for second units in accessory structures as-of-right, for example in detached garages. The City of Ottawa has termed these new detached residential units coach houses, depicting small ancillary residential units detached from a primary residential building.
Description of Unit Type

Coach House

The coach house is a small ancillary residential unit which is detached from the primary residential building. A coach house contains one dwelling unit and must be located on the same lot as the primary residential use building.

The design of a coach house allows for discrete infill housing opportunities within established neighbourhoods. These units can range in size from the minimum permitted size afforded under the Ontario Building Code up to a proposed maximum permitted footprint of 95 square metres of living space. Outdoor amenity space is proposed to be shared with the primary residential use building and servicing must be obtained from the primary home.

Recommendation

To account for coach houses within the Development Charges By-law, the term is proposed to be added to Section 1 - Definitions:

Coach House: Means a separate dwelling unit detached from a principal dwelling unit located either in its own building or within an existing accessory building and on the same lot as the principal dwelling.

Further the following text is proposed to be added to Section 7 – Exemptions:

Item (u) – Coach houses excluding the public transit portion of a development charge.

Rationale

A coach house is meant to be an affordable housing unit. The direction from the province is to create opportunities for the affordable housing system to capitalize on. Charging a full development charge for a coach house would not support this initiative or goal. The City is therefore proposing to exempt coach houses from a development charge with the exception of the public transit component. The public transit component is nominal thus working with the affordability nature of these housing units. Further by charging the public transit component for coach houses assists the City to further strengthen its funding for Light Rail Transit (LRT). It is anticipated that the majority of coach houses will be built within close proximity to LRT thus justifying the application of the transit fee amount. Further, coach houses are seen as affordable housing units where tenants are less likely to own private vehicles, thus relying on public transit.

Coach houses are also proposed to be small in nature where the persons per unit are lower than an average single family dwelling. A coach house also does not require the same level of service as a single family dwelling. Coach houses will be required to obtain City water and sewer services from the existing connections provided to the main home, therefore not allowing any new laterals from City infrastructure. Further, these units are to be built in established neighbourhoods where recreational infrastructure and support services already exist. Road systems will see little impact as these units do not require parking and it is anticipated tenants are less likely to own a vehicle.
Conclusion

Coach houses are a proposed new form of residential housing which is mandated by the province, through the Strong Communities Through Affordable Housing Act. The intent is that these new units are to be an affordable housing option. These units will materialize on existing lots with an established primary residential use building. The coach house will be required to connect both water and sewer from the primary home, therefore reducing the impact on municipal infrastructure. They will be integrated within established residential neighbourhoods where support-services already exist. Coach houses are therefore an appropriate form of housing warranting an exemption from a full development charge rate, under the Development Charges Act. 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.
Site Plan Control By-law Amendment Summary

Overview of the Proposed Amendments:

The proposed amendments implement the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing changes to the *Strong Communities through Affordable Housing Act* which resulted in changes to Section 16 of the *Planning Act*. These changes require municipalities to develop or enhance policies in their Official Plans to allow secondary dwelling units within single detached, semi-detached and townhouse dwellings as well as ancillary structures.

The City currently allows secondary dwelling units within primary residential use buildings but not within ancillary (accessory) structures. The proposed amendments require properties in the rural area on private servicing (septic system and/or well) requesting a coach house to obtain a Site Plan Control approval.

Site Plan Control By-law Amendment Summary:

The proposed amendment adds an additional language to the Site Plan Control By-law to exclude coach houses which are serviced by municipal water and sewer. This proposed amendment therefore requires Site Plan Control approval for coach houses which are located in the rural area and serviced by private well and septic systems. This new amendment requires Site Plan Control for properties located in the rural area and on private well and septic systems in order to confirm the water quality and quantity for servicing the coach house. Further the Site Plan Control process will also allow the municipality to ensure that the ground water is not affected by the increased level of effluent produced as a result of the coach house development.

Approval Timelines & Authority:
The target date the proposal will be considered by the City’s Planning Committee on Sept 13, 2016 and by Agricultural and Rural Affairs Committee on October 6, 2016.

Further Information:
Please go to the project webpage at: [www.ottawa.ca/coachhouses](http://www.ottawa.ca/coachhouses)
OFFICIAL PLAN, ZONING AND RELATED BY-LAW AMENDMENTS: SECOND DWELLING UNITS IN ACCESSORY BUILDINGS (COACH HOUSES)

ACS2016-PIE-PGM-0142 CITY WIDE

REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

That Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee:

a. Recommend that Council approve amendments to the Official Plan, as detailed in Document 1;

b. Recommend that Council approve amendments to the Zoning By-law, as detailed in Document 2;

c. Recommend that Council repeal the policy changes to Section 2.5.2 Policy 10 and Section 3.1 Policy 1 as proposed in Items 107 and 130 of Official Plan Amendment No. 150 and repeal the policy changes to Section 3.1 Policy 1 proposed in Item e. of Plan Amendment No. 140, as they apply to Secondary Dwelling units; and

d. Approve the Public Consultation Section, attached as Document 7 of this report, be included as the “brief explanation” in the Summary of Written and Oral Submissions, to be prepared by the City Clerk and Solicitor’s Office and submitted to Council in tandem with this report, subject to submissions received between the publication of this report and 4 p.m. of the day prior to Council’s consideration.
Alain Miguelez, Program Manager, Policy Development and Urban Design spoke to both items 5 and 6 in a PowerPoint presentation. A copy of the presentation is held on file with the City Clerk’s office.

Following the presentation the Committee heard from the following delegations:

1. Klaus Beltzner - president of the Manotick Village and Community Association (MVCA) noted that secondary buildings are already permitted in rural areas of the city. He says that these changes make it more onerous due to costs and processes for site plan control. He appreciates the amendment motion coming forward.

2. Shirley Dolan – Rural resident in Woodlawn commented that the Coach House is one way to provide affordable housing especially for seniors in the rural areas. She also appreciates the amending motion coming forward however she takes exception to the additional costs being imposed.

3. *Heather Pearl - The Federation of Citizens’ Associations (FCA) stated that the recommendations should be completely separate for the rural wards from the urban and suburban wards. She noted that many good trees and greenery could be destroyed in the urban and suburban area. 

[ * All individuals marked with an asterisk either provided their comments in writing or by email; all such comments are held on file with the City Clerk. ]

Chair Moffatt clarified that fees are necessary in that users of the service pay for the services they use and not general taxpayers.

Following discussion on the motions being presented and their rationale, Vice-Chair Darouze introduced the following motion and directions to staff.

**MOTION ARA 20/01**

Moved by: Councillor Darouze

**WHEREAS Report ACS2016-PIE-PGM-0142 recommends that the permitted height for one-storey Coach Houses in the Rural Area outside of Villages be 4.0 metres;**
AND WHEREAS Report ACS2016-PIE-PGM-0142 recommends that the permitted height for one-storey Coach Houses in Villages be 3.6 metres;

AND WHEREAS upon further consultation it has been recognized that the desire for those permitted heights for accessory buildings originates mostly from the Urban Area, where the denser lot fabric and greater adjacency between neighbours creates concerns of overlook, shading and massing in back yards,

AND WHEREAS such concerns have not emerged in the Rural Area;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the following changes be made to the staff report:

(1) Amend Document 2 by deleting item (8)(7)(a) in the Details of the Recommended Zoning and replacing it with the following:

“(7) The maximum permitted height of a building containing a coach house:

(a) In the AG, EP, ME, MR, RC, RG, RH, RI, RR, RU, V1, V2, V3 and VM Zones, is the lesser of:

   (i) the height of the principal dwelling; or

   (ii) 4.5 metres.

   (iii) despite (ii), where the living area of the coach house is entirely located on the second storey above a detached garage, the coach house may have a maximum height of 6.1 metres.”

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that there be no further notice pursuant to Section 34 (17) of the Planning Act.

CARRIED

The report was then put to Committee and CARRIED as amended.
Direction to staff:

1. Prior to the Council meeting where this will rise on 26 October, provide the Committee members the with the clear distinction between what secondary dwellings and coach houses are and a clear vision on the process for both as well as fees involved for both.

That staff examine publishing the definition, processes and costs for coach houses on the City’s website.
REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

That Planning Committee:

a. recommend that Council approve amendments to the Official Plan, as detailed in Document 1;

b. recommend that Council approve amendments to the Zoning By-law, as detailed in Document 2;

c. recommend that Council repeal the policy changes to Section 2.5.2 Policy 10 and Section 3.1 Policy 1 as proposed in Items 107 and 130 of Official Plan Amendment No. 150 and repeal the policy changes to Section 3.1 Policy 1 proposed in Item e. of Plan Amendment No. 140, as they apply to Secondary Dwelling units;

d. recommend that Council receive the Coach Houses Development Charges Background Study, attached as Document 3;

e. recommend that Council approve amendments to the Development Charges By-law 2014-229, as detailed in Document 4;

f. recommend that Council approve amendments to the Site Plan Control By-law 2014-256, as detailed in Document 5;

g. recommend that Council approve amendments to the Parkland Dedication By-law 2009-385 as detailed in Document 6; and

h. approve the Public Consultation Section, attached as Document 7 of this
report, be included as the “brief explanation” in the Summary of Written and Oral Submissions, to be prepared by the City Clerk and Solicitor’s Office and submitted to Council in tandem with this report, subject to submissions received between the publication of this report and 4 p.m. of the day prior to Council’s consideration.

A PowerPoint presentation, which also incorporated information with respect to Agenda Item 2 (Permitted Building Heights for Accessory Buildings), was provided by the following staff of the Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development Department: Messrs. Tim Moerman, Planner; Alain Miguelez, Program Manager, Zoning, Intensification and Neighbourhoods; and, John Smit, Director, Economic Development and Innovation. A copy of the presentation is held on file.

The following staff also responded to questions: Mr. Tim Marc, Senior Legal Counsel, Office of the City Clerk and Solicitor; Mr. Frank Bidin, Chief Building Official, Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development Department; and, Ms. Lee Ann Snedden, Chief, Development Review Services, Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development department.

The committee heard eight delegations on this matter.

- *Heather Pearl, representing Federation of Citizens’ Associations of Ottawa, accompanied by Sheila Perry, Vice-President and Liaison, Planning and Zoning, raised concerns about the proposal with respect to Coach Houses, particularly the potential for negative impact in the urban area. The concerns were centered primarily on potential impact to trees and neighbouring properties. They felt the by-law should be referred to staff for further consultation to ensure that, when implemented, it appropriately meets the intended goal of providing affordable housing, without creating unintended negative consequences, and be based on principles that promote sustainability, protect urban ecosystems, human health and community character.

- *Duncan Bury, Champlain Park Community Association, was sympathetic to the provincial direction set out in the Planning Act regarding the need for affordable housing, but raised concerns about the Coach House proposal. His primary concerns related to potential loss of adequate open / green space, potential damage / loss of mature trees, and a “one size fits all” approach that shows no regard for individual character or neighbourhood distinctiveness. He asked that
the report be referred back to staff for further consultation and development.

- *Phyllis Odenbach Sutton, President, Old Ottawa East Community Association, was pleased with the proposed (one-story) height limitation but was concerned with how that height might be calculated in specific situations and how a two-storey structure might be approved through the Committee of Adjustment. She also raised concerns with respect to setbacks, building mass and visual obstructions, permitted projections, the grandfathering clause for pre-existing accessory structures, and potential urban forest implications.

- Marlene Koehler was generally supportive of the Coach House concept, but doubted it would have much of a positive impact on affordable housing. She felt the proposal should be referred back to staff for further review.

- Murray Chown, on behalf of the Greater Ottawa Homebuilders’ Association and the Urban Infill Council, was supportive of the proposal but felt there would likely be limited uptake due to the varying technical issues involved. He supported the notion of a two-year review, as was approved with the In-fill II Bylaw.

- Shirley Dolan requested the proposal be referred back to staff for further consideration and clarification of the rural provisions for Coach Houses, and she suggested that the processes and requirements be made more equitable between urban and rural areas.

- Rod MacLean, Katimavik Hazeldean Community Association, stated that the construction and appearance of Coach Houses should be compatible with their existing neighbourhoods.

- Bradley Mazurek felt that the housing market does not show support for this type of housing with the height confines as proposed and that the proposed height limitations might not allow for the gentle intensification that is intended.

[* Individuals / groups marked with an asterisk above provided written comments; all submissions are held on file with the City Clerk.*]

The committee received the following correspondence, as noted with an asterisk above, between 4 October 2016 (the date the report was published in the committee agenda) and the time public delegations were heard on 11 October 2016, a copy of which is held on file:
Comments dated 5 and 11 October 2016 from the Federation of Citizens’ Associations of Ottawa via Sheila Perry, Vice-President and Liaison, Planning and Zoning, and Heather Pearl, Co-Chair, Champlain Park Community Association

Comments dated 7 October 2016 from Phyllis Odenbach Sutton, President, Old Ottawa East Community Association

Comments dated 10 October 2016 from Duncan Bury, President, Champlain Park Community Association.

**Motion N° PLC 33/1**

Moved by Councillor J. Leiper

WHEREAS coach houses are a proposed new use in Ottawa; and,

WHEREAS a significant uptake of those might have significant environmental impacts including impacts to trees and permeable surface; and,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the report be amended to include a two-year review period after which staff will report back on the effectiveness and implications of the coach house rules implications.

CARRIED

Item 1 of Planning Committee Agenda 33, as amended by Motion N° PLC 33/1 and set out in full below, was put to Committee.

That Planning Committee:

a. recommend that Council approve amendments to the Official Plan, as detailed in Document 1;

b. recommend that Council approve amendments to the Zoning By-law, as detailed in Document 2;

c. recommend that Council repeal the policy changes to Section 2.5.2 Policy 10 and Section 3.1 Policy 1 as proposed in Items 107 and 130 of Official Plan Amendment No. 150 and repeal the policy changes to Section 3.1 Policy 1 proposed in Item e. of Plan Amendment No. 140, as they apply to Secondary Dwelling units;

d. recommend that Council receive the Coach Houses Development Charges
Background Study, attached as Document 3;

e. recommend that Council approve amendments to the Development Charges By-law 2014-229, as detailed in Document 4;

f. recommend that Council approve amendments to the Site Plan Control By-law 2014-256, as detailed in Document 5;

g. recommend that Council approve amendments to the Parkland Dedication By-law 2009-385 as detailed in Document 6;

h. recommend Council approve that the report be amended to include a two-year review period after which staff will report back on the effectiveness and implications the coach house rules implications; and

i. approve the Public Consultation Section, attached as Document 7 of this report, be included as the “brief explanation” in the Summary of Written and Oral Submissions, to be prepared by the City Clerk and Solicitor’s Office and submitted to Council in tandem with this report, subject to submissions received between the publication of this report and 4 p.m. of the day prior to Council’s consideration.

CARRIED with the following Direction to Staff:

That, notwithstanding the two-year review period, should staff notice a more significant volume of coach houses being constructed than currently anticipated, an update be brought forward to committee within an earlier timeframe.
1. OFFICIAL PLAN, ZONING AND RELATED BY-LAW AMENDMENTS: SECOND DWELLING UNITS IN ACCESSORY BUILDINGS (COACH HOUSES)

MODIFICATIONS AU PLAN OFFICIEL, AU RÉGLEMENT DE ZONAGE ET À D’AUTRES RÈGLEMENTS: LOGEMENTS SECONDAIRES DANS LES BÂTIMENTS ACCESSOIRES (ANNEXES RÉSIDENTIELLES)

AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS, AS AMENDED

That Council:

1. approve amendments to the Official Plan, as detailed in Document 1;

2. approve amendments to the Zoning By-law, as detailed in Document 2, as amended by deleting item (8)(7)(a) in the Details of the Recommended Zoning and replacing it with the following:

“(7) The maximum permitted height of a building containing a coach house:

(a) In the AG, EP, ME, MR, RC, RG, RH, RI, RR, RU, V1, V2, V3 and VM Zones, is the lesser of:

(i) the height of the principal dwelling; or

(ii) 4.5 metres.

(iii) despite (ii), where the living area of the coach house is entirely located on the second storey above a detached garage, the coach house may have a maximum height of 6.1 metres.”;

3. repeal the policy changes to Section 2.5.2 Policy 10 and Section 3.1 Policy 1 as proposed in Items 107 and 130 of Official Plan Amendment No. 150 and repeal the policy changes to Section 3.1
Policy 1 proposed in Item e. of Plan Amendment No. 140, as they apply to Secondary Dwelling units; and

4. approve that there be no further notice pursuant to Section 34 (17) of the Planning Act.

PLANNING COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS, AS AMENDED

That Council:

1. approve amendments to the Official Plan, as detailed in Document 1;

2. approve amendments to the Zoning By-law, as detailed in Document 2;

3. repeal the policy changes to Section 2.5.2 Policy 10 and Section 3.1 Policy 1 as proposed in Items 107 and 130 of Official Plan Amendment No. 150 and repeal the policy changes to Section 3.1 Policy 1 proposed in Item e. of Plan Amendment No. 140, as they apply to Secondary Dwelling units;

4. receive the Coach Houses Development Charges Background Study, attached as Document 3;

5. approve amendments to the Development Charges By-law 2014-229, as detailed in Document 4;

6. approve amendments to the Site Plan Control By-law 2014-256, as detailed in Document 5; and

7. approve amendments to the Parkland Dedication By-law 2009-385 as detailed in Document 6; and

8. approve that the report be amended to include a two-year review period after which staff will report back on the effectiveness and implications the coach house rules implications.
RECOMMANDATIONS DU COMITÉ DE L'AGRICULTURE ET DES AFFAIRES RURALES, TELLES QUE MODIFIÉES

Que le Conseil :

1. approuve les modifications au Plan officiel, telles qu’elles sont présentées dans le document 1;

2. approuve les modifications au Règlement de zonage, telles qu’elles sont présentées dans le document 2, modifié par la suppression du point (8)(7)(a) des Détails du zonage recommandé et son remplacement par ce qui suit :

« (7) La hauteur maximale permise d’un bâtiment comptant une annexe résidentielle :

(a) correspond, dans les zones AG, EP, ME, MR, RC, RG, RH, RI, RR, RU, V1, V2, V3 et VM, à la moins élevée des hauteurs suivantes :

(i) la hauteur de l’habitation principale; ou

(ii) 4,5 mètres;

(iii) nonobstant le sous-alinéa (ii), lorsque l’aire de séjour de l’annexe résidentielle se borne exclusivement au deuxième étage d’un garage isolé, il est permis que l’annexe résidentielle ait une hauteur maximale de 6,1 mètres. »;

3. abroge les changements à la politique 10 de la section 2.5.2 et à la politique 1 de la section 3.1 proposés aux points 107 et 130 de la modification au Plan officiel n° 150, et d’abroger les changements à la politique 1 de la section 3.1 proposés à l’alinéa e) de la modification au Plan officiel n° 140, dans la mesure où ces changements s’appliquent aux appartements
accessoires; et

4. approuve qu’aucun nouvel avis ne sera donné en vertu du paragraphe 34(17) de la Loi sur l’aménagement du territoire.

RECOMMANDATIONS DU COMITÉ DE L’URBANISME, TELLES QUE MODIFIÉES

Que le Conseil :

1. approuve les modifications au Plan officiel, telles qu’elles sont présentées dans le document 1;

2. approuve les modifications au Règlement de zonage, telles qu’elles sont présentées dans le document 2;

3. abroge les changements à la politique 10 de la section 2.5.2 et à la politique 1 de la section 3.1 proposés aux points 107 et 130 de la modification au Plan officiel n° 150, et d’abroger les changements à la politique 1 de la section 3.1 proposés à l’alinéa e) de la modification au Plan officiel n° 140, dans la mesure où ces changements s’appliquent aux appartements accessoires;

4. prenne acte de l’étude préliminaire sur les redevances d’aménagement des annexes résidentielles ci-jointe à titre de document 3;

5. approuver les modifications au Règlement municipal sur les redevances d’aménagement (n° 2014-229), telles qu’elles sont présentées dans le document 4;

6. approuve les modifications au Règlement régissant la réglementation du plan d’implantation (n° 2014-256), telles qu’elles sont présentées dans le document 5;

7. approuve les modifications au Règlement sur l’affectation de
terrains à la création de parcs (n° 2009-385), telles qu’elles sont présentées dans le document 6; et

8. approuve que le rapport soit modifié par l’ajout d’une période d’essai de deux ans, à la fin de laquelle le personnel fera état de l’efficacité et des répercussions des règles sur les annexes résidentielles.

DOCUMENTATION / DOCUMENTATION


2. Extract of draft Minutes, Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee, 6 October 2016.


4. Summary of Written and Oral Submissions (to be issued separately with the final Council agenda)

   Résumé des observations écrites et orales (à publier séparément, en même temps que la version finale de l’ordre du jour de la réunion du Conseil)
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October 26, 2016 / 26 octobre 2016
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John Moser,
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(613) 580-2424, 13866, John.Smit@ottawa.ca

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

File Number: ACS2016-PIE-PGM-0142
SUBJECT: Official Plan, Zoning and related By-law Amendments: Second Dwelling Units in Accessory Buildings (Coach Houses)

OBJET: Modifications au Plan officiel, au Règlement de zonage et à d'autres règlements: Logements secondaires dans les bâtiments accessoires (annexes résidentielles)

REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee:
   a. Recommend that Council approve amendments to the Official Plan, as detailed in Document 1;
   b. Recommend that Council approve amendments to the Zoning By-law, as detailed in Document 2;
   c. Recommend that Council repeal the policy changes to Section 2.5.2 Policy 10 and Section 3.1 Policy 1 as proposed in Items 107 and 130 of Official Plan Amendment No. 150 and repeal the policy changes to Section 3.1 Policy 1 proposed in Item e. of Plan Amendment No. 140, as they apply to Secondary Dwelling units; and
   d. Approve the Public Consultation Section, attached as Document 7 of this report, be included as the “brief explanation” in the Summary of Written and Oral Submissions, to be prepared by the City Clerk and Solicitor’s Office and submitted to Council in tandem with this report, subject to submissions received between the publication of this report and 4 p.m. of the day prior to Council’s consideration.

2. That Planning Committee:
   a. Recommend that Council approve amendments to the Official Plan, as detailed in Document 1;
   b. Recommend that Council approve amendments to the Zoning By-law, as detailed in Document 2;
c. Recommend that Council repeal the policy changes to Section 2.5.2 Policy 10 and Section 3.1 Policy 1 as proposed in Items 107 and 130 of Official Plan Amendment No. 150 and repeal the policy changes to Section 3.1 Policy 1 proposed in Item e. of Plan Amendment No. 140, as they apply to Secondary Dwelling units;

d. Recommend that Council receive the Coach Houses Development Charges Background Study, attached as Document 3;

e. Recommend that Council approve amendments to the Development Charges By-law 2014-229, as detailed in Document 4;

f. Recommend that Council approve amendments to the Site Plan Control By-law 2014-256, as detailed in Document 5;

g. Recommend that Council approve amendments to the Parkland Dedication By-law 2009-385 as detailed in Document 6; and

h. Approve the Public Consultation Section, attached as Document 7 of this report, be included as the “brief explanation” in the Summary of Written and Oral Submissions, to be prepared by the City Clerk and Solicitor’s Office and submitted to Council in tandem with this report, subject to submissions received between the publication of this report and 4 p.m. of the day prior to Council’s consideration.

RECOMMANDATIONS DU RAPPORT

1. Que le Comité de l'agriculture et des affaires rurales :

   a. recommande au Conseil d’approuver les modifications au Plan officiel, telles qu’elles sont présentées dans le document 1;

   b. recommande au Conseil d’approuver les modifications au Règlement de zonage, telles qu’elles sont présentées dans le document 2;

   c. recommande au Conseil d’abroger les changements à la politique 10 de la section 2.5.2 et à la politique 1 de la section 3.1 proposés aux points 107 et 130 de la modification au Plan officiel n° 150, et d’abroger les changements à la politique 1 de la section 3.1
proposés à l’alinéa e) de la modification au Plan officiel n° 140, dans la mesure où ces changements s’appliquent aux appartements accessoires et

d. accepte que la section consacrée aux consultations publiques, ci-jointe à titre de document 7, soit comprise en tant que « brève explication » dans le résumé des observations écrites et orales, qui doit être rédigé par le Bureau du greffier municipal et chef du contentieux et présenté au Conseil en même temps que le présent rapport, à la condition que les observations aient été reçues entre la publication du présent rapport et 16 h la veille de l’étude du rapport par le Conseil.

2. Que le Comité de l’urbanisme :

a. recommande au Conseil d’approuver les modifications au Plan officiel, telles qu’elles sont présentées dans le document 1;

b. recommande au Conseil d’approuver les modifications au Règlement de zonage, telles qu’elles sont présentées dans le document 2;

c. recommande au Conseil d’abroger les changements à la politique 10 de la section 2.5.2 et à la politique 1 de la section 3.1 proposés aux points 107 et 130 de la modification au Plan officiel n° 150, et d’abroger les changements à la politique 1 de la section 3.1 proposés à l’alinéa e) de la modification au Plan officiel n° 140, dans la mesure où ces changements s’appliquent aux appartements accessoires;

d. recommande au Conseil de prendre acte de l’étude préliminaire sur les redevances d’aménagement des annexes résidentielles ci-jointe à titre de document 3;

e. recommande au Conseil d’approuver les modifications au Règlement municipal sur les redevances d’aménagement (n° 2014-229), telles qu’elles sont présentées dans le document 4;
f. recommande au Conseil d’approver les modifications au Règlement régissant la réglementation du plan d’implantation (n° 2014-256), telles qu’elles sont présentées dans le document 5;

g. recommande au Conseil d’approver les modifications au Règlement sur l’affectation de terrains à la création de parcs (n° 2009-385), telles qu’elles sont présentées dans le document 6 et

h. accepte que la section consacrée aux consultations publiques, ci-jointe à titre de document 7, soit comprise en tant que « brève explication » dans le résumé des observations écrites et orales, qui doit être rédigé par le Bureau du greffier municipal et chef du contentieux et présenté au Conseil en même temps que le présent rapport, à la condition que les observations aient été reçues entre la publication du présent rapport et 16 h la veille de l’étude du rapport par le Conseil.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The province made changes to the Planning Act in 2012 to enhance their policies for affordable housing. These policy changes resulted in amendments requiring municipalities to allow for secondary units both within a home and detached from a home. The City has already implemented a portion of this requirement, permitting what the City has termed “secondary dwelling units” within the home. This report recommends amendments to various development control by-laws to fulfil the remainder of the Planning Act direction to allow for second units in accessory structures. The City has termed these new units “coach houses”. This report introduces amendments to the Official Plan, Zoning By-law, Site Plan Control By-law, Development Charges By-law and Parkland Dedication By-law to permit and regulate this new land use.

In September 2015, the City launched the Coach Houses Study. The study’s purpose was to identify how coach houses could be introduced into residential communities.

Assumption and Analysis

The proposed Official Plan amendment provides policy direction enabling coach houses in the urban and rural area, as well as guidance on when and under what circumstances
variances from the performance standards may be considered. It also clarifies that a coach house may not be severed from the lot containing the dwelling to which it is accessory.

The proposed amendments to the Zoning By-law will:

- allow either a coach house or a secondary dwelling unit, but not both, in the urban and rural areas, as accessory uses to detached, semi-detached, linked-detached and duplex dwellings, as well as in the end units of a townhouse row where the property is also located on a corner lot;

- restrict the size (footprint) of coach houses to a certain proportion (40 per cent) of the yard in which they are located;

- restrict the height of coach houses to one storey in the urban area and two storeys in the rural area;

- require that coach houses be serviced from the main dwelling with which they are associated;

- allow coach houses on private well and septic systems in the rural area, provided the lot is 0.8 hectares or larger; while requiring urban coach houses to connect to public services;

- allow existing accessory buildings to be converted to coach houses, even if they do not meet the footprint, height and yard requirements for a coach house; and

- notwithstanding the above, prohibits coach houses in Rockcliffe Park (as secondary dwelling units are currently not allowed under the Rockcliffe Park Secondary Plan).

The proposed Site Plan Control By-law amendment provides that coach houses located on private services in the rural area will be subject to Site Plan Control. Coach houses connected to public or communal water and sewer services will not require Site Plan Control.

The proposed amendment to the Development Charges By-law exempts coach houses from Development Charges except those levied for public transit, and establishes that a coach house is evaluated as an apartment dwelling for these purposes.
The proposed amendment to the Parkland Dedication By-law will exempt coach houses from parkland dedication or cash-in-lieu of same, as secondary dwelling units are already exempt.

Public Consultation/Input

The Coach House Study was initiated in September 2015 with an online discussion paper and questionnaire to identify the issues for consideration, and to inform the appropriate policy structure for the Official Plan amendment and performance standards for the Zoning By-law amendment. Some of the issues for consideration included maximum height, maximum size, location on the lot and setbacks, and with what type of residential buildings a coach house would be permitted. Feedback was provided via the questionnaire, direct meetings and presentations, stakeholder consultation and individual emails.

In February 2016, a second discussion paper was released to present proposed guiding principles to allow coach houses and supplementary draft policy and zoning directions. Public comments were welcome from February 1-29 via direct correspondence with the project lead. At the request of stakeholders the public consultation of the draft Recommendations was extended until June of 2016 to allow for more public meetings and an increased amount of feedback on the draft policies and regulations. Revised Zoning and Official Plan amendments proposals were formally circulated to community associations and stakeholders city-wide on June 23, and advertised in city-wide newspapers on June 23 and 24.

Notification and public consultation for the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments were undertaken in accordance with the Public Notification and Public Consultation Policy approved by City Council for Zoning By-law and Official Plan amendments. A copy of the staff report was provided to all those who provided comments through the study process.

SOMMAIRE

En 2012, la province a modifié la Loi sur l’aménagement du territoire afin de renforcer ses politiques sur le logement abordable. Ces changements de politiques ont eu pour résultat d’obliger les municipalités à permettre l’aménagement de logements secondaires attenants ou non à un logement principal. La Ville s’est déjà conformée en
partie à cette exigence en autorisant la création de ce qu’elle appelle un « appartement accessoire » à l’intérieur même d’une habitation. Le présent rapport recommande de modifier plusieurs règlements sur l’utilisation du sol pour mettre en œuvre les autres dispositions de la Loi sur l’aménagement du territoire visant à permettre l’aménagement de logements secondaires dans un bâtiment accessoire. La Ville utilise le terme « annexe résidentielle » pour désigner ce nouveau type de logement. Le rapport présente des modifications au Plan officiel, au Règlement de zonage, au Règlement régissant la réglementation du plan d’implantation, au Règlement municipal sur les redevances d’aménagement et au Règlement sur l’affectation de terrains à la création de parcs en vue d’autoriser et de réglementer cette nouvelle catégorie d’utilisation du sol.

En septembre 2015, la Ville a entamé une étude sur les annexes résidentielles, laquelle avait pour but de déterminer comment ces annexes pourraient être intégrées aux quartiers résidentiels.

**Hypothèses et analyse**

La modification proposée au Plan officiel fournit des directives autorisant la création d’annexes résidentielles dans les secteurs urbain et rural, ainsi que des critères pour déterminer dans quelles circonstances une dérogation aux normes de rendement peut être envisagée. Elle précise également qu’une annexe résidentielle ne peut être séparée du lot où est situé le logement principal.

Les modifications proposées au Règlement de zonage auront pour effet :

- de permettre l’aménagement d’une annexe résidentielle ou d’un appartement accessoire, mais non des deux, en lien avec une habitation isolée, une habitation isolée à fondation reliée, une habitation jumelée, un duplex ou une maison en rangée située sur un terrain d’angle, dans les secteurs urbain et rural;
- de restreindre la superficie (l’empreinte) des annexes résidentielles à un certain pourcentage (40 %) de la cour où elles sont situées;
- de restreindre la hauteur des annexes résidentielles à un étage dans le secteur urbain et à deux étages dans le secteur rural;
- d’exiger que les annexes résidentielles soient raccordées aux services publics à partir de l’habitation principale à laquelle elles sont liées;
- de permettre le raccordement d’une annexe résidentielle à un puits et à une fosse septique privés dans le secteur rural, pourvu que le lot fasse au moins 0,8 hectare, tout en exigeant que les annexes résidentielles urbaines soient raccordées aux services publics;
- de permettre aux bâtiments accessoires existants d’être convertis en annexes résidentielles, même s’ils ne respectent pas les limites correspondantes en matière de superficie, de hauteur et de pourcentage de la cour;
- nonobstant ce qui précède, d’interdire l’aménagement d’annexes résidentielles à Rockcliffe Park (puisque les appartements accessoires y sont actuellement interdits en vertu du Plan secondaire du village de Rockcliffe Park).

Selon la modification proposée au Règlement régissant la réglementation du plan d’implantation, les annexes résidentielles raccordées à des services privés dans le secteur rural seront soumises au processus d’approbation du plan d’implantation. Celles raccordées à des services d’eau et d’égouts publics ou collectifs ne seront pas soumises à ce processus.

La modification proposée au Règlement municipal sur les redevances d’aménagement permettra d’exempter les annexes résidentielles de toute redevance d’aménagement, sauf celles exigées pour les services de transport en commun, et précise que pour le calcul de ces redevances, l’annexe résidentielle doit être évaluée en tant qu’appartement.

La modification proposée au Règlement sur l’affectation de terrains à la création de parcs permettra d’exempter les annexes résidentielles de la désignation de terrains à vocation de parcs ou du règlement financier des frais relatifs à ces terrains, puisque les appartements accessoires en sont déjà exemptés.

Consultation publique et commentaires

L’étude sur les annexes résidentielles a commencé en septembre 2015 par la publication en ligne d’un document de travail et d’un questionnaire visant à faire ressortir les enjeux ainsi qu’à orienter la création de directives adéquates pour la
modification au Plan officiel et l’établissement de normes de rendement pour la modification au Règlement de zonage. Entre autres enjeux signalés, on comptait la hauteur maximale, la superficie maximale, l’emplacement sur le lot, les retraits et le type de bâtiment résidentiel auquel une annexe pourrait s’ajouter. Des commentaires ont été recueillis au moyen du questionnaire et de courriels individuels, et lors de rencontres et de présentations en personne, ainsi que de discussions avec les intervenants.

En février 2016, un deuxième document de travail a été publié pour présenter les principes directeurs proposés afin de permettre l’aménagement d’annexes résidentielles ainsi que les politiques complémentaires provisoires et les directives relatives au zonage. Le public a été invité à fournir ses commentaires entre le 1er et le 29 février, en communiquant directement avec le chargé de projet. À la demande des intervenants, la période de consultation publique sur les recommandations provisoires a été prolongée jusqu’en juin 2016 pour qu’il puisse y avoir plus d’assemblées publiques et qu’un maximum de commentaires sur les politiques et les règlements provisoires soient recueillis. Les modifications proposées au Règlement de zonage et au Plan officiel ont été officiellement communiquées aux associations communautaires et aux intervenants de partout dans la ville le 23 juin et annoncées dans les journaux d’Ottawa les 23 et 24 juin.

Un avis public a été donné et une consultation publique a eu lieu conformément à la Politique d’avis et de consultation publique approuvée par le Conseil municipal pour les modifications proposées au Plan officiel et au Règlement de zonage. Une copie du rapport du personnel a été fournie à tous ceux qui se sont exprimés dans le cadre de l’étude.

BACKGROUND

The Official Plan currently contains direction, within Section 3.1(1) and Section 2.5.2(10) permitting secondary dwelling units within detached dwellings, semi-detached dwellings, linked-detached dwellings and duplex dwellings with Section 133 of the Zoning By-law setting out regulations for secondary dwelling units within the primary home. These policy and zoning provisions implement the direction provided by the Planning Act to permit secondary dwelling units within existing residential dwellings. The Official Plan and Zoning By-law, however, do not currently allow for secondary dwelling units in accessory structures, which is also required under the Planning Act. This report provides for introducing policies into the Official Plan and for establishing zoning
provisions to allow for secondary dwelling units in accessory structures (Coach Houses) to provide for the full implementation of the requirements that have been set out in the Planning Act.

If adopted, the proposed Official Plan amendment and Zoning By-law amendment would not be subject to appeal.

DISCUSSION

The intent of the Planning Act in requiring that municipalities permit, in their Official Plans, secondary dwelling units within existing residential dwellings and within accessory buildings is to achieve an increase in affordable housing stock within Ontario municipalities through discreet, small-scale intensification in existing residential communities and enhance housing options for a variety of residents. The proposed amendment to the Official Plan and the proposed zoning provisions to permit coach houses within the City of Ottawa will complement the current Official Plan policies and zoning provisions for secondary dwellings to allow the City to comply with the changes made to the Planning Act by the Province.

Official Plan Amendment

The proposed Official Plan amendment provides the policy framework for allowing second units in accessory structures in the urban and rural areas of the City. The proposed Official Plan amendment is founded on five principles which were determined through public consultation. Those principles are:

1. Coach houses are to be seen as a discreet form of intensification and a means to provide new housing options within established residential neighbourhoods.

2. Coach houses are to remain secondary to the principal dwelling, smaller than the principal dwelling, and leave enough open and amenity space in the back yard.

3. Coach houses are to remain accessory structures and cannot be severed and sold separately.

4. Coach houses must be well integrated into their context, with regard and respect for the privacy of neighbours and the vegetation on the property.
5. Coach houses must be serviced with water and sanitary service from the principal dwelling, or in the rural area, with private services approved through site plan control.

The proposed official Plan amendment incorporates these principles into the policy directions being introduced into the Official Plan for Coach houses.

The policies in Sections 2.5.2 and 3.1, dealing with secondary dwelling units, generally were modified by two previous Official Plan amendments that have been appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board. These amendments are the comprehensive Official Plan Amendment No. 150 and Official Plan Amendment No. 140 which made corrections to OPA 150. The changes made in those amendments are made redundant by the new policies proposed in this report. As such the report is also recommending that the specific changes in OPAs 140 and 150 be repealed in order to avoid any future conflict between the attached Official Plan amendment and any changes to policy that may arise from the Ontario Municipal Board determination of appeals to Official Plan Amendments 140 and 150.

Zoning By-law Amendment

The proposed Zoning By-law amendment establishes regulatory provisions consistent with the policy directions set out in the proposed Official Plan amendment. The proposed zoning provisions will allow coach houses as-of-right throughout the City except in the former Village of Rockcliffe Park, where the Rockcliffe Park Secondary Plan contains restrictions on density and where secondary dwellings units are currently not permitted.

Where permitted, coach houses would be subject to maximum footprints based on the area of the yard in which they are located and the footprint of the main dwelling. Subject to these limits, the footprint of a coach house may not in any case exceed 80 square metres in the urban area or 95 square metres in the rural area. Coach houses would be permitted on lots with detached, semi-detached, linked-detached, duplex and townhouse dwellings. Coach houses would not be considered accessory buildings for the purposes of zoning and would be regulated under their own section of the Zoning By-law. However, coach houses would be included in the calculation of the maximum yard coverage permitted for accessory buildings.
In the urban area, buildings containing coach houses would be restricted to one storey in height, while in the rural area two-storey buildings containing coach houses would be permitted where the coach house is located entirely above a garage. The possibility of a two-storey coach house in the urban area is not provided for in the zoning but may be considered subject to a minor variance, under the proposed Official Plan policy, to ensure that the higher structure does not intrude on neighbouring lots' privacy. Rooftop patios or other roof top outdoor amenity spaces would not be permitted on a coach house. Coach houses would be required to connect to water and/or sewer services through the main dwelling. This requirement is to prevent the severance of a coach house to stand on its own lot and be sold separately so as to ensure that it remains accessory to a main dwelling.

To safeguard neighbouring properties' privacy, coach houses would be required to have any wall with windows or doors set back at least 4 metres from the facing property line. Conversely, where a wall has no doors or windows, the applicable setback would be a maximum of 1 metre from the facing lot line, allowing coach houses to be designed very close to, or on the lot line and maximize usable yard space. This approach ensures that either the coach house is located far enough from the neighbouring lot that privacy is provided by distance, or that the coach house is built close enough to the line that the Building Code will ensure no windows or doors on that wall are included, or added in the future.

Pre-existing accessory structures, where these are proposed to be modified to include a coach house, would be grandfathered with respect to the existing building's height and setbacks.

Development Charges By-law Amendment

The proposed amendment to the Development Charges By-law would establish that coach houses are exempt from all components of Development Charges except for the public transit component. Coach houses are to be treated as apartment dwellings for the purpose of determining the applicable charge.

Subsequent to the posting of the background study, through further consultation with City staff, it has been recommended that a modification to section 9 of the by-law, in respect of the redevelopment of land, be made. As it is proposed that where a coach house is constructed, only the transit component of the development charge be paid, if
land with a coach house on it is redeveloped, it would be appropriate that only a credit for that component be provided, as opposed to the full development charge.

This represents additional Development Charge revenue for the City, since Coach Houses are currently not permitted. Focusing the Development Charge on the transit component reflects the wish to ensure that Coach Houses are as affordable to build as possible, while contributing to the growth-related costs of the service most likely to be triggered by future Coach House residents.

The Development Charges Background Study, attached as Document 3, has been posted on Ottawa.ca since June 16, 2016, in compliance with the provisions of the Development Charges Act.

Site Plan Control By-law Amendment

The proposed amendment to the Site Plan Control By-law would require Site Plan Control for coach houses in the rural area. This will allow the City to undertake the proper review of the adequacy of private services. Coach houses in the urban area or villages where they are serviced by public or communal water and wastewater would not be subject to Site Plan Control approval.

Parkland Dedication By-law

The proposed amendment to the Parkland Dedication By-law would exempt coach houses from triggering a requirement for parkland dedication or cash in lieu of same, consistent with the by-law’s current exemption for secondary dwelling units.

RURAL IMPLICATIONS

The proposed amendments provide for coach houses in the rural area, subject to minimum lot sizes and requirements for Site Plan Control and hydrogeological studies in order to confirm the water quality and quantity for servicing the coach house. The Site Plan Control process will also allow the municipality to ensure that the ground water is not affected by the increased level of effluent produced as a result of the coach house development.
CONSULTATION

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

Details of the consultation are included in Document 7.

COMMENTS BY THE WARD COUNCILLORS

City-wide – not applicable.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Official plan policies and zoning by-law provisions permitting second units in single, semi, row houses, and in accessory structures, are exempt from appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board, except during a comprehensive review. This exemption from appeals extends to the determination of performance standards for second units.

An amendment to a development charges by-law is subject to appeal to the Board. However, the Board only has the authority to dismiss an appeal or lower the amount of the charge, it may not increase the amount of the charge.

RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

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

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Recommendations 1., and 2. a., b., c., d., and f.: There are no direct financial implications.

Recommendation 2.e.: The recommended Development Charges By-law amendments would result in the exemption of Development Charges, with the exception of Public Transit DCs. In accordance with the 2014 Development Charges Policy and Framework (ACS2014-CMR-ARA-004), the City will account for the foregone revenue and reimburse the various DC reserves though the annual Provision for DC Exemptions.
Recommendation 2.g.: The proposed amendment to the Parkland Dedication By-law would exempt coach houses from triggering a requirement for parkland dedication or cash in lieu of same.

ACCESSIBILITY IMPACTS

There are no accessibility implications associated with this report.

TERM OF COUNCIL PRIORITIES

This project 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  Proposed Official Plan Amendment (not subject to appeal) (issued previously and held on file)

Document 2  Details of Recommended Zoning By-law amendment (not subject to appeal)

Document 3  Coach Houses Development Charges Background Study (issued previously and held on file)

Document 4  Proposed Amendment to the Development Charges By-law

Document 5  Proposed Amendment to the Site Plan Control By-law

Document 6  Proposed Amendment to the Parkland Dedication By-law

Document 7  Public Consultation (issued previously and held on file)

DISPOSITION

City Clerk and Solicitor Department, Legislative Services, to notify Program Manager, Assessment Section, Billing, Assessment and Tax Policy Unit, Deputy City Treasurer Revenue Branch.
Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development Department to prepare the implementing by-laws, forward to Legal Services and undertake the statutory notification.

Legal Services to forward the implementing by-laws to City Council.
Document 2 – Details of the Recommended Zoning

1) Amend Section 54 (Definitions) by:

(1) adding the following definition of "coach house" under the definition of "dwelling":

"coach house" means a separate dwelling unit that is subsidiary to and located on the same lot as an associated principal dwelling unit, but is contained in its own building that may also contain uses accessory to the principal dwelling.

(2) adding the following definition of "footprint":

"Footprint" means the area of the ground floor of a building, measured from the exterior of the outermost walls, including an attached garage but excluding any projections.

(3) amending the definition of "Planned Unit Development" by adding the words "or coach house" after the words "garden suite."

2) Amend Section 55 by adding wording similar in effect to the following as 55(7), and by renumbering the existing 55(7) and 55(8) accordingly:

(7) A coach house is not considered to be an accessory use and any building containing a coach house is regulated by Section 142, and not this section.

3) Amend Subsection 58(3) by adding the following as subsection (ag);

(ag) coach house

4) Amend Subsection 58(4) by adding the words "other than a coach house" after the word "development" and before the words "may be permitted."

5) Amend Section 65 by adding the words "or a building containing a coach house" after the words "principal building" and before the words "into a required yard."
6) Amend Table 101 by deleting the existing Row R2 and replacing it with the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>Coach house</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) Amend Subsection 133(17) by adding the words "coach house," after the words "garden suite."

8) Add wording similar in effect to the following as Section 142 - Coach Houses

Section 142 (Coach Houses)

(1) A coach house is permitted on any lot also containing a detached, semi-detached, linked detached, duplex or townhouse dwelling, where that dwelling type is a listed permitted use, subject to subsections (2) through (14).

(2) The coach house may not be severed from the lot containing the principal dwelling.

(3) No more than one coach house is permitted on a lot.

(4) A coach house must be located:

   (a) in the rear yard, or

   (b) in the case of a lot with frontage on both a street and a travelled public lane, in the yard adjacent to the travelled public lane.
(5) Despite (1), a coach house is not permitted:

(a) where the lot contains a garden suite, secondary dwelling unit, or one or more rooming units;

(b) within the area shown as Area A on Schedule XXX;

(c) on a lot that is
   (i) less than 0.8 hectares in area;
   (ii) located within Area D on Schedule 1; and
   (iii) not serviced by both a public or communal water system and public or communal wastewater system;
   or

(d) on a lot occupied by a townhouse dwelling unit, except where the lot containing the townhouse unit abuts two public streets, or a public street and a travelled lane.

(6) A coach house must be serviced:

(a) Within Areas A, B and C on Schedule 1, from the principal dwelling, and the principal dwelling must be serviced by a public or communal water and waste water system;

(b) Within Area D on Schedule 1,
   (i) from at least one of either the existing well or septic system, or
   (ii) from the principal dwelling serviced by a private septic system, private well, communal water system or communal waste water system.

(7) The maximum permitted height of a building containing a coach house:

(a) In the AG, EP, ME, MR, RC, RG, RH, RI, RR and RU Zones, is the lesser of:
   (i) the height of the principal dwelling; or
(ii) 4.0 metres.

(iii) despite (ii), where the living area of the coach house is entirely located on the second storey above a detached garage, the coach house may have a maximum height of 6.1 metres.

(b) In any other zone, is the lesser of:

(i) the height of the principal dwelling; or

(ii) 3.6 metres, with the height of the exterior walls not to exceed 3.2 metres;

(c) Section 64 (Permitted Projections Above the Height Limit) does not apply to a building containing a coach house, except with respect to:

(i) chimneys

(ii) flagpoles

(iii) ornamental domes, skylights or cupolas, provided that the cumulative horizontal area occupied by such features does not exceed 20% of the footprint of the coach house.

(8) Required setbacks from lot lines for a coach house are as follows:

(a) From the front lot line, the minimum setback must be equal to or greater than the minimum required front yard setback for the principal dwelling.

(b) From the corner side lot line, the minimum setback must be equal to or greater than the minimum required corner side yard setback for the principal dwelling.

(c) From the interior side lot line,

(i) 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

(ii) in all other cases, the minimum required setback is 4 metres
(d) From the rear lot line,

   (i) where the rear lot line abuts a travelled lane or where no entrance or window faces the rear lot line, the maximum permitted setback is 1 metre

   (ii) in all other cases, the minimum required setback is 4 metres

(9) The footprint of a building containing a coach house may not exceed the lesser of:

   (a) 40% of the footprint of the principal dwelling, or where the principal dwelling has a footprint of 125 square metres or less, 50 square metres;

   (b) 40% of the area of the yard in which it is located; or

   (c) 80 square metres in Area A, B and C on Schedule 1, or 95 square metres in Area D on Schedule 1.

(10) The total footprint of a building containing a coach house plus all accessory buildings and structures in a yard may not exceed:

    (a) In the AG, EP, ME, MR, RC, RG, RH, RI, RR and RU Zones, 5% of the area of the yard in which they are located, or

    (b) In any other zone, 50% of the area of the yard in which they are located.

(11) A walkway must be provided from a driveway, public street or travelled lane to the coach house, and such walkway

    (a) must be at least 1.2 metres in width;

    (b) must not exceed 1.5 metres in width;

    (c) No person may park a vehicle on any part of a walkway under this subsection, other than that part of the walkway that encroaches on a permitted driveway.

(12) No new driveway may be created in association with a coach house.
(13) A vehicle associated with a coach house may be parked in tandem in the driveway of the principal dwelling.

(14) The roof of a building containing a coach house:

(a) May not contain any rooftop garden, patio, terrace or other amenity area;

(b) Despite (a), may contain a vegetative green roof provided it is not designed or equipped for use as an amenity area.

(15) Where located entirely in the rear yard, all or part of an accessory building existing as of September 14, 2015 may be altered to contain a coach house in accordance with the following:

(a) The building envelope may be enlarged in accordance with this subsection, and subsections 7(a), 7(b) and (8) do not apply except as set out in this subsection;

(b) The building including any enlargement must continue to be located entirely within the rear yard;

(c) No part of the building that is not located within the building envelope of the original accessory building as it existed on September 14, 2015, may exceed the applicable maximum permitted building height in subsection (7.)

(c) No window or entrance is permitted on any wall facing and within 4 metres of a lot line.

(16) Where not located entirely in the rear yard, all or part of an accessory building existing as of September 14, 2015 may be altered to contain a coach house in accordance with the following:

(a) The building may not be enlarged beyond the building envelope of the accessory building as it existed on September 14, 2015;

(b) Subsections 4, 7(a), 7(b), and (8) do not apply except as set out in this subsection; and
(c) No window or entrance is permitted on any wall facing and within 4 metres of a lot line.

(17) Despite subsection (9), where an accessory building existing as of September 14, 2015 exceeds the permissible footprint in subsection (9), all or part of the accessory building may be altered to contain a coach house in accordance with subsections (15) or (16) provided that:

(a) After the addition of the coach house, the building envelope has not been enlarged beyond the envelope existing on September 14, 2015; and

(b) The gross floor area of the coach house does not exceed 80 square metres, if located within Areas A, B or C on Schedule 1, or 95 square metres in Area D on Schedule 1.
(8) Amend Part 17 (Schedules) by adding the following as Schedule XXX:
Document 4 – Proposed Amendment to the Development Charges By-law

Amend By-law 2014-229 as follows:

(1) Amend Section 1 - Definitions by adding the following definition:

"coach house" means a separate dwelling unit that is subsidiary to and located on the same lot as an associated principal dwelling unit, but is contained in its own building that may also contain uses accessory to the principal dwelling

(2) Amend the definition of "apartment dwelling" by deleting the words "and ii) a secondary dwelling unit." and replacing them with the words "ii) a secondary dwelling unit, and iii) a coach house."

(3) Amend Section 7 - Exemptions by adding wording similar in effect to the following as 7(1)(u)

(u) the creation of a coach house

(4) Amend Section 7(3) by deleting the words "(r) and (s)." and replacing them with the words "(r), (s) and (u)."

(5) Amend section 9 by the addition of the following subsection:

(10) In the instance of a demolition of a coach house, only a credit for the transit component of the development charge shall be provided.
Document 5 – Proposed Amendment to the Site Plan Control By-law

Amend By-law 2014-256 as follows:

(1) Amend Section 5 by adding wording to similar in effect to the following to include the establishment of a coach house as a class of exempt development:

   (i) add the text “a coach house, where the coach house is connected to public or communal water and wastewater services” as another clause under subsection 5(1);

   (ii) add the text “a coach house is added to the building” as a new clause 5(3)(c), and re-letter subsequent clauses accordingly.

(2) Add the term “coach house” in alphabetical order to Schedule A.
Document 6 - Proposed Amendment to the Parkland Dedication By-law

Amend By-law 2009-385 as follows:

(1) Amend Section 14(1)(h) by adding the words "unit or coach house" after the words "secondary dwelling"
Passed  Motion To: WHEREAS Report ACS2016-PIE-PGM-0142 recommends that the minimum lot size on which to permit a coach house as-of-right should be 0.8 hectares when on private services; AND WHEREAS the provision of a hydro-geological study is required by the Rural Site Plan Control application that applies in the case of lots with private services; AND WHEREAS public delegations at Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee indicated that there is strong interest across the Rural Area for consideration to be given to allowing coach houses on private services to have a lower financial burden from administrative and technical requirements; THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Staff be directed to further investigate mechanisms through which any or all of the following may be achieved: (a) The possibility of waiving the site plan control requirement while still ensuring that the provision of private services for a coach house in the rural area can take place in full compliance with all safety regulations and Provincial Policy Statement directions on water quality and quantity; (b) The possibility of waiving the requirement for hydro-geological studies, or accepting lower-cost versions of such studies, to demonstrate the suitability of private services; and THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the findings be brought back to Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee by the second quarter of 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Councillor / Conseiller</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S. Moffatt</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Chiarelli</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. El-Chantiry</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Chernushenko</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Blais</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Fleury</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Taylor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Monette</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Harder</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Cloutier</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Brockington</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Darouze</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Wilkinson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Qadri</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Egli</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Deans</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Mitic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Tierney</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Leiper</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Hubley</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Watson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. McKenney</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Nussbaum</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Qaqish</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.
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 road 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.
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.

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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment from FCA</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Associations throughout Ottawa are concerned about the City's current Coach House proposal. The proposal is &quot;one size fits all&quot;. 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please see the detailed responses to individual comments below.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.)</td>
<td>1.2m was selected on the basis of being wide enough for a double-wide stroller or a mobility device with someone walking alongside.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.)

| 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. |

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

| Zoning does not supersede other legislation; construction will still have to comply with the Ontario Building Code. |

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.)

| 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. |

The Coach House proposal focuses on privacy intrusion and overlook.

<p>| Privacy intrusion and overlook are among the issues addressed by the proposed zoning, but not exclusively. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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.)</th>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Coach House proposal does not in any way address open space and preservation of existing vegetation.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.)</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipalities should assess where second units may be appropriate in the primary dwelling versus the ancillary structure. (Similar comments received from Champlain Park CA.)</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More consultation is required. (Similar comments from Katimavik Hazeldean, Champlain Park.)</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By-laws relating to Infill must be part of the decision-making process. (Similar comments received from: Civic Hospital NA.)</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.)</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 &quot;as of right.&quot; (Similar comments from Champlain Park, Old Ottawa East, Rothwell Heights.)</td>
<td>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 m² (urban) and 95 m² (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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With maximum footprint 95 m² (1024 square feet) and a permitted basement, this is not a secondary dwelling unit. This is a house. (Similar comments from Champlain Park CA.)</td>
<td>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 m² limit. However, upon due consideration, Staff does recognize that even in those rare cases, 95 m² is too large for the urban area, and proposes a limit of 80 m² for coach houses in the urban area (the upper limit in the rural area would remain at 95m².)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the case of lots served by a travelled public lane, how can adding a coach house justify adding an additional driveway?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door location should be assessed for each proposal.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the implications of not having coach house dwelling units count towards density control requirements?</td>
<td>This provision would have minimal effect. However, after due consideration, Staff recommends deleting this provision as it does not support current planning goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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, )

The possibility of a 4.0 m coach house with a basement in Residential zones has been removed. Basements are not prohibited outright.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment from Carleton Landowners' Association</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am encouraged by the City’s inclusion of the rural lots on private services for the construction of Coach Houses.</td>
<td>Staff acknowledges receipt of this comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 Planning Act 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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

Staff believes the rationale for prohibiting development in a floodplain to be self-evident.

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.

Staff acknowledges receipt of this comment.

Consider allowing coach houses on privately-serviced lots in the urban area.

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.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment from Champlain Park</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No guarantee that a coach house will be put to the use intended by the legislation or other ideal uses e.g. &quot;mom cave&quot;, &quot;man cave&quot;, 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</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment from Champlain Park</strong></td>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community and the environment.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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;</td>
<td>The proposed zoning prohibits windows on any wall that is closer than 4m from the facing property line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All stormwater runoff to be retained on the property.</td>
<td>Grading and drainage are verified at the building permit stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rooftop structures: skylights should be allowed, but not parapets, cupolas, etc.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend not allowing projections into side or rear yards under 3m.</td>
<td>Given the possibility of designing a coach house to locate within 1m of the lot line, Staff respectfully disagrees with this recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canopies and awnings: no closer than 2.0 m to rear and side yards.</td>
<td>Given the possibility of designing a coach house to locate within 1m of the lot line, Staff respectfully disagrees with this recommendation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment from Champlain Park</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.)</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No driveway extension to coach house. Agree that coach houses share the principal residence's driveway.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Civic Hospital Neighbourhood Association (CHNA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment from Civic Hospital Neighbourhood Association</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment from Civic Hospital Neighbourhood Association</strong></td>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>The proposed Official Plan policy gives guidance in this regard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the city considered any specific requirements for approval of 2 Coach Houses on lots smaller than 0.8 hectares to assist the CoA?</td>
<td>Allowing multiple coach houses on a lot is not provided for by the zoning or the Official Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment from Civic Hospital Neighbourhood Association</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>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 m² (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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment from Civic Hospital Neighbourhood Association</strong></td>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and wastewater services are to be provided from the primary dwelling. Are hydro, natural gas &amp; oil treated the same?</td>
<td>Hydro Ottawa has indicated that only one connection per lot will be permitted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What, if any, are the implications of a Coach House not being considered a planned unit development?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would the permitted projections above the height limit be those listed in Section 64 of the Zoning By-law?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment from Civic Hospital Neighbourhood Association</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adverse impacts on existing city neighbourhoods. Would the City be open to such a Committee?</td>
<td>loopholes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 in place (grandfathered) as of December 31, 2015.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment from Civic Hospital Neighbourhood Association</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandfathering clause: There are some very large existing accessory structures in the downtown core that are well above the maximum footprint of 95m². How does the city envision that these structures would be converted? Can ½ of an existing structure be re-purposed into a Coach House?</td>
<td>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 m² floor area in the urban area (95 m² 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Development will still have to meet the building and fire codes, which ensure minimum standards to protect life safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has the city studied the impact of a Coach House being on or within 1 metre of the rear property line?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHNA is on record as supporting intensification in the downtown core and</td>
<td>Staff acknowledges receipt of this comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment from Civic Hospital Neighbourhood Association</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greater Ottawa Home Builders' Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment from GOHBA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing affordability is the biggest obstacle in our industry. Therefore both secondary dwelling units and coach houses should be permitted on the same property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We remain convinced that coach houses should be permitted on lots with duplexes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please confirm the standardization of development charges for secondary dwelling units and coach houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment from Hydro Ottawa</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Owners shall be responsible for servicing the buildings within the property. Only one service entrance per property shall be permitted.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-standard service installations shall be brought up to current standard as per Hydro Ottawa Conditions of Service, Section G-0, note 13.</td>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment from Hydro Ottawa</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Owners shall ensure that no permanent structures are located within the &quot;restricted zone&quot; defined by Hydro Ottawa’s standard OLS0002. The &quot;restricted zone&quot; 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.</td>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owners are encouraged to contact Hydro Ottawa prior to building the secondary dwelling unit to discuss servicing requirements.</td>
<td>See above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comment from KHCA | Response
--- | ---
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. | 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.

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. | The proposed zoning requires a minimum 1.2 m wide walkway from the coach house to the public street or travelled rear lane.

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. | Staff believes these standards to be excessive and would prohibit coach houses on all but the very largest lots.

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. | 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment from KHCA</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A roof-top patio or deck must be prohibited on the Coach House.</td>
<td>Under the proposed zoning, rooftop patios and decks are prohibited on coach houses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend that a coach house must occupy no more than 35% of the backyard.</td>
<td>The proposed zoning limits coach house footprints to 40% of the back yard; Staff believes this is an appropriate limit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un-even or non-rectangular lots and corner lots need to observe the standard definitions of front, side and backyards.</td>
<td>Irregular lots are not exempt from the zoning definitions of front, side etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>In the Katimavik-Hazeldean area (i.e. outside the area affected by Infill Two), grade &quot;means the average elevation of the finished level of the ground adjoining all the walls of a building.&quot; 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.)</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment from Old Ottawa East</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 (&quot;existing average grade&quot; per Infill Phase 2.</td>
<td>The effect of Infill Two is to alter how &quot;grade&quot; is defined and calculated in this part of the city (and becomes referred to as &quot;existing average grade&quot;); 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment from Old Ottawa East</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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).</td>
<td>Section 65 (Permitted Projections into Required Yards) provides that &quot;Where no yard setback is specified, the provisions of Table 65 do not apply.&quot; 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)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment from Old Ottawa East</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>this provision comes into effect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rideau Valley Conservation Authority**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment from Rideau Valley Conservation Authority</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>This is correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment from Rideau Valley Conservation Authority</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>This is correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>The proposed zoning does not supersede any other regulations, including the Building Code and septic regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposal indicates that servicing arrangements shall be confirmed through the submission of a hydrogeological study. We presume that the hydrogeological study shall</td>
<td>This presumption is correct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment from Rideau Valley Conservation Authority</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be scoped and reviewed by City of Ottawa staff.</td>
<td>The proposed zoning has been amended to clarify that coach houses are prohibited in both the &quot;floodway&quot; and &quot;flood fringe&quot; components of the floodplain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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. | |

| Riverside South Community Association | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment from Riverside South</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment from Riverside South</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>Permitting coach houses does not imply a requirement to build one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Riverside South Community Association (RSCA) agrees with the comments and concerns outlined in the Federation of Citizens’ Associations of Ottawa (FCA.)</td>
<td>See responses to FCA comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment from Rockcliffe Park</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing coach houses in Rockcliffe Park would diminish its heritage character and be in</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contravention of its status as a Heritage Conservation District.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ontario Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) on intensification states that in the pursuit</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of intensification, &quot;Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landscapes shall be conserved.&quot; It defines &quot;cultural heritage landscapes&quot; to include heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conservation districts. All Rockcliffe Park's governing documents identify the essence of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>its cultural heritage landscape as its richly landscaped, heavily treed, park-like setting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and open spaces. The Rockcliffe Park Secondary Plan (RPSP) speaks of the intent to &quot;protect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the present environment, including the spatial relations between buildings, and to conserve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and restore the quality of the landscape.&quot; Furthermore, it states, &quot;Council shall encourage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the retention of grounds, gardens, trees and plantings which contribute to the integrity and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sense of setting of houses on their own.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment from Rockcliffe Park</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lots as well as on public streets.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment from Rothwell Heights</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The draft document indicates a maximum footprint for a coach house of 95 m² (assuming principal dwelling unit footprint and yard area permit); and reference to a “…maximum cumulative floor area of accessory use of 55 m² 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?</td>
<td>In short, the latter. After due consideration, Staff has determined that the reference to cumulative accessory use not exceeding 55 m² 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 existing detached garage, conversion of existing two-storey structures etc.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>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.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment from Rothwell Heights</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 pre-existing, 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?</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While understanding the interests in grandfathering existing structures, we are strongly against new, two-storey secondary residential structures in backyards for many reasons.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment from Rothwell Heights</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>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.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Disclaimer

The information contained in this brochure was determined based upon the costs, legislation and information available at the time this brochure was produced. The information and costs are subject to change and it is in the best interests of property owners wishing to pursue a Coach House to confirm all of the information contained in this document.
Contents

Disclaimer ........................................................................................................................................ 2

Introduction .................................................................................................................................... 4
  What is a Coach House? .................................................................................................................. 4
  Coach House principles: ............................................................................................................... 5
  Know the Rules: ............................................................................................................................ 6
  Can my lot accommodate a coach house? .................................................................................... 10

Step 1: Pre-planning Considerations ......................................................................................... 11
  Servicing Feasibility: .................................................................................................................. 11
  Conversion of Existing Structures: .............................................................................................. 13
  Trees: ....................................................................................................................................... 14

Step 2: Coach House Design and Development ....................................................................... 15
  Size: ......................................................................................................................................... 15
  Height: ..................................................................................................................................... 16
  Location on the lot: ..................................................................................................................... 17
  Windows: ................................................................................................................................... 18
  Trees: ....................................................................................................................................... 18
  Parking: .................................................................................................................................... 19
  Entrances and Access: ............................................................................................................... 19

Application Types: ...................................................................................................................... 28
  Building Permit ......................................................................................................................... 28
  Site Plan Control ....................................................................................................................... 28
  Committee of Adjustment ........................................................................................................ 29

Important Contacts and Resources: ......................................................................................... 30

Frequently Asked Questions: ..................................................................................................... 32

How To Plan Your Coach House in Ottawa
Introduction

What is a coach house?
A coach house is a small accessory apartment located in a small freestanding building detached from the principal dwelling and located on the same lot as the principal dwelling. This type of infill housing is a discreet way to achieve affordable housing and increased density in existing neighbourhoods where existing services and infrastructure are in place.

Is my lot eligible?
An individual analysis will need to be completed to determine if your lot can accommodate a coach house. In general, a lot can accommodate a coach house if:

• The lot is serviced by municipal water and waste-water, or if the lot is in the rural area, it is 0.8 hectares or larger and is serviced by a private well and septic system;

• The lot contains a detached, semi-detached, duplex or townhouse dwelling unit. In the case of a rowhouse, the lot must be a corner lot or have access to a travelled lane; and

• The primary dwelling unit does not already contain a secondary dwelling unit (e.g. a basement apartment), garden suite or any rooming units.

If you would like to evaluate your lot against these criteria, please call 3-1-1 and ask to speak to a Development Information Officer (DIO).
Coach house principles:

**Principle 1 - Form of Intensification**
Coach houses are meant to be a gentle form of intensification, allowing for affordable housing options, on residential properties that are developed with a detached, semi-detached, duplex or rowhouse dwelling (if that rowhouse dwelling is on a corner lot or has access to a travelled lane).

**Principle 2 - Secondary to Principal dwelling**
Coach houses are limited in size (maximum footprint and height) to ensure that they are clearly secondary to, and smaller than, the principal dwelling, and that there is enough space left in the back yard to serve as amenity area for both the principal dwelling and the coach house.

**Principle 3 - Remain as an Accessory Use**
Coach houses are required to remain as an accessory use to the principal dwelling located in a separate detached structure, be on the same lot as the principal dwelling and cannot be severed to create a separate lot for the coach house.

**Principle 4 - Integration with Urban Context**
Coach houses must be designed and located to minimize impacts on neighbouring properties with regards to privacy, shadowing and overlook. They must not negatively impact the streetscape character of the neighbourhood, and must integrate with the existing streetscape character in the case of corner lots or lots having a secondary frontage on a rear lane.

**Principle 5 - Servicing**
For lots serviced by a municipal or communal water and sanitary system, the coach houses will be serviced from the principal dwelling’s connections. For lots serviced by a private well and septic system, the coach house will obtain a direct connection to at least one of the principal dwelling’s services: well or septic.

**Principle 6 – Tree and Landscape Preservation**
Coach houses must be designed and located to ensure that mature trees are preserved, on the subject property and neighbouring properties, in accordance with the *Urban Tree Conservation By-law*. Efforts should be made in planning for and building a coach house to retain existing trees and vegetation.
# Know the Rules:

## Official Plan Requirements:

Section 3.1 of the Official Plan contains the policy direction for coach houses. A brief description of these policies is provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coach Houses</th>
<th>Are only permitted on lots with a detached, semi-detached, duplex or townhouse dwelling and where the primary dwelling does not contain a garden suite, rooming units or a secondary dwelling unit.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duplex Dwellings</td>
<td>Are only permitted to have a coach house if the duplex existed as of July 17, 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse Dwellings</td>
<td>Are only permitted to have a coach house if the townhouse has direct frontage on two public streets or on a public street and a travelled public lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servicing</td>
<td>A coach house must be:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Located on a lot in a public service area where both the water and wastewater services are provided to the main dwelling, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Located on a lot that is 0.8 hectares or greater in size and is located in the rural or village area where the primary dwelling is serviced by: private water and wastewater and will share either water or wastewater with the coach house; OR one public or communal service (water or wastewater) and one private service and will share the public or communal service with the coach house service. Coach houses proposed in the village or rural areas are subject to a Site Plan Control application to confirm water quantity and quality is sufficient to support the coach house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>A coach house must be smaller than the primary dwelling and in the urban area is not intended to exceed that of a typical two bedroom apartment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severance</td>
<td>A coach house must not be severed from the lot accommodating the primary dwelling.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Minor Variances** | Applications for minor variances with respect to coach houses shall have regard for all of the following considerations:
• The coach house is in no circumstance taller than the primary dwelling;
• 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 the 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. |

| **Urban 2 Storey Coach Houses** | An application to allow the height of up to a two storey coach house in the urban area through a minor variance may be considered where the conditions for minor variances have been considered and the coach house is proposed to contain all of its habitable space above a garage. |
## Know the Rules:

### Zoning By-law Requirements:

Section 142 of the Zoning By-law contains the detailed performance standards for coach houses. A brief description of these rules is provided below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Coach house: Means a separate dwelling unit that is subsidiary to and located on the same lot as an associated principal dwelling unit but is contained in its own building that may also contain uses accessory to the principal dwelling.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prohibit Coach Houses in the Floodplain</td>
<td>Coach houses, like all development, are prohibited in the floodplain throughout the City of Ottawa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Number</td>
<td>Only one coach house is allowed per principal dwelling unit on a property. A coach house cannot be located on a lot where the principal dwelling already has a secondary dwelling unit, garden suite or any rooming units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where Permitted</td>
<td>The coach house must be located in the rear yard of the principal dwelling. Despite the above: • In the case of a lot with frontage on both a street and a travelled public lane, the coach house must be located in the yard adjacent to the travelled public lane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Size</td>
<td>The coach house must not: a) be greater in size than 40% of the footprint of the principal dwelling unit on the lot b) exceed a lot coverage of 40% of the yard in which it is located c) exceed a footprint of 80 m² for lots in the urban area or 95 m² for lots in the rural area If the primary home is less than 125 m² in footprint, a coach house of up to 50 m² is permitted, and must not exceed 40% of the yard in which it is located.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footprint</td>
<td>Footprint means the area of the ground floor of a building, measured from the exterior of the outermost walls, including an attached garage but excluding any projections.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Maximum Height

In the urban area:

1) maximum height not to exceed the building height of the existing primary dwelling; and

2a) maximum height of 3.6 metres, with maximum height of the outer walls not to exceed 3.2m.

In the rural area including village areas:

1) maximum height not to exceed the building height of the existing primary dwelling; and

2a) where the living area of the coach house is entirely located on the second storey above a detached garage, maximum height of 6.1 metres; or

2b) in all other cases, maximum height of 4.5 metres.

### Setbacks

The setbacks are as follows:

- Rear and interior side lot line: 1 metre maximum OR 4 metre minimum
- Corner side yard: same as principal dwelling

### Parking Yards and Driveways

The principal dwelling and the coach house must share the same parking area and yards provided for the principal dwelling unit. No new driveway is permitted.

Where a garage or carport is provided as part of the coach house unit, an extension of an existing driveway is permitted.

### Parking Requirements

Parking for a coach house is not required.

A parking space for a coach house unit may be located on a driveway that passes through a front yard to a garage, carport or other parking space, and may be in tandem in the same driveway.

For a more detailed review of all applicable performance standards please see the City’s website ottawa.ca/zoning
Can my lot accommodate a coach house?

The allowable building footprint for a coach house can be calculated by applying the maximum size provisions and setback provisions, as detailed in Section 142 of the Zoning By-law. The building footprint will be used to assess the pre-planning considerations before proceeding to coach house design and development.
Step 1: Pre-planning Considerations

Significant costs can be incurred through the development of a coach house that may affect the viability of building a coach house. These costs should be fully investigated before proceeding to detailed plans.

Servicing Feasibility:

As a first step, a homeowner should investigate the costs associated for servicing the coach house. The coach house will require a potable water service, a sanitary sewer disposal method, appropriate drainage for storm water, electricity connections and possibly a natural gas connection. Below is an overview of the considerations that should be made for each component.

Municipally Serviced Lots with Water and Sewer:

For a lot serviced by municipal water and sewer, the existing house’s water and sewer connections must be extended to the coach house. In some cases this will involve modifying or replacing the service at the point where it connects with the City’s water and sewermain to a level that can accommodate the principal dwelling and the coach house. The City suggests consulting with a qualified Ontario Land Surveyor (OLS), a Certified Engineering Technologist (CET) or a Professional Engineer (P.Eng) to inquire about the costs associated with preparing a Grading Plan / Servicing Plan. The Grading Plan / Servicing Plan will determine if grading changes are required to the lot to meet drainage requirements, if the proposed coach house building footprint will require upgrades or changes to the City connections and to determine the route of service.

There are a number of Ontario Building Code requirements that must be adhered to when establishing service connections. Servicing a coach house with municipal water and sewer services can cost from $10,000 to upwards of $30,000 and will greatly depend on the lot’s circumstances, existing size of service, size of service required for the coach house and the complexity involved with establishing connections.

In some circumstances a sewage pump may be required to assist the sewage to travel from the coach house to the primary homes connection, additionally all service pipes will require a minimum of 5’-0” of frost protection cover, these and other factors will impact the cost of servicing. The Grading Plan / Servicing Plan will outline the existing size of service, the new size of service required, provide a layout of the existing home’s plumbing and a proposed layout for the plumbing connection to the coach house. Should the homeowner move forward with building a coach house, all building permit applicants must arrange for a service consultation meeting prior to applying for a building permit by calling 3-1-1 and asking to speak to the Building Code Services office for your property address.

Noteworthy: each coach house is highly recommended to have an individual water heater that is independent from the primary home. Each dwelling unit, the coach house and the primary home, will require sufficient heated water through the building permit inspection process and although an independent water heater is not required under the Ontario Building Code, this is highly recommended.
Privately Serviced Lots with Septic System and Well:

A coach house located on a lot serviced by a private well and septic system is required to connect with either the well or the septic system servicing the principal dwelling. Provided the well and the septic system meet minimum requirements, it is up to the landowner to decide which service will be shared. A Site Plan Control application will be required in all circumstances. This planning process is required to confirm the existing well water quality and quantity is sufficient to support the coach house, and that the added sewage flow will not unduly impact the environment or water quality.

Well: A hydrogeological report will be required as part of the Site Plan Control application. The City suggests consulting with a qualified Professional Geoscientist (P.Geo.) or a Professional Engineer (P.Eng.) to determine if the existing well can, on its own or with upgrades, support the proposed coach house. A homeowner should investigate the costs associated for servicing the coach house with well water, prior to creating detailed coach house construction plans.

Any existing well or new well will have to meet the requirements of the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) Procedure D-5-5. If a new well is constructed, the old well must be abandoned in accordance with Ontario Regulation (R.R.O. 1990) 903 (re: wells). In addition, the hydrogeological report will have to address the suitability of the site and the impact on the environment from either the new or the existing septic system, in accordance with the MOECC Procedure D-5-4. As part of the hydrogeological report, the geoscientist or engineer will have to review any past studies for the area (e.g. the Hydrogeological and Terrain Analysis report in the case of a subdivision), and the report will have to reflect the requirements of the previous studies, as a minimum.

Septic: Should a property owner choose to connect the septic system from the principal dwelling to the coach house, they will need to explore whether or not the existing septic system has sufficient capacity to accommodate the needs of the coach house, in accordance with requirements set out by the Ottawa Septic System Office (OSSO). An approval from the OSSO is also required for both a new septic system and/or a shared septic system. For a more detailed review of all applicable OSSO requirements please see their website at: rvca.ca/osso.

Electrical:

A homeowner should investigate the existing level of electrical service prior to creating the detailed coach house construction plans. Electrical connections are required to be provided from the principal dwelling to the coach house. In most circumstances, this will require additional capacity from the main home in order to service the coach House. The City suggests consulting with a qualified Electrician to determine if the existing home’s electrical service needs to be upgraded, and the costs associated with doing so.

The electrical service connections will need approval in accordance with requirements set out by the Electrical Safety Authority (ESA). For a more detailed review of all applicable ESA requirements please see their website at: esasafe.com
Grading and Drainage:
A homeowner should investigate the existing grading and drainage of their property prior to creating detailed coach house construction plans. On-site grading and drainage must be maintained or improved with the addition of a coach house. The City suggests consulting with a qualified Ontario Land Surveyor (OLS), Professional Engineer (P.Eng) or a Certified Engineering Technologist (CET) to determine if the proposed coach house footprint will maintain or improve the existing site grading, or require costly mitigation solutions to address drainage concerns.

A formal Grading and Drainage Plan is required as part of a complete building permit application for coach houses that are 55 m² or larger in size and/or for coach houses which are within 1.2 metres from a property line. The Grading and Drainage Plan is to ensure that any changes made to the property do not negatively impact the grading and drainage on the property and the neighbouring properties.

Conversion of Existing Structures:
Existing accessory structures (such as garages, sheds or stables) will be permitted to convert in part or in whole to a coach house, up to a maximum footprint of 80 m² in the urban area or 95 m² in the rural area. The Zoning By-law includes exemptions from certain provisions for accessory structures which were built prior to September 14, 2015. If you would like to evaluate your lot against these criteria, please see Section 142 of the Zoning By-law or call 3-1-1 and ask to speak to a Development Information Officer (DIO).

In all cases a building permit will be required to convert an existing structure. Changing the use of an existing building to something different than it was designed for can be costly. It is important to have the existing structure assessed by a qualified person prior to submitting for a building permit to understand the extent of renovations required to meet the Ontario Building Code requirements for a dwelling unit.
Trees:
Trees add considerable social and environmental value to every neighbourhood. It is important to take trees on the subject property and adjacent properties into consideration when planning a coach house. Coach houses and its services should be designed and positioned so that they will not affect trees or the underground critical root system. The City recommends that you consult with a qualified forester, professional landscape architect, or International Society of Agriculture certified arborist to minimize any potential impacts.

If trees need to be removed, a permit may be required. The Urban Tree Conservation By-law, requires that properties in the urban area which are less than one hectare must obtain a Distinctive Tree Permit for any tree greater than 50 centimeters in diameter which is requested to be removed. If your property is located in the urban area and happens to be larger than one hectare, you will need to obtain a permit for any tree that is greater than ten centimeters in diameter. If needed, the forester, landscape architect, or certified arborist that you retain will be able to assist in obtaining a Distinctive Tree Permit. Information on trees, protecting trees, and tree permits can be found on ottawa.ca or by calling 3-1-1.

For a more detailed review of the Urban Tree Conservation By-law please see the City’s website ottawa.ca/urbantree
Step 2: Coach House Design and Development

Once all of the above considerations have been fully investigated, the coach house design and development information below will help to assist in the planning of a coach house.

Size:
The Zoning By-law sets a maximum footprint for a coach house. The footprint of a coach house is determined by multiplying the principal dwelling’s footprint by 40%. The footprint is defined as:

**Footprint** means the area of the ground floor of a building, measured from the exterior of the outermost walls, including an attached garage but excluding any projections.

The coach house is not permitted to cover more than 40% of the yard in which it is located. The lot’s yard area must therefore be multiplied by 40%. Whichever number is smaller, 40% of the yard area or 40% of the principal dwelling’s footprint, results in the maximum permitted size of a coach house, up to a maximum of 80 m² in the urban areas and 95 m² in the rural area, regardless of principle dwelling or yard size.
Height:

The Zoning By-law sets different height permission for coach houses, depending on location and lot size.

For lots in the urban area – the maximum permitted height for a coach house is 3.6 metres, but no wall can be taller than 3.2 metres. Section 3.1 of the Official Plan includes policy direction to guide under what circumstances a taller coach house (up to a maximum of 2 storeys) could be permitted via a minor variance application to the Committee of Adjustment.

For lots in the village and rural area – the maximum permitted as-of-right height for a coach house is 4.5 metres, or 6.1 metres where a coach house is above a garage.
Location on the lot:

The Zoning By-law includes locational and setback requirements for coach houses, in the urban or village areas, and in the rural area. These requirements will influence the location of the coach house. Other factors must also be considered to determine the best siting for the coach house. Trees, neighbours’ privacy, separation distances to other structures, on-site grading, servicing routes, and pedestrian and vehicular access will all need to be taken into consideration when determining the best placement for the coach house.

A coach house is required:

- To be located in the rear yard, or yard adjacent to a travelled public lane.
- To be set back a maximum of 1 metre from the rear and interior side yard property line OR a minimum of 4 metres from the rear and interior side yard property line.
**Windows:**

Window placement affects the privacy of neighbours. Strategic window placement will allow for light penetration into the coach house while respecting the privacy of adjacent properties.

Where windows are desired, the Zoning By-law performance standard requires a coach house to be 4 metres from a rear and interior side lot line.

---

**Trees:**

A coach house should be designed, placed and serviced to retain existing trees on your property. The trees located on neighbouring properties must also be taken into consideration, as their critical root system can be affected by development on your lot.
**Parking:**

The Zoning By-law does not require additional parking for a coach house. Parking is permitted, provided any new space is in compliance with the parking provisions of the Zoning By-law. Where it is chosen to provide parking, the Zoning By-law limits its location to an existing driveway or an extension of an existing driveway, for example to a coach house which contains a garage or carport.

**Entrances and Access:**

The Zoning By-law requires a 1.2-metre-wide access from the coach house to a public street. This is to provide direct pedestrian access for the coach house, and access for emergency response services. The Zoning By-law restricts the location of a doorway entrance to a coach house to be set back further than 4 m from the lot line unless the lot line in question borders a travelled lane. Also note, it is prohibited to park a car on a walkway. Walkways to a coach house are NOT to be used to park two cars side by side.
Allowable Footprint

The allowable footprint of the Coach House is the lesser of 40% of the Rear Yard Area or 40% of the Principal Dwelling Footprint. In this example 40% of the Rear Yard Area is 38 m² and 40% of the Principal Dwelling Footprint is 44 m². Therefore, the maximum allowable Coach House Footprint = 38 m².

In this example we are illustrating a Coach House with a footprint of 23 m². This “Tiny House” accommodates the minimum OBC requirements for a dwelling unit (approximately 18 m²).

Coach House Type

This example illustrates a one storey Coach House with a small loft (mezzanine). The mezzanine (2.1 m ceiling height) can be achieved by lowering the main floor 0.45 m below grade.
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Illustration Examples: Inner Urban Laneway

Allowable Footprint

The allowable footprint of the Coach House is the lesser of 40% of the Rear Yard Area or 40% of the Principal Dwelling Footprint. In this example 40% of the Rear Yard Area is 60 m² and 40% of the Principal Dwelling Footprint is 40 m². Therefore, the maximum allowable Coach House Footprint = 40 m².

Coach House Type

This example illustrates a two storey Coach House (apartment over garage). Section 3.1 of the Official Plan outlines certain circumstances where a two storey coach house is permitted in the urban through a committee of adjustment application to vary the maximum permitted height.
Illustration Examples: Suburban

SITE PLAN

SCALE 1:300

REQUIRED SETBACKS

15m 5m
**Allowable Footprint**

The allowable footprint of the Coach House is the lesser of 40% of the Rear Yard Area or 40% of the Principal Dwelling Footprint, to a maximum of 80 square metres. In this example 40% of the Rear Yard Area and the Principal Dwelling Footprint is greater than 80 m². Therefore, the **maximum allowable Coach House Footprint = 80 m²**.

**Coach House Type**

This **one storey** example Coach House illustrated here.

**VIEW FROM REAR**

**VIEW FROM STREET**
Illustration Examples: Rural

Allowable Footprint

The allowable footprint of the Coach House is the lesser of 40% of the Rear Yard Area or 40% of the Principal Dwelling Footprint to a maximum of 95 m². In this example 40% of both the Rear Yard Area and the Principal Dwelling Footprint are greater than 95 m². Therefore, the maximum allowable Coach House Footprint = 95 m².
Coach House Type

The Coach House in this example has a garage on the ground floor which allows for a second storey. In this example the Coach House shares the existing well with the Principal Dwelling but requires a new septic system to be installed.
Application Types:

A number of City processes must be completed before starting construction of a coach house. In all circumstances, a building permit is required. There may also be situations that require a Site Plan Control application and/or a Committee of Adjustment Minor Variance application. These processes are described in more detail below:

Building Permit

All coach houses require a building permit.

All coach houses must meet Ontario Building Code requirements for residential structures. The submission requirements for a building permit application will vary depending on a variety of factors: what type of servicing the lot has; whether the development is a retrofit of an existing building or a new purpose-built unit, the size of the structure; whether a structure needs to be demolished to commence construction; etc. Building permit applicants should confirm the information and fees required by calling 3-1-1, going to ottawa.ca or visiting a local Building Code Client Service Centre to obtain all the required information.

Site Plan Control

All coach houses that have a private septic and well require Site Plan Control Approval application.

There are many different types of Site Plan Control applications, however the type that applies to coach houses is “rural-based, no public consultation”. All coach house Site Plan Control applications will require the submission of a Hydrogeological Report. The City will analyze this report and confirm that the well water is of sufficient quality and quantity to support the additional dwelling unit. Site Plan Control applicants must arrange for a Pre-Application Consultation Meeting with City Planning Staff by calling 3-1-1 and asking to speak to the Development Review Rural Services Unit, or by going to ottawa.ca and searching “information for development applications”.

After the pre-application consultation meeting, the applicant should confirm all submission requirements with the intake planner, or by calling 3-1-1, going to ottawa.ca or visiting a local Client Service Centre.
Committee of Adjustment

In cases where circumstances peculiar to a property prevent you from developing your coach house in a way that strictly conforms to the Zoning By-law, you may apply to the Committee of Adjustment for a minor variance.

The Committee of Adjustment will consider a minor variance application and may grant a minor variance if all of the following criteria, outlined in the Planning Act and commonly referred to as the “four tests,” are met:

- The application is truly minor;
- The variance is desirable for the appropriate development or use of the property;
- The general intent and purpose of the Zoning By-law is maintained;
- The general intent and purpose of the Official Plan is maintained.

Minor Variance applications are circulated to neighbours. They are allowed to appear at the Committee of Adjustment hearing to voice their issues or concerns. They also have the right to appeal the decision to the Ontario Municipal Board. This is a time-consuming and expensive process that may affect the viability of a project. Therefore, it is best to comply with zoning. If a minor variance application is required, it is best to talk to the neighbours to explain the plans and hear their reaction, and address any issues they may raise before spending the money needed for the application fee to the Committee of Adjustment.

Anyone wishing to apply for a minor variance should arrange for a Pre-Application Consultation Meeting with City Planning Staff by calling 3-1-1 and asking to speak to a planner in the Planning, Infrastructure and Economic Development Department, Planning Services Branch.

After the pre-application consultation meeting, you should confirm all submission requirements with the planner or by calling 3-1-1, going to ottawa.ca, or visiting a local Client Service Centre and speaking to a Development Information Officer.
Important Contacts and Resources:

• City of Ottawa Help Line: 3-1-1
• Hydro Ottawa: www.hydroottawa.com
• Enbridge Gas: www.enbridgegas.com
• Electrical Safety Authority: www.esasafe.com
• Ottawa Septic System Office: www.rvca.ca/osso/
• Ontario Land Titles Office:
  o Court House: 4th Floor 161 Elgin St., Ottawa ON K2P2K1 Tel: 613-239-1230
• Municipal Property Assessment Corporation: www.mpac.ca
• Committee of Adjustment: www.ottawa.ca/en/committee-adjustment-0
• Client Service Centres:
  o City Hall: 110 Laurier Ave West, Ottawa ON K1P1J1 Mon to Fri 8:30 am - 5 pm
  o Orleans: 255 Centrum Blvd., Ottawa, ON K1E3V8. Mon to Fri 8:30 am - 5 pm
  o West: 101 Centrepoint Dr., Nepean, ON K2G5K7. Mon to Fri 8:30 am - 5 pm
  o Kanata: 580 Terry Fox Dr., Kanata, ON K2L4C2. Mon to Fri 8:30 am - 4:30 pm
  o Metcalfe: 8243 Victoria St., Metcalfe, ON K0A 2P0. Tues 8:30 am - 4:30 pm
  o West Carleton: 5670 Carp Rd., Kinburn, ON K0A2H0. Wed 8:30 am - 4:30 pm
  o First Wed of the Month 7:30 am - 3:30 pm
  o North Gower: 2155 Roger Stevens Dr. North Gower, ON K0A2T0. Thurs 8:30 am - 4:30 pm
Important Contacts and Resources:

- Professional organizations:
  - Association of Ontario Land Surveyors: [www.aols.org](http://www.aols.org)
  - Ontario Association of Architects: [www.oaa.on.ca](http://www.oaa.on.ca)
  - Ontario Association of Landscape Architects: [www.oala.ca](http://www.oala.ca)
  - International Society of Agriculture: [www.isaontario.com](http://www.isaontario.com)
  - Professional Engineers of Ontario: [www.peo.on.ca](http://www.peo.on.ca)
  - Association of Professional Geoscientists of Ontario: [www.apgo.net](http://www.apgo.net)
  - Electrical Contractors Association of Ontario: [www.ecao.org](http://www.ecao.org)
Frequently Asked Questions:

**Does a coach house get a separate address?**
Yes. Please call 3-1-1 and ask to speak to Addressing and Signs. You must have a building permit application in with the City. No costs are associated with obtaining a new address number.

**Can a coach house be sold separately?**
No. A coach house cannot be sold separately. The direction from the province is that the coach house must remain part of the principal dwelling’s property and therefore cannot be severed and sold separately.

**Can I have a Secondary Dwelling Unit and a coach house?**
No. The Official Plan policy says that you can only have one or the other: a secondary dwelling unit inside the home or a detached coach house.

**Can a property owner convert their garage to a coach house?**
Yes. Please see the grandfathering clause in Section 142 of the Zoning By-law. An existing accessory structure is exempt from certain provisions. However, the existing structure will be required to meet Ontario Building Code requirements at time of building permit application.

**Do I need insurance on a coach house?**
Yes. You will need to contact your individual insurance provider for quotes on available coverage.

**Will a coach house affect my property taxes?**
Yes. Your property taxes will increase. Please contact the Municipal Property Assessment Corporation for more information: www.mpac.ca

**What do I do if my lot is not eligible?**
If your lot is not eligible, you cannot build a coach house. In cases where your lot cannot meet Zoning standards by only a very small amount, you may be able to apply to the Committee of Adjustment for a minor variance. Please note, however, that certain standards cannot be “varied.” For example, if your lot is in the urban area and is serviced by a private well or septic system, you cannot build a coach house. If you want to build a coach house that is larger than your existing home, or if you want to create a new driveway, that type of application won’t be accepted as they run counter to policy. To obtain information on the costs of minor variance applications and required submission material, please see the City’s website www.ottawa.ca OR call 3-1-1 and ask to speak to a Development Information Officer.
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Summary

The City of Ottawa is submitting an application for the New and Emerging Planning Initiatives award under the CIP Awards for Planning Excellence program.

The City of Ottawa undertook a study commencing in September 2015 and approved in October 2016 to implement statutory provisions from Section 16 (3)(b) of the Planning Act, to allow for ancillary (detached) secondary dwelling units. These Planning Act provisions took effect in January 2012 with direction from the Strong Communities Through Affordable Housing Act, 2011. This project qualifies for submission under this category as it resulted in the successful adoption of a variety of amendments to municipal statutory planning documents to allow for a new innovative form of housing within the City of Ottawa.

The Coach house project commenced in September 2015 with the release of a Discussion Paper (Appendix 1) and a public questionnaire (Appendix 2). The Discussion Paper introduced the current Official Plan policy and Zoning By-law permissions which allowed in-home secondary dwelling units. The paper then built on this permission to explore the idea of permitting detached secondary dwelling units. The term “Coach houses” was selected by the City of Ottawa to represent a detached secondary dwelling unit and is meant to depict small habitable dwelling units that are located in the rear yards of residential lots.

In November 2015 the City released the results of the 430+ completed Coach house questionnaires (Appendix 3) with the majority of respondents in favor of this new type of detached residential infill unit. The questionnaire results provided the City with locational criteria on where and how coach houses should be permitted. The questionnaire further provided the City with demographics on who were interested in building coach houses and why. Coach houses were a favorable type of development for a variety of family needs: for residents with aging parents looking to combat the high expense of seniors housing; for residents with adult children who cannot afford to purchase break into the housing market; for extended family immigrating to Ottawa and for people with disabilities.

The project then moved into its next phase. The City of Ottawa released a second Discussion Paper (Appendix 4) in January 2016 which included proposed Guiding Principles and Draft Recommendations for public comment. This paper required the quick coordination of many internal departments, including emergency services, the municipal property tax corporation, addressing and building code services. Comments were accepted on the paper directly with the project lead, leaving the door wide open for discussion on every topic.

Public comments on these recommendations were left open for two months and during this time the City of Ottawa completed City wide community presentations at scheduled community association meetings. Once consultation was completed the City released, in April 2016, an “As We Heard It” (Appendix 5) on the feedback received. The City of Ottawa received 130 submissions with over 354 comments over a variety of topics related to the coach house Draft Recommendations. The top comments resulted in direct change to the City’s proposed regulations.
This public feedback was utilized to craft the formal position for how to allow coach houses in the City of Ottawa. On June 24, 2016 the City of Ottawa formally circulated the set of final recommendations and required amendments. The following amendments were required for the Coach house project to move forward as envisioned:

- **Official Plan Amendment**: required to put in place the policy framework to guide coach houses as a new permitted land use (Appendix 6)
- **Zoning By-law Amendment**: required to establish the performance standards for coach house development (Appendix 7)
- **Development Charges By-law Amendment**: required to exempt coach houses from development charges City wide, except the transit portion of the development charge rate (Appendix 8)
- **Site Plan Control By-law Amendment**: required to exempt all coach houses from a Site Plan Control (SPC) process, except those coach houses on private services. Where private services exist, the SPC process is applied to ensure the private well water has sufficient quantity and quality for both units (Appendix 9)

On October 6, 2016 the Coach house project was presented to the Agricultural and Rural Affairs Committee (Appendix 10) who commented on its application and effect on the rural area. The item was passed. On October 11, 2016 the Coach house project was presented to the Planning Committee (Appendix 11) who commented on its application and effect within the urban and suburban areas of Ottawa. The item was passed. Then lastly, on October 26, 2016 the Coach house project rose to Council where the project was approved, as proposed by the Planning Infrastructure and Economic Department, in its entirety (Appendix 12). The item was passed by all 23 Councilors and the Major to bring the project in full force and effect (Appendix 13).

The Coach house project was in part successful due to the expansive public consultation effort undertook by the City of Ottawa (Appendix 14) which lasted just over one year. During this time the public was consulted, kept informed and engaged to help craft the provisions that worked best for Ottawa communities. The Coach house project remains in its implementation phase. The City of Ottawa created a user friendly Guide, titled: *How to Plan Your Coach house in Ottawa* (Appendix 15) which remains a steady resource for the public in understanding how the coach house regulations work. The City of Ottawa remains involved in the promotion of the project, with a presence at a variety of Ottawa trade shows. We, the City of Ottawa, anticipate Coach houses to become a viable housing alternative for those residents needing affordable housing. This project has been completed with great pride in our City to craft an innovative approach to allow for infill type housing which caters to a vulnerable sector of the population.

This project merits an award due to its thorough public consultation efforts; forward thinking and pioneering an approach to implementing the statutory direction; multifaceted and encompassing regime to include urban, suburban and rural scenarios under the permission umbrella and an innovative approach to create affordable infill housing options for property owners. The City of Ottawa is the first major urban municipality in Ontario to implement the directions from the *Strong Communities Through Affordable Housing Act, 2011* and has paved the way for other municipalities to follow suit in creating alternative affordable housing options.